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biosecurity threats to our way of life. If some species of aggressive ants established themselves here, for example, it could become next to impossible to have barbecues outside.

Protect New Zealand has been designed to build public awareness of the importance of protecting this country against economic and social consequences from a range of biosecurity threats.

One serious new pest could threaten our economy, our health, our jobs and our lifestyle. We have witnessed the effect of foot and mouth in Europe. It has been catastrophic for Britain. This must not happen in New Zealand.

New Zealand has one of the most comprehensive biosecurity systems in the world, but we must not be complacent.

We all have to take responsibility for our own actions. Following biosecurity rules should be like following traffic rules – we don’t do the right thing for fear of being caught, we do the right thing because traffic flows better for all of us if we do.

Following basic biosecurity rules needs to become as ingrained in our subconscious as buckling up a seatbelt is when we get into a car.

The Protect New Zealand launch coincided with the release of a national issues paper: Developing a Biosecurity Strategy for New Zealand.

Produced by the Biosecurity Strategy Development Team, it forms the basis of nation-wide consultations that will feed into a final biosecurity strategy for release in December next year.

The paper provides a comprehensive outline of issues relating to increasing biosecurity risks and is the first stage of a programme to develop an overarching biosecurity strategy for the nation.

Biosecurity is currently ill-defined, and I hope that the development of the new strategy will help clarify that.

The biosecurity strategy will set an overall strategic direction for biosecurity in New Zealand, applying to terrestrial, marine, and freshwater environments.

It will be developed with a clear focus on the future, and will take account of environmental, primary production, public health, science, trade, and travel sector interests, as well as Treaty of Waitangi obligations. It will identify the values that we as a society want to protect, and address both the complexity of decision-making for biosecurity, and how to deal with the inevitable trade-offs between risk and benefit.

Public meetings are being held throughout New Zealand during the last three months of this year, and submissions are being collected until December 31.

This is your chance to have a say on an important issue – don’t miss out!

www.biostrategy.govt.nz

Biosecurity People

New MAF DG starts this month

The Ministry’s newly appointed Director General, Murray Sherwin, takes up the reins on 19 November.

Mr Sherwin, currently Deputy Governor and Deputy Chief Executive of the Reserve Bank, says the role represents a whole new range of issues and challenges for him and it’s a task he’s looking forward to with considerable pride and eagerness.

MAF’s present Acting-DG, Larry Fergusson says Mr Sherwin brings a wealth of management and professional experience to the job. “The appointment of someone of his calibre is further recognition of the fundamental importance of our sectors, and our role, to the well being of all New Zealanders.”

Along with his governance and CE roles, Mr Sherwin is currently chairperson of the Reserve Bank’s monetary policy committee, and he has responsibility for the bank’s economics, financial markets, currency, and building services departments.

He is an economist, with more than 25 years’ experience in the public sector. He has worked at the OECD in Paris, and
The Government’s first comprehensive, nation-wide biosecurity awareness programme was launched across the country on September 27.

Hon Jim Sutton hosted an event in Wellington, while Hon Marian Hobbs and Hon Jim Anderton officiated in Auckland and Christchurch respectively.

The Protect New Zealand campaign is designed to raise awareness of the threat posed by unwanted pests and diseases to our farming, marine, agriculture, horticulture, forestry, and conservation sectors.

The greatest challenge for the programme is painting the full picture of New Zealand’s biosecurity programme.

Awareness surveys have shown that the public generally don’t understand ‘biosecurity’ and make vague references to high profile cases, such as painted apple moth and foot and mouth disease. There is very limited understanding of why biosecurity is important, who is involved in managing biosecurity risks and what responsibility individuals need to take for keeping pests and diseases out. There is also a tendency for the public to associate ‘biosecurity’ with border activities and MAF’s Quarantine Service, with limited awareness of pre and post border biosecurity activities.

Using the new Protect New Zealand logo the awareness programme will help the public to identify the various agencies and sectors involved in biosecurity, the multi-layered nature of biosecurity defences and the wide range of biosecurity risks.

The logo will be used by some of the government, non-government and private sector organisations involved in biosecurity, alongside their own logos, to advertise their direct support for the nation-wide effort to prevent, manage and eradicate pests and diseases.

‘Spokesperson’ for the programme – an animated beagle called Max – will help deliver the biosecurity message through a TV campaign, publications and brochures as well as the Protect New Zealand website. Max was well received by launch attendees who were treated to a sneak preview of the TV advertisements that went to air on 7 October.

The Protect New Zealand website, www.protectnz.org.nz, provides easy access to comprehensive biosecurity information. It is a gateway to biosecurity information that currently exists on government, non-government and private sector websites.

‘Spokesperson’ for the programme – an animated beagle called Max – will help deliver the biosecurity message through a TV campaign, publications and brochures as well as the Protect New Zealand website. Max was well received by launch attendees who were treated to a sneak preview of the TV advertisements that went to air on 7 October.

Over the next 12 months, specific awareness campaigns will be targeted at groups who have been identified as likely to introduce or come in contact with biosecurity risks. Next year we are planning to host a Protect New Zealand week that will provide a national focus on biosecurity, including an international biosecurity conference.

Melissa Wilson, MAF Biosecurity Awareness Programme, phone 09 356 9793, wilsonm@maf.govt.nz
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he was a member of the Prime Minister’s advisory group in the early 1980s.

Murray Sherwin began his Reserve Bank career in the field of agricultural economics, including export forecasting where he was “up to his ears” in agriculture sector issues and policy.

At the age of 35, he was elected to the board of the World Bank, one of the biggest public sector organisations in the world. He represented the interests of Australia, Korea, New Zealand, and Papua New Guinea, and a number of Pacific Island countries.

Born and raised on a Waikato dairy farm near Pirongia, he did his secondary schooling at Te Awamutu College before heading off for a year in the USA under an exchange programme. His university studies were completed at Waikato University where he majored in economics with “some dabbling” in politics, geography and philosophy.

Mr Sherwin has maintained an interest in things rural – he is a regular speaker on agricultural economics and export forecasting at rural conferences and is a commentator in the rural media.

He also retains a small hands-on contact with the land. With his brother-in-law, he has a half share in a 275 ha forestry block in the Wairarapa. While there was plenty of time to tend his trees in the early days, that has been crowded out more recently, and he’s not expecting to see much of the forest in the next five years.
Biosecurity Strategy: consultation on Issues Paper under way

A significant milestone in the development of New Zealand’s biosecurity strategy was reached on 27 September when the Minister for Biosecurity launched the Issues Paper. The paper has been widely distributed to biosecurity stakeholders for public consultation and submissions.

The biosecurity strategy needs to provide direction and guidance to all involved in New Zealand’s biosecurity. To do this it must include a vision of the desired future, realistic goals and objectives, and measurable targets.

The launch of the Issues Paper is being followed up by 40 workshops and public meetings, and six regional hui, held in 20 locations beginning in Hamilton (10 October) and concluding in Timaru (21 November). The venues are posted on the biosecurity strategy development website along with the Issues Paper and advertised in local newspapers.

In November and December there is a second series of meetings with central government biosecurity agencies, local authorities, sector organisations and interest groups. Again, these are designed to allow the maximum input from those attending, and the maximum contribution of information and ideas to the draft biosecurity strategy.

Submissions on the Issues Paper

Everyone planning to make a submission on the Issues Paper is asked to look to the future, think strategically and include in their submissions:

- suggestions for biosecurity goals, objectives and targets
- options for (or approaches to) dealing with issues
- implications of using the various options or approaches.

Submissions from biosecurity stakeholders will help with considering the set of biosecurity issues in the Issues Paper and developing a meaningful and practicable Biosecurity Strategy for New Zealand.

A Guide to Making Submissions is included in the Issues Paper and is also available on the website.

Submissions close on 31 December 2001.

Malcolm Crawley, Biosecurity Strategy Development Team, phone 04 460 8710, fax 04 460 8779, bsdteam@biostrategy.govt.nz www.biostrategy.govt.nz

Strategy Advisory Group

A Strategy Advisory Group has been appointed to advise the Biosecurity Council and the biosecurity strategy development team. The Biosecurity Council received nominations from biosecurity stakeholders and appointed ten people, including an independent chair. The first meeting of the Strategy Advisory Group will be held in Wellington by early November 2001.

The members and their main areas of interest and expertise are:

- Anton Meister (Chair)
  Agricultural economics
- Richard Bowman
  Local government and service delivery
- Nici Gibbs
  Marine and environment
- David Hansen
  Travel and tourism
- Mike Harding
  Conservation
- Virginia Hope
  Public health and epidemiology
- Tom Lambie
  Agriculture and organics
- Maui Solomon
  Traditional knowledge and intellectual property
- Neil Taylor
  Primary industry, trade and economics
- Liz Wedderburn
  Science and agriculture
MAF is working toward confirming the complete eradication of Echinococcus granulosus (hydatids) from New Zealand, and its recognition from the world animal health organisation (OIE), so that ‘country of freedom’ status can be declared.

A new controlled area notice under the Biosecurity Act 1993 came into effect for the whole of New Zealand on 2 August 2001. The notice revoked and replaced two existing controlled area notices applying to Arapawa Island in the Marlborough Sounds and the rest of New Zealand. The new notice sets out specific conditions for:

• the slaughter of ruminants and pigs
• the preparation of offal from ruminants and pigs for feeding to dogs
• dog owner responsibilities.

In 1959, when the national control programme was initiated, up to 80 percent of sheep were found to have hydatid cysts at slaughter. By 1990, the occurrence of hydatids had reduced dramatically. The last report of hydatids in New Zealand was in 1995, when it was found on a single property on Arapawa Island.

The parasite infects farm livestock, dogs and, occasionally, humans.

Neil Shaw, Legal Coordinator, Biosecurity Coordination, phone 04 470 2771, fax 04 470 2730, shawn@maf.govt.nz

Saltmarsh mosquito: containment in Kaipara, eradication on East Coast

The southern saltmarsh mosquito is to be eradicated from the North Island East Coast and will be contained/controlled in the Kaipara Harbour.

Kaipara Harbour control

The Government decided in June to contain/control the southern salt marsh mosquito in the Kaipara until its dispersal in that region was known more precisely.

Sites in the Kaipara infested with the mosquito will be treated using a larvicidal product called ‘Bti’. The larvicide will be delivered by ground application near residential areas and from the air in some inner harbour locations.

The control programme will commence when detailed habitat surveys are completed in late October 2001 and stakeholder consents have been obtained. NZ Biosecure, a company with experience in dealing with this mosquito, has been contracted to manage the programme.

The programme faces significant challenges, despite the use of precision mapping techniques that clearly delimit the viable habitat. The Kaipara is a large area and some parts are isolated and difficult to access. To succeed, the cooperation of regulatory authorities and local residents is critical. As well as consultation and information activities, the programme has a number of reassessment rules that will be invoked if new information emerges to challenge the programme’s credibility.

East Coast eradication

The Government decided in June to continue to eradicate the southern saltmarsh mosquito from the Gisborne, Mahia and Porangahau sites discovered in 2000. This would allow the gains that had been made in the eradication programme on the East Coast to be secured.

The results of the original Napier eradication programme are promising. No adult mosquitoes or larvae have been captured, despite intensive post-treatment sampling over the past year.

The southern saltmarsh mosquito (Ochlerotatus camptorhynchus, previously known as Aedes camptorhynchus) was first discovered in New Zealand in December 1998 at Napier. It is a potential vector of arboviral diseases such as Ross River Virus disease (Biosecurity 27:5).

Sally Gilbert, Ministry of Health, phone 04 496 2256, fax 04 496 2340, sally_gilbert@moh.govt.nz

The success of the control/containment programme in the Kaipara Harbour area depends on a good partnership between residents and authorities.
Killer fungus threatens New Zealand native frogs

A fungus held responsible for the extinction of several frog species in Australia is infecting Archey’s frogs in the Coromandel. Previously it has been confirmed at other sites in both islands.

The chytrid fungus *Batrachochytrium dendrobatidis* was confirmed in Archey’s frogs (*Leiopelma archeyi*) in September 2001. The fungus was first identified in New Zealand in introduced frogs in Canterbury in late 1999. At the time, the potential impact on native frogs was unknown, although it was assumed from international studies that native frogs would be susceptible and research was commissioned.

**Unique New Zealand frog species under threat**

New Zealand’s four native frog species are unique. They are considered to be the most primitive of known living frogs. Previously widespread around New Zealand, these frogs are now restricted to sites in the northern half of the North Island, on Great Barrier Island, and on three predator-free islands in the Cook Strait. The chytrid fungus is potentially serious for all four species, and could result in local or total extinction.

International research has implicated this species of chytrid fungus in the decline of amphibians worldwide. Wild frogs infected by the fungus have been found in Spain, Uruguay, Ecuador and the western USA in the last year. The fungus probably caused the extinction of at least one frog species in Costa Rica, and at least six species of Australian frogs. In New Zealand the fungus has now been confirmed in Christchurch, Franz Josef, Tauranga, and most recently in the Coromandel.

**Spread in a number of ways**

The chytrid fungus may be spread naturally or by people translocating infected tadpoles and frogs. Waterfowl are also implicated. Other means of spread are the pet trade and on the boots, clothes or field gear of visitors to ponds.

Quarantine and hygiene procedures are in place for the island sites, and will be enhanced for mainland sites to reduce the risk of further human-assisted spread of the fungus.

Department of Conservation (DoC), MAF and other experts met on 27 September 2001 to discuss the impact of the fungus. They agreed that the future management of native frog species depends on further research into diagnostic techniques for surveys, susceptibility of the other native frog species and transmissibility of the fungus.

**Report sick frogs or tadpoles to DoC**

DoC would like reports of dead or sick frogs. Sick frogs will be slow to respond to disturbance, show behavioural or postural abnormalities, may have sloughed skin or other skin abnormalities, and may fail to show normal eye reflexes. Sick tadpoles of introduced species may be bloated; show bleeding patches on their skin; have rotting tails; and may experience difficulty swimming.

Send frog reports to John Gumbley, Department of Conservation, Waikato Conservancy, 07 858 1051.

Rachel Garthwaite, Biosecurity Technical Officer, Department of Conservation, phone 04 471 3213, fax 04 471 3279, rgarthwaite@doc.govt.nz

---

Medfly, inspector training priorities for Asia/Pacific group

The 22nd session of the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC) was hosted by the government of Viet Nam in Ho Chi Minh City, 17-21 September 2001.

Activity since the last meeting in Jog Jakarta, Indonesia, centred on phytosanitary standards and the application of integrated pest management in rice, cotton and vegetable crops in Asian countries.

International phytosanitary standards were discussed at two regional consultations in Bangkok funded by the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade and the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat. Technical experts from 16 countries attended one or both meetings to prepare comments for the IPPC Secretariat.

The Commission’s September meeting examined, amended and adopted procedures for regional standard setting prepared at the experts’ meeting in July 2001. The Commission then selected the countries that are to supply experts for the APPPC standards committee. The standards given development priority were the safe import of plant products from countries where Mediterranean fruit fly occurs, and the training of phytosanitary inspectors.

John Hedley, National Adviser International Agreements, Biosecurity Coordination, phone 04 474 4170, fax 04 474 4257, John.Hedley@fao.org
The standard for the accreditation of suppliers providing treatment of imported risk goods and forestry/plant related material for export has been signed off for implementation.

The implementation date for the various types of treatment will vary but the expected schedule is:

**Imported risk good treatments: March 2002**

Existing suppliers and new suppliers will be assessed under the new standard. Suppliers of treatment types carried out on both import and export products fall into this category, i.e. methyl bromide fumigators

**Export plant and plant products**

For new suppliers of treatments unique to plant exports the standard will be effective immediately.

For existing accredited operators exercising a treatment option unique to plant exports, their treatment option must be updated to meet the new standard before their next systems audit.

**Export forest produce**

This depends on the repeal of the Forest Export and Import Regulations 1967, expected to happen in early 2002. It covers treatment suppliers unique to forest exports, i.e. CCA.

**Requirements**

The standard sets out what is required for a supplier to become accredited to carry out treatments on behalf of MAF Biosecurity. Treatments are those either directed by the Quarantine Service for imported risk goods, or to meet export certification requirements of importing countries for plants, plant or forestry products. The standard can also be used for animal products when required.

The treatments covered are any officially authorised procedure, for the killing, removal or rendering infertile of pests and also rendering non-viable, or devitalising, a consignment of plants, forest or plant products, and animals.

To become accredited, a supplier will need to apply to the appropriate Director within MAF Biosecurity, depending on the predominant products being treated. The application is to include a description of their treatment procedure and the critical control points for each stage of their system; and they must submit to the chosen Independent Verification Authority (IVA) for evaluation, their ‘Operator System’ documentation. (Suppliers must demonstrate independence from the chosen IVA.)

Each treatment type and location will be audited on at least three consecutive, separate occasions and be successful before accreditation is granted (no major or critical non-compliances).

Suppliers wanting accreditation for pre-shipment export purposes must sign an agreement of accreditation but those treating imported goods are covered under the Biosecurity Act 1993.

The supplier is required to have an effective quality system appropriate to the type, range and volume of work performed and adhere to that system. The suppliers will be audited by MAF Biosecurity or an IVA to a prescribed level (ranges from twice a year to 1 in 5 treatments) depending on the type of treatment and the performance of the supplier.

The standard specifies that treatments will be monitored in a way that verifies the application of the treatment such as a Fumoscope with gas or a thermometer with heat.

The standard does not replace or interfere with other legislation administered by other government departments such as the Fumigation Regulations 1967.

Each supplier will be assessed for competency in the treatment being applied.

When suppliers are approved by MAF Biosecurity to carry out particular treatments, their advertising as being MAF approved:

- can only use ‘Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry’ name in full
- must ensure the claim is specific and truthful
- does not use the MAF logo.

For example, the following would be acceptable:

"Approved by the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry to carry out quarantine fumigation of imported goods"

All costs incurred by MAF Biosecurity or the IVA (including time and any travel associated with evaluation of the accredited supplier’s system, audit of the accredited supplier, communication and reporting) shall be met by the supplier during the accreditation process and future audits.

The supplier will be automatically considered (by MAF Biosecurity) to lose their accreditation for any critical non-compliance.

The standard is available for viewing on:


Ken Glassey, Programme Coordinator, Border Management Group, phone 04 498 9610, fax 04 470 2730, glasseyk@maf.govt.nz
Keeping rescue squads in the express lane

Recent events in the United States have highlighted the role of rescue teams when a major disaster strikes. In the event of a major urban disaster in New Zealand it is likely that other countries with appropriate expertise will offer personnel and equipment to help with the rescue of survivors.

Forward planning is imperative to ensure that unnecessary red tape at the border does not impede speedy arrival at the disaster scene.

The Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management is working with MAF Biosecurity and other relevant government departments to prepare a manual that gives New Zealand’s requirements for overseas disaster relief teams and their equipment.

The manuals will be provided to international agencies involved in rescue activities to ensure that New Zealand’s minimum requirements are known in advance of any disaster. Likewise overseas countries will supply their manuals to New Zealand.

The manual will also be of use to the operational staff at ports of entry who will need guidance in the event of a major urban disaster where a temporarily altered approach may be required to expedite the entry of overseas goods and personnel.

Areas of quarantine concern to MAF are:

• the arrival of unscheduled aircraft
• importation of sniffer dog teams
• used equipment and vehicles
• used tents and temporary accommodation
• victuals
• personal effects of arriving workers.

Brendan McDonald, Programme Coordinator, Border Management Group, phone 04 474 4204, fax 04 470 2730, mcdonaldb@maf.govt.nz

Varroa update

Processing varroa compensation claims is well under way

As at October 2001, the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry had received 53 varroa compensation claims, under section 162A of the Biosecurity Act 1993.

Subject to meeting other statutory criteria, compensation can be paid under section 162A of the Biosecurity Act for a loss that:

• is verifiable; and
• results from damage to, or destruction of property, or from restrictions placed on the movement or disposal of goods; and
• is caused by the exercise of powers under the Biosecurity Act for the purpose of managing the varroa mite.

MAF has made a determination for approximately 83 percent of the 53 claims made to date. Determinations for the remaining 17 percent will depend on the outcome of investigations by the MAF Special Investigations Group and/or claimants or specialist advisers responding to MAF requests for additional information.

The pie graph below illustrates the progress that has been made.

9 percent of claimants have been advised that MAF is awaiting the outcome of an investigation into whether section 162A(4)(c) of the Act prevents them from receiving compensation. That section particularly applies where a person has committed a serious or significant breach of the Biosecurity Act or regulations made under the Act.

8 percent of claims have not been able to be determined, as MAF awaits a response to requests for additional information or input from specialist advisers.

33 percent of claims have been declined on the grounds that criteria in section 162A of the Biosecurity Act have not been met. Several of these claims are being assessed to determine whether an ex gratia offer is appropriate. One such offer has been made to date.

25 percent of claims have been accepted as full and final a MAF compensation offer.

25 percent of claimants have accepted in part and/or continue to correspond about a MAF compensation offer.

25 percent of claimants have been advised that MAF is awaiting the outcome of an investigation into whether section 162A(4)(c) of the Act prevents them from receiving compensation. That section particularly applies where a person has committed a serious or significant breach of the Biosecurity Act or regulations made under the Act.

Henry Dowler, National Adviser Policy Coordination, Biosecurity Coordination, phone 04 470 2745, fax 04 470 2730, dowlerh@maf.govt.nz
New programme reinforces New Zealand’s BSE-free status

Following recent confirmation of the further spread of bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE), overseas authorities and consumers are seeking even greater assurances that BSE-free countries like New Zealand are actively looking for the disease and enforcing measures to prevent its spread. The New Zealand BSE programme is a collaboration between MAF and industry to maintain consumer confidence in New Zealand meat and meat products and underpin official assurances of BSE freedom.

New Zealand is recognised internationally as being free from BSE. We already meet the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) requirements for BSE freedom and, as such, have often provided negative control samples to other countries for research.

The European Commission has also recognised New Zealand as free from BSE and exempted New Zealand from the requirement to remove specified BSE risk material during processing. However, any further assessments of New Zealand’s BSE-free status, will probably require us to show how we comply with the ban on feeding ruminant protein to ruminant animals (a known disease pathway) and with testing of specified categories of cattle for absence of the BSE agent.

MAF, other government departments and various industry groups have been working together on the New Zealand BSE programme so that we can provide the information to our trading partners to support our BSE free status.

The BSE programme is made up of four major components:

- trade risk mitigation: to ensure consumer protection and New Zealand’s BSE-free status remains the priority for measures taken in relation to the food supply
- animal health status: to ensure New Zealand continues to maintain its BSE-free status as recognised by the World Animal Health Organisation
- imported processed food: to ensure that standards for imported food for New Zealand consumers are appropriate
- communications: to deliver accurate and timely information to all interested parties and members of the public.

The meat industry is funding a large proportion of this programme.
Issues relating to human to human transfer (e.g. through blood transfusion) are dealt with by the Ministry of Health.

www.maf.govt.nz/biosecurity/pests
diseases/animals/tse/index.htm

Sandra Daly,
Director Communications,
MAF Food Assurance Authority,
phone 04 474 4286
fax 04 474 4240,
dalys@maf.govt.nz
Draft slaughter code to balance religious beliefs and animal welfare

The National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee (NAWAC) has now finalised its response to the submissions on the NAWAC discussion paper The Animal Welfare Standards to Apply when Animals are Slaughtered in Accordance with Religious Requirements.

The NAWAC position on religious slaughter that will appear in the draft code for the commercial slaughter of animals can be summarised as follows:

NAWAC requires as a minimum standard that all animals undergoing commercial slaughter be stunned effectively prior to the throat or neck cut. This applies to all commercial slaughter, including Halal slaughter (i.e. slaughter by the Muslim method) which already meets this minimum standard.

NAWAC recommends that a dispensation be granted under section 73 of the Animal Welfare Act 1999 to allow Shechita, the Jewish method of slaughter, to be practised in order to meet the direct needs of the New Zealand Jewish community.

This is necessary to allow Jewish people to manifest their religion and belief (as provided for in the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990) and because NAWAC considers that Shechita does not meet the minimum standard for commercial slaughter.

However, NAWAC considers that this dispensation should be conditional upon certain requirements being met during Shechita.

- MAF approval to undertake Shechita must be contingent on each Shochet (the Jewish slaughterman) providing MAF with evidence of appropriate training and current competency in executing the neck cut effectively. This could take the form of appropriate documentation from a recognised rabbinical authority.
- Any cattle beast, sheep or goat declared by the Shochet to be non-Kosher (due to an incorrect cut or any other reason) during the period of consciousness following the neck cut must be stunned immediately. The Shochet must make that decision immediately after making the cut.
- All cattle slaughtered by Shechita must be stunned no more that five seconds after the cut.

NAWAC notes the following additional points regarding Shechita.

- NAWAC is concerned about the long period between the neck cut and the onset of loss of brain activity in poultry (e.g. on average 90 seconds). Nevertheless, at this time, it does not intend to impose a requirement to stun poultry within five seconds of the neck cut because practical and aesthetically acceptable means are not readily available to effect this.
- NAWAC notes the additional issue of the hind-quarters of each cattle beast and sheep not being processed because of cost and technical difficulties, so that this portion of the carcass is declared non-Kosher and cannot be consumed by the observant Jewish community. NAWAC considers that the Jewish community should be urged to process the whole carcass of each animal killed by Shechita to minimise the numbers slaughtered in this way.
- NAWAC does not require a post-cut stun for sheep and goats killed by successfully executed Shechita, as their average period of consciousness after the cut is usually about five to seven seconds.

NAWAC also considers it desirable that the Jewish community agree to participate in ongoing discussions regarding scientific and other developments in the humane slaughter arena.

NAWAC would wish to see the Jewish community explore approaches to stunning during Shechita that are closer to the minimum standard required for commercial slaughter in New Zealand.

NAWAC is totally opposed on animal welfare grounds to the development of a Kosher export meat trade.

This would involve a vast increase in animals slaughtered by Shechita, compared to present low numbers.

Code later this year

It is anticipated that the draft code of welfare for the commercial slaughter of animals, including provisions relating to religious slaughter, will be released for public consultation later this year.

NAWAC will then be required to consider any submissions received on the draft code – including the provisions relating to religious slaughter – before recommending that the code be approved.

The Minister of Agriculture, Hon Jim Sutton, has approved the inclusion of the above position on religious slaughter in the draft code of welfare for the commercial slaughter of animals. The Minister has, however, deferred any final decision on this matter until he receives the entire draft code of welfare for the commercial slaughter of animals.

For further details on the NAWAC response to the discussion paper, The Animal Welfare Standards to Apply when Animals are Slaughtered in Accordance with Religious Requirements or on the process for the development of the code of welfare for the commercial slaughter of animals, contact:

NAWAC Secretary, C/- Animal Welfare Group, MAF, PO Box 2526, Wellington, phone 474 4296, fax 04 498 9888, nawac@maf.govt.nz
CSIRO's newly appointed special adviser on animal welfare visited New Zealand in July and August. His contact with welfare experts in this country underscored the value of a strong trans-Tasman relationship on animal welfare issues – both domestic and international.

After 10 years as Director, Dr Mike Rickard stepped down as head of Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) Livestock Industries Australian Animal Health Laboratory (AAHL) in June this year. He has assumed a new role as special adviser on animal welfare. Dr Rickard is a past chair of the Australian and New Zealand Council for the Care of Animals in Research and Teaching (ANZCCART) and is the current chair of the trans-Tasman Animal Welfare Committee (AWC).

The main purpose of his visit was to discuss animal welfare research being done in New Zealand, and learn more about animal welfare policy in this country. He was based with Professor David Mellor, Director of the Massey University Animal Welfare Science and Bioethics Centre and Chair of the National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee (NAWAC).

Dr Rickard visited the Animal Behaviour and Welfare Research Centre (AgResearch) and the Technology Development Group (HortResearch) in Hamilton; the Vertebrate Pest Control Group at Landcare Research in Christchurch and the AgResearch Laboratory and Field Station at Poukawa in Hawke’s Bay.

He was impressed with both the animal welfare science research being carried out in New Zealand and the seriousness with which the New Zealand agricultural industries, and Government, view the likely impact of animal welfare issues on the future of intensive and extensive farming. Although some of the particular issues are different than those in Australia, the underlying issues are the same.

He also attended meetings of both NAWAC and the National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee (NAEAC) and provided both committees with a valuable Australian perspective.

Dr Rickard is CSIRO’s representative on the board of ANZCCART and attended the NAEAC/ANZCCART Conference in Hamilton entitled Learning, Animal and the Environment: Changing the Face of the Future. This conference provided an excellent forum for discussion between groups with disparate views on the use of animals in research and teaching, including research on gene technology. It highlighted the critical role of dialogue and consultation with the public, if we want to fully capture the benefits offered to agriculture by the new technologies.

There is much scope to consolidate, and further develop, the trans-Tasman relationship on animal welfare issues. This applies equally to domestic animal welfare policy and practice and international public policy issues such as the role of animal welfare in international trade.

MAF welcomes the appointment of Dr Rickard to this strategically important new role.

An invitation to Dr Wayne Ricketts, National Adviser Animal Welfare, to speak at the recent 3rd International Animal Feeds and Veterinary Drugs Congress in Manila provided a first-time opportunity to talk about animal welfare in New Zealand and gain a valuable insight into animal welfare in the Philippines.

The conference is the largest of any type held in the Philippines and this year was the first time papers were presented on animal welfare.

Wide range of welfare issues

Presentations were made by speakers from the University of Bristol, the World Society for the Protection on Animals, the Animal Transportation Association, the Philippines Committee on Animal Welfare and the Biosecurity Authority’s Animal Welfare Group. Papers presented, covered a wide range of welfare issues including the welfare of poultry and pigs, stray dogs, welfare during transport, welfare of animals used in science, humane slaughter, welfare in veterinary clinics and hospitals and animal welfare in New Zealand.

Regulation of animal welfare is very much in its infancy in the Philippines, with the first ever animal welfare legislation being passed in 1998. This was a result of a major push from the veterinary profession combined with the current Government’s commitment to the care and welfare of animals.

Leap forward

The recent legislation has been a major leap forward for animal welfare in the Philippines. The conference provided an excellent forum for discussion between groups with disparate views on the use of animals in research and teaching, including research on gene technology. It highlighted the critical role of dialogue and consultation with the public, if we want to fully capture the benefits offered to agriculture by the new technologies.

There is much scope to consolidate, and further develop, the trans-Tasman relationship on animal welfare issues. This applies equally to domestic animal welfare policy and practice and international public policy issues such as the role of animal welfare in international trade.

MAF welcomes the appointment of Dr Rickard to this strategically important new role.

David Bayvel, Director Animal Welfare, phone 04 474 4251, fax 04 498 9888, bayvel@maf.govt.nz

Animal welfare in the Philippines – New Zealand lends a helping hand

An invitation to Dr Wayne Ricketts, National Adviser Animal Welfare, to speak at the recent 3rd International Animal Feeds and Veterinary Drugs Congress in Manila provided a first-time opportunity to talk about animal welfare in New Zealand and gain a valuable insight into animal welfare in the Philippines.

The conference is the largest of any type held in the Philippines and this year was the first time papers were presented on animal welfare.

Wide range of welfare issues

Presentations were made by speakers from the University of Bristol, the World Society for the Protection on Animals, the Animal Transportation Association, the Philippines Committee on Animal Welfare and the Biosecurity Authority’s Animal Welfare Group. Papers presented, covered a wide range of welfare issues including the welfare of poultry and pigs, stray dogs, welfare during transport, welfare of animals used in science, humane slaughter, welfare in veterinary clinics and hospitals and animal welfare in New Zealand.

Regulation of animal welfare is very much in its infancy in the Philippines, with the first ever animal welfare legislation being passed in 1998. This was a result of a major push from the veterinary profession combined with the current Government’s commitment to the care and welfare of animals.

Leap forward

The recent legislation has been a major leap forward for animal welfare in the Philippines. The conference provided an excellent forum for discussion between groups with disparate views on the use of animals in research and teaching, including research on gene technology. It highlighted the critical role of dialogue and consultation with the public, if we want to fully capture the benefits offered to agriculture by the new technologies.

There is much scope to consolidate, and further develop, the trans-Tasman relationship on animal welfare issues. This applies equally to domestic animal welfare policy and practice and international public policy issues such as the role of animal welfare in international trade.
Forest product exports committee established

Forest Biosecurity Group/forest industry consultation has been strengthened following the establishment of the Forest Products Export Committee (FPEC) – a vehicle for communication and consultation between forest produce exporters and the Forest Biosecurity Group.

The inaugural meeting of FPEC was held on 13 September in Wellington. The agreed purpose of FPEC is to advise the Director, Forest Biosecurity (DFB), and for the DFB to advise the committee, on forest product export issues.

The committee is to be chaired by Mr Howard Tonge (Ahead Lumber Limited). Membership of the committee from outside MAF spans the log, lumber and manufactured products industries, including representatives from AgriQuality, Carter Holt Harvey (Forest Fibre Solutions), Fletcher Challenge Forests, Ministry of Economic Development, NZ Wood, New Zealand Pine Manufacturers’ Association, New Zealand Forest Owners’ Association, Plants Market Access Consultative Committee and Rayonier.

Strategic matters discussed at the meeting included management of phytosanitary certification following the revocation of the Forest Produce Import and Export Regulations 1989, electronic certification and prioritisation of market access work undertaken by the Forest Biosecurity Group.

Current projects discussed included:
- the use of in-hold phosphine fumigation of logs
- the phytosanitary requirements of China and Korea
- operation research on the taxonomy and biology of the burnt pine longhorn (Arhopalus tristis), and definition of the flight season of the same longhorn.

Mark Self, National Adviser, Forest Product Export Standards, MAF Forest Biosecurity, phone 04 498 9612, fax 04 498 9888, selfm@maf.govt.nz

Continued from Page 13

Philippines. Such practices as the human consumption of cats and dogs, horse (stallion) fighting and cock fighting still occur in the Philippines, even though dog fighting and horse fights are expressly prohibited by the new Act.

Responsibility for the implementation of the Act lies with Philippines Bureau of Agriculture. Enforcement of the Act is to be carried out by three animal welfare officers (all veterinarians) employed by the Bureau, in each of the country’s 15 regions. While the Act is less extensive than New Zealand’s Animal Welfare Act, it is still reasonably comprehensive.

The Philippines Act establishes an animal welfare committee (the Committee on Animal Welfare) in much the same way as our Act establishes the National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee. Its role is to develop Administration Orders, which are equivalent to our codes of welfare. Administration Orders are used to implement the provisions of the Act. Eight orders have so far been passed or drafted including orders for the welfare of pigs, air transport, scientific procedures using animals, euthanasia and slaughter, the welfare of pigs and chickens, and animal facilities.

Common language guidelines

To supplement the Administration Orders, guidelines will be produced which will be written in common language. To date the Bureau of Agriculture has been devoting extensive efforts to running an education campaign about the new Act.

The Philippines has received copies of all of the New Zealand codes of recommendations and minimum standards and a number of Administration Orders are extensively based on our codes. The Philippines Bureau of Agriculture and the Animal Welfare Committee both noted their appreciation for the New Zealand codes and looked forward to developing a closer association with this country in regard to animal welfare.

Wayne Ricketts, National Adviser, Animal Welfare, phone 04 474 4726, fax 04 474 4133, rickettsw@maf.govt.nz

Programme coordinator, Forest Biosecurity Group

Moira Burdan joined the Forest Biosecurity Group in early October as Programme Coordinator, following in the footsteps of former Executive Coordinator Anna Cardno. Moira comes to the Group with extensive experience in office administration and coordination.

During the past 15 years she has held a variety of roles, including: production manager with considerable emphasis on deadlines and quality control within the design/typsetting industry. She has held a lead position in project management and administration for Colonial First State Property Trust; and was administration manager for a team of 75 with Cap Gemini Ernst & Young.

Living next to a bush reserve allows Moira to indulge her interest in plants and birds.

Moira Burdan, Programme Coordinator, Forest Biosecurity Group, burdanim@maf.govt.nz
No further finds of a new pest, an Australian chrysomelid beetle, have been found since it was first discovered in a Wellington park last year. A further survey will shortly be carried out to establish whether or not it has been successfully eradicated.

A suspect new-to-New Zealand beetle was found feeding on shoots of *Acacia retinodes* at Hataitai Park in Wellington on 6 October 2000 during a risk site survey undertaken by MAF contractors. It was subsequently identified as an Australian chrysomelid beetle, *Peltoschema suturalis* (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae). It had not been previously recorded in New Zealand.

*Peltoschema suturalis* in its natural range is regarded as a minor pest of phyllodinous wattles, including *Acacia pycnantha, A. retinodes, A. longifolia, A. hakeoides, A. cyclops, A. mucronata* and *A. stricta.* Following the beetle’s discovery last year, a delimiting survey was conducted to determine the extent of the incursion. The work was done on 24 November 2000 by a MAF National Plant Pest Reference Laboratory entomologist and one of Vigil’s forest health advisers.

Only eight trees, all *Acacia retinodes*, located at Hataitai Park were found to be infested with the exotic beetle. The infested trees were treated during December 2000. The originally infested trees and other phyllodinous wattles in Hataitai Park were subsequently inspected at monthly intervals. No further finds of *P. suturalis* have been made to date.

In an effort to establish whether the eradication attempt has been successful, MAF contractors will this month conduct a detailed survey of all phyllodinous wattles in the area around Hataitai Park within a 500-metre radius of the original infestation site. Some additional sites around Wellington Airport will also be surveyed for the presence of the beetle during the first week of November.

**Davor Bejakovich,**
National Manager,
Forest Pest Surveillance and Response,
phone 03 325 7132,
bejakovichd@maf.govt.nz

---

**Update**

**New import health standards issued**

**Inclusion of PRRS safeguard for imports of pig meat products**

The following standards, now dated 31 August 2001, have been amended to include all safeguards against porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome (PRRS). The processing clause now notes that pig meat products may be either heat-treated or pH treated (see also *Biosecurity* 30, pages 12 and 21).

- processed pig meat products for human consumption from Canada
- processed pig meat products for human consumption from the USA
- processed pig meat products for human consumption from Denmark
- processed pig meat products for human consumption from Mexico (State of Sonora)
- frozen pig by-products from Canada and the USA
- unprocessed pig meat products for human consumption from Canada.
- unprocessed pig meat products for human consumption from the USA
- unprocessed pig meat products for human consumption from Denmark

---

**Fish food, fish bait and *Artemia salina* from all countries.**

The standard has been updated to include an option (clause 6.2) for importers to irradiate fish food upon entry into New Zealand. It is now dated 18 September 2001.

**Marine fisheries products for human consumption**

The additional countries listed below have been added to clause 6.2 of this standard, to allow imports of marine finfish to be considered of marine origin unless there is evidence to the contrary. The standard is now dated 18 September 2001.

The countries are:

- Vanuatu, Tuvalu, Federated States of Micronesia (which includes Mariana Islands, Caroline Islands, Marshall Islands, Kiribati and Nauru), French Polynesia (replaces Tahiti, which is only one island in French Polynesia), Republic of Belau and the Solomon Islands.

**Ornamental animal products from all countries**

This standard, now dated 18 September 2001, has been amended to allow additional post-entry treatment options (clauses 8.3.2 and 8.3.3) for products that arrive in New Zealand.
Bovine semen from Northern Ireland

The following import health standards, now dated 28 August 2001, have been issued:
- bovine semen from Northern Ireland
- bovine semen from the United Kingdom and the Channel Islands.

These standards replace the standards for bovine semen from the United Kingdom and the Channel Islands, dated 22 May 2001 and for bovine semen from Northern Ireland, dated 13 August 2001, respectively.

The import health standard for Northern Ireland has been amended to remove the safeguard put in place in May, to allow the importation into New Zealand of semen collected prior to 1 June 2001. New Zealand MAF now considers Northern Ireland to be free from foot and mouth disease. The import health standard for the United Kingdom and the Channel Islands has had clause 3.3 added to note that a separate IHS has been developed for bovine semen from Northern Ireland.

Ruminants and ruminant semen from Australia

The standards for importing ruminants and ruminant semen from Australia have been amended to accommodate regionalisation of the bluetongue virus in Australia. The relevant import health standards are now dated 10 October 2001 and are:
- bison from Australia
- cattle from Australia
- deer from Australia
- goats from Australia
- lamoids from Australia
- sheep from Australia
- bovine semen from Australia
- caprine semen from Australia
- ovine semen from Australia.

Amendment to scrapie clause for imports of small ruminants and their germplasm from Australia

The scrapie clause previously added to the following standards has been amended to better clarify the eligibility requirements. The amended standards are dated 10 October 2001:
- goats from Australia
- caprine embryos from Australia
- caprine semen from Australia
- sheep from Australia
- ovine embryos from Australia
- ovine semen from Australia.

Buffalo semen and embryos from Italy

These standards have been reinstated and are now dated 3 October 2001. They were revoked on 14 March 2001 due to foot and mouth disease in Europe. The embryo standard has had the safeguards for bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE) amended due to confirmation of BSE in Italy. The semen standard has had the infectious bovine rhinotracheitis (IBR) safeguards amended.

Bovine semen and embryos from Japan

Following the recently confirmed case of bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE) in Japan, MAF has amended the BSE safeguards in the embryo standard. The safeguards for foot and mouth disease (FMD) in the semen standard have also been amended in recognition that Japan is once again free of FMD. The amended versions are dated 8 October 2001.

Jessie Chan, Technical Adviser, International Trade,
phone 04 478 9897, fax 04 474 4227, chanj@maf.govt.nz
www.maf.govt.nz/biosecurity/consultation.htm

Draft import health standards for horses – consultation extended

The following draft import health standards were notified for consultation in issue 29 of Biosecurity (1 August 2001). Various countries affected by these standards asked for an extended consultation period and comments will now be accepted until 1 November 2001. The proposed implementation date is now 1 December 2001.

The draft standards are:
- horses from Australia
- horse semen from Australia
- horses from the USA
- horse semen from the USA
- horses from Canada
- horses from the EU
- horse semen from the EU.

Argali sheep semen risk analysis available for consultation

A private consultant, acting on behalf of a would-be importer, has completed an analysis of the disease risks posed by semen collected from an Argali ram. The semen is currently being held in a MAF-approved transitional facility.

This is not an official MAF risk analysis but it has been subjected to MAF’s internal and external scientific review processes. The risk analyst has addressed all the points raised by MAF and the external reviewers. (For more on MAF’s process for conducting import risk analyses see Biosecurity 21:7.)

MAF considers this risk analysis to be technically sound and sufficiently robust for use in developing an import health standard. The document, Disease risk assessment: The use in New Zealand of imported semen derived from an Argali sheep is now available for public consultation.

The progeny of the imported semen will be held in containment...

The deadline for submissions is 15 December 2001

Martin Van Ginkel, Technical Adviser, Risk Analysis, Animal Biosecurity, phone 04 474 4100 extn 8502, fax 04 474 4133, vanginkelm@maf.govt.nz

www.maf.govt.nz/biosecurity/pests-diseases/animals/ira-argali-sheep

Export bacteriology testing: comments invited on draft standard

A draft standard has been created for veterinary diagnostic laboratories wishing to undertake bacteriological testing for animals or animal germplasm being exported from New Zealand.

The standard describes the technical requirements a laboratory would need to meet in order to conduct nominated export bacteriological tests for nominated endemic micro-organisms. Laboratories undertaking such export testing will be expected to work in close conjunction with the New Zealand Animal Health Reference Laboratory, which will undertake the testing for all exotic organisms.

The key requirement of the standard is that a laboratory undertaking export bacteriology testing must be third party accredited to ISO 17025, or an equivalent standard, by a third party accreditation agency that is accredited to ISO 58. This is in order to ensure organisational commitment to quality assurance and international acceptance of the competence of the laboratory to perform the tests.

Comments are required no later than 15 December 2001.

Roger Poland, Programme Coordinator, Surveillance, phone 04 498 9820, fax 04 474 4133, polandr@maf.govt.nz

Pig feeding discussion paper delayed

The need for controls over the feeding of organic waste to pigs (also known as swill feeding or garbage feeding) was featured in Biosecurity 29 (15 August 2001). A MAF discussion paper seeking feedback on the subject was expected to be released at the end of July, with a closing date for submissions of 30 September.

However, since the article was published our internal review process has identified some additional issues that needed to be worked through, and the release of the paper has been delayed.

When the paper is ready for public comment, a further update will appear in Biosecurity and a new closing date for submissions will be set. If you would like to be advised by email when the paper is released, please use the contact below. The paper will still be available on the MAF website and sent to interested organisations and individuals directly.

Allen Bryce, Programme Manager, Surveillance and Response, phone 04 470 2787, fax 04 474 4133, brycea@maf.govt.nz

Notifiable organisms

Small hive beetle (Aethena tumida) is to be added to the list of notifiable organisms in New Zealand.

Other proposed additions were published in Biosecurity 28:17.

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

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

Import health standard amended

Apple and pear seed for sowing

Schedules for apple and pear seed have been added to the MAF Biosecurity Authority Standard 155.02.05: Seed for Sowing.

Consignments of these seeds being imported now require Phytosanitary Certification with additional declarations declaring that the seed was grown in areas free from specified viruses.

Inspection of seed in hermetically sealed containers/packages

An amendment has been made to section 2.2.6 of the MAF Biosecurity Authority Standard 155.02.05: Seed for Sowing.

Seed for sowing imported in hermetically sealed containers/packages is now subject to inspection for contamination on arrival in accordance with a sampling plan. A list of approved suppliers for seed exempt from inspection will no longer be operated. Importers have the option of obtaining a Seed Analysis Certificate in lieu of inspection.

Dr Dave Nendick, National Adviser, (Plant Imports, Seed and Nursery Stock), Plants Biosecurity, phone 04 474 4200, fax 04 474 4257

Michele Dickson, Technical Adviser, (Plant Imports), Plants Biosecurity, phone 04 498 9631, fax 04 474 4257

plantimports@maf.govt.nz

www.maf.govt.nz/Plants/import/seedsgrainnuts/155-02-05.pdf

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: Nil

Codes of ethical conduct revoked or arrangements terminated
• Awatapu College
• National College of Security Personnel and Technology

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

Draft codes of welfare for broiler chickens and pigs

The National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee (NAWAC) has received copies of draft codes of welfare for broiler chickens and pigs, to replace the deemed codes of welfare under the Animal Welfare Act 1999.

The draft codes have been written by industry groups with consultation from animal welfare groups and the major users of the codes. The draft codes will be considered by NAWAC to ensure they meet the requirements of the Act. They will then be released for a 6-week period of public consultation. It is anticipated that the draft codes of welfare will be available for consultation at the end of October 2001.

Wayne Ricketts, National Adviser Animal Welfare, phone 04 474 4276, fax 04 474 4133, rickettsw@maf.govt.nz

Welfare reports available

The 2000 annual reports for the National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee (NAWAC) and the National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee (NAEAC) are now available.

Both committees are established under the Animal Welfare Act 1999. NAWAC advises the Minister of Agriculture on matters relating to the welfare of animals, while NAEAC’s role is to advise the Minister on ethical and welfare issues arising from the use of animals in research, testing and teaching.

Both reports are available on MAF’s website at: www.maf.govt.nz/biosecurity/animal-welfare/

Draft Cordyline/Dracaena import health standard out for consultation

The draft import health standard for Cordyline/Dracaena foliage has been released for consultation.

Submissions must be received by 9 November 2001.

The document is available on www.maf.govt.nz/forestry/

Used vehicle import health standard

The import health standard for used buses, cars, motor cycles, trucks, utility vehicles and vans from any country was issued on 11 September 2001.

A draft import health standard for used vehicle imports was released for consultation in August last year and, as a result of the submissions received, a final modified standard has now been released. The new revised import health standard addresses the need to more explicitly reduce the risks associated with pre-shipment and on-arrival inspection arrangements.

By introducing clear time limits for these inspections, MAF has strengthened the current requirements that every used vehicle entering New Zealand is inspected and decontaminated as required.

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

New organism records: 4/8/01 – 14/9/01

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 4/8/01 – 14/9/01, and held in the Plant Pest Information Network (PPIN) database. Wherever possible, common names have been included.

PLANTS BIOSECURITY RECORDS 4/8/01 – 14/9/01

Validated new to New Zealand reports: No new records for this period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism</th>
<th>Host</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Submitted by</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pleospora tarda (sooty mould)</td>
<td>Limonium sp.</td>
<td>Mid Canterbury</td>
<td>National Plant Pest Reference Laboratory (NPPRL)</td>
<td>Other PPIN hosts include asparagus, broad bean, brussel sprout, echiun, feijoa, nectarine, parsley, passionfruit and tomato.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudomonas stutzeri</td>
<td>Actinidia delicosa cv. Hayward</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>This bacterium is common in the environment. Pseudomonas spp. bacteria are often found in soil, water and on plants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colletotrichum acutatum (anthracnose)</td>
<td>Pelargonium sp.</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>Other PPIN hosts include apple, avocado, blueberry, camellia, Capiscum spp., carnation, Citrus spp., feijoa, grape, kiwifruit, macadamia, nashi, peach, pear, persimmon, pumpking, rhododendron, strawberry, tomato, and winter rose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albugo tragopogonis (white powdery mildew)</td>
<td>Bracteaantha sp.</td>
<td>Hawke's Bay</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>No other PPIN hosts are recorded. Other New Zealand hosts include bachelor's buttons, Californian thistle, cineraria, salsify, and Transvaal daisy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudomonas viridiflava (leaf spot)</td>
<td>Raphanus sativus (radish)</td>
<td>Mid Canterbury</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>Other PPIN hosts include apricot, blueberry, camisoon, carrot, courgette, grape, kiwifruit, melon, nectarine, onion, passionfruit, pea, pumpkin, rose, tomato and watermelon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibberella acuminata (fusarium root rot)</td>
<td>Medicago sativa (lucerne)</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>Other PPIN hosts include broad bean, carnation, garlic, nectarine, passionfruit, peach, potato, sandersonia, and tomato.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

FOREST BIOSECURITY RECORDS 4/8/01 – 14/9/01

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>Peltoschisma subulatis (no common name)</td>
<td>Acacia retinodes (Marri)</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>MAF National Plant Pest Reference Laboratory</td>
<td>Although this chrysomelid was discovered in October 2000, the identification has only recently been confirmed. A delimiting survey conducted last year indicated it was only present in Hataitai Park. The 8 infested trees were treated and subsequent monitoring indicates that it may have been eliminated. A follow-up survey to confirm this is to be undertaken in November.</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>Vermsporium eucalypti (no common name)</td>
<td>Eucalyptus radiata (grey peppermint)</td>
<td>Taupo</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other host records noted by Forest Research include Eucalyptus saligna, E. muellerana, E. pyrocarpa, E. microcorys, E. piliularis and E. delegatensis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalotus sp. (algal leaf spot)</td>
<td>Banksia marginata (banksia)</td>
<td>Gisborne</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other PPIN host records include avocado, climbing fig, passionfruit and saw banksia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryptosporioides eucalypti (no common name)</td>
<td>Eucalyptus leucocorys (white iron bark)</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other host records noted by Forest Research include E. botryoides, E. bridgesiana, E. calophylla, E. ficifolia, E. gunnii, E. leucoxylon and E. ovata var grandiflora.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrocerops laciniella (black butt leafminer)</td>
<td>Eucalyptus microcorys (tallowwood)</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 spp., globulus, E. pulchella, E. melliodora, E. saligna and E. leucoxylon sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holoclea sp. cf. triangulana (pink blackwood leafminer)</td>
<td>Acacia floribunda (gossamer wattle)</td>
<td>Wanganui</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other PPIN host records include Acacia longifolia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarcostruma grevilleae (no common name)</td>
<td>Grevilia x gaudichaudii</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>No other PPIN host records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navomorpha lineata (striped longhorn)</td>
<td>Abies nordmanniana (Caucasian fir)</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other PPIN host records include Populus sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mycophasiaella swarti (no common name)</td>
<td>Eucalyptus maculata (spotted gum)</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other PPIN host records include Eucalyptus leucoxylon spp., leucoxylon and Eucalyptus sp.</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>Stigmata eucalypti (no common name)</td>
<td>Eucalyptus ficifolia (red flowering gum)</td>
<td>Wanganui</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other distribution records noted by Forest Research include Hawkes Bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heloclea sp. cf. triangulana (pink blackwood leafminer)</td>
<td>Acacia longifolia (Sydney golden wattle)</td>
<td>Bay of Plenty</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other PPIN distribution records include Auckland and Wanganui.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uraba lugens (gum leaf skeletoniser)</td>
<td>Eucalyptus cinerea (silver dollar tree)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other distribution records noted by Forest Research include Hawkes Bay. In Auckland and Hawkes Bay, this insect is the subject of an official control programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cryptosporioides eucalypti (no common name)</td>
<td>Eucalyptus leucocorys (white iron bark)</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>No other PPIN distribution records.</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>Previously reported in July this year as a new host record. Now, re-reported as a new distribution record only. No other PPIN distribution records.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exotic disease and pest emergency hotline: 0800 809 966
Animal welfare complaint hotline: 0800 327 027
www.maf.govt.nz/Biosecurity/index.htm