



SUBMISSION FORM

Once you have completed this form

Send by post to: Environmental Protection Authority, Private Bag 63002, Wellington 6140

OR email to: submissions@epa.govt.nz

Once your submission has been received the submission becomes a public document and may be made publicly available to anyone who requests it. You may request that your contact details be kept confidential, but your name, organisation and your submission itself will become a public document.

Submission on application number:	APP202142
Name of submitter or contact for joint submission:	Dr John Liddle, Chief Executive
Organisation name (if on behalf of an organisation):	Nursery and Garden Industry New Zealand (NGINZ)
Postal address:	PO Box 3443 Wellington 6140
Telephone number:	04 918 3511
Email:	john@nginz.co.nz

I wish to keep my contact details confidential

The EPA will deal with any personal information you supply in your submission in accordance with the Privacy Act 1993. We will use your contact details for the purposes of processing the application that it relates to (or in exceptional situations for other reasons permitted under the Privacy Act 1993). Where your submission is made publicly available, your contact details will be removed only if you have indicated this as your preference in the tick box above. We may also use your contact details for the purpose of requesting your participation in customer surveys.

The EPA is likely to post your submission on its website at www.epa.govt.nz. We also may make your submission available in response to a request under the Official Information Act 1982.

- I support the application
- I oppose the application
- I neither support or oppose the application

The reasons for making my submission are¹:

NGINZ:

1. Notes the non-contact periods were removed from the reassessment application (APP201045) when the risks to bees were considered to arise from direct exposure to pesticide spray
2. Notes this reassessment is a corrective action seeking to place non-contact periods on some substances. It will do so by putting significant information that was not presented to, or did not form part of the material considered by the decision makers before the decisions makers.
3. Supports, in principle non-contact periods being applied to minimise the post-application exposure risks.
4. Advocates the use of robust science to support decision making and applauds the application of such robust science including, aged residue studies and foliar residue degradation studies to confirm and inform the need for non-contact periods
5. Supports the proposal to reinstate non-contact periods for the substances listed noting the need for many sectors, including the nursery sector (but less-so than some fruit producers), to time the application of pesticides to coincide with the need to protect the crops from pathogens, insects and mites to ensure crop quality and to co-ordinate operational activities.
6. Does not believe the controls will adversely impact the sector.
7. Notes that this control is of particular importance for use of pesticides on crops that flower over long periods and that EPA staff consider that no safe application period can be specified. Staff notes that alternative insecticide control options should be used wherever possible.
8. Cautions that the EPA carefully considers the impact of removing tools from the plant protection tool box in the belief that a suite of proven "alternative insecticide control options" is available - until such alternatives are available and have demonstrated efficacy.

In supporting this reassessment NGINZ notes:

9. The requirements of Regulation 49 of the Hazardous Substances (Classes 6, 8, and 9 Controls) Regulations 2001 requiring that Class 9.4 substances are not applied in areas where bees are foraging or if the substance is in a form that the bees are likely to be exposed to it.
10. The purpose of the application is to review the necessity for establishing and setting non-contact periods for these substances, in order to ensure that bees are not exposed to levels of residual pesticides that may have a toxic or fatal effect to bees or other pollinators.
11. That non-contact periods have been in place since the HSNO approval for the substances were originally granted. The proposal to 'reinstate' non-contact periods is consequently not considered to be a significant concern for the sector.
12. Believes its members were aware of the previous requirements for non-contact periods as specified on the labels.

- I wish to be heard in support of my submission (this means that you can speak at the hearing)
- I do not wish to be heard in support of my submission (this means that you cannot speak at the hearing)

¹ Further information can be appended to your submission, if you are sending this submission electronically and attaching a file we accept the following formats – Microsoft Word, Text, PDF, ZIP, JPEG and JPG. The file must be not more than 8Mb.

I wish for the EPA to make the following decision:
