Diseases of Antelope: Risks of introducing live antelope into zoological gardens.

REVIEW OF SUBMISSIONS

8 August 2000

MAF Biosecurity Authority

Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Te Manatu Ahuwhenua, Ngaherehere
ASB Bank House
101-103 The Terrace
P O Box 2526
Wellington
New Zealand

Telephone: +64 4 474 4100
Facsimile: +64 4 474 4133
Internet: http://www.maf.govt.nz

Animal Biosecurity
Biosecurity Authority

Diseases of Antelope: Risks of introducing live antelope into zoological gardens.

REVIEW OF SUBMISSIONS

8 August 2000

Approved for general release

Dr B D O'Neil
Group Director
Biosecurity Authority

Table of Contents

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On 30 May 2000 MAF Biosecurity Authority approved for release the *Diseases of Antelope: Risks of introducing live antelope into zoological gardens* risk analysis. This risk analysis was conducted by a private consultant on behalf of would-be importers.

The risk analysis was subjected to MAF's internal scientific review process and to external expert review. The risk analyst addressed all the points raised by MAF and the external reviewers. MAF considers this risk analysis technically sound and sufficiently robust to base Import Health Standards on.

MAF received one submission on this risk analysis. Minor modifications where made as a result of this submission. The submission did not question the overall validity of the risk analysis.

2. INTRODUCTION

MAF notified the availability of the risk analysis for submissions in the 15 June 2000 Issue of Biosecurity. The deadline for submissions was 1 August 2000.

MAF received one submission:

1. Department of Conservation. 17 July 2000. Clare Miller, New Organisms Officer.

3. REVIEW OF SUBMISSIONS

3.1 Department of Conservation

3.1.1 The Department of Conservation sought additional information on the ticks included in the risk analysis. Accordingly to their advice, it would be prudent to allow six weeks total quarantine time to ensure all ticks had completed their life cycles. This is two weeks longer than the four-week period recommend in the risk analysis (p 11). The Department of Conservation was not confident that the four-week period would be long enough to ensure that there are no ticks still completing their life cycles on the host.

MAF comment:

Pre-export isolation period will be extended from 4 weeks to 6 weeks.

3.1.2 The risk analysis does not comment on what type of insecticide should be used to control ticks. Department of Conservation would like to see some recommendation of this nature included in the import health standard for antelope when and if one is prepared.

3.1.3 DoC also recommends the use of a chemical called fluazuron while animals are in quarantine. This chemical sterilises female ticks and affects moulting. This chemical is not registered for use in New Zealand.

MAF comment:

The issue of whether MAF should include chemical or product names in import health standards is one that has been raised and discussed before within the Ministry. If the Ministry is confident that the product is registered in the exporting country for use in that species, the Ministry will insist on its use. However, products frequently are not registered for use in the species being imported and in such cases it is not appropriate for the Ministry to prescribe the use of that product. In most importations, New Zealand is dealing with veterinarians or wildlife experts who have considerably more knowledge and experience than the Ministry has with regard to the efficacy of the chemical products available.

3.1.4 The Department of Conservation does not have the expertise to comment on the sections of the IHS relating to antelope diseases. They ask that MAF examine

these sections and ensures that the standards incorporated into any IHS that is produced will be sufficient to reduce any risk of disease being passed to wildlife to negligible levels.

3.1.5 The Department supports the conclusions of the analysis relating to the reduced risks associated with import of embryos and semen. They would support the idea of antelope being introduced by these means rather than as live adult animals.

3.1.6 DoC noted that there appear to be some spelling errors on pages 9-10 of the risk analysis

MAF comment:

Spelling errors were noted.

4. CONCLUSIONS.

4.1 No significant opposition to the risk analysis.

Only one submission was received. This recommended some minor changes which will be dealt with during the development of the import health standards.

5. REVISED RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendation is different from those in the risk analysis and were changed as a result of the consultation process:

- Quarantine period of 6 weeks