



Corn smut Gisborne 2015: A GIA biosecurity response exercise

12 March 2015

Dr Edwin Massey – Manager Plant and Environment Response – MPI

Brad Chandler - Senior Adviser Plant and Environment Response - MPI

Growing and Protecting New Zealand



Managing biosecurity responses

- One CIMS based system for all responses, small or large
 - National Biosecurity Response System
 - GIA aims to improve the system resulting in better biosecurity outcomes.
- GIA Response Guide:
 - Intro to the response system
 - What industry's role within the system is
 - What decisions industry participants will be required to make

Participants in responses

GIA industry signatories are entitled to take part in decision making for a response if their sector:

- **Is affected by the organism**

and

- **Will benefit from the response**

Rapid notification

MPI must rapidly notify potentially affected Signatories if a suspected unwanted organism is detected in New Zealand



Response decision making

The Response governance team is responsible for:

- Strategic decision making
- Approving critical documentation
- Monitoring and responding to strategic risks
- Empowering the incident controller to deliver response objectives

Corn smut response exercise

- We are going to run through response decision making using a corn smut incursion scenario
- Please note – this is an exercise only!
- Timelines, cost estimates and the 50/50 cost-share arrangements presented are for illustrative purposes only



Introducing the organism

Corn smut

- *Ustilago maydis*
- Native to Mexico
- Distributed world wide
- Parasitic on maize
- Difficult to contain, but successfully eradicated in NZ 2006-2011

Exercise only



Impacts

- Affects maize grown for grain, silage, sweetcorn and seed
- Forms large galls containing powdery spores
- No reduction on palatability to stock
- Reports of human health effects
- Reduction in yield between 1-18%
- 25% reduction in seed yield
- Trade barriers unlikely
- Best case scenario if established: loss of \$1.55 million per year (annual industry profit +\$150 million per year)



The scenario

- **On 4 March MPI notified corn smut detected in a two hectare block on leased land in Gisborne, MPI and GIA partners agree to respond. 50:50 cost share agreed.**
- Investigation shows spread to 88% of 124 rows
- Could have arrived in 2014 or 2015 – pathway unknown
- Restricted notice in place, adjacent properties being investigated, tracing of seeds underway

Exercise only



Response objectives

- Protect New Zealand from damage and nuisance caused by *U. maydis*
- Minimise and manage impacts of the response on property owners and other stakeholders.
- Maintain international trade in affected sectors at current levels.
- Maintain the reputation of MPI and the working relationship with GIA partners

What happens at a governance meeting?

- Governance group provides **strategic** oversight and direction to the response, not operational oversight
- Response manager provides a situation report
- Items are discussed that require strategic direction
- Other issues that present major risk to the response may also be discussed

Who is at this governance meeting?

- **Governance members**
 - MPI and Governance Chair (Ed Massey)
 - Vegetable NZ and Process Vegetables NZ (John Seymour)
 - Foundation for Arable Research (Anna Heslop)
 - NZ Grain and Seed Trade Association (Thomas Chin)
 - NZ Feed Manufacturers Association (Michael Brooks)
- **Response team representative**
 - Incident controller (Brad Chandler)

Governance meeting simulation

- We will now hold a governance meeting to discuss three response options:
 - Do nothing
 - Slow the spread/long-term management
 - Eradication
- During the discussion consider which response option you would recommend if you were on governance – **you get a vote too.**

Questions?

