



Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water & Environment  
PO Box 303  
Devonport  
Tasmania 7310  
AUSTRALIA

+61 3 6421 7634 Telephone  
Andrew.Bishop@dpiuwe.tas.gov.au

8 October 2012

Committee Secretary  
Senate Standing Committees on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport  
PO Box 6100  
Parliament House  
CANBERRA ACT 2600

To whom it may concern,

**Tasmanian Government Submission on the Proposed Importation of Potatoes from  
New Zealand**

Please find attached our comments submission in relation to the Senate Inquiry into the proposed importation of potatoes from New Zealand as outlined in the Commonwealth Government *Draft Report for the Review of Import Conditions for Fresh Potatoes for Processing from New Zealand*.

The comments in this submission are based on those made to DAFF Biosecurity as part of the consultation process on this issue and have been prepared based on advice from a DPIPWE Biosecurity Technical Working Group with representatives from Tasmanian government and Tasmanian potato industry.

Yours sincerely

Andrew Bishop  
Chief Plant Health Manager (Tasmania)

# **Senate Inquiry Submission on the Proposed Importation of Fresh Potatoes for Processing from New Zealand**

## **DEPARTMENT OF PRIMARY INDUSTRIES, PARKS, WATER, & ENVIRONMENT- TASMANIA**

### **(ON BEHALF OF TASMANIAN GOVERNMENT)**

#### **SENATE COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The proposed importation of potatoes from New Zealand, including:

- a) Validity and supporting scientific evidence underpinning the Pest risk Analysis included in the New Zealand Potatoes Import Risk Analysis 2009
- b) The extent of scientific knowledge and understanding of the tomato/potato psyllid and other pests identified in the Draft Review of Import Conditions; and
- c) Any related matters

#### **SUBMISSION APPROACH**

This submission addresses each of the Terms of Reference to some degree (emphasis on b and c) and is presented as a review of the proposal (as per the draft report provided by the Commonwealth) and highlights matters of concern with some aspects of the proposal. In the submission to DAFF Biosecurity, we have sought additional details and clarification on what is said (or is not said) in the report.

#### **BACKGROUND & CONTEXT OF TASMANIAN INTEREST**

Potato production and processing represents a significant horticultural industry in Tasmania. Hence import proposals related to crops such as potatoes are of particular relevance to the Tasmanian plant biosecurity system. Of interest to both the Tasmanian Government and the Tasmanian potato industry is the extent of risk the importation of fresh potatoes for processing from New Zealand poses to the State biosecurity status and how the Commonwealth Government have assessed those risks and proposed mitigation measures.

Our favourable biosecurity status is integral to, and at the heart of, the Tasmanian brand, and hence underpins our ability to maintain and position ourselves as a unique source of a broad range of quality, natural produce and products for discerning national and international markets. Accordingly, a biosecurity threat to any single industry, such as the potato industry, is also a threat to how the whole Tasmanian brand is maintained, perceived and valued in the market.

Further, Tasmania's small size and reliance on primary industries means that even a modest impact on one industry can have relatively greater impacts on the State's economy and people, than is the case for other larger, more diverse mainland economies.

The pests and disease of potatoes of primary concern to Tasmania are Potato Cyst Nematode (PCN), Tomato Potato Psyllid (TPP), *Candidatus Liberibacter solanacearum*, and Bacterial Wilt. These priority pests and diseases do not necessarily exclude concern about the other pests and diseases listed in the DAFF Biosecurity report.

**GENERAL COMMENTS/CONCERNS:**

- The brevity of the report is noted as a concern by DPIPWE. Though understanding the report on the proposal is not presented as an import risk analysis but rather a report on existing policy, given the pests of concern, we would have preferred to see additional detail on each of the identified pests with a risk analysis approach taken. Currently some descriptions simply refer to other reviews, e.g. zebra chip complex<sup>1</sup>, which affects the transparency of the report.
- The brevity of the report appears to present an incomplete consideration of the 21 pests identified in the DAFF biosecurity report. The report leaves the reader assuming that the proposed Quarantine Approved Premises (QAP) status of the processing end point addresses each of these pest risks. That may be the case but if so it should be stated.
- Stakeholder consultations are briefly referred to in the document as part of the considerations in determining final recommendations. Further detail on who was consulted and issues raised along with responses from DAFF Biosecurity to those issues would have been helpful in assessing the report and its findings.
- A concern, not just restricted to this proposal and draft recommendations, is the apparent lack of an independent third-party arbiter. The Beale Review recommended the decisions associated with reviews and proposals such as these be the responsibility of an expert-based Biosecurity Commission within an independent Biosecurity Authority. This model is supported by DPIPWE.

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS (Section by Section):**

**1. Introduction**

No comments

**2. Background**

In the background section, the first reference is made to the *MAFBNZ Export compliance programme for the provision of additional declarations (Potato Cyst Nematode and Potato Wart)* which outlines operational requirements that it appear to support the DAFF Biosecurity recommendations on import of the fresh potatoes. Despite this significance, little detail is provided on these guidelines in the review.

DPIPWE would like to see additional detail with respect these requirements. In the interests of transparency, we believe this document should have been provided by DAFF Biosecurity as an attachment to the report. Also mentioned is that a “brief account of these assessments and verification activities is provided in Section 3”. This implies a full account exists but this is not provided.

---

<sup>1</sup> This relates to Inquiry terms of reference (a).

### 3. Pests and Diseases identified in association with fresh potatoes from New Zealand

The list of pests provided are those deemed by DAFF Biosecurity to be on pathway with respect the proposed importation. DPIPWE notes that this list of 21 pests and diseases is an extract from that originally provided by the New Zealand authorities as pests and diseases associated with potato tubers in New Zealand. DPIPWE would like the opportunity to view the full list.

Australian states where particular pests are recognised as being of particular concern/are free are indicated via the jurisdiction's initials against the pest. The report appropriately flags *Ralstonia solanacearum* with Tasmania's initials. However Tasmania also has comprehensive regulations (Attachment 1) in place to protect its PCN status and has formal claims for State freedom from PCN (Attachment 2). It would seem then that PCN should also be flagged in the list with Tasmanian initials.

In the same paragraph as the explanation is the ambiguous statement "*Where a pest is identified as being of regional concern, any quarantine measures proposed for that pest need only be applied to product destined for that state where regional freedom is recognised*"

DPIPWE interprets this to mean that where regional freedom is recognised for the listed pest that region/State's quarantine requirements would need to be met if the proposed imports of fresh potatoes are to enter that State.

Also in this section is what appears to be a dismissal of *Candidatus Liberibacter solanacearum* and the psyllid *Bactericera cockerelli* from the tuber import pathway though initially both are shortlisted as members of the 21 pathway-associated organisms. The report provides little detail to determine how this lack of pathways association has been demonstrated though it is noted later in the report the bacteria is considered further.

This section finishes with the sentence that DAFF considers a combination of mitigation measures may be required to manage risks associated with imported potatoes from New Zealand to Australia consistent with Australia's Appropriate Level of Protection (ALOP) with reference to Section 6.

DPIPWE believes there is insufficient information in this section to show how each of the 21 shortlisted pests and diseases have been assessed for their likely risks. The only comments provided were on zebra chip and brown rot and even these were more statements rather than assessments.

DPIPWE would like to have seen additional detail as to how the proposed risk mitigation measures referred to later in the report had been arrived at based on assessments of the listed 21 pests and disease in this section.

#### **Additional comments on Specific pests and diseases:**

**Tomato potato psyllid (TPP) & *Candidatus Liberibacter solanacearum* (Liberibacter):** DAFF Biosecurity suggests that TPP will not be transported with fresh potato. TPP is present in high numbers associated with all potato cropping regions (and all potato crops) in New Zealand. The egg load within any crop is likely to be very high. It is currently unknown how TPP entered New Zealand from the USA, the pathways of pest entry are not understood in any detail. There is not enough information available to conclusively state that TPP will not traffic with tubers (no evidence of association with tubers does not mean comprehensive surveys and experimental evidence proving lack of association with tuber) either attached or as a contaminant. It is also quite possible that eggs could be associated with residual soil in exported bins/containers. They are generally laid

on leaf margins held by a fine thread-like structure – but could be knocked off leaves into the soil or dropped with leaf trash and released into soil.

TPP that enter Australia are quite likely to carry *C. Liberibacter*. *C. Liberibacter* is an obligate plant parasite found and propagated within potato tubers and is present in all cropping regions in New Zealand. The report states it is only transmitted between plants by its psyllid vector – it can however survive and propagate within vegetative propagules of potato in absence of its vector. It occurs at high incidence in affected crops. The current diagnostic testing procedures are not completely reliable. It is therefore to be expected that any shipment of potatoes from New Zealand will contain *C. Liberibacter* in substantial quantities. Potatoes/potato peel that escapes a Quarantine Approved Premise is therefore likely to contain the pathogen and provide a potential source for its propagation. Importantly, it is unknown whether native psyllids present in Australia (including members within the same family) possess the ability to vector *C. Liberibacter*.

**Potato Cyst Nematode (PCN):** New Zealand possesses both *Globodera pallida* and *G. rostochiensis*. Australia has limited occurrence of only *G. rostochiensis*, which are under strict quarantine management to exclude movement of potato material from areas of known infestation. Potato cultivars resistant to Ro1 strains of *G. rostochiensis* offer a management tool for areas with PCN infestation, however they will not necessarily possess resistance to *G pallida*. Residual soil associated with imported potatoes (see comment re “practically free” from soil) may carry nematode resting cysts. Area freedom status is extremely difficult to confirm given the insidious nature of cyst nematodes. Accuracy of soil testing is reliant on adequate sampling procedures which are problematic. Low levels of nematode infestation are not easily visually observed within the growing crop. Area-freedom status should be regarded with caution, and be confirmed through long term testing of sites with repeated negative results following comprehensive surveys over many years.

**Viruses and virus-like agents- PVS-A** - New Zealand has the Andean strain of Potato Virus S (PVS-A). PVS-A has greater capacity for aphid transmission and induces greater impacts on yield than ordinary strains of PVS (PVS-O) present in Australia. PVS (all strains) are poorly managed due to inconspicuous symptoms and can be present at high incidence. Because of this difficulty the virus is not included within a seed certification system. The virus is efficiently transmitted from mother plant to daughter tuber. There is a reasonable chance that PVS-A could enter Australia within infected tubers. Several aphid species present in Australia would have the capacity to spread the virus to other potatoes or alternate hosts (which could easily be present in metropolitan regions). Viruses could spread from discarded tubers or even from sprouts on tubers in storage prior to processing.

**Viruses and virus-like agents- PVM** – Potato virus M belongs to the same genus as PVS, and similarly produces inconspicuous symptoms. It would not be observed (nor tested for within crop certification processes). As with PVS-A it would be readily spread by aphids present within Australia to other potatoes and alternate hosts.

**Viruses and virus-like agents- PSTVd** – Potato spindle tuber viroid is a highly significant pathogen of potato. Establishment of PSTVd in Australia would result in significant losses. Viroids are spread by mechanical transmission – however it has also been shown the PSTVd can be spread by common aphids by associating with other viral pathogens (such as the common Potato leafroll virus).

#### 4. Existing Policies for Potatoes

This section of the report provides a useful overview of current international and domestic policies in relation to fresh potato imports. The risk mitigation measures for potato tubers with respect C

*Liberibacter solanacearum* and sourcing from countries where TPP is present appears to be processing in Quarantine Approved Premises (QAP) with all aspects of the import being under quarantine conditions.

With respect PCN and potato wart the primary policy under consideration for risk analysis appears to be the *MAFBNZ Export compliance pre for the provision of additional declarations (potato cyst nematode and potato wart)*. Little or no detail is provided about this plan in the review so it cannot be assessed.

Domestic policy descriptions focus on two policies in relation to PCN. These are:

- Victorian Department of Primary Industries “PCN compliance Agreement: Sourcing Potatoes from a PCN control area” (2007)
- Interstate Certification (ICA) Agreement: potatoes from a PCN Control Area, ICA-44).

The first is described as allowing for the movement of potatoes from PCN control areas within Victoria and the other the movement into other States of Australia subject to specific phytosanitary measures.

The review implies these domestic regulations are an acceptable platform for potato movement obviously seeking to establish a case for potato movement subject to phytosanitary measures. The description of State acceptability in the review is misleading though. In relation to cross-border movement only ICA-44 is relevant but the review fails to detail that the ICA is not accepted by Tasmania, Western Australia, Northern Territory, or Queensland. In South Australia it is only partially accepted. From Tasmania’s perspective it is not acceptable as it is not equivalent in terms of risk mitigation to our current Tasmanian restrictions in relation to fresh potato imports based primarily on PCN concerns and the importance of our State freedom based on surveillance and regulation.

## **5. Verification visits**

DPIPWE believe insufficient detail has been provided in this section with respect the verification visits. A few brief sentences refer to the DAFF Biosecurity visit to the proposed processing facility in Australia and only a brief reference (one sentence) is made to the procedures for waste management, cleaning and maintenance. ICA-44 is referred to inferring the facility aligns appropriately with ICA-44 though this is not stated. ICA-44 is not accepted in most jurisdictions.

An even briefer account is provided of the DAFF Biosecurity visit to New Zealand. With no details provided apart from a reference to the MAFBNZ export compliance program, the appropriateness of the production process in New Zealand cannot be assessed.

DPIPWE has requested to see additional detail on the verification visits in Australia and New Zealand including the processes used in New Zealand to determine PCN freedom and the methodology used at the QAP processing facility to manage waste.

## **6. Proposed risk management measures for fresh potatoes for processing from New Zealand**

### **6.1 Declarations**

This section provides a few more details with respect the MAFBNZ Export compliance program identifying four elements that DAFF considers suitable as part of risk mitigation. These (and appropriate queries) are: Registered production sites, annual soil testing to demonstrate PCN freedom (this is positive but additional detail of how the soil tests are done is needed), MPI approved labs to undertake soil analysis (details of actual accreditation), and potato black wart free places of production- proof by certification (what type of certification is proposed?)

### **6.2 Pack House Processes**

The points defining measures to be undertaken in the pack house refer to washed and/or brushed potatoes so as to be 'practically free' from soil. "Practically free of soil" is not robust. What is the definition of that? There is no guarantee that a tuber that appears visibly free of eggs actually is free of eggs.

### **6.3 Packing and Labelling**

As part of mitigation measures to address the risk of contamination by pests or disease while in storage and prior to export, potatoes are to be stored at least one metre from potatoes from non-designated production sites.

DPIPWE query what is the basis of this distance determination to suggest efficacy of preventing contamination?

### **6.4 Phytosanitary Import requirements**

Reference is once again made to the MAFBNZ Export compliance program but as stated previously without the details of this program it is difficult to assess level of risk mitigation. The certification requirements must state the potatoes are sourced from PCN-Free and potato black wart free areas. The report neither here or elsewhere provides details as to the basis of freedom or how it is determined. The claim is also made in this section that the requirements (listed in Section 3) have been developed to prevent the listed quarantine pests from being introduced into Australia. This suggests a guarantee and is a departure from the standard biosecurity approach of mitigating risk.

### **6.5 Transport to DAFF Biosecurity quarantine approved premises for inspection and processing**

Of concern is the proposed 'door ajar' shipping being proposed. One must assume 'door ajar' is a convenient shipping method, allowing air exchange without the cost of refrigerated containers. However this appears to be a significant weakness in the quarantine pathway. It would seem **refrigerated sealed containers** would be required to assist properly in risk mitigation. Also, what is the situation if potatoes are spoiled during transit and need to be dumped? This scenario then becomes distinctly different to the disposal of starch and water, the result of processing.

### **6.6 Processing in a quarantine approved premises (QAP)**

Limited information is provided on the end-point processing that includes disposal of waste. It seems that what is really required is a 'closed-loop' system and yet the description given and

practical limitations suggests this is not possible. Additional information on end-point treatments would assist in the understanding of this part of the process.

## **7. Stakeholder Consultation**

A range of consultations are referred to in this section implying ongoing stakeholder support of the content of the report. It would have been informative if additional information had been provided with respect the consultations undertaken, responses from stakeholders and how stakeholders concerns were addressed in the development of recommendations arising from this report.



## Attachment 1: State Regulatory requirements to mitigate risk of PCN entry.

Import requirements are enforced under the *Plant Quarantine Act 1997*. The requirements specifically related to PCN are published in the *Plant Quarantine Manual Tasmania (PQMTas)*. The PQMTas and further information at [www.dpipwe.tas.gov.au/biosecurity](http://www.dpipwe.tas.gov.au/biosecurity).

Regulations can also be accessed electronically through the Department's Tasmanian Biosecurity Import Requirements Database (TBIRD) is available at <http://www.dpipwe.tas.gov.au/inter.nsf/WebPages/LBUN-7YRVLU?open>

### IMPORT REQUIREMENT 9

Prior to import, a "Notice of Intention to Import Plants or Plant Products into Tasmania" must be received by the relevant Quarantine Centre AND comply with general conditions for packages specified in Section 2.5 of the Manual

#### 9 *Importation of Potatoes*

- I. Imported potatoes or parts of potatoes intended for propagation must be in the form of tissue culture plantlets or minitubers and meet the requirements detailed in Note 1.
- II. Potato tubers intended for processing or consumption must be free of all other potato plant parts and washed completely free from soil and other extraneous matter. The potato tubers will be subject to a barrier inspection by Quarantine Tasmania at the port of entry and must be accompanied by a Plant Health Certificate or Plant Health Assurance Certificate signed by an approved person stating that:
  - (a) The potato tubers were grown in a State, Territory or Country that can demonstrate freedom from Potato Cyst Nematode (PCN) (*Globodera rostochiensis* and *G. pallida*). [*Validation of State, Territory or Country freedom will be on provision of survey data, the requirements of which are outlined in Note 2. Where such freedom cannot be demonstrated, potatoes may be imported under the Area Freedom conditions outlined in Clause IV. (a) and (b); and*
  - (b) The potato tubers were grown in a State, Territory or Country that can demonstrate freedom from Bacterial Wilt (*Ralstonia solanacearum*). [*Validation of State, Territory or Country freedom will be on the provision of survey data, the requirements of which are outlined in Note 3. Where such freedom cannot be demonstrated, potatoes can be imported under the Area Freedom conditions outlined in Clause V. (a) and (b); and*
  - (c) Following a field and a tuber inspection by an independent crop inspector approved by the Secretary of the Department of Primary Industries and Water the potatoes are, to the best of the approved person's knowledge, free from any List A and List B Declared Pests and Diseases under the Plant Quarantine Act 1997. (*See Appendix 2 of the Plant Quarantine Manual Tasmania*);

**and**

- (d) The potatoes were produced from certified seed (*to be accompanied by a Red Certification Label and PCN Soil Test Certificate if grown in Victoria*) which was grown in a region where PCN, Bacterial Wilt and Potato Spindle Tuber Viroid have not been recorded; **and**
- (e) The potatoes were produced on a property that does not share agricultural equipment with any properties in another State, Territory, Country or area unless that State, Territory, Country or area meets all the conditions of this Import Requirement for freedom from PCN and Bacterial Wilt; **and**
- (f) The potatoes have been packed in clean (free from soil, extraneous matter or other residues) containers (bags, bins etc); **and**
- (g) To the best of the approved person's knowledge the potato tubers do not derive from a crop infected with Potato Spindle Tuber Viroid.

**III.** The consignment must be accompanied by a statutory declaration signed by the grower stating that he/she complies with clause II. (e) above.

**IV.** Where State, Territory or Country Freedom from PCN cannot be demonstrated as outlined in Note 2, in addition to complying with Clauses II. (b) to (g) the following documentation must be supplied to validate Area Freedom from PCN:

- (a) Complete survey data for PCN from all the potato crops within a defined growing Area plus a 20 km buffer zone surrounding the Area, covering the 3 years prior to the proposed potato tuber importation. Survey requirements are outlined in Note 2; **and**
- (b) A PCN soil test from the paddock in which the potatoes were grown, conducted either pre-planting, during the growing season, or post-harvest (Note 2).

**V.** Where State, Territory or Country Freedom from Bacterial Wilt cannot be demonstrated as outlined in Note 3, in addition to complying with Clauses II. (a) and (c) to (g), the following documentation must be supplied to validate Area Freedom from Bacterial Wilt:

- (a) Complete survey data for Bacterial Wilt from all the solanaceous crops within a defined growing Area plus a 20 km buffer zone surrounding the Area, covering the 3 years prior to the proposed potato tuber importation. Survey requirements are outlined in

Note 3; and

- (b) A soil test for Bacterial Wilt from the paddock in which the potatoes were grown, conducted either pre-planting, during the growing season, or post-harvest.

**Note 1: Importation of potatoes for propagation**

Tissue culture: Sterile potato plantlets produced at a VicSPA accredited tissue culture laboratory and accompanied by a copy of the Certificate of Accreditation.

Minitubers: G0 material (minitubers, microtubers etc) produced at a VicSPA accredited facility and accompanied by a Black Certification Label indicating material variety and generation and a copy of the Certificate of Accreditation of the minituber facility that produced it.

**Note 2: Survey requirements for PCN.**

In order to demonstrate State, Territory, Country or Area Freedom from PCN, the following information is required:

(a) A survey of all of the potato crops in the defined Area for which freedom from PCN is being claimed must have been completed over the 3-year period prior to the proposed importation. The survey should also encompass a 20km buffer surrounding the Area. One third or greater of the crops in the Area must be surveyed each year. Survey information must be accompanied by a map detailing the Area for which freedom from PCN is being claimed. If freedom from PCN is to be claimed, survey data must indicate no cases of PCN within the Area or the buffer zone over the 3-year period.

(b) The National protocol for soil sampling and testing for PCN must be followed (Hinch, 1991. National sampling strategies and standards for detection of potato cyst nematode. In: Potato Cyst Nematode- Impact on Australian Horticulture and a Proposed National Strategy). Horticultural Policy Council Industry Report No 6, 1993, pp 127-131).

The minimum acceptable sampling intensity under this protocol is deemed to be the collection of 200 x 10cm<sup>3</sup> samples on a 10 x 10m grid pattern for every 2 hectares, providing a combined 2kg field sample from which a 500g sub sample of dried soil is processed.

In order to declare freedom from PCN, no cysts will have been found in any of the samples over the entire three-year period of testing.

**Note 3: Survey requirements for Bacterial Wilt.**

In order to demonstrate State, Territory, Country or Area Freedom from Bacterial Wilt, the following information is required:

(a) A visual survey of all solanaceous crops within the defined Area for which freedom from Bacterial Wilt is being claimed will have been completed over the 3-year period prior to the proposed importation. The visual survey should also encompass a 20km buffer surrounding the Area. One third or greater of the crops in the Area must be surveyed each year. Any suspect plants will have been serologically tested for Bacterial Wilt. Survey information must be accompanied by a map detailing the Area for which freedom from Bacterial Wilt is being claimed. If freedom from Bacterial Wilt is to be claimed, survey data must indicate no cases of Bacterial Wilt within the Area or the buffer zone over the 3-year period. Specimens suspected of infection with *R. solanacearum* must be laboratory tested for the presence of the bacterium.

#### IMPORT REQUIREMENT 29

Prior to import, a “Notice of Intention to Import Plants or Plant Products into Tasmania” must be received by the relevant Quarantine Centre AND comply with general conditions for packages specified in Section 2.5 of the Manual

### **29 Plants and Plant Products other than Potatoes from Areas Where Potato Cyst Nematode Infestation Occurs (Victoria) (*Globodera rostochiensis* (Wollenweber) Behrens and *G. pallida* (Stone) Behrens)**

Plants and plant products (bulbs) from the Potato Cyst Nematode (PCN)-restricted areas in Victoria must be accompanied by a certificate signed by an approved person stating that they comply in full with the PCN Protocol agreed between Tasmania and Victoria for the movement of such plants and plant products into Tasmania.

#### **PCN Protocol Developed With Victoria**

This protocol refers to additional requirements for movement to Tasmania of plants and bulbs that have been grown in the PCN restricted areas in Victoria.

#### **I. GENERAL CONDITIONS FOR ALL PROPERTIES**

- (a) The property does not share agricultural equipment with a potato grower, or with other nurseries within 20 km of an infestation that are not accredited under this protocol.
- (b) The property is not exposed to the same irrigation source as the infested property or to run-off from PCN-infested properties.
- (c) Cropping records will be inspected to demonstrate that solanaceous crops have not been grown on the property for a period of 10 years immediately prior to the commencement of accreditation or where solanaceous crops have been grown within the last 5 to 10 years the soil has been fumigated with a registered soil fumigant at the recommended rate since the last Solanaceous crop (Nurseries with potted Plants excepted).
- (d) Accreditation may be given following an annual inspection by the Victorian Department of Agriculture to assess the relevant criteria detailed below. An up-to-date list of accredited properties will be provided to Tasmania by the Victorian Department of Primary Industries as required.

#### **II. SPECIFIC CONDITIONS FOR PARTICULAR PROPERTY-TYPES**

- (a) NURSERIES WITH POTTED PLANTS
  - (i) Plants are grown in containers using a soil-less mix
  - (ii) Containers are not in contact with the soil
- (b) TREE NURSERIES
  - (i) Trees are to be bare-rooted and visibly free of soil.
- (c) BULB GROWERS
  - (i) The bulbs are to be cleaned and graded prior to sale.

## Attachment 2: Tasmanian Declaration of State Freedom from Potato Cyst Nematode



### Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water & Environment

BIOSECURITY AND PRODUCT INTEGRITY DIVISION

**Hobart** GPO Box 44, Hobart, Tasmania, 7001

**Launceston** PO Box 46, Kings Meadows, Tasmania, 7249

**Devonport** PO Box 303, Devonport, Tasmania, 7310

Ph 1300 368 550

Web [www.dpipwe.tas.gov.au](http://www.dpipwe.tas.gov.au)

## AREA FREEDOM CERTIFICATE

I hereby declare the organisms known as Potato Cyst Nematode (*Globodera rostochiensis* and *Globodera pallida*) to be absent from Tasmania.

The declaration is made on the basis of general and passive surveillance, import controls and specific survey activities described for IPPC Notification of Pest Free Area (attached) consistent with specifications of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures No. 4, No 6 and No 8.

### Description of Area:

- All of the State
- None of the State
- That part of the State comprising the following \*

\* Use appropriate descriptions such as local government area, counties or statistical divisions. Please attach a map indicating the area free of the pest or disease.

**Name:** Andrew Bishop

**Official Designation:** Chief Plant Health Manager (Tasmania)

**Date:** 3 December 2010