

**Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2013

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** 157

**Division/Agency:** Food Division

**Topic:** Verification of National Residue Survey Data

**Proof Hansard page:** 49

**Senator COLBECK asked:**

**Senator COLBECK:** I understand so, too, so we are on the same page. What are the implications for horticulture industries that participate in the National Residue Survey given that we have access to that direct information on the FreshTest database? Can the National Residue Survey use those FreshTest results to provide government to government assurances? My perspective is looking at this in the context of gathering all of this data at farm level as part of our quality assurance systems. I think it is good that the government is now accessing the information. Is there a possibility for a positive cost implication in utilising data that is there anyway rather than having another process that overlays it again?

**Mr Read:** I understand the question. The element that I will need to take on notice is in regard to the verification of that data and whether the sorts of assurances we are providing government to government can be met from that industry dataset. Where you can take that dataset and verify the integrity of the testing and the methodology sitting around that, and also the international standards relating to the reporting of the residues and they meet those requirements, I would imagine that that sort of approach could be applied, but I need to check that specifically in this context.

**Answer:**

Yes, noting that the principal objectives of the National Residue Survey (NRS) and FreshTest differ, there are ways in which the two testing programs complement each other, resulting in reduced costs. Both sets of data can and have been used to demonstrate compliance with residue levels; in 2011 both sets of data were used to demonstrate residue monitoring of Australian horticultural produce to the Indonesian and Korean governments.

The NRS objectives focus on residue monitoring programs to enable and support international market access. Sometimes the programs are specifically designed to address requirements for a particular market. Six NRS horticultural programs (apples, almonds, pears, citrus, macadamias and onions) are in place for these industries that have voluntarily sought to establish statutory producer levies to support national residue monitoring programs or have entered into year by year contractual arrangements.

FreshTest objectives predominantly support commercial quality assurance requirements in the domestic market.

Liaison occurs between the two organisations to minimise any overlap in horticultural residue.

**Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2013

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** 158

**Division/Agency:** Food Division

**Topic:** Quality Assurance Schemes

**Proof Hansard page:** 51-52

**Senator COLBECK asked:**

**Senator COLBECK:** But aren't we almost talking about duplicating stuff that is already out there potentially? You look at FreshTest, which basically rounds up data from third-party certified labs, the NATA certified labs that we have just been talking about. That collects all that data, and my understanding is that up until very recently the government had not subscribed to that information and so was not aware of it or what was there.

Again, rather than using the data that is there, which from my looking at it could provide a lot of quality information to a whole range of people, whether it is our markets and our government's oversight of that, whether it is the ag and vet chemical companies who look to check on efficacy use, failure rates or otherwise of application—all those sorts of things.

There is a whole heap of information that is basically sitting there and is not being used for a number of things that it could be used for. Rather than find new ways to collect and test it, we could utilise that. It is not necessarily an industry-run scheme. It is funded by industry but, as Mr Read has said, the issue is having confidence in the efficacy of that information and data. If you have a quality assurance system sitting behind it—a GLOBALG.A.P or whatever the scheme might be—surely we ought to be trying to reduce the number of these interventions rather than increase them.

**Mr Glyde:** As Mr Read said, neither of us knows enough about the detail of how that works. We have agreed to come back on notice on that specific question. I was trying to say that we agree with the principle of what you are doing. We are trying to find the least cost way of providing that certainty to both the governments in Australia and the countries we export to.

**Answer:**

The testing done by National Residue Survey (NRS) and Freshtest does not duplicate each other as they are for different purposes.

Participation in NRS programs is voluntary and six horticultural commodities are covered: apples, almonds, pears, citrus, macadamias and onions. The programs in place for these commodities are primarily designed to address particular market access requirements, though they can also be used to demonstrate compliance domestically. The laboratories that conduct NRS programs are also subject to verification by the NRS to ensure the testing to underpin international market access is robust.

By contrast FreshTest cover many commodities, but generally not to the same level of detail or to specific market access requirements, with results used to provide domestic commercial assurances. The FreshTest results may also be used as NRS by state and territory governments that purchase the results to demonstrate compliance domestically.

**Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2013

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** 158 (continued)

Reduced duplication also occurs with laboratory oversight. FreshTest do not subject laboratories to verification. FreshTest use the same laboratories that are subject to NRS oversight, including routine proficiency testing and auditing. As such, the need for further laboratory oversight by FreshTest to verify its residue testing results is significantly reduced.

**Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2013

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question: 159**

**Division/Agency:** Food Division

**Topic:** China's Imported Food Quality

**Proof Hansard page:** Written

**Senator HEFFERNAN asked:**

1. China appears in the International Media a lot more than Australia for adulterated food/meat, can DAFF guarantee China's imported food quality? Is that the role of BioSecurity Food or AQIS?
2. Can DAFF list out all the approved food products coming in from China? – can we have a list please?
3. Are the Chinese processed meat factories operating at a level of hygiene acceptable to AUSTRALIAN STANDARDS? Who checks these factories and how often, please provide details of inspections since 2010?
4. Can DAFF identify all of the processed meat factories? If so, can we have a list?
5. How many of these processed meat factories has DAFF staff inspected since 2010?
6. Why does New Zealand MAFF have a system based Veterinary protocol in place commencing June of this year (including tripes) and yet Australia is nowhere near getting a systems based Protocol in place with China? Is DAFF looking at the NZ model, if not, why not?
7. Does DAFF send officials to NZ to inspect NZ meat factories?
8. Do you believe accessing market for Australian meat and agricultural products is all about veterinary and health standards Protocols.
9. Why is it that some Australian meat exporters have managed to get approvals for certain countries when DAFF has failed? -Examples of this are beef plants for Egypt, Kangaroo meat into Russia, etc, etc.

**Answer:**

1. The Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (DAFF) administers the *Imported Food Control Act 1992* which has the objective of providing for compliance of food imported into Australia with Australian food standards and the requirements of public health and safety.

To do this DAFF administers a risk based border inspection scheme (the Imported Food Inspection Scheme) to verify importer compliance in sourcing food that complies with

Australian food standards and to target those foods known to present a medium to high risk to human health and safety.

**Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2013

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question: 159 (continued)**

Food Standards Australia New Zealand provides food safety assessment advice to DAFF which identifies foods that have medium to high hazards associated with them. FSANZ also provides assessment policy advice on emerging food safety issues, such as when melamine was found in certain foods from China. Such assessment advice enables DAFF to implement action at the border under the Imported Food Inspection Scheme.

2. Imported food must first comply with biosecurity requirements under the *Quarantine Act 1908*. Where there are biosecurity risks associated with foods, strict biosecurity requirements must be complied with and import permits are issued for these foods prior to importation being permitted. Not all foods require an import permit.

Under the *Imported Food Control Act 1992*, there is no requirement for food to be approved prior to import. However, importers must ensure they import food that complies with Australian food standards and this is verified by departmental inspection and testing under the Imported Food Inspection Scheme. Some foods are considered a medium to high risk to human health and safety and subject to inspection at the rate of 100 per cent of consignments, reducing with a history of compliance. Many foods from China are considered low risk to human health and safety and subject to inspection at the rate of five per cent of consignments.

Where a noncompliant or unsafe food is found, 100 per cent of subsequent consignments of that food will be subject to inspection and testing until a history of compliance is demonstrated.

The lists of foods that require an import permit under the *Quarantine Act 1908* are:

- Apples
- Garlic shoots
- Asparagus
- Pears
- Garlic
- Taro
- Berries (freeze dried or dried)
- Snowpeas/sugar snap peas
- Onions
- Processed seeds, nuts and grains
- Dried herbs and spices
- Lychees and Longans
- Soybeans for processing
- Various dried and frozen fruits and vegetables
- Mushrooms (fresh/dried/frozen)

**Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2013

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question: 159 (continued)**

There are foods imported to Australia that are not of quarantine concern and because of low food safety risk do not have an imported food risk profile. DAFF does not have records of these foods. For a complete list of all food that has been imported, including those that do not require an import permit and are not subjected to inspection under the Imported Food Inspection Scheme, a request must be made to the Australian

Customs and Border Protection Service as their Integrated Cargo System captures all commercial imports of food.

Additional information on products imported into Australia can be found in the Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics and Sciences report on Australian Food Statistics 2010-11 - Table 6.7: Australian food imports from selected countries. China is listed on page 170, report can be found at;  
<http://www.daff.gov.au/agriculture-food/food/publications/afs/australian-food-statistics>

3. Inspections of overseas factories are not required under the *Imported Food Control Act*. The Imported Food Inspection Scheme is an end product testing scheme and targets foods arriving in Australia based on the outcomes of a science based food safety assessment performed by Food Standards Australia New Zealand.
4. Yes. There are 30 meat processing facilities in China eligible to export to Australia however DAFF is unable to provide a list as information associated with import permits is commercial confidential. The types of meat products imported are canned meat (pork and chicken) products and meat based flavours.
5. Refer to the answer for question 3.
6. Australia has examined the New Zealand model. We continue to seek systems recognition for the export of meat to China, which would provide similar outcomes for Australian meat exporters. A number of productive discussions have been held with Chinese authorities on this issue including regarding tripe access.
7. No. Refer to the answer for question 3.
8. No, there are a range of commercial and other influences.
9. Internationally government to government negotiation are the most effective approach to securing and maintaining market access. This ensures recognition of a countries national system, provides transparency and ensures equitable access for all eligible establishments. Additionally, industry assistance at the commercial level within an importing country aids in supporting formal negotiations, therefore DAFF works closely with industry in this regard.

**Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2013

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question: 160**

**Division/Agency: Food Division**

**Topic: Microbial Testing of Kangaroo**

**Proof Hansard page: Written**

**Senator Rhiannon has asked:**

1. In answer to my request from October 2012 Supplementary Budget Estimates asking for a copy of the data and results of microbial testing on kangaroo carcasses, I was provided with a graph showing the median E.coli counts:
  - a. What was the range of the counts?
  - b. What was the E.coli count of each of the kangaroo carcasses tested, and the corresponding days of age of the carcasses.
  - c. May I please have a copy of the Salmonella testing results for each of the kangaroo carcasses tested.
2. Answer 4 advised the purpose of the study was not directly related to the safety of the kangaroo meat, but to verify that 14 days was an acceptable interval between the shooting of kangaroos and processing.
  - a. What is the average interval in the industry between shooting and processing?
  - b. What does “acceptable interval” relate to, if not safety of the kangaroo meat?
  - c. May I please have a copy of the response to the Russian authorities of which this survey played a part.
  - d. How is the safety of kangaroo meat tested if not by these tests?
3. Given that this survey play a part of the response to the Russian authorities’ concern over microbial loads of kangaroo meat, and Answer 5b stated that the on-site DAFF veterinarian ensured only carcasses passed as fit for processing for human consumption were sampled:
  - a. Is an on-site veterinarian always present in processing establishments to ensure carcasses processed are always fit for human consumption?
  - b. How many carcasses are rejected as unfit for human consumption per year?
4. In answer 7, it was stated that Salmonella spp and Toxoplasma gondii are food-borne zoonotic agents known to cause disease in humans and also present in kangaroos, but that FSANZ do not require the testing of raw meat for food-borne pathogens:
  - a. Please confirm that this means kangaroo carcasses sold for meat are not tested for either of these two diseases?
5. Papers like Tenter et al (2011) and Parameswaran et al (2009) state that that kangaroo is highly susceptible to T.gondii. They also identify the growing kangaroo meat trade as a public health significance which has the potential of a new source of infection for European customers given that as a lean meat it is usually served undercooked.
  - a. Given that T.gondii may cause abortion or congenital disease in its intermediate hosts, what safety warnings are being given to consumers and importers of kangaroo meat?
  - b. Are importing countries advised of the risks of T.gondii on human health; the significant problem of T.gondii in kangaroos; and that kangaroo carcasses are not routinely tested for T.gondii and other food-borne zoonotic diseases?
  - c. If not, why not? Is there expectation of importing countries to be made aware of food safety risks in kangaroo meat?

**Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2013

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** 160 (continued)

**Answer:**

1.a The range of *E. coli* counts detected was from “not detected” to 1000 cfu/cm<sup>2</sup>. detection. *E. coli* was detected on approximately 14 per cent of kangaroo carcasses. This is not dissimilar to the prevalences of *E. coli* detected on other retail meats or even on fruits and vegetables. Arthur et al (2007) identified *E. coli* prevalences of 13.4 per cent in parsley, 11.6 per cent in organic leaf lettuce, 6.5 per cent in leaf lettuce, 6.4 per cent in scallions, 4.9 per cent in cilantro and 1.3 per cent in muskmelon with none detected in head lettuce or fresh market.

1.b The table below contains the age range (days) and *E. coli* counts for individual carcasses

Carcase age range	<i>E.coli</i> (cfu/cm <sup>2</sup> )	Carcase age range	<i>E.coli</i> (cfu/cm <sup>2</sup> )	Carcase age range	<i>E.coli</i> (cfu/cm <sup>2</sup> )	Carcase age range	<i>E.coli</i> (cfu/cm <sup>2</sup> )
11-12	<0.6	9-10	<1	9-10	<0.6	13-14	<0.6
13-14	0.6	9-10	<1	11-12	120.0	13-14	<0.6
13-14	<0.6	9-10	50.0	11-12	<0.6	13-14	<0.6
13-14	51.0	9-10	24.0	9-10	110.0	13-14	<0.6
11-12	<0.6	9-10	<1	11-12	<0.6	13-14	<0.6
13-14	9.0	7-8	<1	13-14	<0.6	13-14	<0.6
11-12	<0.6	7-8	<1	13-14	<0.6	13-14	<0.6
11-12	<0.6	7-8	<1	13-14	<0.6	13-14	<0.6
11-12	<0.6	7-8	4.0	13-14	<0.6	13-14	<0.6
11-12	<0.6	7-8	<1	13-14	<0.6	13-14	<0.6
13-14	<0.6	7-8	14.0	11-12	<0.4	13-14	<0.6
13-14	<0.6	7-8	<1	11-12	<0.4	13-14	<0.6
13-14	<0.6	9-10	<1	11-12	<0.4	13-14	<0.6
13-14	<0.6	7-8	150.0	11-12	0.4	13-14	<0.6
13-14	<0.6	7-8	<1	11-12	<0.4	13-14	<0.6
13-14	<0.6	11-12	<0.6	11-12	2.4	13-14	<0.6
7-8	<0.6	9-10	<0.6	11-12	1.8	13-14	<0.6
7-8	<0.6	11-12	<0.6	11-12	<0.4	11-12	<0.6
7-8	<0.6	11-12	<0.6	9-10	<0.6	13-14	<0.6
7-8	24.0	11-12	<0.6	9-10	<0.6	9-10	0.6
7-8	<0.6	11-12	<0.6	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.6
9-10	<0.6	9-10	<0.6	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.6
7-8	<0.6	9-10	<0.6	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.6
9-10	<0.6	11-12	<0.6	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.6
11-12	<0.6	7-8	0.6	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.6
7-8	<0.6	11-12	<0.6	9-10	1.2	9-10	1.8
7-8	<0.6	9-10	<0.6	11-12	<4	9-10	0.6
11-12	<0.6	9-10	<0.6	11-12	<4	9-10	<0.6
7-8	<0.6	13-14	<0.6	11-12	<4	9-10	<0.6
13-14	<0.6	9-10	<0.6	11-12	<4	9-10	4.0
13-14	<0.6	13-14	<0.6	11-12	<4	9-10	<0.4
13-14	<0.6	9-10	5.4	11-12	<4	11-12	4.4
9-10	<0.6	13-14	<0.6	11-12	<4	9-10	<0.4

**Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2013

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question: 160 (continued)**

<b>Carcase age range</b>	<b>E.coli (cfu/cm2)</b>						
7-8	<0.6	13-14	84.0	11-12	<4	9-10	<0.4
9-10	<0.6	11-12	5.4	11-12	<4	11-12	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	11-12	<0.6	11-12	<4	9-10	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	13-14	<0.6	11-12	<4	9-10	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	13-14	<0.6	11-12	<4	9-10	<0.4
9-10	<0.6	13-14	<0.6	11-12	<4	11-12	224.0
7-8	<0.6	13-14	<0.6	11-12	<4	11-12	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	13-14	<0.6	11-12	<4	11-12	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	13-14	<0.6	11-12	72.0	11-12	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	13-14	<0.6	11-12	32.0	11-12	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	13-14	<0.6	7-8	>90	11-12	<0.4
9-10	<0.6	7-8	8.4	9-10	15.6	7-8	6.8
9-10	<0.6	9-10	>90	7-8	6.8	7-8	<0.4
9-10	<0.6	7-8	<0.6	7-8	<0.4	7-8	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	7-8	0.6	7-8	<0.4	7-8	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	9-10	<0.6	7-8	<0.4	11-12	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	9-10	<0.6	11-12	<0.4	11-12	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	9-10	<0.6	11-12	<0.4	11-12	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	9-10	<0.6	11-12	<0.4	11-12	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	9-10	<0.6	11-12	<0.4	9-10	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	11-12	<0.6	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	11-12	<0.6	9-10	<0.4	11-12	<0.4
7-8	1.8	11-12	<0.6	11-12	<0.4	11-12	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	11-12	1.2	11-12	<0.4	9-10	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	13-14	<0.4	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	11-12	<0.4	9-10	<0.4	11-12	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	13-14	<0.4	11-12	<0.4	11-12	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	11-12	<0.4	11-12	<0.4	11-12	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	11-12	<0.4	11-12	<0.4	11-12	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	13-14	<0.4	11-12	<0.4	11-12	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	13-14	0.4	11-12	<0.4	9-10	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	11-12	0.4	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.4
7-8	1.2	13-14	<0.4	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.4
13-14	3.0	11-12	<0.4	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.4
13-14	<0.6	13-14	2.4	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.4
13-14	0.6	13-14	<0.4	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.4
13-14	<0.6	11-12	0.4	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.4
13-14	<0.6	11-12	0.8	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.4
13-14	<0.6	7-8	<0.4	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.4
13-14	<0.6	7-8	<0.4	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.4
13-14	<0.6	7-8	<0.4	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.4
11-12	0.6	7-8	0.8	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.4
13-14	16.8	7-8	<0.4	9-10	<0.4	9-10	2.4
7-8	<0.6	9-10	<0.4	9-10	2.4	9-10	<0.4

**Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2013

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question: 160 (continued)**

<b>Carcase age range</b>	<b><i>E.coli</i> (cfu/cm<sup>2</sup>)</b>						
9-10	<0.6	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.4
11-12	<0.6	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.4	11-12	<0.4
9-10	<0.6	9-10	<0.4	11-12	<0.4	11-12	<0.4
9-10	<0.6	9-10	<0.4	11-12	<0.4	11-12	<0.4
7-8	<0.6	11-12	<0.4	11-12	<0.4	9-10	<0.4
13-14	<0.6	11-12	0.4	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.4
11-12	<0.6	11-12	<0.4	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.4
11-12	<0.6	11-12	<0.4	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.4
11-12	<0.6	11-12	0.4	9-10	<0.4	9-10	<0.4
13-14	<0.6	11-12	72.0	9-10	<0.4	7-8	<0.4
13-14	<0.6	11-12	<0.4	7-8	<0.4	7-8	<0.4
11-12	<0.6	11-12	<0.4	7-8	<0.4	7-8	<0.4
13-14	<0.6	11-12	<0.4	7-8	<0.4	7-8	<0.4
13-14	1.8	11-12	<0.4	7-8	<0.4	7-8	<0.4
13-14	<0.6	9-10	<0.4	7-8	<0.4	7-8	<0.4
11-12	<0.6	11-12	<0.4	7-8	<0.4	7-8	<0.4
7-8	<0.4	11-12	<0.4	7-8	<0.4	7-8	<0.4
7-8	<0.4	11-12	<0.4	7-8	<0.4	7-8	<0.4
7-8	<0.4	11-12	<0.4	7-8	<0.4	7-8	<0.4
7-8	<4	11-12	2.4	7-8	<0.4	7-8	<0.4
7-8	<4	9-10	<0.4	7-8	<0.4	7-8	<0.4
7-8	<0.4	13-14	<4	13-14	<4	13-14	<0.4
7-8	<0.4	13-14	<4	13-14	<4	13-14	<0.4
7-8	<0.4	11-12	<4	13-14	<4	13-14	<0.4
7-8	<0.4	11-12	<4	13-14	<4	13-14	<0.4
7-8	<0.4	9-10	<4	13-14	<4	13-14	<0.4
9-10	<0.4	9-10	<4	13-14	<4	13-14	<0.4
9-10	<0.4	9-10	<4	11-12	<4	13-14	<0.4
9-10	<0.4	9-10	390.0	7-8	<4	13-14	<0.4
11-12	<0.4	9-10	1000.0	7-8	<4	13-14	<0.4
11-12	<0.4	9-10	<4	7-8	<4	13-14	<0.4
11-12	<0.4	9-10	84.0	7-8	<4	13-14	<0.4
11-12	<0.4	9-10	4.0	7-8	<4	13-14	<0.4
7-8	<0.4	9-10	<4	7-8	<4	13-14	<0.4
7-8	<0.4	9-10	<4	7-8	<4	13-14	<0.4
7-8	<0.4	9-10	<4	7-8	<4	13-14	<0.4
7-8	<0.4	9-10	<4	7-8	<4	13-14	0.8
7-8	<0.4	9-10	<4	7-8	<4	13-14	2.4
7-8	<0.4	9-10	<4	7-8	20.0	13-14	<0.4
7-8	<0.4	9-10	260.0	7-8	<4	13-14	<0.4
7-8	<0.4	9-10	64.0	13-14	<4	13-14	<0.4
7-8	<0.4	9-10	280.0	13-14	<4	13-14	<0.4
7-8	<0.4	9-10	<4	13-14	6.0	13-14	<0.4
7-8	<0.4	9-10	<4	13-14	20.0	13-14	<0.4
7-8	<0.4	9-10	<4	13-14	<4	13-14	<0.4
7-8	<0.4	7-8	<4	13-14	26.0	13-14	<0.4
13-14	<4	7-8	<4	13-14	<4	13-14	<0.4
13-14	20.0	7-8	<4	13-14	<4	13-14	<0.4
13-14	8.0	7-8	<4	13-14	<4	13-14	<0.4

**Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2013

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** 160 (continued)

Carcase age range	E.coli (cfu/cm2)						
13-14	<0.4	7-8	<4	13-14	<0.4	13-14	<0.4
		7-8	<4	13-14	<0.4	13-14	<0.4

- 1.c Salmonella testing was not carried out in the study
- 2.a The information is not collected by the Department of Agriculture Fisheries and Forestry (DAFF). The requirement is that processing occurs within 14 days of field harvest. DAFF verifies the requirement that carcasses that are processed for the production of kangaroo meat for export are no older than 14 days post harvest.
- 2.b Acceptable interval relates to carcass hygiene.
- 2.c The document requested forms part of Australia's market access negotiations with a trading partner and remains government to government in confidence.
- 2.d As it is with all meat produced at Australian abattoirs, safety is assured through adherence to Good Manufacturing Practice and the implementation of a system of Hazard Analysis (and) Critical Control Point (HACCP). Tests of carcass hygiene are used to monitor process control.
- 3.a It is the responsibility of the processing establishment to ensure carcasses processed are fit for human consumption in compliance with the Australian Standard. State authorities do not require the presence of a veterinarian for production of kangaroo meat for the domestic market. DAFF requires the presence of a veterinarian in kangaroo processing facilities preparing meat for export to meet certification requirements of importing countries.
- 3.b DAFF does not keep statistics on the number of rejected carcasses.
- 4.a Carcasses are not tested for *T. gondii*. Testing of carcass surfaces for *E. coli* and salmonella is required as part of monitoring of hygienic production. Salmonella is monitored following the same procedure as for other slaughter classes such as beef, sheep, goat and pigs under the *E. coli* and Salmonella monitoring program.
- 5.a We understand that the paper referenced in the question notes that the seroprevalence in kangaroo is usually lower than in placental mammals such as sheep. *T. gondii* is ubiquitous and found in slaughtered species the world over. The Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code does not require monitoring of *Toxoplasma gondii* or Salmonella in any slaughter species in Australia. The advice to wash hands and maintain good hygiene in the kitchen applies to kangaroo meat as any other meat.

**Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2013

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** 160 (continued)

5.b No market routinely tests or requires monitoring for *Toxoplasma*. Kangaroo meat is predominantly exported frozen and freezing inactivates *T. gondii* tissue cysts (El-Nawawi et al. 2008). Importing countries are aware of the health risks associated with the consumption of all raw meat, fruits and vegetables and exposure to felids.

5.c See above answers.

References quoted:

Arthur L, Jones S, Fabri M, Odumeru J (2007) Microbial survey of selected Ontario-grown fresh fruits and vegetables. *J Food Prot.* 70:2864-2867.

El-Nawawi FA, Tawfik MA, Shaapan RM (2008) Methods for inactivation of *Toxoplasma gondii* cysts in meat and tissues of experimentally infected sheep. *Foodborne Pathogens and Disease* 5(5):687–690

CDC (2013) Parasites - Toxoplasmosis (*Toxoplasma* infection).  
[http://www.cdc.gov/parasites/toxoplasmosis/gen\\_info/pregnant.html](http://www.cdc.gov/parasites/toxoplasmosis/gen_info/pregnant.html)

**Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2013

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question: 161**

**Division/Agency:** Food Division

**Topic:** Reform of Australia's Export Certification Services

**Proof Hansard page:** Written

**Senator COLBECK asked:**

If New Zealand is the only country that fully recovers costs of export inspection and certification, what is the range of support provided to exporters in other countries, particularly our major competitors?

**Answer:**

The Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry does not collect information/data on the range of support provided by other governments for export inspection and certification services.

**Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee**

**ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

Additional Estimates February 2013

**Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry**

**Question:** 162

**Division/Agency:** Food Division

**Topic:** National Residue Survey

**Proof Hansard page:** Written

**Senator COLBECK asked:**

In response to QON 196 October 2012, the budget deficits were reported to be due to “new projects relating to residue management”. What were these “new projects” and what did they cost?

**Answer:**

Excess industry reserves were held in the National Residue Survey (NRS) special account. The NRS, in consultation with participating industries developed an expenditure program to reduce the excess reserves of the special account:

- Since 2008–09, up to \$2.0 million per annum of cattle industry reserves were used on the Livestock Production Assurance Scheme’s cattle property management audit project.
- In 2009–10, NRS commenced redevelopment of its information management system to replace the paper-based scheme with a web-based interface. The \$1.9 million project was approved and implemented on 4 October 2011.
- In 2012, the cattle industry requested NRS commence a three year project at \$1 million per annum on the National Livestock Identification Scheme.