Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000026

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: National Animal Disease Preparedness Coordinator

Topic: Infection Rates and Risk Levels of Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD)

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. According to the most recent information that your department has, how many Indonesian provinces does FMD have a presence in? Is the Department able to provide a case breakdown on individual provinces?
2. What are the current infection and vaccination numbers for cattle in Indonesia?
3. What level of potency are the vaccines being administered by the Indonesian Government against FMD? Does this avoid transmission?
4. How many animals have been destroyed as a result of this outbreak in Indonesia?
5. How many FMD vaccines has the Indonesian Government administered?
6. Is the Indonesian Government strategically managing the FMD outbreak by prioritising the vaccine in specific provinces?
7. Are these efforts by the Indonesian Government keeping up with the infection rate?
8. When can we expect the first doses of the Australian FMD vaccines to be administered into Indonesian cattle?
9. The Indonesian Government has given a six-month deadline to get on top of the outbreak. Does the Department share their confidence?
10. On page 6 of the Incoming Government Brief on Agriculture, prepared by the Department, it states clearly:
"The two key risk pathways are international travellers, and movement of people and goods through the Torres Strait"
This appears to be at odds with what the Minister for Agriculture has been claiming in the media - and in the Parliament House briefing on 27 July - that the biggest threat to FMD entering Australia is through the mail and post. Has the Department's official advice on FMD risk pathways changed?
11. What is the current biosecurity risk of FMD entering Papua New Guinea?
12. What happens if the disease becomes endemic in Indonesia?
13. How would the Department assess the quality of the data being provided from the Indonesian Government? Is the Department getting a clear picture of the situation?

Answer:

1. All statistics have been drawn from and are publically available on the Indonesian Ministry of Agriculture FMD Outbreak and Prevention Measures site at https://siagapmk.crisis-center.id/?l=en

   As at 3.30pm on 17 August 2022, cases have been reported in 24 provinces. Case numbers per province are available at https://siagapmk.crisis-center.id/?l=en

2. As at 3.30pm on 17 August 2022, there are 492,894 confirmed cases, 141,678 active cases and 1,527,756 animals have been vaccinated.

3. The Indonesian Government is sourcing foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) vaccines from multiple suppliers and the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry is not in a position to comment on all of these.

   The vaccines procured by the Australian Government are considered to be highly effective and suitable for emergency vaccination for the control of FMD in outbreak situations. These vaccines are a high potency formulation and, if used appropriately, provide rapid immunity after a single dose and decrease the incidence of clinical disease and reduce virus amplification.

4. As at 3.30pm on 17 August 2022, 10,037 animals have been slaughtered.

5. As at 3.30pm on 17 August 2022, 1,527,756 vaccines have been administered.

6. The Indonesian Government is vaccinating livestock in affected provinces in accordance with its FMD control program.

7. According to Indonesia's official website, as at 17 August 2022, over 1.5 million of livestock have been vaccinated. Official data shows daily infections continue to slow with new infections reported in 19 provinces and no new cases reported in 5 provinces.

8. Vaccines funded by the Australian Government are provided to Indonesia to support their FMD control program. The timing of administration of vaccines is a matter for the Indonesian Government.

9. The department is supportive of Indonesia's efforts to control the FMD outbreak as quickly as possible. The department is working collaboratively with Indonesia to provide tangible support for its FMD control program.

10. There are a range of risk pathways for FMD including in contaminated, illegally imported animal products which could enter Australia via travellers, mail and cargo, all of which are significant. The department monitors all risk pathways to ensure it can respond to changing threats and trends associated with the movement of people and goods through the Australian border.

11. The department has not conducted a specific risk assessment for an FMD incursion in Papua New Guinea. The department is currently working with other Australian partners to support Papua New Guinea's National Agriculture Quarantine and Inspection Authority (NAQIA) to conduct a rapid risk assessment for the introduction of FMD into PNG. This work aims to identify risk pathways for the introduction of FMD, to inform NAQIA's public awareness, disease surveillance and FMD preparedness activities.

12. The endemic presence of FMD in Indonesia could affect its future livestock production, farmers livelihoods and its broader economy. It would require measures to be implemented by Indonesia to manage the disease as endemic. It could also have implications for the region's FMD situation with potential to act as a source of infection to non-endemic countries.

13. The Indonesian Government has made information on the outbreak publicly available and this is being updated on a regular basis. This information can be found at the following website: https://siagapmk.crisis-center.id/

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000027

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: Biosecurity Operations Division (BOD)

Topic: Screening and International Arrivals

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. In the time between 5 July and 27 July 2022, how many international travellers arrived in Australia from Indonesia, and what proportion of these people were coming from Bali?2. Over the past week (Sunday 31 July 2022 – Sunday 7 August 2022) how many international travellers arrived in Australia from Indonesia, and of these, how many underwent screening? Is it correct that incoming passengers from Indonesia are only subject to screening, on the basis of risk profiling which is informed by responses given on travel declaration forms?3. The National Farmers' Federation (NFF) and other industry associations have been calling for 100% screening (which means personalised biosecurity questioning and luggage checks) for all returning passengers from Indonesia, while the FMD situation remains higher risk. The following questions are:a) What would this measure cost?b) Why hasn't the Government adopted this?4. 3D X-ray technology allows organic and plant matter to be detected in luggage. Has the Department provided any advice to Government on the possibility or costings of establishing a 3D X-ray program with the Indonesian Government? If not, why not?5. What would it cost to use 3D X-ray screening technology on passengers leaving Bali airport?6. Has the enhanced screening at airports taken resources away from mail screening?

Answer:

1. Between 5 July and 27 July 2022, 79,374 international travellers arrived in Australia from Indonesia, with 93.4 % of these arriving from Bali.
2. From 31 July to 7 August 2022, 25,771 international travellers arrived in Australia from Indonesia. The following biosecurity controls were applied in relation to these passengers:
    - 100% of passengers on all flights from Indonesia are assessed against biosecurity risk profiles, and those presenting a higher risk are flagged on arrival for biosecurity intervention with x-ray, detector dogs or manual baggage inspection. This process is independent of traveller declarations.
    - Sanitisation foot mats have been implemented at all international airports that receive direct flights from Indonesia. All passengers and crew from Indonesian flights are required to walk across the mats to treat the soles of their footwear.
    - 100% of passengers who use the SmartGates are asked "Have you been in Indonesia in the last 7 days". Those who have been in Indonesia are referred for biosecurity assessment.
        i. Biosecurity assessment consists of targeted questioning, and may include screening with x-ray or detector dog, or physical inspection of baggage.

- Biosecurity officers and Australian Border Force officers are asking the same question of passengers from hub flights who go to the manual immigration line, rather than use the SmartGate.
    i. Those from direct Indonesian flights, and from hub flights if they have been in Indonesia in the last 7 days, are referred for biosecurity assessment.
- Passengers who declare on the Incoming Passenger Card (a legal declaration) they are carrying biosecurity goods, and those who have undertaken an activity overseas which could present a biosecurity risk, are referred for biosecurity assessment.
- Real time risk assessments are undertaken by biosecurity officials in the baggage collection area. The decision to refer any traveller for biosecurity screening is made by biosecurity officers regardless of the declaration status of the traveller.

3. a) The Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry already undertakes 100% risk profiling and assessment of all arriving travellers including those from Indonesia.
    - Prior to disembarking, biosecurity officers board the planes and deliver a new biosecurity message on all inbound flights from Indonesia to reinforce Australia's strict biosecurity measures and provide FMD-specific advice to travellers. Travellers are reminded to declare all biosecurity risk material.
    - All travellers from Indonesia are directed to walk over the sanitisation foot mats after disembarking.
    - Biosecurity officers screen all travellers that have been flagged for further intervention using detector dogs or x-rays, and may include manual baggage inspections where appropriate.
    - The department does implement additional targeted intervention on some Indonesian flights and directed these for 100% screening by detector dogs or x-ray. The results of these continue to show high levels of compliance and confirm that our measures and risk profiling are appropriate at this time.
    - There are no reliable costings for the department to conduct full 100% baggage inspections (full unpack and repack) on all arriving Indonesian travellers, as it is not logistically possible to do so at major airports like Sydney and Melbourne.

    b) The department applies a multi-layered range of controls across the biosecurity continuum. These measures complement each other and are considered to mitigate risks at the border in line with Australia's appropriate level of protection (ALOP). The measures include offshore and onshore communication on biosecurity risks, legal declaration requirements, detector dog and x-ray screening, and other border controls such as biosecurity risk profiling which is based on data analytics. Heightened measures, such as the determination of biosecurity response zones and the use of sanitisation foot mats are additional temporary controls implemented to address the heightened risk due to the active outbreak of FMD in Indonesia.

4. No, the department has not provided advice to the government on the possibility or costings of establishing a 3D X-ray program for screening outgoing goods. Legislative constraints around the international sharing of intellectual property and x-ray images for biosecurity purposes, along with the long lead-in times for the design, manufacturer, installation and establishment of a 3D x-ray capability, means that offshore x-ray screening is not deemed viable in this instance.

5. This would be a decision for Indonesia. For 3D x-rays that have been installed in Australia by the department, the cost of a single Rapiscan RTT 3D x-ray unit is approximately $2.1 million. Additional costs associated with the required hardware, bag/parcel tracking technology, bespoke conveyor belts and ongoing maintenance would also need to be considered.
6. No. The realignment of the workforce in travellers and mail is undertaken periodically to ensure staffing numbers are commensurate with the workload with a minimum number of staff moving across both mail and travellers pathway.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000028

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: Biosecurity Operations Division (BOD)

Topic: Foot Mats

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. From when FMD was detected in Bali, and until as recently as 15 July 2022, the Agriculture Minister claimed that foot sanitation was not an effective biosecurity measure to combat FMD, and that the chemicals used are "dangerous to human skin". On 20 July, the Government announced the rolling out of foot mats at Australian international airports. Was this change on the use of foot mats supported by any formal advice from the Department? And if there was official advice on foot mats since the outbreak of FMD in Bali, did this change?

Answer:

Verbal advice was provided to the Minister about the unsuitability and utility of foot baths in an international airport environment, consistent with his public remarks.

The Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry explored alternatives to foot baths, including foot mats options, chemical treatments, logistics, and legal options between 6 and 15 July. The Minister was verbally briefed on progress during this period and was provided with written advice on a range of options and considerations on 12 July.

The Minister instructed the department to expedite consideration of 'wet mats' on 13 July.

The department advised all airport operators on 14 July that it was considering how it could work with them to operationally deploy foot mats.

The department sought advice and received a permit on 17 July 2022 from the Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority to use 3% citric acid in foot mats to assist in mitigating the risk of foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) entering Australia on footwear worn by arriving international travellers.

The department identified a suitable foot mat, dry mat and chemical treatment on 15 July and confirmed orders with suppliers on 18 July.

The department met again with airport operators on 18 July to advise them of its intention to deploy foot mats. Airport operators responded positively.

On 20 July, the Minister announced that foot mats would be introduced at international airports as another layer of biosecurity protection against FMD.

The proposed Biosecurity Response Zone Determination to give effect to the lawful deployment of foot mats was considered by Agriculture Senior Officials (in accordance with subsection 368(1) of the *Biosecurity Act 2016*) at its meeting of 21 July

A *Biosecurity (Foot and mouth disease Biosecurity Response Zone) Determination 2022* enabling the foot mats to be deployed was signed and brought into effect by the Director of Biosecurity on 22 July.

At 6.20am on 25 July the first foot mat was trialled on travellers arriving on a military flight at Jet Aviation in Sydney. Wet mats were deployed on two large early morning flights at Sydney Kingsford Smith Airport on 26 July with all other airports receiving flights from Indonesia becoming fully operational on 27 July.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000029

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: Biosecurity Operations Division (BOD)

Topic: Contractors

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. The Minister for Agriculture stated to the Senate on the 28 July that "my department is bringing on an additional 65 contractors and 10 team leaders to assist with biosecurity efforts at our international airports and mail centres." Please advise how many of those personnel have now been deployed, when were they deployed, at what airports and mail centres and what are their specific intervention tasks?

Answer:

The Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry has brought on additional resources that do not require biosecurity skills or biosecurity authority to perform supporting activities for the biosecurity clearance of travellers at airports.

Around 45 contractors have now been engaged through a supplier agreement at all international airports that receive direct flights from Indonesia which commenced on 25 July 2022. Under this agreement, contractor personnel have been progressively rolled out at international airports included in the *Biosecurity (Foot and mouth disease Biosecurity Response Zone) Determination 2022*.

The specific tasks undertaken by the contractors include:

- the preparation and maintenance of footwear sanitisation mats and wet area mats
- the preparation and maintenance of cleaning stations
- assistance with directing travellers to biosecurity intervention points and/or cleaning stations
- assistance with, or the conduct of, the cleaning of traveller personal effects, for example footwear or luggage
- general cleaning and disinfection activities
- handing out foot-and-mouth information flyers

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000030

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: Biosecurity Animal Division

Topic: FMD Detections

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. On 20 July 2022, while announcing the installation of foot mats at airports, Minister Watt stated that traces of FMD had been detected in pork floss at a Melbourne supermarket and in beef products brought in by a traveller from Indonesia. Questions on this are:
a) Who decided to make this public?
b) Did the Department advise the Minister to make this public?
c) How was the announcement and subsequent reporting of these detections received by export markets?
d) Did the Department consider that this could feed public and overseas anxieties?
e) Will the Government continue to make future detections public as they occur?
f) Has there been any further detection of FMD in Australia since these two examples?

Answer:

a. The decision to go public with a statement was made by the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry.

b. Minister Watt was briefed on the issue by the department.

c. The announcement of the detection was covered by local media in a number of countries. As a result of this media, a number of competent authorities contacted the department to confirm the veracity of the media reports.

d. The department was aware of the sensitivities of the message and stressed in all public information that these detections did not change Australia's disease-free status.

   The department considered it important to raise awareness of the risks and our surveillance activities. Foot-and-mouth disease viral fragments have been found in seized pork products previously.

e. The department will continue to consider the circumstance of specific detections in providing advice to the minister.

f. No.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000032

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: Biosecurity Operations Division (BOD)

Topic: Cruise ships

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. What is being done to minimise the risks of FMD entering Australian jurisdictions via cruise ship passengers?

Answer:

The first cruise vessel from Indonesia is expected to arrive in Australia in November 2022. The Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry is in the process of implementing biosecurity requirements for cruise vessel and travellers entering Australia where they have voyaged directly from or through Indonesia. As with air travellers, existing biosecurity requirements will apply including the need to declare foot-an-mouth (FMD) risk material and contaminated footwear. The department is working with cruise vessel operators on communication materials on FMD (including flyers) to ensure travellers are aware of their biosecurity obligations. The use of sanitisation foot mats at cruise vessel terminals is being considered as part of these enhanced measures.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry:	Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness
Question No:	IQ22-000035
Hearing Date:	10 August 2022
Division/Agency:	National Animal Disease Preparedness Coordinator
Topic:	Biosecurity impact and FMD domestic outbreak management - general
Question Date:	12 August 2022
Question Type:	Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. What is the cost sharing arrangement with the states and territories, and industry, if FMD is detected in Australia?
2. Does the $80 billion impact of an FMD outbreak on the Australian economy include the response costs from government and industry?
3. On 4 August, Minister Watt announced the Australian Defence Force (ADF) would be used in helping contain any FMD outbreak. What would this look like?
4. Last month, the WA State Minister for Agriculture was reported as saying FMD would not be "catastrophic", that the disease had to be kept "in perspective" and suggested an outbreak could make meat and diary products cheaper. Is the Department confident that state governments have the capability and the resolve to eradicate FMD quickly, should it enter the country?
5. What assurances can the Department give the dairy, livestock and agricultural industries that FMD won't be spread by wildlife and introduced species through soil and faeces transfer? What plans are in place to cull native animals in the event of an outbreak? What plans are in place to cull feral animals in the event of an outbreak?

Answer:

1. Australia's Emergency Animal Disease Response Agreement (EADRA) documents nationally agreed arrangements for the cost sharing of emergency animal disease responses between governments and the affected industries.

   Foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) is a Category 2 emergency animal disease under the EADRA, which means that eligible costs would be shared between Commonwealth and State and Territory Government (80%) and Industry Parties (20%). Further information on the determination of proportional split between government and Industry Parties is provided in Schedule 6 of the EADRA - https://animalhealthaustralia.com.au//wp-content/uploads/dlm_uploads/2015/09/210323_EADRA_Version2001_0820_FINAL.pdf

2. Yes. The $80 billion figure is the estimated direct economic impact over 10 years of a large, multi-state FMD outbreak. The estimated economic impact includes revenue losses and the cost of disease control. Further information is available in Buetre, B, Wicks, S, Kruger, H, Millist, N, Yainshet, A, Garner, G, Duncan, A, Abdalla, A, Trestrail, C, Hatt, M, Thompson, LJ & Symes, M 2013, Potential socio-economic impacts of an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Australia, ABARES research report, Canberra, September. CC BY 3.0 and https://www.agriculture.gov.au/abares/research-topics/biosecurity/biosecurity-economics/fmd-update-of-2013-estimate#:~:text=Background,by%20the%20time%20of%20detection

3. As part of a whole of Commonwealth response under the Australian Government Crisis Management Framework (AGCMF), Defence will consider requests for assistance through Defence Assistance to the Civil Community (DACC) arrangements.

   The AGCMF outlines the roles and responsibilities of ministers and senior officials and the arrangements enabling the Australian Government's 'all hazards' crisis management approach.

   The Australian Government Biosecurity and Agricultural Response Plan (AUSBIOAGPLAN) describes the coordination arrangements between Australian Government agencies during the response to animal biosecurity incidents - https://www.agriculture.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/ausbioagplan.pdf

   AUSBIOAGPLAN may be used when the scale or scope of the incident requires increased coordination across jurisdictions or agencies.

   As of 5 August, Defence is providing four specialist ADF planning staff to the Emergency Management Australia/Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry co-chaired Exotic Animal Diseases Preparedness Taskforce.

4. Australia has well practiced and documented response arrangements in place for emergency animal diseases (EADs), including FMD. These are nationally agreed between the federal, state and territory governments and peak industry bodies.

   The length of time taken to control and eradicate FMD will depend on how long the virus has been present before it is detected and the degree of spread.

   The Exotic Animal Disease Preparedness Taskforce (the taskforce) was established to ensure Australia is fully prepared to respond swiftly to growing biosecurity threats. The taskforce was established by Senator the Hon Murray Watt, Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry and Minister for Emergency Management. Minister Watt requested that the taskforce provide him with advice about the level of preparedness, across all levels of government, to respond to an incursion.

   The taskforce is engaging across all levels of government and with industry to assess the level of preparedness. The taskforce is ongoing and is due to report to Minister Watt on 5 September 2022.

5. Feral species present in Australia that may transmit FMD include cattle, water buffalo, sheep, deer, pigs and goats.

   Targeted surveillance is undertaken for the detection of emergency animal diseases in feral animal populations.

   International evidence suggests that wild and feral populations of animals pose a low risk of transmitting infection to domestic livestock.

   It isn't possible to eliminate the risks of feral animals transmitting FMD or other livestock diseases. On farm biosecurity will play a vital role in reducing feral animals coming into contact with their stock.

   If there was an incursion in Australia, disease control strategies for feral animal populations would be determined based on the circumstances of an outbreak.

   Australia's Veterinary Emergency Plan (AUSVETPLAN) recognises the possibility of feral animals transmitting FMD and contains guidance on surveillance and population control measures in an incursion.

The AUSVETPLAN – Wild Animal Response Strategy sets out the management strategies and overall control procedures for wild terrestrial animals during an animal health emergency in Australia – https://animalhealthaustralia.com.au//wp-content/uploads/dlm_uploads/AVP_Wild-An-Resp-Strategy_v3.3_2011-1.pdf

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000036

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: National Animal Disease Preparedness Coordinator

Topic: States and Territories

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. Was the Department asked by the Agriculture Minister's office or the Government to provide any FMD update for the National Cabinet meeting that was held on 16 July?
2. Was the Department asked by the Agriculture Minister's office or the Government to provide any update on FMD for the Prime Minister's meeting with state and territory First Ministers that was held on 17 July?

Answer:

The Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry has no record of requests specifically associated with those meeting references. The department notes at that date the Agriculture Minister was already well briefed, having delivered a detailed press briefing on his return from Indonesia on 15 July.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000037

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: National Animal Disease Preparedness Coordinator

Topic: Veterinarians

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. Can the Department confirm the number of Australian veterinarians that have been deployed to Indonesia to assist on-the-ground, and to which provinces?

Answer:

1. One Australian Government veterinarian has been deployed to Indonesia, based in the Australian Embassy in Jakarta. A second Australian Government veterinarian will be deployed in the week beginning 22 August.

Additional technical expertise and assistance provided to Indonesia

The Australian Government is actively working with international partners and through its development programs in Indonesia to provide support as needed. Existing programs include:

- Technical experts from the Australia Indonesia Health Security Partnership regularly engaging with Indonesian officials to provide support and expertise. These experts have been highly engaged with Indonesian officials on the ground in Indonesia and in supporting FMD control.
- Two Australian experts participated in a Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations Emergency Management Centre for Animal Health (EMC-AH) mission to Indonesia to strengthen foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) prevention and control measures in June 2022.
- Experts from Australian Centre for Disease Preparedness (ACDP) provide diagnostic and laboratory capacity support including laboratory reagents which are essential to support FMD diagnostics.
- An Australian technical expert in vaccines arrived in Indonesia on 17 August to support the Indonesian Government's efforts to produce FMD vaccine domestically. This has been funded by the Australian Government.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000038

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: Exports and Veterinary Services Division (EVSD)

Topic: Restoring market access in the event of an outbreak

Question Date: 10 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1.If an outbreak of FMD was contained to one region of Australia, would it be possible to demonstrate other parts of the nation were FMD free?
2. What discussions is the Department currently having with major import countries such as South Korea and Japan, in the event there is a lumpy skin disease outbreak in Australia?
3. What would be the minimum period of time to reopen markets if an FMD outbreak was detected in Australia? Is there an overseas precedent? Is this based on international protocols or is it expected that our major export markets will go beyond these periods?

Answer:

1. The World Organisation for Animal Health (WAOH) provides standards on demonstrating freedom for foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) and a pathway for official WOAH recognition of FMD free zones. These standards are set out in the Terrestrial Animal Health Code at Section 8, Chapter 8. https://www.woah.org/en/what-we-do/standards/codes-and-manuals/terrestrial-code-online-access

   While members of the WOAH are obliged to have regard to these standards, it remains the prerogative of importing countries to recognise any FMD-free zones established in Australia.

2. The Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry has identified a number of trading partners where negotiation of new trade conditions, in the event of an lumpy skin disease outbreak, may be possible. This work has commenced.

3. It is difficult to confirm a potential timeframe for the lifting of trade restrictions following an incursion of FMD. The timeframe for recommencement of trade will be dependent on the nature of the outbreak, the eradication/control program deployed, whether vaccination was used, the response of Australia's animal health systems, recognition of freedom by the WOAH and by an importing country's own FMD freedom recognition guidelines.

   In order to recommence trade, the department will need to submit for the consideration of a trading partner, a comprehensive submission outlining all actions taken as part of a response, including but not limited to, surveillance and other animal health data, traceability information and national systems controls. This will require time to prepare and significant internal, state and territory representative and industry engagement.

   The department anticipates that recommencement of trade to some markets will be a protracted process, and, pending the circumstances surrounding an FMD detection, may take several years to resolve after the disease has been controlled.

The United States has a well-established FMD freedom recognition process and as such, this is likely to be a best-case estimate for the recommencement of trade for Australia, noting that some major trading partners require country freedom for twelve months before FMD freedom will be considered.

United States Department of Agriculture analysis of the time taken to regain freedom recognition by WOAH and the US suggests that even if an FMD outbreak is controlled exceptionally quickly (Ireland), the fastest that the US has recognised FMD freedom was 228 days. The longest time taken by the US to recommence trade after an outbreak was with Japan, where trade to the US did not recommence for 774 days.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000039

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: National Animal Disease Preparedness Coordinator

Topic: Standard words used for replies to FMD correspondence

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. In relation to the approved standard words cleared by the Department on the Government's FMD response, which were presumably used by the Minister's office to communicate with stakeholders, they state that:
"In direct response to the emergence and spread of FMD to Bali, I requested the Department to strengthen biosecurity measures to protect Australia FMD incursion.
These measures are stronger than those that were implemented by the former government."
Since the FMD outbreak in Bali on 5 July how many pieces of ministerial correspondence on FMD have been issued? What types of stakeholders have these been sent to?

Answer:

1. Since the foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) outbreak in Bali on 5 July, 217 pieces of ministerial correspondence have been issued. These have been issued to various groups of stakeholders including the general public, industry, state and territory government, and local MPs.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000040

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: Biosecurity Animal Division

Topic: FMD Vaccines

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. What is the potency level of the FMD vaccinations that are owned by Australia in the United Kingdom, and will these vaccines stop transmission of the disease?

Answer:

1. A vaccine's potency is a measure of the number of protective doses (PD) in a vaccine. One 50% protective dose (PD_{50}) represents the dose of vaccine that will protect 50% of vaccinated animals against clinical foot-and-mouth disease (FMD). The quantity of PD_{50} doses present in a standard dose is its PD_{50} value. A PD_{50} of greater than or equal to 3 is classed as acceptable for routine vaccination, while a PD_{50} of greater than or equal to 6 is suitable for emergency vaccination.

   The FMD vaccines in the Australian vaccine bank are high potency vaccines (at least 6 PD_{50}) that produce a rapid, strong immune response in the animals, thereby providing rapid protection from virus challenge.

   This will reduce the incidence of clinical disease and therefore reduce virus spread.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000042

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: Biosecurity Strategy and Reform Division (BSRD)

Topic: Social Media Campaign

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. On 6 July 2022, the Government announced some additional biosecurity measures, including an expanded social media campaign. What date did this social media campaign commence – and on what specific platforms and accounts?
2. What activities and types of materials were put in place, and when? Where there any further social media activities put in place, and if so, what dates did these commence?
3. How much did these social media campaigns cost, and what is the evidence or data that indicates if they were effective?

Answer:

1. To enable communications about foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) to reach a broader audience, the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry has invested in some social media advertising.
    a. The advertising commenced on 14 July 2022 and involves sponsored (paid) posts that are targeted to Australians travelling and returning to Australia, and off-shore audiences travelling to Australia.
2. The sponsored social media posts include three static posts and two video posts.
    a. The advertising complements frequent social media posts (organic) released on the department's platforms – Facebook and Instagram (DAFF and Biosecurity), LinkedIn and Twitter (DAFF), and social media by state and territory agriculture departments.
    b. The department has also put in place other paid advertising elements including location-based advertising (geofencing) to mobile phone users in Australian international airports, Jakarta and Bali airports.
3. The total cost for the sponsored (paid) social media posts is $11,959 (GST exclusive). The Australian Government media buy agency, Univesal McCann, will provide data to assist in measuring effectiveness, at the conclusion of the advertising period.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000045

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: Biosecurity Operations Division (BOD)

Topic: Foot mats at airports

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. The current regulation allowing for foot mats at airports does not provide for foot mats at Gold Coast airport, but Virgin have announced direct flights from Gold Coast to Bali starting next year. Are there plans to include them there then?

Answer:

The *Biosecurity (Foot and Mouth Disease Biosecurity Response Zone) Determination 2022* (the determination), which supports implementation of sanitisation foot mats at Australia's international airports that receive flights direct from Indonesia, was made based on the active nature of the foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) and risks associated with travellers arriving directly from Indonesia.

The biosecurity response zones include relevant parts of all international airports that receive direct flights from Indonesia. Changes to the risk settings and the conveyance on which they might arrive remains under active review.

The response zones will be in place for as long as is necessary to manage the heightened risk. The determination was made for a period of three months from 22 July 2022. It is subject to repeal after this time but may be remade should the Director of Biosecurity consider it necessary.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000047

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: Biosecurity Animal Division (BAD)

Topic: Bos Indicus prevalence

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. Does the Bos Indicus prevalence in northern herds provide any protection against the incursion or spread of foot and mouth disease?

Answer:

1. Australia has a naïve (previously unexposed) population of foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) susceptible animals.

   The presence of *Bos indicus* breeds in the northern herds may provide some limited protection. Noting that FMD has spread in the Indonesian cattle population during the current outbreak despite this herd being predominately comprised of *Bos indicus* breeds.

   In *Bos indicus* breeds, FMD infection or disease may be clinically mild or not evident. In FMD endemic countries, *Bos indicus* usually show milder clinical signs than introduced European breeds (*Bos taurus*). This may also result in undetected spread.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000051

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: Biosecurity Animal Division (BAD)

Topic: AUSVETPLAN - GM vaccine status

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. The AUSVETPLAN states that "A genetically modified FMD vaccine, using a replication-deficient human adenovirus backbone, has recently been conditionally licensed in the United States." What is the current status of these GM vaccines for FMD? Do we have access to them or are there plans to gain access and if so, when?

Answer:

1. There are several vaccines under development for foot-and-mouth disease (FMD), including some that utilise genetically modified vaccine technologies. The technologies are in various stages of development and commercialisation.

   Australia's Vaccine Expert Advisory Group (VEAG) reviews FMD vaccines made with new and existing technologies for inclusion in Australia's FMD vaccine bank. Based on what was available at the time, VEAG did not recommend vaccines based on genetically modified virues for consideration in the 2020-24 FMD vaccine bank.

   VEAG will continue to monitor new FMD vaccines on the market, including their effectiveness, for consideration in future bank purchases.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000052

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: Biosecurity Animal Division

Topic: Swill feeding access

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. What are the restrictions on swill feeding access across different Australian jurisdictions? Who enforces these restrictions?

Answer:

All jurisdictions have legislation banning the feeding of swill (also known as prohibited pig feed).

The nationally-agreed definition of prohibited pig feed is referred to in all relevant legislation except in Tasmania and South Australia.

The nationally-agreed definition of prohibited pig feed is material of mammalian origin, or any substance that has come in contact with this material, but the definition does not include:

- Milk, milk products or milk by-products either of Australian provenance or legally imported for stockfeed use into Australia.
- Material containing flesh, bones, blood, offal or mammal carcases which is treated by an approved (nationally-agreed) process.
- A carcass or part of a domestic pig, born and raised on the property on which the pig or pigs that are administered the part are held, that is administered for therapeutic purposes in accordance with the written instructions of a veterinary practitioner.
- Material used under an individual and defined-period permit issued by a jurisdiction for the purposes of research or baiting.

The nationally-agreed definition of feeding prohibited pig feed includes:

- feeding or allowing or directing another person to feed prohibited pig feed to a pig
- allowing a pig to have access to prohibited pig feed
- the collection and storage or possession of prohibited pig feed on a premises where one or more pigs are kept
- supplying to another person prohibited pig feed that the supplier knows is for feeding to any pig.

In Tasmania, the definition of prohibited pig feed will be aligned with the national definition under the new *Biosecurity Regulations 2022* (due to be introduced later this year).

In South Australia, products which may cause livestock to become affected with a notifiable condition can only be supplied as fodder, or disposed of in a manner which might permit access by livestock, with the approval of the Chief Inspector.

The national definition of prohibited pig feed is a minimum standard. Some jurisdictions have additional conditions for swill feeding which pig producers in those jurisdictions must comply with, over and above the requirements of the national definition.

Each jurisdiction is responsible for enforcing compliance with relevant legislation, and compliance inspection programs in each jurisdiction may involve: prohibited pig feed audits at premises with pigs; investigating potential suppliers (e.g., food outlets) of food waste products potentially containing or having come into contact with prohibited pig feed; and auditing waste facilities where feral or domestic pigs may be present nearby.

Agreed *Prohibited Pig Feed (Swill) Compliance National Uniform Guidelines* are in place which harmonise investigation and reporting approaches across jurisdictions.The outcomes of industry audits and government inspections are shared through annual reports to Animal Health Committee and SAFEMEAT.

A summary of state and territory legislation regulating prohibited pig feed and the feeding of prohibited pig feed is provided below.

Jurisdiction	Name of legislation
New South Wales	*Biosecurity Act 2015*
Northern Territory	*Livestock Act 2014; Livestock Regulations 2015*
Queensland	*Biosecurity Act 2014*
South Australia	*Livestock Act 1997, South Australian Livestock Regulations 2013*
Tasmania	*Animal Health Act 1995 and Animal Health Act Regulations 2006*
Victoria	*Livestock Disease Control Act 1994 Section 41*
Western Australia	*Biosecurity and Agriculture Management (Agriculture Standards) Regulations 2013*

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000053

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: Biosecurity Animal Division (BAD)

Topic: AUSVETPLAN - legislation

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. The AUSVETPLAN for foot and mouth disease states that "A multi-agency approach will be needed to enforce current swill-feeding bans and swiftly introduce legislation, if not already in place, to ban feeding of dairy products to pigs and other FMD susceptible species (unless the products have been treated as described in Section 3.2.7 or are to be fed to the offspring of dairy animals resident on the same farm)." Is the legislation referred to here in place or would it need to be passed after an outbreak of foot and mouth disease? If after, what are the details of such legislation and how long do we expect it to take to be enacted?

Answer:

1. As set out in the answer to IQ22-000052, existing state and territory legislation is sufficient to prevent the feeding of dairy products (milk and milk by-products) to pigs and other foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) susceptible species (unless treated or fed to animals on the same farm) during an outbreak of FMD in Australia.
2. If an outbreak of FMD were to occur in Australia, authorities in affected jurisdictions would utilise existing legislation to mandate treatment and movement by permit only, of milk and milk by-products for animal consumption.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000054

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: Legal and Governance Division

Topic: Public relations material - FMD outbreak

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. Have we begun to prepare public relations material in case of an outbreak of foot and mouth disease?

Answer:

1. Yes.

The Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry has prepared public information materials to provide accurate, timely and coordinated national messaging in the case of a foot and mouth disease incursion.

Communication protocols and arrangements are provided in the national emergency animal disease response plans and associated documents, including the:

- AUSVETPLAN
- Biosecurity Incident Public Information Manual (BIPIM)

The department also engages with state and territory agriculture/primary industry departments via the National Biosecurity Communications and Engagement Network to ensure biosecurity messaging is nationally consistent and aligned, and would continue to do so in the event of any incursion.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry:	Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness
Question No:	IQ22-000055
Hearing Date:	10 August 2022
Division/Agency:	National Animal Disease Preparedness Coordinator
Topic:	Recommendations - Matthews' inquiry
Question Date:	12 August 2022
Question Type:	Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. Have the recommendations from the Matthews' inquiry into our foot and mouth disease been implemented?

Answer:

1. In 2011, the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry engaged Mr Ken Matthews to provide an independent assessment of Australia's biosecurity continuum to assess the department's and Australia's current level of preparedness and capacity to prevent and respond to an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease (FMD).

   In response to the Matthews report a dedicated FMD Taskforce was established in the department from 2012-2014 to lead the work with jurisdictions and stakeholders and fast-track improvements across the biosecurity system.

   The FMD Taskforce led the development of a National FMD Action Plan. The implementation of the Action Plan was overseen by the National Biosecurity Committee (NBC). The Action Plan was endorsed by the (then) Primary Industries Standing Council and Primary Industries Ministerial Council. Progress against the National FMD Action Plan was reported to NBC. The Action Plan was concluded in 2014. The department is doing an internal review to ensure that the plan is still current

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000056

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: Biosecurity Animal Division (BAD)

Topic: AUSVETPLAN review

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. How long has it been since the AUSVETPLAN for FMD has been reviewed and revised? Is there a review of the FMD AUSVETPLAN scheduled soon?

Answer:

1. The current AUSVETPLAN disease strategy for foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) was last updated in 2014.

   An update of the manual is nearing completion with government and industry experts and coordinated by Animal Health Australia. The revised manual is expected to be published in mid October 2022.

   The currently published FMD AUSVETPLAN disease strategy remains robust and contemporary. No major changes to the operating environment, necessitating review had been identified until the detection of FMD in Indonesia earlier this year.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000057

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: Trade Reform Division (TRD)

Topic: NLIS system

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. Has the Department recently reviewed, or been involved in reviewing the NLIS system and its effectiveness in helping to respond to a foot and mouth disease outbreak? If so, when was that review, what were the recommendations, and have they been implemented?

Answer:

The most recent review of the NLIS was undertaken in 2018-19 by SAFEMEAT, a partnership between industry and government that provides the platform for engagement and collaboration on policy. SAFEMEAT conducted a significant consultation activity to develop reform options for Australia's livestock traceability system. The outcomes from this review were provided to Australian governments, through the National Biosecurity Committee (NBC), in February 2020.

The SAFEMEAT report made five (5) recommendations:

- The establishment of a regulatory or statutory entity responsible for managing Australian livestock traceability,
- Investment into a database capable of handling all foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) susceptible livestock species,
- Mandating individual digital/electronic identification of livestock,
- Creating an equitable funding arrangement for both the establishment and ongoing maintenance of the system, and
- That a consultation Regulatory Impact Statement be conducted to fully assess the impacts of these recommendations to provide a fully costed decision paper to AGMIN.

Regulatory responsibility for livestock traceability in Australia resides with the state and territory governments, with current systems run by industry to meet their differing jurisdictional obligations. The Australian Government's responsibility is for export trade and the necessary systems to support it, including adequate proof of claims to satisfy export destinations, as well as to support a nationally consistent biosecurity system. In that capacity, the government has been working with states and territories to progress these recommendations through the Agriculture Ministers' Meeting (AMM; formerly AGMIN), Agriculture Senior Officials Committee (AGSOC) and the National Biosecurity Committee.

In July 2022, Australian Agriculture Ministers' agreed in-principle to advance work on a national approach to Australia's livestock traceability systems noting the urgent need for a national (harmonised) system for the individual identification of sheep and goats. Officials were tasked to work on implementation options and funding arrangements with industry. This work commenced in August 2022 and is being led by the department through a collaborative, co-

design process with the states and territories, and industry. This work will have due regard to the SAFEMEAT report's recommendations, and report to Agriculture Ministers.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000058

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: Biosecurity Animal Division (BAD)

Topic: FMD - Kangaroos

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. Can Kangaroos spread FMD? How do we know they do not?

Answer:

1. It is unknown what role kangaroos and other Australian marsupials would play in the spread of a foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) outbreak in Australia.

   There is also one recorded case of a kangaroo in a zoo in India which was strongly suspected of having been infected with FMD virus (Bhattacharya et al. 2003).

   The study by Snowden (1968) did demonstrate that experimentally infected kangaroos could transmit infection to cattle; however, the study was unable to demonstrate that cattle could infect kangaroos.

   There appears to be a low likelihood of transmission occurring in the field (Bunn 2013, Snowdon 1968).

References:

Animal Health Australia (2014). Disease strategy: Foot-and-mouth disease (Version 3.4). Australian Veterinary Emergency Plan (AUSVETPLAN), Edition 3, Agriculture Ministers' Forum, Canberra, ACT, available at https://animalhealthaustralia.com.au/ausvetplan/

Bhattacharya S, Banerjee R, Ghosh R, Biswas A, Chatterjee A, 2003, Identification of foot-and-mouth disease from a captive kangaroo in a zoological garden in India, *The Veterinary Record,* 153, 504.

Bunn C (2013) Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD) Risks Relating to Wildlife - Scope, Gap Analysis and Future Priorities. Animal Wildlife Health Network, Sydney, NSW

Snowdon, WA, 1968, 'The susceptibility of some Australian fauna to infection with foot and mouth disease virus', *Australian Journal of Experimental Biology and Medical Science*, 46(6), pp.667-687.

Wildlife Health Australia, 2022, *Foot and Mouth Disease Virus (FMD or FMDV) – Information*, available online https://www.wildlifehealthaustralia.com.au/AboutUs/News.aspx#FMDInfo

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000059

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: Biosecurity Operations Division (BOD)

Topic: Bag and mail searches

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. Has the Federal Government commenced searches of 100% of all incoming bags and mail coming from Indonesia?
2. Can the Federal Government implement a process to search all incoming bags and mail from FMD positive countries?

Answer:

1. The Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry applies a multi-layered range of controls across the biosecurity continuum. These measures complement each other and are considered to mitigate risks at the border in line with Australia's appropriate level of protection (ALOP). The measures include offshore and onshore communication on biosecurity risks, legal declaration requirements, detector dog and x-ray screening, and other border controls such as biosecurity risk profiling which is based on data analytics.

   The department already undertakes 100% risk profiling and assessment of all arriving travellers and mail including those from Indonesia.

   In response to the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) in Indonesia, the department implemented a range of additional measures to mitigate the risk at the border. This includes:

   a. Enhanced communication and awareness tools to educate travellers to leave risks offshore and to declare any risk goods they may be bringing into the country (compliance rates of travellers from Indonesia are high and have increased due to this messaging).

   b. 100% of passengers on all flights from Indonesia are assessed against biosecurity profiles, and travellers presenting a higher risk are flagged on arrival for biosecurity intervention with x-ray, detector dogs and/or manual baggage inspection.

   c. Prior to travellers disembarking, biosecurity officers board the planes and deliver a new biosecurity message on all inbound flights from Indonesia to reinforce Australia's strict biosecurity measures and provide FMD-specific advice to travellers. Travellers are reminded to declare all biosecurity risk material.

   d. Sanitisation foot mats have been implemented at all international airports that receive direct flights from Indonesia. All travellers and crew from Indonesian flights are required to walk across the mats to treat the soles of their footwear.

   e. 100% of travellers who use the SmartGates kiosks for immigration clearance are asked "Have you been in Indonesia in the last 7 days". Those who have been in Indonesia are referred for biosecurity assessment.

- Biosecurity assessment consists of targeted questioning, and may include screening with x-ray or detector dog, and/or physical inspection of baggage.

f. Biosecurity officers and Australian Border Force officers are asking the same question of travellers from hub flights who go to the manual immigration line, rather than use the SmartGate.
    - Those from direct Indonesian flights, and from hub flights (if they have been in Indonesia in the last 7 days), are referred for biosecurity assessment.

g. The department is inspecting 100% of all non-letter class mail from Indonesia, this includes inspection of express mail service, parcels and other articles.

2. The department already undertakes 100% risk profiling and assessment of all arriving travellers and mail including for FMD positive countries.

   A recent risk assessment undertaken by the department found that additional measures should be implemented to address the FMD risk of travellers arriving from countries experiencing an active and widespread FMD outbreak such as that in Indonesia.

   The same assessment concluded that where there is no active outbreak in a particular country or where there are existing controls to manage FMD, the biosecurity risk can be managed per normal traveller and mail clearance processes. These processes include biosecurity profiling, assessment, declarations, screening with x-rays and detector dogs and inspections.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000060

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: Biosecurity Operations Division (BOD)

Topic: Foot mats - FMD positive countries

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. Can the Federal Government roll out disinfectant foot mats for incoming passengers from FMD positive countries?

Answer:

Deployment of foot mats is associated with a Biosecurity Response Zone determination by the Director of Biosecurity. This is based on specific advice on the risk to Australia's adequate level of protection under the *Biosecurity Act 2015*.

At present the risk assessment only covers travellers arriving directly from Indonesia, as the *Biosecurity (Foot and Mouth Disease Biosecurity Response Zone) Determination 2022* (the determination), is based on an assessment of the foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) risk associated with specific flights from an area with an active and widespread outbreak.

FMD is present in many overseas countries, including throughout the Middle East, Africa, Asia and most of South America. Where FMD is endemic, local veterinary authorities usually have in place control programs including surveillance, movement control and vaccination to limit the spread of the disease.

The Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry continues to monitor the FMD risk across the globe, and changes in the risk profile of other nations will trigger further assessment and potentially new determinations.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000061

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: Legal and Governance Division

Topic: Advertising campaign - feeding animals swill

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

1. Will the Commonwealth be running an advertising campaign to inform the public of the dangers of feeding animals swill? (There are concerns people in Western Syd with a pet pig etc may feed meat products to those animals etc.)

Answer:

- The Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry has published and distributed a range of materials to support awareness of foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) with the Australian community, in particular travellers, and with industry.
- With regard to the dangers of feeding animals swill, communications activities have included:
    - Information on the departments website: www.agriculture.gov.au/footandmouthdisease
    - Links from the departments website to an Australian Pork factsheet "Swill feeding – It's Illegal"
    - Two social media posts on the departments social media channels warning that swill feeding is illegal and pointing to where to find out further information
    - A number of links from the departments website and from the departments social media posts to the Farm Biosecurity website (www.farmbiosecurity.com.au) that includes information about the illegal practice of swill feeding
    - FMD communications materials, including links to the material outlined above, have been shared with agriculture industry stakeholders for distributing via their own networks.
- The department engages with state and territory agriculture/primary industry departments via the National Biosecurity Communications and Engagement Network (NBCEN). This network helps to ensure biosecurity messaging is nationally consistent and aligned.
- The department understands that NBCEN members have shared materials with stakeholders in their states and territories regarding FMD, including in at least some cases, the dangers of swill feeding and the fact that it is an illegal practice. These materials include:
    a. New South Wales Department of Primary Industries
        i. Food waste is NOT livestock food – Facebook post, 18 July 2022

ii. Primefact Fact Sheet – Swill feeding (July 2022) (https://www.dpi.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0019/163414/Primefact-637-Swill-feeding.pdf)

iii. Website: www.dpi.nsw.gov.au/animals-and-livestock/pigs/pig-nutrition/swill-feeding

b. South Australia Department of Primary Industries and Resources

i. Prohibited pig feed posters and brochures are being updated to include FMD content. These are being distributed to pig owners, retail outlets, specialty supermarkers and feed retailers. A prohibited pig information package is being sent to retail outlets and include copies of printed collateral.

c. Agriculture Victoria, Department of Jobs, Precincts and Regions

i. Don't feed swill to pigs – Facebook and Twitter posts, 21 July 2022

d. Tasmania Department of Natural Resources and Environment (DNRE), Biosecurity Tasmania

i. DNRE Website – Swill and Restricted Animal Materials Feeding

ii. DNRE Social media campaign including posts highlighting that feeding swill to pigs is illegal, with links to further information (Facebook and Instagram)

iii. Biosecurity Tasmania Poster: "Please don't feed us swill. You can help protect Australia and Tasmania from Foot and Mouth Disease"

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000063

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: Biosecurity Animal Division (BAD)

Topic: Pork floss product - additional questions

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

Supplementary questions in response to evidence provided by DAFF officials during the hearing on 10 August 2022.
1. Further to evidence provided, that the pork floss product detected in Melbourne was appropriately heat treated to render all FMD viral particles unviable:
a) Have all units of that product been recovered in the recall?
b) Was an opportunity to identify the virus strain in the pork floss product from China lost because of the regulatory restraint on doing an isolation test?
c) Might identifying the FMD strain have been important, especially if not all the pork floss product was able to be recalled, to negate the disease risk it represented in a swill feeding scenario?

Answer:

a) Yes, all the product identified by the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry was seized and ordered for destruction.

b) No, the intent of the testing was to determine the presence or absence of foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) genomic fragments only.

c) The risk posed by potential swill feeding is not dependent on the FMD strain.

Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Answers to questions on notice
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Portfolio

Inquiry: Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness

Question No: IQ22-000064

Hearing Date: 10 August 2022

Division/Agency: National Animal Disease Preparedness Coordinator

Topic: FMD risk profile

Question Date: 12 August 2022

Question Type: Written

Senator Canavan asked:

Supplementary questions in response to evidence provided by DAFF officials during the hearing on 10 August 2022.
1. Further to evidence provided that the FMD risk profile has changed since the June structured judgement:
a) What is the incursion risk now and why has this not been disseminated to industry generally?
b) Why has an updated risk structured judgement not been undertaken?
c) Does the government have incursion risk assessments for different countries or for incursion via certain pathways (eg. swill feeding vs foot traffic)?

Answer:

1. a) The probability of a foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) incursion in Australia is a function of a number of complex factors. To help broadly characterise the probability of an Australian FMD outbreak in the next 5 years, a structured expert judgement (SEJ) exercise was facilitated by the Centre of Excellence for Biosecurity Risk Analysis (CEBRA) for the department in June 2022. The estimated probability was 11.6%. While the exercise preceeded reports of outbreaks in Bali, the figure remains relevant as participants took into account events that subsequently occurred such as the likelihood of ongoing spread within Indonesia and increasing tourism to Bali. The estimate was communicated to participants and in discussions with industry, as well as communicated to the public via the media.

   A SEJ approach is not based on modelling, but uses an internationally recognised process to make evaluative judgements on a range of complex and uncertain systems. SEJ exercises are one of the tools the department has used to help characterise the potential threat and complement other risk assessment activities that may provide further in-depth or sensitive appraisals on specific risks or risk pathways.

   b) The June 2022 SEJ exercise was a repeat of a similar exercise undertaken in March 2021, where participants estimated the probability of a disease outbreak in Australia in the next 5 years. The exercise has not been repeated again as participants had taken into consideration events that have occurred in the short time since including ongoing spread in Indonesia, as part of their view of the situation over the coming 5 years.

   c) The department routinely undertakes science and evidence-based evaluations to support the management of animal biosecurity risks across various pathways and implements appropriate risk management measures to meet Australia's appropriate level of protection (ALOP).

   These form the basis of import conditions and take into consideration the animal health status of the importing country and/or country of origin as well as the various risks that goods may pose.

The department monitors the movement and spread of animal diseases globally and adjusts risk management measures appropriately.