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Biosecurity key to growing New Zealand’s biotechnology sector

by Hon Pete Hodgson
Minister for Research, Science and Technology

The Biotechnology Taskforce, which I co-chair, has released its report on growing the biotechnology sector in New Zealand. The report supports the fact that New Zealand’s competitive advantage in biotechnology lies in our unique disease-free animal and plant health status, which is closely linked to vigilant biosecurity regulations.

New Zealand’s economy is built on our exceptional ability to add value to our agricultural sector by applying biological knowledge. New Zealand depends on the health and productivity of its agricultural sector for a substantial part of its exports and GDP.

Key to maintaining the competitive edge of our agricultural sector is to grow our vibrant biotechnology sector. New Zealand’s internationally respected biosecurity regulations are critical to that growth.

New Zealand must continue to maintain a biosecurity regulatory environment that is effective, transparent and equal to the best practice in the world. In a global environment where businesses can locate anywhere in the world, this is our quality safeguard. We can, and do, leverage the effectiveness of our biosecurity regulations to market New Zealand as a biotechnology investment destination to international investors and researchers.

Biotechnology is essentially the application of scientific and engineering principles to the processing of material by biological agents and the processing of biological materials. Contrary to popular belief, genetic modification is only a small part of the wider biotechnology picture.

Biotechnology activities in New Zealand include animal-based applications that cover animal models of human diseases and transgenics. Plant-based work, including forestry, covers germplasm and genome database development to improve the efficiency of primary producers. Other work done in New Zealand includes biomedical science and drug discoveries, agritechnology products such as animal vaccines and biocontrol detection technologies to reduce the effects of environmental pollution.

New Zealand is well placed to take advantage in these biotechnology-related activities, with annual export earnings predicted to reach up to $7 billion by 2010. The long-term benefits to New Zealand from growth in the biotechnology sector are immense.

We will be able to dramatically increase the quality of our research, grow our talent pool and develop exciting new applications that are built on New Zealand scientific know-how and expertise.

The dedicated professionals who look after New Zealand’s biosecurity can add another tick to their accomplishments – that they are ensuring the health of an industry that will boost New Zealand’s economic growth and place it at the top of the ladder for international scientific research.

Biotechnology Taskforce Report and other information on New Zealand’s biotechnology sector:
- www.industrytaskforces.govt.nz
- www.biospherenz.com

Successful animal welfare prosecutions

The strengthening of protection for animal welfare under the provisions of the Animal Welfare Act 1999 has been highlighted in two recent cases taken by MAF’s Special Investigations Group.

In the first of these, Lester Donald Reuben Johnstone, a farmer of Maungatapere near Whangarei, was charged with four charges relating to stock on two properties at Maungatapere and Oakleigh for a failure to provide for the physical, health and behavioural needs of cattle.

Mr Johnstone entered guilty pleas to all charges. Judge Everitt convicted Mr Johnstone and fined him $34,000 in total for the four charges, plus $520 in Court costs and $1,800 in legal fees.

In addition Mr Johnstone was disqualified from farming dairy cattle for a period of five years.

In the second case, Invercargill farmer, Russell Scobie was convicted of 12 charges under the Animal Welfare Act 1999 and sentenced to a total of 400 hours of community service and total costs of $7225 dollars.

Trial witnesses had described Mr Scobie’s stock as severely underfed and suffering from chronic malnutrition. One expert witness commented that Mr Scobie’s property was extremely overstocked with four times the stocking rate of other properties in the area.

MAF was alerted to the state of the animals by a concerned member of the public.

Animal Welfare Complaint Hotline: 0800 327 027
Biocontrol of pests: the regional government role

Scientific biocontrol is an environmentally benign, nil-to-low impact pest control tool that, when successful, gives greater benefit to cost than any other method. However it is perhaps the least reliable of all single methods in terms of predictability of results.

New research fostered by regional government aims to increase success rates by more accurately matching agents to hosts’ weaknesses. Regional government is likely to become more involved in biocontrol research funding and monitoring in the future, provided that compliance costs do not continue to soar.

Regional councils (and several unitary authorities) administer almost all of New Zealand’s local and regional biosecurity programmes, mainly through regional pest management strategies under the Biosecurity Act. Many of these strategies include biocontrol as a weapon in the armoury of pest control methods.

Public acceptance

The place of biocontrol is now well understood by regional ratepayers, particularly for plant pests or weeds. People generally understand that an effective programme will not eradicate a pest but that its impacts, control costs and overall threat will be reduced. Other advantages (compared to other control methods) include selectivity to target, much less or no disturbance to land, fewer training and notification requirements, no residues or withholding periods, and less need for logistical or campaign planning.

Regional councils have helped many user groups in establishing needs, making funding applications, monitoring and reporting. Groups have included the Californian Thistle Action Group, Hieracium Control Trust, Amuri Broom Group, West Coast Ragwort Group and the Rodney Monitor Farm Group. These groups have gained support from funding bodies such as Agmardt and MAF’s Sustainable Farming Fund.

Research providers included Manaaki Whenua – Landcare Research (MWLR - see below), HortResearch, Forest Research Institute (e.g. buddleia), and AgResearch (e.g. Sclerotina sclerotiorum for Californian thistle, and Fusarium tumidum and Chondrostereum purpureum for gorse and broom).

Hope for pest control in natural areas

The range of conventional pest treatments that can be used in natural areas is usually more restricted than for production areas. Biocontrol is therefore seen as the major hope for widespread pest control in natural areas. As regional councils become more involved in protection of native habitats (Biosecurity 43:6), biocontrol is being increasingly considered as a management tool.

A well-established tenet of biocontrol research is to ensure that the control is specific to the pest -- people trust that procedures for introducing new organisms are robust. Regional councils have informed and consulted communities widely in this regard.

Researching biocontrol of weeds

Many regional pest plant programmes involve funding research into: biological control of weed species, release of agents, monitoring progress, and stakeholder survey and liaison. Along with the Foundation for Research, Science and Technology (ForST), regional councils are the major funders ($400,000+ pa) of research programmes for biocontrol of weeds in New Zealand. In some cases, regional councils have brokered co-funding bids and have acted as the applicant to the Environmental Risk Management Authority for importation and release of biocontrol agents. The Department of Conservation (DOC) is also now providing significant funding for biological control programmes and working closely with regional councils.

Most regional council spending on biocontrols is directed to M WLR. Since the mid-1980s, this Crown Research Institute has had a programme to identify regional biocontrol needs and then find ways of tackling them. Regional councils, acting through the Biosecurity Managers’ Group,
collectively decide on priorities and commitments. DOC has also joined the collective. With this collaboration, a lot more research is made possible, particularly into finding new agents, undertaking host-specificity trials and funding applications for importation and release.

Successes include the rust fungus Entyloma ageratinae, which has caused spectacular decline of mist flower Ageratina riparia, a serious pest of native forests. In many places the shade-loving mist flower is the only weed present, so the benefit of mist flower removal is high indeed. Nodding thistle and ragwort programmes have also been very successful to date. Scotch thistle, heather, gorse and broom programmes all look promising.

**Biocontrol of animal pests**

Regional councils have also been involved with assisting research into vertebrate and invertebrate biocontrol, monitoring, spread of agents, user group liaison and stakeholder consultation. The MWLR Vertebrate Pests Team is a research provider for vertebrate animals such as possums and rabbits. One of the biggest issues facing biocontrol is the high cost of applications to import agents into New Zealand. This process is the responsibility of the Environmental Risk Management Authority (ERMA) which passes part of the costs on to the applicant. For example, it can cost as much as $18,000 to gain permission to import into quarantine, and a further $50,000 - $70,000 for permission to release from quarantine.

Because compliance costs might make biocontrol research unfeasible, regional government is working with ERMA and looking to streamline application procedures and minimise application costs.

One potential area is host specificity, where reliable overseas work establishing host dependence could be given more credence.

Jack Craw,
Biosecurity Manager,
Auckland Regional Council,
phone 09 366 2000 ext 8771,
fax 366 2166,
jack.craw@arc.govt.nz
Recent reviews of biosecurity highlighted a backlog in the development of import health standards and their supporting import risk analyses.

New Zealand’s biosecurity system is designed to protect the country from the impacts of exotic pests and diseases. It is based on four interlocking subsystems:

- management of risks offshore as much as possible
- border controls, quarantine and post-entry measures to exclude unwanted organisms
- surveillance systems to detect and respond to serious pests that are new arrivals; and
- control and eradication programmes to manage or eliminate unwanted organisms that are established.

The legal mechanism for border and pre-border risk management is the import health standard, which sets out the conditions under which risk goods may be imported. Developing import health standards is a complex and time-consuming task and there is a large backlog. Analysis suggests that additional resource alone would do little to reduce the backlog or potential risk, and that the current situation is unsustainable.

MAF and the Treasury are jointly sponsoring an independent review of the methodologies and processes used by MAF Biosecurity Authority in developing its import health standards. This review will provide recommendations to Ministers so decisions can be made about development of import health standards. It will advise on the nature and magnitude of any trade and biosecurity risks attributable to current practice, identify challenges to achieving a more effective and sustainable import health standard system and make recommendations to achieve such a system.

An international search was conducted to source a suitably skilled, multi-disciplinary team to undertake this review. The team awarded the contract has been put together by Minter Ellison Rudd Watts and Market Access Solutionz and consists of specialists from both Australia and New Zealand.

The review is currently underway and the final report should be publicly available in August 2003.

Chris Bicknell,
Project Manager,
Biosecurity Coordination,
phone 04 498 9887,
fax 04 470 2730
Legislation for new organisms before select committee

A Bill amending the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms (HSNO) Act 1996 to improve the way it operates for new organisms (including genetically modified organisms) is before Parliament's education and science select committee.

 Conditional release option

The Bill provides for the conditional release of new organisms. Currently, the Environmental Risk Management Authority can only approve or decline the full release of a new organism for which an application has been made. The conditional release category will provide the authority with a third option for deciding an application. The authority could impose conditions on release where it thinks the new organisms will be of benefit, but may carry risks if unconditionally released. For example, the Authority might specify that only one sex of an animal species could be released, so preventing the animal from breeding and eventually becoming a pest.

 Compliance with release conditions

An organism, including a genetically modified organism, released with conditions will remain a new organism and subject to the HSNO Act. MAF Biosecurity will receive additional funding to ensure applicants comply with the controls imposed by the Authority. MAF already inspects laboratories doing genetic modification work to make sure they meet the required standards of containment and have the proper approvals.

 Strict liability

The Bill imposes strict civil liability in cases where harm has been caused through breaches of the HSNO Act, such as failing to get approval for a new organism or failing to comply with conditions for its release. Strict civil liability means that the person who breaks the law is liable to pay compensation to those affected even if the breach was unintentional, or the person took reasonable care when the breach occurred.

 Civil penalties regime

Other amendments introduce a civil penalties regime which would enable the State to take civil proceedings to have a penalty imposed by the Courts for breaching the HSNO Act, whether or not the breach had resulted in any harm to individuals, the environment or to public safety. The maximum penalty levels will be large to provide an incentive to comply with the requirements of the HSNO Act. Defences are available, including ‘inadvertent breach’ where the person does not know and could not reasonably have known of the breach. Prosecutions could still be brought on the grounds of nuisance or negligence where an activity did comply under the Act.

 Maori perspectives

The HSNO Act will be changed to try to ensure greater knowledge and understanding of Maori issues when decisions are made by ERMA, and to improve Maori involvement in the development of research programmes as well in the ERMA application process.

 Libby Harrison,
Senior Operator – New Organisms,
Ministry for the Environment,
phone 04 916 7649,
fax 04 917 7523, libby.harrison@mfe.govt.nz

About the New Organisms and Other Matters Bill 2003:
www.mfe.govt.nz/issues/organisms/legislation/

Border Bites

Desiccated frogs

More than 1 kg of dried frogs was intercepted recently by MAF Quarantine Officers at the International Mail Centre. The frogs, which were discovered by a MAFQS x-ray machine operator, originated in Thailand. After checking with the Department of Conservation to ensure they were not covered by Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species, the frogs were seized, and the importer was given the option to re-ship them or have them destroyed.

Pat on affected area

A strong smell of cow manure and an indication on the x-ray screen led to the discovery of these Ayurvedic medicines in a package by MAF Quarantine Officers at the International Mail Centre in Auckland. There was no English on the packaging, so the importer was asked to describe the goods. She explained that the products were medicines made from cooked ‘cow poo’, used to treat a skin condition where part of the skin loses pigmentation. After consultation with MAF Biosecurity Authority, the medicines were heat treated, then released.
Comprehensive reviews for AECs

Dr Harding, a veterinarian with post-graduate qualifications in animal welfare, is one of eight independent reviewers accredited by the Director-General of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry to assess compliance with Part 6 of the Animal Welfare Act 1999 - the section that deals specifically with the use of animals in research, testing and teaching.

As a response to societal concerns about this particular use of animals, the Animal Welfare Act 1999 imposes strict legislative obligations and significant responsibilities on those who use animals for scientific purposes. Any research, testing or teaching project involving the use of live animals must gain approval from an animal ethics committee which has been set up under a code of ethical conduct approved by the Director-General. In addition, every animal ethics committee must include at least three members with no connection to the research or teaching institution - one represents the New Zealand Veterinary Association; one represents an approved animal welfare organisation such as the RNZSPCA; and the third is nominated by a territorial authority or regional council. But further to this external input to the committee process - and to help maintain and build public confidence in the legislative system - research and teaching institutions must also undergo regular independent reviews with the aim of assessing "... the extent to which the code holder and their animal ethics committees are implementing the policies, procedures, and requirements set out in the Act".

A satisfactory review report is a prerequisite to obtaining approval of a code of ethical conduct for a second or subsequent period.

Last year was the first in which these audits were undertaken under the Animal Welfare Act 1999, and the reviewers involved found the experience overwhelmingly positive. "There was a real keenness to comply," says Dr Nita Harding. "Although some were not fully conversant with what are still relatively new legislative requirements, most saw the review as an educative process."

The review process is extremely thorough, Dr Harding adds. It involves scrutiny of the codes of ethical conduct and all meeting minutes, as well as a selection of a range of protocols. This is followed by a site visit, with inspection of facilities and interviews with animal ethics committee members, researchers, teachers and animal technicians.

"The list of questions is quite exhaustive, covering the relevance and adequacy of the code of ethical conduct, as well as the committee processes. The standard of both animal care and the housing and facilities is also looked at," explains Dr Harding. As a final step in ensuring the integrity of the process, the reviewers themselves must also undergo a regular audit of their procedures.

Dr Virginia Williams, BVSc, MACVSc, Dip Prof Ethics, Animal Welfare Coordinator, NZVA, williams@xtra.co.nz

Border and import permit charges increase

A streamlined cost recovery system for biosecurity services was introduced in May.

Under the new system, the Biosecurity (Costs) Regulations 1993, the Forest Disease Control Regulations 1967 and the Forest Produce Import and Export Regulations were replaced with the Forests (Notice of Export of Indigenous Timber) Regulations 2003 and the Biosecurity (Costs) Regulations 2003.

These regulations outline the charges for the biosecurity services provided by the different business groups within MAF including the Verification Agency, Quarantine Service, the National Plant Pest Reference Laboratory and the National Centre for Disease Investigation. Previous cost recovery legislation had not been reviewed since 1993 and no longer reflected the actual costs involved in maintaining New Zealand’s biosecurity border defences.

As a result of the changes, charges for key biosecurity services including the inspection and clearance of passengers, mail and cargo and the supervision of transitional and containment facilities have increased. In relation to cargo, all biosecurity activities are funded by users of the services, such as importers and shipping companies.

Costs continue to be charged at either a fixed or an hourly rate. Veterinary inspection rate of $96.10 per hour remains the same, but the rate for general border inspection increases from $57.40 per hour to $72.30 per hour.

The new categories of Biosecurity Scientist and Biosecurity Adviser are charged out at hourly rates of $104.40 and $130.00 respectively.

Under the new regulations the basic cost for a permit issued by the Biosecurity Authority under the Biosecurity Act for the import of risk goods is $130.

The new regulations were gazetted in April 2003. Copies are available from Bennetts Bookshop Limited.

Philippa White, Communications Adviser, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, ph 04 498 9948 or 025 223 1875 whitep@maf.govt.nz
New Zealand involvement with UK Home Office continues

What do squid, wild-caught primates and the largest snowfall in a decade have in common? They're all par for the course in Kate Littin's work with the UK Animal Procedures Committee Secretariat. In the following article Kate highlights some of the areas she has been engaged in.

Five months into a short contract and I have already learnt so much about the regulation of animal-based experiments in the UK. I followed in the footsteps of Kate Horrey (see Biosecurity 37:14) and so have naturally assumed the mantle 'Kate 2'.

The Animal Procedures Committee (APC) is an independent body providing advice to the Government about the use of animals in scientific procedures. Under the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986, which regulates animal-based research and testing in the UK, the APC must consider animal welfare and the needs of science and industry in any deliberations.

Expert advice on ethics and welfare

While the APC performs a similar function to New Zealand's National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee, there is an interesting difference: an Inspectorate also provides expert advice to the Government on the ethics and welfare of animal use in scientific procedures. In addition, the Animal Procedures Licensing and Animal Procedures Policy sections in the Home Office perform particular government functions. One of the most stimulating parts of my job has been learning how the APC, the Inspectorate, and the Home Office interact in advising on, administering and enforcing the Act.

While the APC deals with a range of issues, including the use of wild-caught primates, I've been mainly involved in six areas, including:

- housing and husbandry for laboratory animals
- education and training for all people involved in animal procedures (there is a three-tier licensing system in the UK)
- cost/benefit assessment – this is the mandatory assessment under the Act of the costs of proposed experiments to animal welfare and benefits to humans. A licence is not issued unless the benefits outweigh the costs
- the overproduction and disposal of surplus laboratory animals
- a review of euthanasia methods; and finally
- a bid to expand the Act to include all cephalopods (squid, cuttlefish, octopus and nautiloids). Only one invertebrate species is currently protected: the cephalopod Octopus vulgaris.

Experiment licences to be made public?

The APC and the Home Office itself are also considering several issues that have stemmed from the recent report of the House of Lords Select Committee on Animals in Scientific Procedures. The most significant are the recommendations for a UK Centre for Research on the 'Three Rs' and for project licence summaries to be made public. Such a summary could contain details of experiments, the nature and severity of any suffering, and possibly the number of animals subjected to each experiment. Currently, only the average severity of a project and the number of animals used overall are made public. To publicise project licences would represent a significant change, and one which is likely to affect scientists strongly in the UK where animal rights extremism is, unfortunately, still very much a concern.

The APC secretariat is currently looking for a replacement for me, and your name does not have to be Kate! It is possible that this might involve another New Zealand appointee and hopefully such a person will also get to see the snowmen in St James Park.

Kate Littin,
Animal Procedures Committee Secretary,
Committee Secretariat,
Home Office, UK, Kate.Littin@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk
www.apc.gov.uk

“Lifting the veil” at 2003 ANZCCART conference

In 2002, New Zealand Green Party MP and animal welfare spokesperson Sue Kedgley threw down the gauntlet with a provocative speech about secrecy in animal research, in which she criticised the lack of detail behind animal usage statistics, and questioned the regulatory processes that govern research using animals.

The Australian and New Zealand Council for the Care of Animals in Research and Teaching (ANZCCART) is picking up the challenge and will be discussing these issues at its 2003 annual conference, to be held in Christchurch on August 18-19.

The conference will explore how and why scientists use animals in research, and what are the strengths and weaknesses of current processes governing this work. Speakers from a diversity of research areas, working with widely different species, will help to lift the perceived “veil of secrecy”, stimulating discussion about the value and ethics of animal research.

Topics covered will include: public attitudes to animal research, marine mammal research, animals and heart disease, can we do cancer research without animals, and ethical issues associated with veterinary animal experiments.

For registration details see:
www.rsnz.org/advisory/anzccart
“Science in the service of animal welfare”

The Universities Federation for Animal Welfare (UFAW) hosted a major international conference, Science in the Service of Animal Welfare, in Edinburgh, Scotland over the period 2-4 April. Two invited papers were presented by New Zealand delegates.

UFAW is an internationally recognised, independent, scientific and educational animal welfare charity. The organisation is concerned with promoting high standards of welfare for farm, companion, laboratory, and captive wild animals, and for those with which we interact in the wild.

UFAW works to improve animal welfare in the UK and overseas by:

• promoting and supporting developments in the science and technology that underpin advances in animal welfare
• promoting education, particularly at the university and college level, in animal care and welfare, in current issues and in the assessment of welfare
• providing information, organising meetings, and publishing books, videos, articles, technical reports and the quarterly scientific journal Animal Welfare
• providing expert advice to government departments and other bodies and helping to draft and amend laws and guidelines.

This 33rd UFAW symposium attracted about 370 delegates from 24 countries, and was supported by the following sponsors:

• Proctor and Gamble
• GlaxoSmithKline
• DEFRA
• The Welcome Trust
• WSPA

David Bayvel presented a paper, Science-based animal welfare standards: The international role of the Office International des Epizooties (OIE). A second invited New Zealand paper, Using science to support ethical decisions promoting humane livestock slaughter and vertebrate pest control, was presented by David Mellor and Kate Littin from Massey University.

Other papers presented at the conference provided a valuable update on key welfare issues associated with farm animals, research animals and wildlife, and will be published, in due course, in a special issue of the journal Animal Welfare.

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

Border Patrol tops ratings again!

The second episode of Border Patrol was the top rating programme for Auckland viewers aged 5 and over for the week ending 9 May, and was number three with the same age group nationwide. Subsequent episodes have also achieved high ratings. Border Patrol screens on TV One on Mondays at 8pm, and features MAF Quarantine Service and Customs Officers at work. MAFQS Officers from Auckland Port, and Christchurch and Auckland International Airports feature in the current series, which highlights some of the challenges and interesting situations regularly faced by Quarantine Officers.

MAF Quarantine Officer Stuart Rawnsley, based at Ports of Auckland, features again in the new series of Border Patrol.

(Photo courtesy of TVNZ)
Moth response update

In the last issue of Biosecurity (No. 43, 1 May 2003) we featured updates on the biosecurity responses to several moth incursions in the northern North Island. In this latest update we can report no further finds of two of the moths concerned. Technical advisory groups have been meeting and planning the next stages for the responses.

Gum leaf skeletoniser

On the week of 12 May 2003 all pheromone traps were removed from the field. Sixty five moths have been caught – five of these outside the known infested area. As a follow up, host trees in the immediate vicinity of the traps are being inspected and ground spraying will be carried out if larvae are detected. This is to allow for containment of the infestation until decisions on future response are made.

A Technical Advisory Group met on 20 May 2003 to determine the next stage in the gum leaf skeletoniser response. The outcomes of this meeting will be reported in the next issue of Biosecurity.

Gypsy moth update

As of 20 May 2003, no further evidence of the gypsy moth has been detected.

Daily inspection of the pheromone traps was completed on 14 May 2003. As a precaution, traps will remain in the field over winter and will continue to be checked every 2-4 weeks.

The Technical Advisory Group met for the first time on 30 April 2003. Recommendations were developed for short-term (over winter) strategic actions. This will involve intense ground searching around the epicentre for evidence of egg masses, pupal skins and webbing. Less intense ground searching will be carried out in outer zones. In addition, traps will remain in the field, movement controls will continue to be enforced, and the public awareness campaign will be enhanced.

Longer-term strategic actions were discussed and options around actions (e.g. mass trapping, aerial spraying, ground spraying, host removal) in spring are still being considered.

DNA profiling continues to determine the exact strain of gypsy moth. To date there is very good evidence that the trapped moth is of Japanese origin, i.e. Asian biotype.

The Controlled Area has been determined and communicated to the Hamilton public via the Waikato Times and local radio. Restrictions have been placed on the movement of all plant matter (except lawn clippings) from the greater Hamilton area. Disposal of vegetative material is permitted at three dumpsites that fall within the Controlled Area.

Compliance agreements and special permits have been issued to nurseries, commercial growers and the like who fall within the Controlled Area so that they can move treated plant material outside the Controlled Area.

Fall webworm

Initial response actions have been completed with no further finds of the fall webworm (Biosecurity 43:5). A trapping grid has been formed, with 658 traps deployed to 10 km radius. Traps are inspected twice weekly. No fall webworm males have been caught to date. Vegetation control zone and measures have been implemented within 200 metres of the find.

A combined Gypsy Moth and Fall Webworm TAG meeting took place on 30 April. Recommendations included repeated ground surveys after leaf-fall, continued trapping over winter, and actions for the following season to include intensified trapping in spring and preparation for treatment if any further fall webworm life stages are found.

Peter Thomson,
Director MAF Forest Biosecurity,
phone 04 498 9639,
fax 498 9888,
thomsonp@maf.govt.nz
Animal exotic disease response capability to be increased

New Zealand’s ability to respond to exotic disease incursions, and foot and mouth disease (FMD) in particular, is to be strengthened. This follows a review of what is needed to meet New Zealand’s current standard (see box) for animal exotic disease response capability. The review was one of the outcomes of our involvement in the 2001 FMD outbreak in the United Kingdom.

Faster diagnosis

The New Zealand Animal Health Reference Laboratory will be getting new diagnostic hardware that will allow quicker and more sensitive laboratory diagnosis of FMD and other exotic diseases. For example, FMD will be able to be confirmed within 3 hours of samples arriving at the laboratory rather than the current 48 hours. The equipment will also be able to process a broader variety and greater volume of samples. This will also potentially enable testing of flocks and herds in an emergency response before clinical signs of the disease appear.

The laboratory will also be getting a new information management system with enough capacity to meet the demands of responses that are now critically dependent on large-scale, rapid testing.

Enhanced computer tools

The response computer tools EpiMAN, AgriBase, InterSpread, Windspeed, and the geographical information systems, will be upgraded, modernised and added to. For example, EpiMAN will be enabled to work across the internet, have more than one field operation headquarters and link with the laboratory information management system for samples.

Another project in this area is the development of a library of disease profiles for exotic diseases that can be loaded into EpiMAN when required.

Field response capability

Three new roles have been created:

• field epidemiologists, to collect epidemiological information on infected places
• induction trainers, to plan and provide rapid training for the additional people needed for the whole range of roles in an emergency response
• coordinators, to work with other emergency management services such as Civil Defence, regional councils and Police at local level.

A new programme to manage livestock saleyards will be modelled on the existing programmes for meat, dairy, wool, hides and skins processing, and the aquaculture industry. MAF, the contracted supplier, and sector representatives will work together to develop and keep updated a biosecurity risk profile of the sector, procedures and a generic site response plan. Individual companies will be responsible for deciding how to implement the new requirements and MAF will monitor preparedness.

Training, education and information

A new capability will be developed to coordinate training activities and ensure that consistent standards are achieved. A
modular biosecurity response training programme will be developed within the New Zealand Qualifications Authority framework. A library of training resources will be established, which will also help deal with requests for help with exotic disease response awareness and/or training from the wider biosecurity community – for example, regional councils, companies and Massey University undergraduate veterinarians.

**Animal destruction and disposal**

The armoury of animal destruction equipment will be reviewed, with a minimum capacity to be maintained. An inventory management approach will be taken for the armoury.

An air curtain incinerator will be purchased for portable high temperature incineration of carcasses and other waste. Field trials will be conducted and standard operating procedures developed.

The issues associated with carcass disposal, both on farm and in landfills, are to be presented to interested parties in a workshop format. From there, a work programme to develop detailed plans for carcass disposal in every region of New Zealand will be initiated.

**Role of vaccines**

MAF Biosecurity Authority will become the registrant of vaccines for FMD, anthrax, equine influenza and porcine respiratory and reproductive syndrome (PRRS). These vaccines are only likely to be used if other measures, such as containment and eradication, are inadequate to control an outbreak. In addition, New Zealand is looking at options for the supply of FMD vaccine that protects against a wider range of virus strains and enables vaccinated animals to enter the human food chain.

**The current EDR standard**

The current standard for animal exotic disease response preparedness requires capability to respond to 25 restricted places in the first week and 10 new restricted places in each subsequent week. The 2001 UK FMD outbreak highlighted the importance of being able to rapidly scale up a response beyond these parameters. For FMD, New Zealand’s primary strategy to contain an outbreak continues to be early detection and immediate aggressive action. The review of this standard for preparedness will be informed by current research into rates of livestock movement within New Zealand.

**Investigation funding**

Funding for exotic organism investigations by the National Centre for Disease Investigation has been increased. The number of investigations has almost trebled since the Centre was established in 1998, and investigations are becoming increasingly complex.

**Programme coordination**

Lastly, it has been recognised that MAF Biosecurity will need an additional person to coordinate the increased capability. This person will be working with Clifton King (see page 14).

**Big block gets the chop**

Although this item looks very like a huge Stilton cheese, it is in fact a huge chopping board covered in mould. The board, which weighed around 50kg, was intercepted by a MAF Quarantine Officer in Wellington in a consignment of personal effects from China. The board was seized and destroyed.
Biosecurity Coordination Group

Simon O’Connor was appointed Technical Adviser, Biosecurity Coordination – Indigenous Flora and Fauna team in May 2003.

With an applied science degree in natural resource management from Adelaide, Simon began his career as a soil surveyor and horticultural consultant for integrated pest management. He primarily managed export citrus and grape crops in the Riverina region of central New South Wales.

Simon then worked in the Wanganui Area office of the New Zealand Department of Conservation, where he coordinated and supervised biosecurity measures for weeds and feral animals.

Just before joining MAF, Simon coordinated the weed and feral efforts in Kakadu National Park, Northern Territory. In conjunction with the CSIRO, Simon managed the mapping and eradication of big headed ants (Pheidole megacephala) and ginger ants (Solenopsis germinata) from within the new park and took part in the preliminary surveys of the yellow crazy ant (Anoplolepis gracilipes) in Arnhem Land. He assessed weed management methodology across the park, assisting the inception of a specialist team to boost control of introduced pasture grasses running rampant across woodland and wetland habitats. Simon is looking forward to re-establishing old New Zealand contacts and forming new collaborative relationships with key stakeholder groups. He is also looking forward to playing a more active role in the protection of New Zealand’s at-risk fauna and flora.

Christine Reed was recently appointed Manager, Indigenous Flora and Fauna team. Christine’s previous position in this team was National Advisor (Biosecurity 32:9). Christine will manage the work programme for the three permanent team members while continuing to contribute technical expertise. A contract position will be added to the team in July, with the recruitment of a wildlife disease surveillance coordinator funded from the Cross-Departmental Research Pool administered by the Ministry of Research, Science and Technology.

Forest pest surveillance and response

Brendan Murphy has recently joined the Forestry Biosecurity group as an Adviser for Forest Pest Surveillance and Response. Brendan will be assisting with the evaluation and redesign of forest biosecurity surveillance systems.

He is near completion of his PhD on biological control and risk assessment of the Eucalyptus tortoise beetle, Paropsis charybdis and related species. Currently five paropsine species are established in New Zealand and one is currently the subject of an eradication programme by MAF. Brendan’s research targeted introduction and release of Tasmanian strains of already established egg parasitoid that was anticipated to improve control of the beetle in colder regions of New Zealand. Some biological aspects of over 20 other species were also evaluated.

Unfortunately biology is not exempt from Murphy’s law, and a natural enemy of the egg parasitoid establishing in New Zealand was discovered during Brendan’s research. Despite this, molecular methods successfully detected establishment of a Tasmanian strain so the research was not in vain.

Animal Biosecurity Programme Coordinator, Exotic Disease Response

Clifton King is the new Animal Biosecurity Programme Coordinator, Exotic Disease Response.

Clifton transferred from the National Centre for Disease Investigation, where he was an exotic disease investigator for three years. He joined MAF two months prior to the discovery of Varroa destructor in April 2000, and also worked on the responses to Brucella canis, red imported fire ant, foot and mouth disease in the United Kingdom, Mycoplasma mycoides mycoides (Large Colony), and Brucella suis.

Before joining MAF, Clifton held positions in university and private practice where he specialised in dairy production medicine. In 1997 he completed an MSc in Epidemiology and Business Management at North Carolina State University.
Focus shifts to South Island

The 2003 round of varroa surveillance in the lower North Island shows that there is now extensive spread of varroa south of the movement control line.

The existing movement control line is scheduled to be removed no later than 30 June 2003, when the government-funded transitional varroa management programme ends. The Varroa Planning Group (made up of local government, MAF and rural sector organisations) does not intend to include North Island movement controls within their National Pest Management Strategy proposal, which will focus solely on keeping varroa out of the South Island. However, the VPG does intend to discuss the possibility of short-term retention of North Island controls with the Minister for Biosecurity. South Island varroa surveillance is continuing.

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

Update

Import health standards issued - Plants

The import health requirements for cotton (Gossypium) and palm (approximately 600 species in 173 genera, including species of Acrocomia, Brahea, Butia, Calamus, Caryota, Ceroxylon, Chamaedorea, Cocos, Dypsis, Geonoma, Livistona, Phoenix, Pritchardia, Sabal, Syagrus and Trachycarpus) seed for sowing were amended on 1 and 19 May 2003 respectively. The new requirements can be found under the Gossypium, and Acrocomia, Cocos, Corypha, Elaeis, Livistona and Phoenix schedules in MAF standard 155.02.05 Importation of Seed for Sowing at:

www.maf.govt.nz/biosecurity/imports/plants/planimports@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:
• Zapadappa Concepts Ltd

Amendments to codes of ethical conduct approved: Nil

Notifications to MAF of minor amendments to codes of ethical conduct: Nil

New import health standards

Specified bee products from all countries

Medicines, health foods and tonics containing bee products such as pollen, royal jelly, propolis, honey and bee venom must now be commercially packaged for direct retail sale. Bulk importation of capsules, tablets or vials now requires a permit to import. This standard is dated 1 May 2003 and replaces that dated 7 June 2001.

Dogs and cats

All import health standards for dogs and their germplasm have been updated in line with the Customs Prohibition Order banning dangerous dog breeds from importation into New Zealand. The restricted breeds of dogs are the American Pit
Bull Terrier, Dogo Argentino, Japanese Tosa and Brazilian Fila. Interim measures to test for Babesia gibsoni have also been added to the dog standards (excluding germplasm) until the risk analysis has been completed.

The new standards are all dated 12 May 2003 and replace the following:

- Dogs and cats from specified countries and territories recognised as countries or territories in which canine rabies is absent or well controlled and approved rabies-free island countries, replace those dated 21 August 2002.
- Dogs and cats from Bahrain, Barbados, Fiji, Iceland, Japan replace the standards dated 25 June 2002.
- Dogs and cats from Malaysia and South Africa replace the standards dated 26 June 2002.
- Dogs and cats on yachts from all countries, replacing that dated 4 July 2002.
- Dogs and cats from Australia, replacing that dated 29 October 2002.
- Dogs and cats from Ireland, Hawaii, Norway, Singapore, Sweden all replace those dated 25 September 2002.
- Dogs and cats from New Caledonia, replacing that dated 1 September 1999.
- Dogs and cats from the United Kingdom, replacing that dated 2 December 2002.
- Dog semen from Australia, replacing that dated 22 May 1998.
- Dog semen from Belgium, the Netherlands and Hungary, replacing that dated 30 October 2002.
- Dog semen from Denmark, Hawaii, Norway, Sweden, Canada, the United States (excluding Hawaii), the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland replace the standards dated 11 January 1998.

Kerry Mulqueen, National Adviser, Import Management, phone 04 498 9624, fax 04 474 4132, mulqueenk@maf.govt.nz

www.maf.govt.nz/animal-imports

Revoked import health standards

BSE case in Canada
The import health standards listed below have been withdrawn following the detection of a case of native-born bovine spongiform encephalopathy in Canada:

- Cattle from Canada dated 19 August 2002
- Llamas and alpacas from Canada dated 4 September 2002
- Filtered and irradiated foetal bovine serum, calf serum and bovine serum from Canada and the United States dated 12 March 2001
- Foetal bovine serum, calf serum and bovine serum for further processing from Canada and the United States dated 12 March 2001
- Frozen bovine by-products for further processing from Canada and the United States dated 12 March 2001
- Inedible tallow from Canada dated 22 May 2001.

Kerry Mulqueen, National Adviser, Import Management, phone 04 498 9624, fax 04 474 4132, mulqueenk@maf.govt.nz

www.maf.govt.nz/animal-imports

Bison from Canada and Australia, bison embryos and semen from Canada or United States
The conditions of these standards have been reviewed and found to be no longer suitable for trade. These standards were dated 4 September 2002, 29 June 2001, 29 June 2001 and 27 September 1999 respectively.

Cattle from New Caledonia
New Zealand is concerned that bovine herpes virus 1 (BHV 1) may be present in New Caledonia and the import conditions had no restrictions for BHV 1. This standard was dated 19 August 2002.

Kerry Mulqueen, National Adviser, Import Management, phone 04 498 9624, fax 04 474 4132, mulqueenk@maf.govt.nz

Draft import health standards for consultation

Antelope from South Africa and Canada for zoos
The standards are based on the MAF risk analysis Diseases of Antelope: Risks of introducing live antelope into zoological gardens, May 2000, and relevant parts of the Organisation International des Epizooties International Animal Health Code, Eleventh Edition 2002. There is strong emphasis on the prevention of the importation of ticks on the antelope. Once imported, antelope will be confined to zoos for their whole life.

Antelope from Australia for zoos
Conditions have been tightened to ensure freedom from ticks and other external and internal parasites. Other changes include:

- Wildebeest have been included in the list of antelope that can be imported.
- The post-export isolation period has been reduced to 30 days and post-arrival quarantine to 7 days.
- The importer’s obligation to obtain ERMA clearance for importation of new species is specified.
- Imported antelope will be permanently confined in zoos under the new MAF/ERMA Standard 154.03.04 (Containment Facilities for Zoo Animals).
- Only one certificate signed by an official veterinarian is required.
- Testing and treatment requirements are minor.

Chicken hatching eggs from the United States
It is proposed to add the United States to the import health standard for chicken hatching eggs from Canada. The poultry health status of the two countries are equivalent and therefore the safeguards applied to hatching eggs from Canada are applicable to hatching eggs from the United States.

Submissions on the above draft import health standards should be received in writing by Friday 4 July.

Paul Berentson, Technical Adviser, International Trade, phone 04 498 9897, fax 04 474 4227, berentsonp@maf.govt.nz

www.maf.govt.nz/biosecurity/consultation.htm#draft-ihs
Honey bee genetic material

The public consultation period for the import risk analysis for honey bee (Apis mellifera) genetic material and a draft import health standard for carniolan honey bee (Apis mellifera carnica) semen has been extended.

The closing date for submissions is now 1 August 2003.

Martin van Ginkel, Technical Adviser, Risk Analysis
phone 04 470 278, fax 474 4133
vanginkelm@maf.govt.nz

www.maf.govt.nz/biosecurity/consultation

New organism records: 24/03/03 – 09/05/03

Forest biosecurity records 24/03/2003 – 09/05/2003

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>Uraba lugens (gum leaf skeletoniser)</td>
<td>Eucalyptus rubida(Candle-bark gum)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other PPIN hosts include silver dollar gum, brown barrel, cut tail, narrow-leaved black peppermint, white iron-bark, Southern mahogany, sugar gum and Bosisto's box.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eucalyptus pauciflora (eucalyptus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eucalyptus camaldulensis (Murray red gum, red river gum, river red gum)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nambouria xanthops (no common name)</td>
<td>Eucalyptus rubida (eucalyptus, Candle-bark gum)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other PPIN hosts include Tasmanian blue gum, Ribbon gum, Southern mahogany and Bosisto's box.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nambouria xanthops (no common name)</td>
<td>Eucalyptus macarthurii (Cameren woollybutt)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other PPIN hosts include Tasmanian blue gum, Ribbon gum, Southern mahogany and Bosisto's box.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermisporium obtusum (Vermisporium leaf spot)</td>
<td>Eucalyptus macarthurii (Cameren woollybutt)</td>
<td>Coromandel</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other hosts recorded include Eucalyptus delegatensis, Eucalyptus fraxinoides, Eucalyptus regnans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marssonia betulae (leaf spot fungus)</td>
<td>Betula papyrifera (paper birch)</td>
<td>Waikato</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other host recorded was Betula pendula.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oemona hirta (lemon tree borer)</td>
<td>Rhus succedanea (Japanese wax tree)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>This species has a very wide host range and geographical distribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capulinia orbiculata (no common name)</td>
<td>Metrodiersos excelsa (Pohutukawa)</td>
<td>Coromandel</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
<td>No other hosts recorded in PPIN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creis hirtatus (jumping plant lice)</td>
<td>Eucalyptus saligna (Sydneu blue gum)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other PPIN hosts include Southern mahogany.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrocercops lacticella (black butt leaf miner)</td>
<td>Eucalyptus dentromorpha (eucalyptus)</td>
<td>Taupo</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other PPIN hosts include Red flowering gum, Shining gum, Red ironbark, Tasmanian blue gum, White peppermint, Yellow box, Sydney blue gum, Tallow wood, Brush box, Blackbutt, and Alpine Ash.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vizelia tunicata (no common name)</td>
<td>Pseudopanax laetus (lacewood)</td>
<td>Coromandel</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other hosts include Houpara, Pseudopanax discolor, Myrsine australis, Pittsporum tenuifolium, Pseudopanax simplex and Pseudopanax crassifolium.</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>Essigella californica (Californian pine needle aphid, Monterey pine aphid)</td>
<td>Pinus nigra (Nelson's pine)</td>
<td>Mackenzie</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other PPIN distributions include Northland, Auckland, Coromandel, Taupo and Hawke's Bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambrosiodmus compressus (bark beetle)</td>
<td>Lingen insect trap</td>
<td>Gisborne</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other PPIN distributions include Auckland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllosticta spinarum (no common name)</td>
<td>Chamaepcyris lawsoniana (Lawson's cypress)</td>
<td>Taupo</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other PPIN distributions include Auckland, Bay of Plenty, Hawke's Bay, Nelson, Bulier and Wellington.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermisporium obtusum (Vermisporium leaf spot)</td>
<td>Eucalyptus macarthurii (Cameren woollybutt)</td>
<td>Coromandel</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>No other distributions recorded in PPIN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nematus digospilus (European sawfly?, willow sawfly?)</td>
<td>Salix sp. (willow)</td>
<td>Buller</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
<td>Other PPIN distributions include Auckland, Bay of Plenty, Gisborne, Mid-Canterbury, Waikato, Dunedin and Nelson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salix fragilis (crack willow)</td>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued next page
FOREST BIOSECURITY RECORDS 24/03/2003 – 09/05/2003 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism Host</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Submitted by</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stegognomata sulfuratella (banksia leaf miner)</td>
<td>Bankisia integrifolia (coastal banksia)</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiaspina fiscella (brown lace lerp)</td>
<td>Eucalyptus saligna (Sydney blue gum)</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vizella tunicata (no common name)</td>
<td>Pseudopanax laetus (lancewood)</td>
<td>Coromandel</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudovalsa lanciformis (no common name)</td>
<td>Betula pendula (silver birch)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterella betulea (no common name)</td>
<td>Betula pendula (silver birch)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monomorium sydneyense (No common name)</td>
<td>Bait pottle</td>
<td>Bay of Plenty</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANIMAL BIOSECURITY RECORDS 24/03/2003 – 09/05/2003

Validated to New Zealand reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism Host</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Submitted by</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Microthyriella hibisci (no common name)</td>
<td>Hibiscus sp. (Hibiscus)</td>
<td>Gisborne</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorea senniana (copper leaf)</td>
<td>Protea nerifolia (black protea)</td>
<td>Taranaki</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudocercospora beilschmiediae (no common name)</td>
<td>Beilschmiedia tarairi (Taraire)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>National Plant Pest Reference Laboratory (NPPRL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phytophthora brassicae (phytophthora rot of cauliflower)</td>
<td>Brassica oleracea ssp. botrytis subgroup caulliflora (caulliflora)</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLANTS BIOSECURITY RECORDS 24/03/2003 – 09/05/2003

Validated New to New Zealand reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism Host</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Submitted by</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oemona hirta (lemon tree borer)</td>
<td>Hibiscus rosa-sinensis (Chinese hibiscus)</td>
<td>Bay of Plenty</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrobacterium tumefaciens (crown gall)</td>
<td>Campanula sp. (Campanula)</td>
<td>Mid Canterbury</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoma exigua (phoma leaf spot)</td>
<td>Echium plantagineum (Paterson's curse)</td>
<td>Mid Canterbury</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorea senniana (copper leaf)</td>
<td>Protea cynaroides (giant protea, king protea)</td>
<td>Bay of Plenty</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceroplastes sinensis (Chinese wax scale)</td>
<td>Berbers gayacocarpca (barberry)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Forest Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cercospora api (cercospora leaf spot)</td>
<td>Chenopodium capitatum (strawberry blite)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>NPPRL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accredited reviewers for organisations with a code of ethical conduct
Organisations with a code of ethical conduct are required to undergo a review from time to time. Reviews must be carried out by independent reviewers accredited by MAF for the purpose in accordance with section 109 of the Animal Welfare Act 1999. The following people have been accredited to carry out independent reviews:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title and Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date of approval</th>
<th>Expiry date of accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr Howard Vernen Brooks</td>
<td>AgriQuality NZ Ltd PO Box 585 Palmerston North</td>
<td>06 351 7935</td>
<td>06 351 7919</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brooksh@agriquality.co.nz">brooksh@agriquality.co.nz</a></td>
<td>05.02.03</td>
<td>04.02.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Norman Richard Burton</td>
<td>Home Office PO Box 31 Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 7WN United Kingdom</td>
<td>0044 1734 241612</td>
<td>0044 1743 344691</td>
<td><a href="mailto:norman.burton@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk">norman.burton@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk</a></td>
<td>09.04.03</td>
<td>08.04.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Kenneth John Patrick Cooper</td>
<td>61 Amapur Drive Khandallah Wellington</td>
<td>04 479 5092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01.07.02</td>
<td>30.06.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Angenita Blanche Harding</td>
<td>AgriQuality NZ Ltd Private Bag 3080 Hamilton</td>
<td>07 834 1777</td>
<td>07 838 5846</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hardingn@agriquality.co.nz">hardingn@agriquality.co.nz</a></td>
<td>29.05.02</td>
<td>28.05.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Patricia Elaine Hartley</td>
<td>Home office PO Box 1138 Swindon SN1 2RZ United Kingdom From 1.7.03 3/10 Jason Avenue Mt Albert Auckland</td>
<td>0044 1793 514029</td>
<td>0044 1793 432979</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cpd.aspa.swindon@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk">cpd.aspa.swindon@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk</a></td>
<td>09.04.03</td>
<td>08.04.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr David Rowlane Morgan</td>
<td>Landcare Research NZ Ltd PO Box 69 Lincoln</td>
<td>03 325 6700</td>
<td>03 325 6705</td>
<td><a href="mailto:morgand@landcare.cri.nz">morgand@landcare.cri.nz</a></td>
<td>11.10.02</td>
<td>10.10.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Keith Douglas Paterson</td>
<td>AgriQuality NZ Ltd PO Box 951, Rotorua</td>
<td>07 345 8720</td>
<td>07 345 8729</td>
<td><a href="mailto:patersonk@agriquality.co.nz">patersonk@agriquality.co.nz</a></td>
<td>17.03.03</td>
<td>16.03.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Virginia Margaret Willams</td>
<td>15 Tongariro Street Mt Eden Auckland</td>
<td>09 630 1197</td>
<td>09 630 1197</td>
<td><a href="mailto:williams@xtra.co.nz">williams@xtra.co.nz</a></td>
<td>23.01.03</td>
<td>22.01.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Dr Burton wishes to undertake reviews for professional development reasons. He will pay for his own travel to New Zealand. He will be visiting New Zealand in August 2003.
2 Dr Hartley is moving to New Zealand later this year. She will be available to undertake reviews in 2004.

CODES OF WELFARE - Animal Welfare Act Update
This part of the Directory section of Biosecurity is a new, regular feature. The table below is a quick guide as to the status of the various codes of welfare as they are developed under the Animal Welfare Act 1999.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broiler Code</td>
<td>Final code due to be issued by the Minister of Agriculture in July 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig Code</td>
<td>Final code to be presented to Minister of Agriculture July 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layer Hen Code</td>
<td>Public consultation completed. Final code to be presented to Minister of Agriculture August 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodeo Code</td>
<td>Public consultation completed. Final code to be presented to Minister of Agriculture late July 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circus Code</td>
<td>Under development. Final code to be presented to Minister of Agriculture mid September 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoo Code</td>
<td>Under development. Final code to be presented to Minister of Agriculture mid November 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Slaughter Code</td>
<td>Public consultation completed. Final code to be presented to Minister of Agriculture late September 2003</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