### **Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee**

### ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

### **Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** 246

**Division/Agency:** Biosecurity - Policy Division

**Topic: Myrtle Rust** 

Proof Hansard page: Written

### **Senator SIEWART asked:**

Has the Department funded any trials on Myrtle Rust? If yes, please outline the nature of the trial/s, location/s and funding.

#### **Answer:**

### **Myrtle rust - transition to management program**

- 1. The Australian Government announced on 11 May 2011 funding of \$1.5 million to support a pilot of the national transitional containment principles developed by National Biosecurity Committee. The *Plan for the Transition to Management of Myrtle Rust* includes projects that are aimed at: improving knowledge of the disease; actions to manage and slow down spread; chemical control options and resistance breeding options.
- 2. Plant Health Australia is managing the pilot transition program that will operate from July 2011 to June 2013. The plan and implementation progress reports are available at http://myrtlerust.net.au.
- 3. A transition to management group chaired by the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry and comprising affected state and territory agencies, forest industry representatives and some technical specialists has been established to oversee the implementation of the program and monitor delivery of the program outcomes. Details for projects and funds committed to date<sup>1</sup> by the Australian Government are as follows:

Taxonomy and identity of the pathogen

Agency	Project	Funding
NSW Department of	3.1 Genome sequencing of Myrtle	\$175 000
Primary Industries	rust and guava rust.	
CSIRO	3.2 Determining infectivity of \$23 549	
	Myrtle rust at specific	
	developmental stages and	
	investigating nuclear behavior using	
	microscopy techniques.	
NSW Department of	3.3 Collection of guava rust in \$60 000	
Primary Industries	South America for genome	
	sequencing and classification	
	projects - pending Brazilian export	
	requirements.	
University of Tasmania	3.4 Classification and diversity of \$60 000	
	the guava rust complex using	
	molecular and morphological	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Details of some projects differ from those presented in the plan due to revisions

## **Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee**

# ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

## **Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

Agency	Project	Funding
	characters.	
Sydney Royal Botanical	3.5 Family placement of Myrtle rust	\$60 000
Gardens	and guava rust, by DNA extraction	
	from both myrtle and guava rust	
	families to determine exact species.	

Potential impact and distribution

Agency	Project	Funding
The University of	Genetic basis of the virulence of \$385 836	
Sydney	Myrtle rust across its geographic	
	range in Australia. Evaluating	
	resistance of selected Myrtaceous	
	species. Establishing a national	
	myrtle rust resistance screening	
	facility.	

**Chemical Control Options** 

Agency	Project	Funding
The University of	Gathering efficacy data to identify	\$223 859
Sydney and NSW	the most effective chemicals for	
Department of Primary	controlling myrtle rust.	
Industry		

**Resistance Breeding Options** 

Agency	Project	Funding
Research School of	6.1Discovery of genetic markers for \$121 460	
Biology, Australian	resistance to Myrtle rust infection in	
National University	Myrtaceae (excluding members of	
	tribe Eucalypteae).	
CSIRO	6.2 Discovery of genetic markers \$100 000	
	for resistance to Myrtle rust	
	infection in members of tribe	
	Eucalypteae.	

In addition, CSIRO has made the following contributions to Myrtle rust research:

CSIRO	Taxonomy and Identity	\$190 000 (\$25 000 from the Myrtle
	of the Pathogen.	rust transition to management
		program)
CSIRO	Resistance Breeding	\$178 000 (\$100 000 from the Myrtle
	Options.	rust transition to management
		program)
CSIRO	Strategic management	\$87 500 (\$69 000 from the eradication
	of <i>Uredo rangelii</i> rust.	program)

### **Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee**

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2012

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry** 

**Question: 257** 

**Division/Agency:** Biosecurity - Policy Division **Topic: Reform of Australia's biosecurity system** 

Proof Hansard page: Written

### **Senator EDWARDS asked:**

With reference to Written Question on Notice 276, part 1, f, i (May Budget Estimates 2012) the Department was asked about the reforms that will increase the management of risks offshore and enhance co-regulatory arrangements. The Department stated that the costs of these arrangements will be met by the commercial entity.

- 1. What are the likely costs for the commercial entity under these arrangements (or if there are different costs incurred by different commercial entities depending on their activity, what is the range of costs likely to be borne by the commercial entity)?
- 2. How does this compare to the old system? Please provide examples of the rates under the new and old system for the same activity.

#### **Answer:**

- 1. Commercial entities incurred costs under the following examples listed in Written Question on Notice 276, part 1, f, i (May Budget Estimates 2012):
  - Audits of offshore activities that are conducted for the benefit of specific importers are cost recovered from the commercial entities. This includes, but is not limited to flights, transfers and accommodation. When the officer daily rate, incidentals and meals have been charged the basis for the charges currently aligns with the rates set out in the *Quarantine Service Fees Determination 2005*. Contracts with commercial entities are commercial-in-confidence.
  - The cost of developing improved offshore port and container hygiene systems was borne by the offshore entities. The department is not advised of these costs.
  - The training of Thai officials was jointly funded by the department and the Federal Chamber of Automotive Industries.
- 2. The intention of the reforms is to manage biosecurity risk at the most efficient and effective point on the continuum of offshore, border and onshore environments. Identification of direct comparisons of costs pre and post reforms is not possible at this stage due to the new and varied nature of the systems.