

Dear Native Plant Food stakeholder,

As part of the strategy for meeting the new requirements of the Food Industry code, the steering group has prepared a list of those native plant foods known to be traded in quantities of more than 500kg pa.

To try to eliminate any ambiguity which has arisen over the last 20 years over some names and products, it is proposed to nominate a preferred product name (like apple, sweet corn, zucchini) which can be commonly understood by producers, traders and end users.

Since it is to be hoped that these products will move out into the international market from an Australian base, the ideal result would be international recognition of products by their Australian names – head off such appropriations as ‘kiwifruit’ at the pass, so to speak.

For this to happen, the names used should be robust, that is – well recognised and used in Australia, and not employing idiosyncratic references (eg bush, tucker, native, wild) which will culturally be confusing when used overseas.

None of this prevents imaginative and enthusiastic proponents from marketing their own varieties or using their trademark names (Pink Lady (apple variety), Japanese Squash (trade euphemism for pumpkin)).

The chart below shows only those species traded at >500kg pa. A suggested product name is shown in bold, in the first column. Many will be uncontentious but several need some discussion and input from industry stakeholders.

Please note and comment on the following points:

1) Use of European names for indigenous species (such as ‘native cranberry’, ‘bush tomato’) has been deliberately avoided. The point here is that such usage can be confusing or inappropriate where botanical links are absent, the product is completely unlike the European version, or indigenous names have wide recognition. Furthermore, if the products are to reach a wider (international) market, words like ‘bush’ and ‘native’ won’t travel and are likely to be replaced by market-friendly alternatives and their Australian origins obscured.

2) The inclusion of wattle seed from a group of species might be a risky strategy as it could encourage indiscriminate inclusion of other **untested** species in the market offering, with the obvious risks.

The industry should recognise **only** seed from nominated species identified by their Latin binomials, and prescribe some simple germination tests to confirm identity.

Davidson’s Plums from QLD and NSW should be described as such, pertaining to two separate species.

3) Unless otherwise mentioned, product definition should take the form of a brief, unambiguous description to include the botanical binomial, plant part and preparation method eg. ‘Dried berries of the species *Tasmannia lanceolata*’ or ‘Blanched leaves of the species *Tetragonia tetragonioides*’ Where mentioned in the table, diagnostic tests to confirm origin and purity of the plant material should be specified and described in the Food Standard Code, in particular giving the range within which identifying parameters must fall.

4) In some instances, the name proposed refers to the **primary product**, itself (wattleseed, pepperberry), rather than the commonly used name of the plant (eg Elegant wattle, Mountain Pepper). Where extracts, essential oils and infusions are marketed, a derivative description should be developed – eg Lemon myrtle oil – essential oil obtained from the leaf of *Backhousia citriodora* (citral chemovar).

5) Indigenous names have only been used in a couple of cases - issues of regional usage and language are avoided, but heritage is overlooked – comments please

Thanks for taking the time to think about this – please address your comments to the steering group via me: cd_read@intas.net.au

Sincerely

Chris Read
5/4/05

PROPOSED TRADING NAME	BOTANICAL NAME (S)	PLANT PARTS	NOTES, Queries for comment	Analytical procedure for confirmation of origin, (where necessary)
Wattleseed	<i>Acacia aneura</i> , <i>A. coriacea</i> , <i>A. murrayana</i> , <i>A. victoriae</i> , <i>A. sophorae</i>	seeds - recommend roasting to remove protease inhibitor	All seed traded must be labelled as to the species concerned. Any others traded at more than 500kg pa?	Germ test
Lemon Aspen	<i>Acronychia acidula</i>	Whole fruits		
Aniseed Myrtle	<i>Anetholea anisata</i>	Leaf or essential oil (trans e anethole chemovar only)		Analysis of essential oil
Bunya Nut	<i>Araucaria bidwillii</i>	Nut		
Lemon Myrtle	<i>Backhousia citrodora</i>	Leaf or essential oil (citrал chemovar)	chemotype def'n required	Analysis of essential oil
Rainforest limes	<i>Citrus australe</i>	fruit	Species indicated on packages	
Desert limes	<i>Citrus glauca</i>	fruit	Species indicated on packages	
Finger lime	<i>Citrus australasica</i>	Fruit	Species indicated on packages	
Davidson's Plum	<i>Davidsonia pruriens</i> <i>D. jerseyana</i>	Fruit	Nominally Qld and NSW Davidsons Plums, respectively. Species indicated on packages	
Muntries	<i>Kunzea pomifera</i>	Fruits	This rendition most commonly used and least likely to be misspelt	
Illawarra Plum	<i>Podocarpus elatus</i>	Fruit		
Quandong	<i>Santalum acuminatum</i>	fruit		
Akudjera	<i>Solanum centrale</i>	Dried Fruit	prefer to avoid 'bush' - several spellings recognised	
Olida	<i>Eucalyptus olida</i>	Leaf	Species indicated on packages.	Analysis of essential oil
Riberry	<i>Syzygium luehmannii</i> (Muell) L. Johnson	Fruits	many other edible spp. Should these be included as Riberry??	
Pepperleaf	<i>Tasmannia lanceolata</i> (Poir) AC Smith	Leaf	Avoid 'native'	Analysis of leaf extract
Pepperberry	<i>Tasmannia lanceolata</i> (Poir) AC Smith	Fruit	Ditto	
Kakadu Plum	<i>Terminalia ferdinandiana</i>	Fruit		
Warrigul Greens	<i>Tetragonia tetragonioides</i>	Blanched Leaves	?arguments for Warrigal Spinach?? Avoid native spinach?	
Lemon Ironbark	<i>Eucalyptus staigeriana</i>	Dried Leaf		Analysis of essential oil
Mintbush	<i>Prostanthera incisa</i> , <i>P. rotundifolia</i>	Dried leaf	often combined in product. Traded as cut leaf and roundleaf mint resp. but not <i>Mentha</i> spp.	