Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2017

Department of Agriculture and Water Resources

Question Number: 30

Division/Agency: Biosecurity Animal Division

Topic: Bait and burley surveys

Proof Hansard Page: 42-43 (24.05.2017)

Senator KETTER asked:

Senator KETTER: It is the 22 May report. I think on page 7 you indicate that prior to 1 December 2016 Australia was considered to be free of WSSV. I know there was work done in 2009 on that issue. Was any risk assessment done in relation to the potential for bait to be an issue?

Dr A Cupit: When we did the risk assessment in 2009 there were a couple of bait and burley surveys that were done that informed the decision-making process when we did the IRA, and it did find that there was the potential, and always a small percentage of anglers would use prawns as bait.

Senator KETTER: When was that?

Dr A Cupit: Those two surveys—I cannot remember the exact dates, but they were done from the early 2000's after the Darwin incident. We did one in 2001 and one in 2007 or 2008. I will get the exact dates later.

Answer:

The two surveys referred to by Dr A Cupit are:

- National survey of bait and berley use by recreational fishers Report to Biosecurity Australia, AFFA December 2002 (report prepared by Kewagama Research)
- National survey of bait and berley use by recreational fishers: A follow-up survey focusing on prawns/shrimp Report to Biosecurity Australia January 2007 (report prepared by Kewagama Research)

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2017

Department of Agriculture and Water Resources

Question Number: 31

Division/Agency: Biosecurity Animal Division

Topic: Structural diagram

Proof Hansard Page: 55 (24.05.2017)

Senator STERLE asked:

Senator STERLE: Chair, can I just do something? I just want to ask for some information. I do not want to go back to white spot, but I am going to ask for a structural diagram on who is in charge of what in terms of the eradication and the whole lot between you guys, federally, Secretary Quinlivan, the state government and all the bodies that fall under you, so we know who is who.

Mr Quinlivan: That is a very complicated picture.

Senator STERLE: I thought it might be.

Mr Quinlivan: It works well for most things. We will do that.

Senator STERLE: Thanks, if you can provide that.

Ms O'Connell: Yes.

Answer:

Australia has well established national, state and territory arrangements for managing the response to emerging and emergency animal diseases, plant pests and environmental biosecurity incidents. Each state and territory has legislative responsibility for the management of biosecurity incidents that occur within their borders. To support states and territories affected by biosecurity incidents, nationally agreed approaches have been developed and ensure nationally consistent response to all biosecurity incidents.

The below figure illustrates the individuals, groups and centres, typically involved in the operational phase of a response to a biosecurity incident.

Question Number: 31 (continued)



The operational phase commences when the presence of a pest, disease or other threat is confirmed and activities under an incident specific response plan are implemented. Typically the aim of the operational phase is to contain, eradicate or eliminate the identified pest, disease or threat.

During the operational phase:

- **coordination centres** will be established at the appropriate levels (i.e. national, state and/or local) to manage strategic and operational aspects of the response. State and local coordination centres are operated by state or territory biosecurity agencies. Operation of the National Coordination Centre (if established) is the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources.
- a **national consultative committee** may be established depending on the nature of the incident (membership consists of the Australian Government, state and territory governments and in the case of emergency animal diseases and plant pests, the relevant peak industry bodies).

Question Number: 31 (continued)

• a **national management group** may be established. This is a decision-making body and reviews the advice given by the consultative committee relating to response policy and funding mechanisms. It comprises the Chief Executive Officers of states and territories and Australian Government departments of agriculture (or equivalents), as well as industry representatives in the case of emergency animal diseases and plant pests.

Membership of national consultative committees and national management groups for the responses to various pests and diseases are set out under the following response agreements/deeds:

- Emergency Animal Disease Response Agreement
- Emergency Plant Pest Response Deed
- National Environmental Biosecurity Response Agreement

An Emergency Aquatic Animal Disease Response Agreement is currently being negotiated.

During the operational phase, the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources will also assess whether the incident is of interest to, or has the potential to involve other Australian Government agencies. The Secretary will also assess whether the Australian Government Agricultural Incident Plan or any aspect of it needs to be activated. If so, the Department will notify the:

- Minister for Agriculture and Water Resources, and
- Crisis Coordination Centre (within the Attorney General's Department), and
- Other relevant Australian Government agencies.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Budget Estimates May 2017

Department of Agriculture and Water Resources

Question Number: 32

Division/Agency: Biosecurity Animal Division

Topic: FMD training in Nepal

Proof Hansard Page: 73-74 (24.05.2017)

Senator CAROL BROWN asked:

Senator CAROL BROWN: I want to go to the investment by the government in FMD training in Nepal. Can you tell me how much funding has been allocated to FMD training in Nepal since the white paper was released on 4 July 2015.

Dr Martin: We did have some funding for FMD training in Nepal prior to the white paper. I do not have the exact figure, so I will have to take that on notice.

Senator CAROL BROWN: Okay.

Dr Martin: It is over several years in that, so I will give you the total amount.

Senator CAROL BROWN: That is fine. I would appreciate that. If you could take that on notice, that would be good. But the minister did make a more recent announcement of funding on 16 December. Was that \$491,000? That's okay.

Dr Martin: I can give you the amount.

Senator CAROL BROWN: On notice, because you probably will not have this here either, can you provide a breakdown of the industry and state funding contributions to the training in Nepal as well?

Dr Martin: Yes, I will have to take that on notice. We do have partners with industry and with states.

Senator CAROL BROWN: Yes, I understand. You can take it on notice to do that. Also, take on notice a breakdown of funding allocated to the government's biosecurity surveillance funding and a list of programs it funds?

Dr Martin: Can I just clarify. That is a very broad issue. Is it to do with animal disease surveillance from the white paper?

Senator CAROL BROWN: Yes.

Dr Martin: That is fine.

Question Number: 32 (continued)

Answer:

The foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) Real-time Training programme is cost-shared between the Australian Government, as well as participating state and territory governments, Australian industry organisations, and government counterparts in the Quadrilateral countries (Canada, New Zealand and the USA). The current programme will conclude on 31 December 2019.

The table below outlines the funding for course costs committed from 2016 through the *Agricultural Competitiveness White Paper*, and a breakdown of funding provided by cost-sharing partners.

Organisation	Value (GST exclusive)
Department of Agriculture and Water Resources	\$490,220
Quadrilateral partners (Canada, New Zealand and USA)	\$107,565
Department of Agriculture and Food Western Australia	\$40,796
Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport and	
Resources, Victoria	\$54,840
Dairy Australia	\$40,796
Sheepmeat Council of Australia	\$67,882
Wool Producers Australia	\$67,993
Total	\$870,092

A list of administered funded onshore animal health, aquatic animal health and marine pest surveillance projects under the *Agricultural Competitiveness White Paper* in 2016-17 is presented below.

Activity	Value (GST exclusive)
Foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) real-time training and online training	\$145,560
Funding for private vets to participate in FMD real time training	\$32,000
Development of reference material for veterinarians on emergency animal disease surveillance	\$21,600
Improving producer and livestock professionals' understanding of surveillance requirements through 'surveillance champions'	\$147,995
Enhancing Laboratories for Emergency Animal Disease Diagnosis and Response (LEADDR) network quality assurance program and assay roll-out	\$124,000
Quality-assured national capacity for sequencing and comparative analysis of genomes for animal disease surveillance and diagnosis	\$100,000
Deploy the Neptune aquatic animal health information system	\$100,000
Validation of diagnostic tests for priority aquatic animal diseases	\$110,000
Strengthening marine pest passive surveillance	\$60,000
National avian influenza in wild birds surveillance programme	\$150,000
Newcastle disease surveillance in wild birds	\$120,000
Surveillance for antimicrobial resistance in food producing animals	\$70,000

Structured surveillance pilot programme in the pig industry	\$270,000
Testing for Brucella suis in cattle	\$100,000
Validation of marine pest modern diagnostic methods	\$270,000
Studies for the detection and characterization of bluetongue virus serotypes – Segment Sequencing Primers	\$54,800
Studies for the detection and characterization of bluetongue virus serotypes – Individual Type Specific Assays	\$91,950
Total	\$1,976,905