

**Draft import health standard for the importation into New Zealand of
ornamental fish and marine invertebrates**

Review of submissions

**Biosecurity New Zealand
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Wellington
New Zealand**



15 December 2006

Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Te Manatu Ahuwhenua, Ngaherehere
ASB Bank House
101-103 The Terrace
P O Box 2526
Wellington
New Zealand

Telephone: +64 4 894 0100
Facsimile: +64 4 894 0720
Internet: <http://www.maf.govt.nz>

Pre Clearance
Biosecurity New Zealand

Draft import health standard for the importation into New Zealand of ornamental fish and marine invertebrates

Review of submissions

15 December 2006

Approved for general release

Clive Gower-Collins
Biosecurity Standards Group Manager
Biosecurity New Zealand

INTRODUCTION

The draft import health standard for the importation into New Zealand of Ornamental Fish and Marine Invertebrates from all countries was notified for public consultation on 4 August 2006. Submissions closed on 15 September 2006.

Biosecurity NZ (BNZ) received the following submissions:

Name	Organisation represented	Date received
Debbie Fawcett for Bob Ward	Redwood Aquatics Aquarium & Water Garden Centre	14 August 2006
Phillip Collis	New Zealand Discus	4 September 2006
Warren Garrett	Brooklands Aquarium Ltd	14 September 2006
Richard Woolley	Highway Fisheries Ltd	15 September 2006
Asela Atapattu	Department of Conservation	21 September 2006

This document summarises the issues raised in the submissions, and presents the Biosecurity New Zealand response to each. Please note that only comments received on the species list have been addressed in this document. Any comments received on the importation procedure have been noted and will be considered at a later date.

APPENDIX I contains the copies of the full submissions

1. Debbie Fawcett for Bob Ward, Redwood Aquatics Aquarium & Water Garden Centre
2. Phillip Collis, New Zealand Discus
3. Warren Garrett, Brooklands Aquarium Ltd
4. Richard Woolley, Highway Fisheries Ltd
5. Asela Atapattu, Department of Conservation

Review of Submissions

1. Debbie Fawcett for Bob Ward, Redwood Aquatics Aquarium & Water Garden Centre

1.1 Redwood Aquatics Aquarium & Water Garden Centre queried why the following fish were left off the revised list.

- *Oxycirrhites typus*, Hawkfish.
- *Pseudochromis aureus*, Golden Dottyback.
- *Pseudochromis diadema*, Diadem dottyback.
- *Pseudochromis fridmani*, Orchid dottyback.
- *Pseudochromis paccagnellae*, Royal dottyback
- *Pseudochromis porphyreus*, Magenta dottyback
- *Pseudochromis splendens*, Splendid Dottyback
- *Pseudochromis springeri*, Springer dottyback
- *Microgeophagus altispinosus*, Bolivian Dwarf Butterflyfish.

Biosecurity New Zealand response:

Biosecurity New Zealand accepts that *Oxycirrhites typus* could have been imported under the current import health standard under the genus *Cirrhitichthys* therefore *Oxycirrhites typus* has been added to the revised species list.

Biosecurity New Zealand accepts that the *Pseudochromis* species listed above could be imported under the current import health standard under the genus *Gramma*. The revised species list has been amended to include the following species of *Pseudochromis*:

Pseudochromis fuscus (previously known as *Pseudochromis aureus*), *Pseudochromis diadema*, *Pseudochromis fridmani*, *Pseudochromis paccagnellae*, *Pseudochromis porphyreus*, *Pseudochromis splendens* and *Pseudochromis springeri*

Biosecurity New Zealand accepts that *Microgeophagus* is incorrect and that this *Mikrogeophagus* species could have been imported under the current import health standard under the genus *Apistogramma*. The revised species list has been amended to include this species as *Mikrogeophagus altispinosus*.

2. Phillip Collis, New Zealand Discus

2.1 New Zealand Discus queried why *Hypancistrus zebra* was not on the revised species list.

Biosecurity New Zealand response:

Hypancistrus zebra is not covered by a genus listed on the current import health standard therefore cannot be added to the revised list at this stage. *Hypancistrus zebra* is however one of the additional species submitted by importers by the cut off date but not covered by the current import health standard.

The Environmental Risk Management Authority, New Zealand considered the species submitted by importers by the cut off date but not covered by the current import health

standard to be present in New Zealand therefore not subject to requirements under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act, 1996. However, the current MAF Biosecurity New Zealand Risk Analysis for Ornamental Fish and Marine Invertebrates is only looking at genera and/or species currently listed on the Import Health Standard for ornamental fish and marine invertebrates. Before these additional species can be added to the permitted species list in the import health standard and therefore eligible for import into New Zealand, Biosecurity New Zealand and the Department of Conservation will need to do a risk analysis on the species.

- 2.2 New Zealand Discus also indicated that *Panaque L 090* is not *Panaque suttonorum* it is *Panaque papa*.

Biosecurity New Zealand response:

Panaque papa is not a valid scientific name so remains as *Panaque suttonorum* on the revised list.

- 2.3 New Zealand Discus queried how the listed *Peckoltia* species were chosen.

Biosecurity New Zealand response:

The *Peckoltia* species on the revised list are the species for which import documentation was provided by importers at the time this information was requested and that are currently eligible for import into NZ.

3. Warren Garrett, Brooklands Aquarium Ltd

- 3.1 Brooklands Aquarium Ltd asked for clarification on whether the quarantine period will be modified.

Biosecurity New Zealand response:

The quarantine period for ornamental fish is outside the scope of the review of the species list however it is being addressed in the risk analysis for ornamental fish.

- 3.2 Brooklands Aquarium Ltd indicated that it would be useful to show both the old and new scientific names of permitted species. They also indicated that it would be useful for the MAF inspectors if the common names for each species were also listed.

Biosecurity New Zealand response:

The final list in the import health standard will only contain the valid scientific name and common name for each species of fish and marine invertebrate. A 'Fishbase' reference was provided at the time of consultation so stakeholders were assured that the actual species stated on the list existed. These references have now been removed from the revised species list. Documentation accompanying the consignment must however state the scientific species name not just the common name.

- 3.3 Brooklands Aquarium Ltd indicated that *Osteoglossum bicirrhosum* and *Osteoglossum ferreirai* are not CITES listed species however *Scleropages formosus* is a CITES listed species.

Biosecurity New Zealand response:

Thank you for noting this. The import health standard has been amended accordingly.

- 3.4 Brooklands Aquarium Ltd queried why *Cichlasoma festae* and *Crenicara filamentosus* were omitted from the revised list.

Biosecurity New Zealand response:

As both these species are permitted under the current import health standard the revised species list has been amended to include *Cichlasoma festae* and *Dicrossus filamentosus* (previously known as *Crenicara filamentosus*).

- 3.5 Brooklands Aquarium Ltd asked why the Department of Conservation consider *Synodontis angelicus* poses very high environmental risk and, therefore, is not on the revised species list.

Biosecurity New Zealand response:

Synodontis angelicus has been added back on to the revised species list as this was an error in the consultation notice.

- 3.6 Brooklands Aquarium Ltd wanted clarification as to why *Corydoras melini*, *Corydoras metae*, *Corydoras punctatus*, *Corydoras rabauti*, *Corydoras reticulatus* and *Corydoras trilineatus*, are considered by the Department of Conservation as posing very high environmental risk and, therefore, not on the revised species list.

Biosecurity New Zealand response:

Corydoras melini has been added back on to the revised list as this was an error in the consultation notice.

Corydoras metae, *Corydoras rabauti*, *Corydoras reticulatus*, *Corydoras punctatus* and *Corydoras trilineatus* are considered by the Department of Conservation to be very high environmental risk species as they are known to have a thermal preference of 13°C and below. Therefore, these species would be very likely to survive in New Zealand natural waters if escape occurred.

- 3.7 Brooklands Aquarium Ltd requested clarification as to the status of the new species that were submitted at the time MAF requested information on the species present in NZ.

Biosecurity New Zealand response:

The Environmental Risk Management Authority, New Zealand considered the species submitted by importers by the cut off date but not covered by the current import health standard to be present in New Zealand, therefore, not subject to requirements under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act, 1996. However, the current MAF Biosecurity New Zealand Risk Analysis for Ornamental Fish and Marine Invertebrates is only looking at genera and/or species currently listed on the Import Health Standard for Ornamental Fish and Marine Invertebrates. Before these additional species can be added to the permitted species list in the import health standard and, therefore, eligible for import into New Zealand, Biosecurity New Zealand and the Department of Conservation will need to do a risk analysis on each of these species.

Note: any additional risk analyses will only be carried out on the tropical fish species that were submitted to Biosecurity New Zealand in November 2005.

4. Richard Woolley, Highway Fisheries Ltd

- 4.1 Highway Fisheries Ltd noted that *Acanthopthalmus angularis* may be a typing error and this species is actually permitted as *Pangio anguillaris*.

Biosecurity New Zealand response:

As the genus *Acanthopthalmus* was permitted, *Pangio anguillaris* has been added to the revised species list.

- 4.2 Highway Fisheries Ltd requested clarification as to why *Crenesmusicara filamentosa*, *Crenesmusicara maculata* and *Crenesmusicara punctulata* were removed from the draft list. They queried that this may have been due to incorrect names on the current import health standard in which the genus should have been *Crenicara* therefore the above 3 fish species are permitted as *Dicrossus filamentosus*, *Dicrossus maculatus* and *Crenicara punctulatum* respectively.

Biosecurity New Zealand response:

There was a spelling error in the import health standard, therefore, *Dicrossus filamentosus*, *Dicrossus maculatus* and *Crenicara punctulatum* have been added to the revised species list.

- 4.3 Highway Fisheries Ltd indicated that they would like the new list presented in two formats. Format one would be in order of the old scientific name. Format two would be in the order of the new scientific name.

Biosecurity New Zealand response:

The final list in the import health standard will only contain the valid scientific name and common name for each species of fish and marine invertebrate. As this list is large it would not be practical to present it in two formats. Documentation accompanying the consignment must however state the scientific species name not just the common name.

- 4.4 Highway Fisheries Ltd indicated that many hours were spent reorganising the list so that the list of names could be compared against the current list. This was an unnecessary waste of time when the author(s) could have easily presented the list in a format that was easily organisable. Perhaps the Biosecurity Act could be amended so that we can also recover fair and reasonable costs.

Biosecurity New Zealand response:

Biosecurity New Zealand thoroughly appreciates the co-operation from importers of ornamental fish and marine invertebrates in providing information to collate this revised list.

- 4.5 Highway Fisheries Ltd indicated that quarantine officers require photographic evidence from reference books when a fish is imported under a name that does not match the current import health standard. They also noted that locating books with fish identified under the latest scientific names would be difficult and that overseas suppliers would be reluctant to produce invoices listing new names when the names are not commonly used.

Biosecurity New Zealand response:

A copy of the previous scientific name will be provided to MAF QS inspectors to assist with identification of species. However, the final list in the import health standard will only contain the valid scientific name and a common name.

Biosecurity New Zealand recommends importers send a copy of the revised species list to suppliers and exporters of ornamental fish and marine invertebrates.

5. Asela Atapattu, Department of Conservation

5.1 The Department of Conservation indicated it would be useful to also include the following in the species list:

- a) parenthesise to denote reclassification of the genus
- b) family names
- c) page numbers for the authority

Biosecurity New Zealand response:

The 'Fishbase' reference for each species has now been removed from the revised list. This reference was provided at the time of consultation so stakeholders were assured that the actual species stated on the list existed.

5.2 The Department of Conservation asked for clarification as to whether the species marked * and unknown species with unknown authority will remain on the list.

Biosecurity New Zealand response:

All the unknown species with unknown authority have been removed from the list as it was indicated in the consultation notice that if the species marked 'unknown' were not clearly identified during the consultation period then they would be removed from the list.

The species marked * were to indicate they are a Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) listed species therefore these species will remain on the revised list. During consultation it was noted that *Scleropages formosus* is the only CITES listed species not all the *Osteoglossum* species. The list has been amended accordingly.

5.3 The Department of Conservation noted there may have been an error in the listing of that the following two species:

Labeo chrysophekadion Bleeker, 1850 *Labeo chrysophekadon* Black shark; and
Labeo chrysophkadion Bleeker, 1850 *Morulus chrysophkadion* Black shark

Biosecurity New Zealand response:

Labeo chrysophkadion has been removed from this revised list as *Labeo chrysophekadion* is the correct spelling of this species.

5.4 The Department of Conservation noted that the revised list has a significant number of species that were not risk profiled in the NIWA report and recommend that there be a process setup to carry out the necessary temperature profiling for those species missed by the NIWA report.

Biosecurity New Zealand response:

At this stage the species that appear on the list but have not been risk profiled by NIWA will remain on the list. Biosecurity New Zealand is however willing to revise the list once a risk profiling report has been completed on the additional species.

- 5.5** The Department of Conservation requested the following species to be removed from the list as they pose serious risk: *Corydoras nanus*, *Stigmatogobius sadanundio*, *Rineloricaria fallax*, *Steatogenys elegans*, *Tropheus moorii* and *Xiphophorus variatus*.

Biosecurity New Zealand response:

As *Corydoras nanus* and *Stigmatogobius sadanundio* are considered by the Department of Conservation to pose a very high environmental risk in the NIWA report they will be removed from the revised species list.

Xiphophorus variatus has also been removed from the revised list as this species was considered to be a serious environmental risk species by the Department of Conservation and poses a disease risk concern to Biosecurity New Zealand.

Rineloricaria fallax, *Steatogenys elegans* and *Tropheus moorii* are all indicated as not a very high environmental risk, therefore, they will remain on the species list.

- 5.6** Department of Conservation noted that guppies, sailfin mollies and swordtails remain on the list though they have been found in the geothermal waters of New Zealand and suggested they be removed from the list.

Biosecurity New Zealand response:

Biosecurity New Zealand recommends that guppies, sailfin mollies and swordtails remain on the revised list unless they present a serious risk according to species profiling reports undertaken by the Department of Conservation.

Appendix 1: Copies of Submissions

1. Debbie Fawcett for Bob Ward, Redwood Aquatics Aquarium & Water Garden Centre

----- Original Message -----

From: "Debbie Fawcett" <redwoodaquatics@xtra.co.nz>

To: "Arun Siva" <Arun.Siva@maf.govt.nz>

Sent: Monday, August 14, 2006 10:51 AM

Subject: Re: NOTIFICATION OF CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT LIST OF ORNAMENTALFISH AND MARINE INVERTEBRATES

Thank you for a copy of the draft standard.

We do not want to leave this question until the end of the process with the submission's but can you please explain as why the following fish were left off the draft standard?

These were clearly supported on our last submissions to MAF.

Oxycirrhites typus – Hawkfish. Imported as Cirrhitichthys Spp - Discussed with Area vet and Approved some years ago.

Pseudochromis Aureus - Golden Dottyback

Pseudochromis diadema - Diadem dottyback. Current fish list ref: Gramma Spp. In 1969 Gramma's are

Pseudochromis fridmani - Orchid dottyback. Referred to as Basslets therefore consider these to be approved

Pseudochromis paccagnellae - Royal dottyback. On current import standard as Basslets are included.

Pseudochromis porphyreus - Magenta dottyback

Pseudochromis Splendens - Splendid Dottyback

Pseudochromis springeri - Springer dottyback

Microgeophagus altispinosus - Bolivian Dwarf Butterflyfish, Actinopterygii, Perciformes, perch-like, Cichlidae (Haseman, 1911) Part of the Apistogramma family. We have written proof from a book printed in 1974. The book states Microgeophagus does not actually exist. Can provide copy if required.

Regards

Debbie Fawcett

for Bob Ward, Director

Redwood Aquatics Aquarium & Water Garden Centre

21 Hussey Road

Harewood, Christchurch

New Zealand

PO Box 5114, Northlands,

Christchurch

New Zealand

Phone 0064 3 3596936

Fax 0064 3 3596935

email: redwoodaquatics@xtra.co.nz

website: www.redwoodaquatics.co.nz

Microgeophagus	altispinosus		Bolivian Dwarf Butterflyfish	Actinopterygii	Perciformes	perch-likes	Cichlidae	(Haseman, 1911)
Part of the Apistogramma family. We have written proof from a book								
printed in 1974. The book states Microgeophagus does not actually exist.								
Can provide copy if required.								

<i>Oxycirrhites typus</i>	Hawkfish	Imported as Cirrhitichthys Spp - Discussed with Area et and Approved some years ago.
<i>Pseudochromis Aureus</i>	Golden Dottyback	}
<i>Pseudochromis diadema</i>	Diadem dottyback	} Current fish list ref: Gramma Spp. In 1969 Gramma's are
<i>Pseudochromis fridmani</i>	Orchid dottyback	} referred to as Basslets therefore consider these to be approved
<i>Pseudochromis paccagnellae</i>	Royal dottyback	} on current import standard.
<i>Pseudochromis porphyreus</i>	Magenta dottyback	}
<i>Pseudochromis Splendens</i>	Splendid Dottyback	}
<i>Pseudochromis springeri</i>	Springer dottyback	}

2. Phillip Collis, NZ Discus

Hi

I have looked over list and thing the list Jenny Brunton sent out a time back of What ID as in New zealand has not been taken in to account.. One in memory was Hypancistrus Zebra.

The L numbers can be found at www.planetcatfish.com "Click page centre" Go to e catalogue then L numbers Bottom with ?? Most are hemiancistrus or panague and i believe are in nz. L 090 is not suttonorum its Papa and i have some..Suttonorum is blue eye panaque.

Also see Peckoltia was Hemiancistrus and any there that show New as Peckoltia should be included.

Ancistrini were also Panaque , New name...This can go on forever

Cheers
Phill Collis

www.newzealanddiscus.com

3. Warren Garrett, Brooklands Aquarium Ltd

14 September 2006

Jennie Brunton
Technical Adviser
Import Health Standards
Biosecurity New Zealand
Ministry of Agriculture & Forestry
PO Box 2526
WELLINGTON

Dear Jennie

RE: DRAFT IMPORT HEALTH STANDARD FOR THE IMPORTATION INTO N.Z. OF ORNAMENTAL FISH AND MARINE INVERTEBRATES FROM ALL COUNTRIES

Issued pursuant to Section 22 of the Biosecurity Act 1993

Dated: 28 July 2006

Part C: Clearance Procedure

8.1 *Upon arrival in New Zealand the documentation accompanying the consignment shall be inspected by an inspector at the port of arrival.*

The wording needs to be altered here to state the consignment shall be inspected by an inspector *at the transitional facility on arrival.*

Shipments arrive at the airport in dark sealed polystyrene boxes. Firstly, the fish are stressed and will not be showing their true colouration. Identifying fish at the port of arrival would be very difficult even for an expert in fish identification. Secondly, time is critical in fish transportation and any further delays such as these random checks will be detrimental to the well being of the shipment.

Our current system with pickup from Auckland airport involves all containers being sealed by MAF staff in Auckland with official MAF sealing tape. They are not opened at the airport due to time constraints and staff limitations at MAF. These containers are then transferred to our facility in an approved vehicle. On arrival at our facility a MAF Inspector is present to check the integrity of all seals and witness the shipment being unpacked. Once the fish have been released into their tanks and had time to acclimatize their colour will start to become apparent. At this point the MAF Inspector identifies and checks off the species imported.

9.3 *During the unloading , the water in the containers shall be treated with a chorine based disinfectant*

During unloading, why should the water in the containers be treated differently to the any other waste water from the facility? If any pathogens are present in this water surely the fish themselves are also carriers and so once released in the tanks the entire body of water in the facility would pose the same risk? On arrival this waste water should be treated in the same way as any waste water from the facility with UV, chlorine or other approved means outlined in the standard.

Also with many species an important step in acclimatisation is actually mixing the water from the shipping bag with “new water”. If one was to introduce these fish straight into new water, the shock would be enough to kill many delicate species. This step obviously means mixing water from the bag with water in the tank.

9.4 The ornamental fish an marine invertebrates must be held in the facility named in the permit to import , for a quarantine period of not less than six weeks in the case of freshwater fish or three weeks in the case of marine fish and marine invertebrates.

We understand that the length of quarantine is also under review. New Zealand operates a much longer quarantine period than other countries. Because the risks involved with marine imports are significantly less than with freshwater we believe that marine imports should be subject to 2 week quarantine. In Australia marines are subject to 1 week quarantine as they recognise marines pose minimal risk. With marine imports the main reason for mortalities are factors such as starvation and water quality issues. Marine fish are very sensitive and difficult to maintain in the aquarium for this reason.

For freshwater imports we would suggest a 4 week quarantine period. Australia has one to three week quarantine for freshwater fish depending on the species. In my 20 years experience any disease outbreak or significant mortalities tend to occur within the first 10 days of quarantine. With 4 week quarantine this gives the importer and the inspector plenty of time to take action should a disease outbreak occur. If there is any concern the MAF Inspector has the authority to extend the quarantine period at his or her discretion.

Part D: Appendix One: Ornamental Fish and Marine Invertebrates

- 1. * Note the previously used synonym and common name are in this consultation document for ease of reference. Only the valid scientific name and fishbase reference will appear on the new list.***

In recent years a vast number of fish species have been reclassified and now are listed under new valid names. This is something which has been made apparent during the review of the permitted species review. In theory it would be great if we could follow the new valid names. However the fact is that almost all overseas suppliers still use the old scientific names. Also most of the reference books and literature are still using the old scientific names.

It is important to show both the old and new scientific names, and is really only a matter of how the list is sorted. I would suggest that the list still be sorted by the old scientific name at this point in time. EG.

Scientific name (old) *Valid scientific name* *Common Name*

The Fishbase reference is important information which needs to be retained in some form but really serves no purpose for those using the list in the field such as MAF Inspectors and Importers.

The common name although not an accurate means of identification is important as this is the name MAF Inspectors and Importers will generally refer to fish by in the field as a quick reference. To expect all concerned to memorise lengthy and difficult to pronounce Latin names is just not practical.

I think you would find that we all currently refer to fish by their common names rather than the scientific name during our everyday duties.

However for marine invertebrates a common name is not really necessary as most refer to these by scientific name.

2. *Osteoglossum bcirrhosum*

Osteoglossum ferreirai

Please note that these two species are not CITES listed as is *Scleropages formosus*.

3. *Omitted species*

The following two species were submitted with evidence of import into NZ, but appear to have been missed off the list. Under the current list they are permitted and no mention has been made as to why they might have been omitted. Please can you check on these two species:

Cichlasoma festae Boulenger, 1899

Crenicara filamentosus Ladiges, 1958 (*Diocrossus filamentosus*)

3. *Synodontus angelicus*

DOC have put this species forward as being "very high risk".

This is difficult to believe as the *Synodontus angelicus* is a very rare fish and one that I am not even aware of anyone in NZ ever breeding, even under controlled conditions. The *Synodontus angelicus* is a tropical species which will not survive, let alone breed in our waterways. Due to this fish being extremely difficult to breed domestically, the limited number of specimens we do receive are wild-caught from the Congo in Africa. The price they currently command is up to \$200.00 retail because of their scarcity and no hobbyist would even consider releasing an expensive exotic species like this into our local waterways. Even if they were to this species would not survive let alone reproduce.

3. *Corydoras trilineatus, rabauti, reticulatus, punctatus, melini, metae*

DOC have put these species forward as being "very high risk".

Unlike the *Synodontus angelicus* these species have been bred domestically. Whether all have been bred by hobbyists in NZ I am not sure but they have been bred overseas (the FNZAS might have this data). Still these *Corydoras*

are all tropical species which are not fit to survive and breed in our waterways. Again they are exotic species which are some of the more difficult to breed in an aquarium and because of this are relatively rare in the aquarium industry. For this reason they command a higher price than most tropical species of up to \$30.00 each retail and no hobbyist would even consider releasing an expensive exotic species like this into our local waterways. Even if they were to this species would not survive let alone reproduce.

4. *New species submissions*

We were invited to make new submissions in November 2005 re any species that we were aware of existing in NZ collections which were not listed on the current permitted list at that time.

Brooklands alone put forward a list of 36 species along with supporting evidence. A copy of this list is attached for your reference. These are all species which we believe are not high risk and are in line with the current standard. They are simply not on the list because it has not been kept up to date with new findings. We have attached a copy of this list for your reference and would ask that you revisit this issue. I myself spent countless hours working on the permitted list review as did many others and we were led to believe that there would be an opportunity to submit new species for review.

Thank you for giving consideration to our submission on the Draft Import Health Standard. /should you have any queries re our comments please don't hesitate to contact me.

Yours Sincerely

Warren Garrett
General Manager
Brooklands Aquarium Ltd

Genus	Species	New Valid Name	Common Name	Class	Order	Order	Family	Sub Family	List Status
Species approved on the current Import List									
Acanthopthalmus	kuhlii	Pangio kuhli	Coolie loach	Actinopterygii	Cypriniformes	Loaches	Cobitidae		(Valenciennes, 1846)
Barbodes	daruphani	Hysibarbus vernayi	Yellowfin barb	Actinopterygii	Cypriniformes	Minnows or carps	Cyprinidae		(Norman, 1925)
Crossocheilus	oblongus		Siamese flying fox	Actinopterygii	Cypriniformes	Minnows or carps	Cyprinidae		Kuhl & Van Hasselt, 1823
Danio	choprae		Glowlight danio	Actinopterygii	Cypriniformes	Minnows or carps	Cyprinidae		Hora, 1928
Eirmotus	octozona		Eight banded barb	Actinopterygii	Cypriniformes	Minnows or carps	Cyprinidae		Schultz, 1959
Hasemania	nana		Silvertip tetra	Actinopterygii	Characiformes	Characins	Characidae		(Lütken, 1875)
Hyphessobrycon	rosaceus		Rosy tetra	Actinopterygii	Characiformes	Characins	Characidae		Durbin, 1909
Pterygoplichthys	joselimaianus	Glyptoperichthys joselimaianus	Leopard Pleco	Actinopterygii	Siluriformes	catfish	Loricariidae		Weber, 1991
Rasbora	argyrotaenia		Silver rasbora	Actinopterygii	Cypriniformes	Minnows or carps	Cyprinidae		(Bleeker, 1850)
Rasbora	cephalotaenia			Actinopterygii	Cypriniformes	Minnows or carps	Cyprinidae		(Bleeker, 1852)
Rineloricaria	hasemani		Whiptail Cat	Actinopterygii	Siluriformes	catfish	Loricariidae		Isbrücker & Nijssen, 1979
Tetraodon	travancoricus	Carinotetraodon travancoricus	Dwarf Puffer	Actinopterygii	Tetraodontiformes	puffers and filefishes	Danioiidae		Hora & Nair, 1941
Tetraodon	nigroviridis		Spotted puffer	Actinopterygii	Tetraodontiformes	puffers and filefishes	Tetraodontidae		Marion de Proce, 1822
Species existing in NZ but not listed on the current Import List									
Aulonocara	baenschi		Nkhomo-benga peacock	Actinopterygii	Perciformes	perch-like	Cichlidae		Meyer & Riehl, 1985
Aulonocara	jacobfreibergi		Fairy cichlid	Actinopterygii	Perciformes	perch-like	Cichlidae		(Johnson, 1974)
Aulonocara	maylandi maylandi		Blue Orchid Peacock	Actinopterygii	Perciformes	perch-like	Cichlidae		Trewavas, 1984
Aulonocara	stuartgranti		Fluorescent peacock	Actinopterygii	Perciformes	perch-like	Cichlidae		Meyer & Riehl, 1985
Baryancistrus sp			Gold nugget pleco	Actinopterygii	Siluriformes	catfish	Loricariidae		
Baryancistrus sp			Snowball pleco	Actinopterygii	Siluriformes	catfish	Loricariidae		
Haplochromis	borleyi	Copadichromis borleyi		Actinopterygii	Perciformes	perch-like	Cichlidae		(Iles, 1960)
Haplochromis	brownae			Actinopterygii	Perciformes	perch-like	Cichlidae		Greenwood, 1962
Hypancistrus	zebra		Imperial Zebra Plecostomus	Actinopterygii	Siluriformes	catfish	Loricariidae		Isbrücker & Nijssen, 1991
Labidochromis	caeruleus		Electric Yellow	Actinopterygii	Perciformes	perch-like	Cichlidae		Fryer, 1956
Lamprologus	sexfasciatus	Neolamprologus sexfasciatus	Six-Bar Lamprologus	Actinopterygii	Perciformes	perch-like	Cichlidae		(Trewavas & Poll, 1952)
Maravichromis	ericotaenia			Actinopterygii	Perciformes	perch-like	Cichlidae		(Regan, 1922)
Maylandia	callainos		Cobalt blue cichlid	Actinopterygii	Perciformes	perch-like	Cichlidae		(Stauffer & Hert, 1992)
Melanochromis	johannii		Blue melanochromis	Actinopterygii	Perciformes	perch-like	Cichlidae		(Eccles, 1973)
Microgeophagus	altispinosus	Crenicara altispinosa	Bolivian Dwarf Butterflyfish	Actinopterygii	Perciformes	perch-like	Cichlidae		(Haseman, 1911)

Nimbochromis	fuscotaeniatus		Fuscotaeniatus	Actinopterygii	Perciformes	perch-likes	Cichlidae		(Regan, 1922)
Oligancistrus	punctatissimus		Blue spotted pleco	Actinopterygii	Siluriformes	catfish	Loricariidae		(Steindachner, 1881)
Peckoltia	pulcher	Dekeyseria pulcher	Butterfly peckoltia	Actinopterygii	Siluriformes	catfish	Loricariidae		(Steindachner, 1915)
Peckoltia	vittata		Clown peckoltia	Actinopterygii	Siluriformes	catfish	Loricariidae		(Steindachner, 1881)
Pseudotropheus	aurora		Aurora Cichlid	Actinopterygii	Perciformes	perch-likes	Cichlidae		Burgess, 1976
Pseudotropheus	estherae		Red zebra	Actinopterygii	Perciformes	perch-likes	Cichlidae		Konings, 1995
Pseudotropheus	greshakei	Mylandia greshakei	William's mbuna	Actinopterygii	Perciformes	perch-likes	Cichlidae		(Meyer & Foerster, 1984)
Sciaenochromis	fryeri		Electric blue hap	Actinopterygii	Perciformes	perch-likes	Cichlidae		Koning, 1993

4. Richard Woolley, Highway Fisheries Ltd



14th September 2006

Arun Siva
Pre-Clearance Directorate
MAF
Wellington

Dear Sir,

Re: The draft list of ornamental fish and marine invertebrates

Our submissions are as follows:

Note 1

Part D: Appendix One
Acanthopthalmus angularis typing error?

Original combination: Acanthopthalmus anguillaris (Valliant, 1902)

Valid as:

Pangio anguillaris

Note 2

Part D: Appendix One
The following fish were removed from the list:

- Crenesmusicara filamentosa - Checkerboard Cichlid
- Crenesmusicara maculata - Checkerboard Cichlid
- Crenesmusicara punctulata - Checkerboard Cichlid

One can only assume that the name was incorrect on the original IHS.

The correct names were:

1. Crenicara filamentosa, valid as Dicrossus filamentosus (checkerboard cichlid)
2. Crenicara maculata, valid as Dicrossus maculatus (checkerboard cichlid)
3. Crenicara punctulata, valid as Crenicara puctulatum (checkerboard cichlid)

We can see no reason why these fish should be removed from the list given the original typing error.

Note 3

- We believe the new list should be presented in two formats. Format one would be in order of the old scientific name.
Format two would be in the order of the new scientific name.

Many hours were spent reorganising the list so that the list of names could be compared against the current list. This was an unnecessary waste of time when the author(s) could have easily presented the list in a format that was easily organisable. Perhaps the Biosecurity Act could be amended so that we can also recover fair and reasonable costs.

- MQOs require photographic evidence from reference books. This is normally necessary when a fish arrives named with an old or new scientific name that does not appear on the current list. There would be very few, if any reference books available in English that would list the fish under the latest scientific names.

- Overseas suppliers would be reluctant to produce invoices listing new names when the names are not commonly used. Most suppliers have automated invoicing software while other suppliers are family businesses that have been using the same names for the last 40 years and just type the invoices. Asking them to change names would be onerous for them, and a simple typing error may send some of the MQOs into a bit of a panic.

This is probably the first significant overhaul of the scientific names since the list was originally created.

While it is commendable to update the New Zealand industry and comply with relevant legislation, attempting to update the worldwide ornamental fish industry is unlikely to be possible.

If you require any further information, please contact the author via the details below

Yours faithfully

Richard Woolley
Managing Director