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Report Highlights: Unfavorable weather in major growing regions adversely affected the size profile and quality of this year's apple crop. Apple exports during the 2002/03 marketing season will reach $\mathbf{3 2 5 , 0 0 0}$ tons thanks to this year's larger harvest. Export returns, however, are expected to decline in response to a stronger New Zealand dollar and smaller-sized fruit. Pear production and exports dropped sharply this year.

## SECTION I. SITUATION AND OUTLOOK

Severe frosts in September and October 2002 in the Hawke's Bay region and a major hail storm last November in the Nelson growing zone reduced the size profile and the overall quality of this year's apple crop. Total tonnage harvested, however, is estimated to increase to 495,000 tons. New Zealand's pear crop fell more than 40 percent to 13,500 tons largely due to cool spring weather, heavy pruning and early fruit thinning.

Despite, the increase in apple tonnage, this year's harvest has a smaller proportion of export quality apples ( 65 percent in 2003 compared with nearly 70 percent in 2002). Apple exports during the 2002/03 season are estimated at 325,000 tons. Fresh pear exports are likely to halve to 5,000 tons. The volume of apples utilized for juice production in 2002/03 will increase nearly 25 percent to 105,000 tons. Apple juice supplies have risen markedly in response to a larger processing volume and increased imports of juice concentrate. With domestic consumption at near stable levels, juice exports will increase sharply to 13,500 tons. Although the largest apple exporters have not yet published export returns for the 2003 season, industry officials believe that difficult global marketing conditions, significantly larger volumes of smaller-sized fruit, and a stronger New Zealand currency will decrease FOB prices approximately 8 percent.

At the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UN/ECE) on fruit and vegetables in Geneva, minimum weight-based sizing criteria (independent from a minimum diameter) for apples was accepted as a commercially relevant method for determining size. The European Commission usually adopts the UN/ECE standards for application in the European Community. This represents a breakthrough for the New Zealand pipfruit industry. In the past, New Zealand has been unsuccessful in convincing the UN/ECE to accept minimum weight-based sizing criteria which are independent from a minimum diameter. Pipfruit Growers New Zealand Incorporated (PGNZI) estimates that exports to Europe may increase two to three percent once the new criteria are in place.

New Zealand's pipfruit industry is hopeful that the recent World Trade Organization Dispute Panel ruling on Japan's quarantine measures with respect to the risk of fireblight on commercial apple and pear imports will: (1) improve access for New Zealand apples to the Japanese market, and (2) compel Australia to review its fireblight quarantine measures imposed on New Zealand apple and pear imports. Australia has used similar arguments as Japan to justify restrictions on New Zealand apples into Australia. According to the New Zealand industry, if these quarantine measures were lifted, the annual value of increased apple and pear shipments to Australia could reach as much as NZ $\$ 40$ million. Although Australian industry officials maintain that there are significant differences between the U.S.-Japan case and Australian restrictions on New Zealand apples and pears, an import risk assessment currently is being drafted by Australian authorities. The New Zealand industry anticipates that the assessment is likely to reflect important aspects of the recent WTO ruling.

## SECTION II. STATISTICAL TABLES

PS\&D TABLE - FRESH APPLES

| PSD Table |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Country | New Zealand |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commodity | Fresh Apples |  |  |  | (HA)(1000 TRE | ES)(MT) |
|  | 2000 | Revised | 2001 | Estimate | 2002 | Forecast |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { USDA } \\ \text { Official [Old] } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Post Estimate [New] | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { USDA Official } \\ \text { [Old] } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Post Estimate [New] | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { USDA Official } \\ \text { [Old] } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Post Estimate [New] |
| Market Year Begin |  | 10/2000 |  | 10/2001 |  | 10/2002 |
| Area Planted | 13500 | 13500 | 13000 | 13000 | 13000 | 11700 |
| Area Harvested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bearing Trees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non-Bearing Trees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Trees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Commercial Production | 384000 | 384000 | 446500 | 446500 | 431000 | 460000 |
| Non-Comm. Production | 29000 | 29000 | 33500 | 33500 | 31000 | 35000 |
| TOTAL Production | 413000 | 413000 | 480000 | 480000 | 462000 | 495000 |
| TOTAL Imports | 23 | 23 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 275 |
| TOTAL SUPPLY | 413023 | 413023 | 480070 | 480070 | 462070 | 495275 |
| Domestic Fresh Consump | 60000 | 60000 | 70070 | 70070 | 72070 | 65000 |
| Exports, Fresh Only | 260000 | 260000 | 325000 | 325000 | 288000 | 325000 |
| For Processing | 93023 | 93023 | 85000 | 85000 | 102000 | 105275 |
| Withdrawal From Market | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL UTILIZATION | 413023 | 413023 | 480070 | 480070 | 462070 | 495275 |

PS\&D TABLE - CONCENTRATED APPLE JUICE

| PSD Table |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Country | New Zealand |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commodity | Concentrated Apple Juice |  |  |  | (MT) |  |
|  | 2000 | Revised | 2001 | Estimate | 2002 | Forecast |
|  | USDA Official [Old] | Post Estimate [New] | USDA Official $\qquad$ | Post Estimate [New] | USDA Official [Old] | Post Estimate [New] |
| Market Year Begin |  | 10/2000 |  | 10/2001 |  | 10/2002 |
| Deliv. To Processors | 93023 | 93023 | 85000 | 85000 | 102000 | 105275 |
| Beginning Stocks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Production | 16000 | 16000 | 14450 | 14450 | 17300 | 17900 |
| Imports | 400 | 400 | 1700 | 1700 | 200 | 3600 |
| TOTAL SUPPLY | 16400 | 16400 | 16150 | 16150 | 17500 | 21500 |
| Exports | 9300 | 9300 | 9050 | 7500 | 10000 | 13500 |
| Domestic Consumption | 7100 | 7100 | 7100 | 8650 | 7500 | 8000 |
| Ending Stocks | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL DISTRIBUTION | 16400 | 16400 | 16150 | 16150 | 17500 | 21500 |

PS\&D TABLE - FRESH PEARS

| PSD Table |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Country | New Zealand |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commodity | Fresh Pears |  |  |  | (HA)(1000 TREES)(MT) |  |
|  | 2000 | Revised | 2001 | Estimate | 2002 | Forecast |
|  | USDA <br> Official <br> [Old] | Post Estimate [New] | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { USDA Official } \\ \text { [Old] } \end{array}$ | Post Estimate [New] | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { USDA Official } \\ \text { [Old] } \end{array}$ | Post Estimate [New] |
| Market Year Begin |  | 10/2000 |  | 10/2001 |  | 10/2002 |
| Area Planted | 995 | 995 | 995 | 995 | 995 | 995 |
| Area Harvested | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bearing Trees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non-Bearing Trees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Trees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Commercial Production | 20800 | 20800 | 19400 | 19400 | 19200 | 11900 |
| Non-Comm. Production | 3500 | 3500 | 4400 | 4400 | 4200 | 1600 |
| TOTAL Production | 24300 | 24300 | 23800 | 23800 | 23400 | 13500 |
| TOTAL Imports | 1500 | 1574 | 1300 | 2048 | 1300 | 3000 |
| TOTAL SUPPLY | 25800 | 25874 | 25100 | 25848 | 24700 | 16500 |
| Domestic Fresh Consump | 12000 | 12000 | 11200 | 11948 | 11200 | 9000 |
| Exports, Fresh Only | 9100 | 9100 | 10500 | 10500 | 10000 | 5000 |
| For Processing | 4700 | 4774 | 3400 | 3400 | 3500 | 2500 |
| Withdrawal From Market | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL UTILIZATION | 25800 | 25874 | 25100 | 25848 | 24700 | 16500 |

TRADE MATRIX

| NEW ZEALAND APPLE EXPORTS |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| (Calendar Years, MT) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Destination | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | $2003^{*}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Other EU | 115,267 | 78,224 | 93,922 | 84,312 |
| United Kingdom | 92,343 | 76,499 | 80,955 | 75,714 |
| United States | 78,152 | 55,782 | 64,427 | 40,705 |
| Netherlands | 2,539 | 4,310 | 21,678 | 30,174 |
| Taiwan | 9,419 | 6,594 | 15,481 | 13,975 |
| Germany | 4,055 | 18,354 | 15,390 | 22,409 |
| Malaysia | 9,368 | 7,008 | 12,356 | 6,510 |
| Singapore | 10,008 | 7,109 | 10,127 | 6,714 |
| Hong Kong | 21,246 | 14,374 | 8,583 | 10,548 |
| United Arab Emirates | 1,680 | 2,287 | 3,985 | 1,736 |
| Indonesia | 5,106 | 3,575 | 3,984 | 3,158 |
| India | 1,034 | 1,966 | 2,701 | 2,868 |
| France | 253 | 27 | 2,582 | 2,988 |
| Thailand | 2,674 | 2,908 | 2,428 | 3,300 |
| Canada | 815 | 113 | 2,079 | 3,524 |
| Other | 19,877 | 15,392 | 13,531 | 9,850 |
| TOTAL | 373,832 | 295,422 | 354,209 | 318,483 |
| * YTD (Jan - Jun) |  |  |  |  |
| Source: Statistics New Zealand |  |  |  |  |

TRADE MATRIX

| NEW ZEALAND PEAR EXPORTS |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| (Calendar Years, MT) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Destination | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | $2003^{*}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| United States | 6,991 | 2,204 | 5,056 | 1,834 |
| United Kingdom | 3,053 | 1,260 | 2,549 | 714 |
| Destination Unknown EU | 1,709 | 358 | 1,486 | 230 |
| Netherlands | 76 | 29 | 1,016 | 37 |
| Singapore | 0 | 0 | 125 | 55 |
| Fiji | 4 | 3 | 89 | 4 |
| France | 0 | 0 | 80 | 65 |
| Other | 49 | 98 | 279 | 126 |
| T0TAL | 11,881 | 3,952 | 10,680 | 3,064 |
| *YTD (Jan - Jun) |  |  |  |  |
| Source: Statistics New Zealand |  |  |  |  |

## SECTION III. SUPPLY AND DEMAND, POLICY

## PRODUCTION \& DEMAND

Approximately 90 percent of New Zealand's apple production is contributed by the Hawke's Bay ( 50 percent) and the Nelson ( 40 percent) regions. Severe frosts last September and October in the Hawke's Bay region and a major hail storm in November in the Nelson region reduced the size profile and quality of this year's crop. Despite the unfavorable weather, New Zealand's apple harvest reached 495,000 tons compared to only 480,000 tons a year earlier. The New Zealand pear crop was less affected by this weather pattern since flowering of pear varieties occurred over a longer period of time (see NZ3001). Nevertheless, the national pear harvest was significantly smaller this season.

The effects of the frosts did not have a uniform impact on apple orchards throughout Hawke's Bay. Export packouts ranged from 50 to 95 percent. The Braeburn crop was characterized by both big and small fruit, but showed significantly less medium-sized fruit. Low calcium levels and misshapen fruit also was evident. Fruit size for the Royal Gala crop had a greater spread than usual, although fruit size tended to be smaller with an average count size of 125 (per 18 kg . box). Overall, quality was better than expected given this season's weather. As a result of the smaller fruit size, 60 percent less fruit was submitted to the Hawke's Bay USDA pre-clearance program compared to the previous season. The apple crop from the Nelson region was less affected by the poor weather witnessed in Hawke's Bay. Export volumes for both the Royal Gala and Braeburn varieties were similar and the size profile was only marginally smaller than shown during the 2002 season.

Post had initially anticipated a reduction in apple export volumes for the 2002/03 season. However, larger volumes of smaller-sized but high quality fruit compensated for a reduced tonnage of larger-sized fruit and total export volume this season is expected to match the 325,000 tons recorded a year earlier.

Pear production this year fell more than 40 percent to 13,500 tons and fresh pear exports almost halved to 5,000 tons. Heavy pruning and early fruit thinning together with cooler spring weather were factors in the smaller harvest.

Apple volume utilized for the production of juice in 2002/03 is estimated to have increased 20,000 tons over a year earlier as a result of the difficult growing conditions. A larger juice output along with increased apple juice concentrate imports will boost apple juice supplies to 21,500 tons. With relatively stable domestic consumption levels, exports are estimated to increase to 13,500 tons compared to only 7,500 tons in 2001/02.

Industry representatives anticipate a steady increase in apple volumes in the near-term. Attractive grower returns in recent years prompted growers to replace old apple trees with higher performing rootstock.

Although apple exporters have not yet published export sales figures for the current 2003 season, industry officials project that difficult global marketing conditions and a stronger New Zealand currency resulted in an 8 percent decline in average FOB price levels. Taking advantage of a two month supply gap in the Chinese apple market (August/September), New Zealand exported 1,128 tons of small-sized Royal Gala apples to the northern port of Longkou where they were packed and marketed as New Zealand apples. Given that the fruit size was relatively-small, the average grower return of NZ $\$ 26$ per 18 kg . carton is generally viewed as a significantly better price than that achieved for small-sized fruit sold in other exports markets this season.

The expected consolidation of exporter numbers from more than 80 in the 2002 season has not occurred. However, exporters are seeking to integrate with growing operations and many growers are attempting to become exporters in their own right. ENZA, which exported more than 45 percent of New Zealand's apple exports in the 2002 season, is expected to account for less than 40 percent of New Zealand's apple exports this year.

## POLICY

## New Zealand's Apple \& Pear Breeding Program Continues

A multi-party joint venture, headed by Pipfruit Growers of New Zealand Limited (PGNZI), which seeks to secure future research funding for New Zealand's apple and pear breeding program is unlikely to be finalized before the end of the year (see NZ3008). Majority shareholders PGNZI and Apple and Pear Australia Limited, as well as minority shareholders HortResearch (a New Zealand Government Crown Research Institute), Horticulture Australia Limited (HAL), and HortResearch's global partner, the Associated International Group of Nurseries (AIGN) ${ }^{1}$ have agreed in principle to form this joint venture. The partnership will fund both HortResearch's apple and pear breeding program as well as the commercialization of the breeding program's output. The joint venture partners have agreed to fund the breeding research program with NZ $\$ 1.2$ million annually in return for access to HortResearch's new apple and pear varieties. Negotiations between the potential partners are expected to be finalized once differing views on commercialization, allocation of intellectual property rights, and preferred options for a shareholding arrangement are resolved. While negotiations continue, HortResearch is funding the apple and pear breeding program from its financial reserves. The joint venture partners have agreed to pro-rata contributions to ensure that funding for the program is not compromised. According to PGNZI, New Zealand apple and pear growers will determine which apple and pear varieties from the breeding program will be commercialized. AIGN will manage the intellectual property generated by the breeding program while HortResearch will be contracted to conduct the actual breeding research.

## Weight-Based Sizing Accepted by UN/ECE

[^0]During June negotiations in Geneva at the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UN/ECE) on fruit and vegetables, New Zealand pipfruit growers achieved a breakthrough in having minimum weight-based sizing criteria (independent from a minimum diameter) for apples accepted as a commercially relevant method for determining size. The committee of UN/ECE experts administers more than 50 quality standards for a wide range of fresh fruit and vegetables. These standards are used by governments, producers, importers and exporters as well as other international organizations, to monitor and control the quality of fruit and vegetables sold in their countries. The European Commission usually adopts the UN/ECE standards for application in the European Community.

New Zealand has to date been unsuccessful in convincing the UN/ECE to accept minimum weight-based sizing criteria which are independent from a minimum diameter. While the current UN/ECE Standard for apples contains weight-based sizing criteria, the minimum size criteria is determined by a diameter measurement. New Zealand's government and industry representatives have maintained that the weight method accurately and verifiably determines size, and that this method is both commercially effective and relevant. The New Zealand delegation also argued that this sizing standard is commercially used by most consumers, retailers, and by a significant portion of apple producing countries. Acceptance of the new standard should encourage increased fruit shipments to European markets. In the past, apples meeting minimum weight requirements were rejected because they did not meet minimum diameter requirements. Pipfruit Growers New Zealand believes that acceptance of the new standard may result in an increase in apple export volumes to Europe of two to three percent. Additionally, local packinghouses which predominantly use weight sizing equipment would no longer have to calibrate their sizing equipment to adjust for varietal and regional diameter differences.

## WTO/Japan Fireblight Ruling

The World Trade Organization Disputes Panel ruled in July that Japan's quarantine measures to eliminate the risk of introducing fireblight on commercial imports of apples and pears were inconsistent with the WTO Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement). The case was taken by the United States and backed by New Zealand as a third party. Australia, which has similar concerns as those expressed by Japan, was a third party to Japan's case. The WTO ruling is important to New Zealand because Australia has used similar arguments as Japan to justify its own restrictions on New Zealand's apples. The WTO Disputes Panel ruled that scientific evidence did not support Japanese assertions that trade in apples and pears presented a fire blight risk. Therefore, the various measures Japan has put in place to deal with the purported risk are unjustified. Although Japan has appealed the ruling, the New Zealand Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry expects the WTO appellate body to uphold the panel ruling. The New Zealand apple and pear industry views the WTO ruling as a breakthrough in its own efforts to eliminate trade restrictions on apple and pear exports to Australia which have been in place since the early 1920's. According to industry estimates, if Australian restrictions are lifted, annual export value could increase $\mathrm{NZ} \$ 40$ million. Although Australia maintains that there are no parallels between the U.S.-Japan case and Australian restrictions on New Zealand's apple and pear imports, Australian authorities are understood to be preparing a draft import risk assessment for New Zealand apples which is likely to reflect important aspects of the WTO ruling.

The New Zealand industry has identified similarities between Japan's SPS requirements and those imposed by the Australian Department of Agriculture, Fisheries, and Forestry's eleven measures that New Zealand growers must comply with. Five of the most restrictive requirements have strong similarities to measures imposed by Japan on imports of U.S. apples and pears; all of which were deemed to be without sufficient scientific evidence by the WTO.

The New Zealand industry is aware that Japan has appealed the WTO decision and anticipates that it will take at least two years before better access into the Australian market may be attained. New Zealand hopes that access into the South Korean market, which also has placed restrictions on New Zealand's fruit over fireblight concerns, may improve as a result of the WTO ruling.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The group includes growers from Australia/Asian region, the United States, South America, Europe, and South Africa.

