### A5 - GIA partner biosecurity system activities and engagement opportunities

**Table Two - the level of engagement GIA Partners should expect from each other for specific activities under each layer of the biosecurity system**

*Note: The explanatory text in the Comments field can be updated as required over time to better meet information needs*

|  |
| --- |
| **Cross biosecurity system**  |
|   |
|  |  |  | **Key biosecurity activities under each layer of the system** | **Current levels of engagement** | **COMMENTS** |
|  |  |  |  |  | Engagement with stakeholders  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Engagement with GIA Partners |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **MPI Responsible Owner(s)** | **MPI led** | **Industry led** |  | **Inform** | **Network** | **Co-operate** | **Collaborate** | **Partner** |  |
| MPI Biosecurity Governance BoardChair – Chief Operations Officer |  |  | Biosecurity system governance |  |  |  |  |  | The 2003 Biosecurity Strategy made the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) accountable for overall management of the biosecurity system on behalf of all New Zealanders. However, many others also play a role in the biosecurity system, including central and local government, Maori/iwi, primary industry organisations, and community groups. The Biosecurity 2025 proposed Direction Statement recommends current governance arrangements for the biosecurity system be assessed and options that can increase inclusiveness, collaboration and transparency considered.*NOTE:**The Biosecurity Ministerial Advisory Committee (BMAC) was set up to provide advice to the Minister on biosecurity system matters. While BMAC is part of the governance system, they are not decision-makers. MPI considers their advice, but is not obliged to act on it. MPI is working closely with BMAC to provide better context for issues, and to help informed discussion. The role of BMAC likely to be reviewed under B2025.**MPI Biosecurity Governance Board – An MPI governance group set up to lead, oversee and coordinate activities related to MPI’s biosecurity system leadership role. Sets MPI high level biosecurity work programme.* |
|  |  | System performance measurement, management and reporting |  |  |  |  |  | Performance of the biosecurity system is currently an MPI accountability – managed through the MPI Biosecurity Board. The draft Biosecurity 2025 Direction Statement recommends that ways of increasing the transparency of biosecurity system performance be considered. Any review of system governance arrangements will likely influence the process by which this happens. In the meantime, MPI will consult with GIA Partners on the development of biosecurity system-wide performance measures, and will report on and discuss performance against these. This is already starting to happen through fora such as the GIA DGG, Biosecurity Fora, annual bi-lateral discussions, and summer-end Border Clearance performance discussions.  |
|  |  | Implementation of the GIA Deed |  |  |  |  |  | As members of the GIA DGG, GIA Partners retain oversight of Deed processes and directly influence the evolution of GIA over time. GIA Partners also participate in bi-annual Biosecurity Fora, and annual bi-lateral discussions between MPI and each industry partner on general and specific biosecurity system issues. MPI and GIA Partners will agree how to fill annual bi-lateral meeting obligations. |
|  |  | System-wide strategic projects |  |  |  |  |  | GIA Partners are engaged early and directly on MPI strategic projects of relevance to biosecurity. For example, Biosecurity 2025, First Principles Cost-recovery Review.  |
|  |  | Biosecurity emerging risk system. Includes Intelligence, environmental scanning, and monitoring of biosecurity system threats |  |  |  |  |  | The MPI Emerging Risk System - Biosecurity (ERS) is designed to proactively identify and manage potential and emerging risks to New Zealand’s biosecurity. MPI is responsible for management and delivery of the biosecurity emerging risk system. However, many industry groups are undertaking activities in this area and opportunities for collaboration with GIA Partners can be identified. Results can (among other things) help industry identify their priority pests and inform discussions between Partners that lead to joint response and readiness commitments under Operational Agreements. |
|  |  | Identify and assess organisms that are a high priority for biosecurity risk management |  |  |  |  |  | MPI is ultimately responsible for determining organisms that are a high priority for biosecurity risk management across the system, but will do so through consultation with affected stakeholders and with input from the wider scientific community. MPI and GIA industry Partners will work together (Collaborate/Partner) to identify and agree organisms that are a priority for joint investment in Readiness and Response – documented in Operational Agreements. |
|  |  | Set priorities for risk management and allocation of resources across the system |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Policy and advice to the Government; Development of legislation and legislative amendments. |  |  |  |  |  | GIA industry partners will be consulted early, and can act as key influencers |
|  |  | Communications strategies and programmes  |  |  |  |  |  | MPI is accountable for system-wide communications strategies and programmes, however, there may be opportunities to collaborate on high level messaging where Partners are seeking the same outcomes. GIA industry partners also have a responsibility for communicating with their members on issues that affect them. |
|  |  | Biosecurity science, research and advice |  |  |  |  |  | Biosecurity research can extend to Collaboration and Partnership where a joint priority and/or jointly funded. For example, research jointly funded by NZFOA and Centre for Excellence in Biosecurity Risk Analysis (CEBRA). |
|  |  | Meet Treaty of Waitangi obligations and responsibilities |  |  |  |  |  | While this is a Crown responsibility, GIA industry partners are also responsible for ensuring Maori interests and perspectives are considered in biosecurity activities they undertake and that affect Maori. |

|  |
| --- |
| **International plant & animal health standards**Developing international standards and rules under the WTO SPS Agreement |
| There are three key areas in this layer of the system - Sharing IPPC/OIE work programmes, consulting on draft standards, identifying and advocating for NZ priorities. There are a lot of mechanisms already in place to share/consult on/discuss these. However, MPI is open to industry suggestions for improvement. |
|  |  |  | **Key biosecurity activities under each layer of the system** | **Current levels of engagement** | **COMMENTS** |
|  |  |  |  |  | Engagement with stakeholders  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Engagement with GIA Partners |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **MPI Responsible Owner(s)** | **MPI led** | **Industry led** |  | **Inform** | **Network** | **Co-operate** | **Collaborate** | **Partner** |  |
| Director, International Policy |  |  | Lead New Zealand’s input on strategic direction and priorities for international standard setting bodies. Includes World Trade Organisation (WTO), World Organisation for animal health (OIE), International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), Codex Alimentarius Commission (Codex), International Maritime Organisation (IMO) |  |  |  |  |  | These are multi-lateral bodies, of which NZ (represented by MPI) is one player. MPI consults with stakeholders when developing a NZ position on recommended priorities. The ‘network’ category of engagement stated here reflects that MPI is an influencer rather than a decision-maker.  |
|  |  | Lead New Zealand input into priority setting for international standard development |  |  |  |  |  | Planning horizons tend to be over longer (eg, five-year) timeframes. While there are exceptions, MPI can more readily influence the development of subsequent five-year plans (compared with items already scheduled). MPI consults with stakeholders when developing a NZ position on recommended priorities. |
|  |  | Lead New Zealand input into content of draft standards |  |  |  |  |  | MPI consults with stakeholders on the content of draft standards as part of its process to compile and submit feedback. The consultation process MPI follows for development and review of CODEX and OIE standards is well documented. MPI is currently developing a more formal/structured approach for the way it engages on IPPC matters – to better align with OIE engagement processes |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Trade agreements & bilateral arrangements**Negotiation, agreements and processes for future biosecurity cooperation and trade |
|  |
|  |  |  | **Key biosecurity activities under each layer of the system** | **Current levels of engagement** | **COMMENTS** |
|  |  |  |  |  | Engagement with stakeholders  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Engagement with GIA Partners |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **MPI Responsible Owner(s)** | **MPI led** | **Industry led** |  | **Inform** | **Network** | **Co-operate** | **Collaborate** | **Partner** |  |
| Director, Market Access |  |  | Ensure SPS principles are enshrined in trade agreements and bilateral arrangements  |  |  |  |  |  | MPI can engage with industry on priorities for trade negotiations (including new and revised trade agreements).*Note: Work such as contingency plans to maintain market access in the event of a new fruit fly new incursion (completed in partnership through PMAC) is considered a response readiness activity, and hence is not reflected here.* |
|  |  | Implementation of trade agreements and bilateral arrangements |  |  |  |  |  | MPI will engage with industry groups on implementation issues. In certain circumstances, MPI can arrange for industry representatives to meet MPI’s international counterparts – a learning opportunity to improve understanding of how things work, and to better understand constraints/limitations. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Risk assessment**Identification of risk for people and goods coming into New Zealand |
|  |
|  |  |  | **Key biosecurity activities under each layer of the system** | **Current levels of engagement** | **COMMENTS** |
|  |  |  |  |  | Engagement with stakeholders  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Engagement with GIA Partners |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **MPI Responsible Owner(s)** | **MPI led** | **Industry led** |  | **Inform** | **Network** | **Co-operate** | **Collaborate** | **Partner** |  |
| Director, Biosecurity Science, Food Science & Risk Assessment |  |  | Assessment of biosecurity risk to inform Import Health Standard development |  |  |  |  |  | In this context, ‘risk assessment’ refers to an internationally-defined process that provides an objective and defensible method of assessing the disease risks associated with imported commodities. The outcomes of the risk assessment are aids in decision making (in this case, import health standard development). Whilst the decision maker must also take into account other factors such as Appropriate Level of Protection (ALOP) and the availability of the sanitary or phytosanitary measures and their practicality, feasibility and cost, the outcomes of the risk assessment should be the most significant basis upon which the decision maker makes his or her decision. |
| **Import health standards (IHSs)**Specification of requirements for people and goods coming into New Zealand |
| * A number of fora (eg, FreshPAC, PMAC, ATAC, GermAC) have been set up to support robust MPI-industry engagement on pre-border matters. Smaller working groups are often set-up to deal with specific issues. While it can take longer to work through this process, the aim is for a better and more effective result over time.
* MPI has an obligation to consult with all potentially interested parties, and in the interests of fairness, equity, transparency and efficiency must run a single IHS consultation process. However, MPI can make good use of GIA fora for coordinated and collective feedback from interested Signatories, reducing engagement overheads for all.
* There are international norms for getting decisions on risk assessments and IHS's made in a timely manner. NZ has started to stretch these in some areas with negative consequence. From an international perspective we are seen as NZ Inc. There is no distinction between sectors, and a slow process in one sector impacts on how others are viewed. The GIA Partnership presents an opportunity to help develop an appropriate balance.
 |
|  |  |  | **Key biosecurity activities under each layer of the system** | **Current levels of engagement** | **COMMENTS** |
|  |  |  |  |  | Engagement with stakeholders  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Engagement with GIA Partners |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **MPI Responsible Owner(s)** | **MPI led** | **Industry led** |  | **Inform** | **Network** | **Co-operate** | **Collaborate** | **Partner** |  |
| Director, Plants, Food & EnvironmentDirector, Animal & Animal Products |  |  | Work with stakeholders to facilitate compliant importation of goods |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | IHS prioritisation |  |  |  |  |  | All stakeholders are invited to submit candidates for IHS prioritisation process. Usually occurs once every two years. |
|  |  | IHS development and issuing |  |  |  |  |  | Early engagement occurs through FreshPAC, GermAC, ATAC and other industry specific fora. Technical working groups are established for specific IHS’s where there is interest. Any GIA partner or other stakeholder wanting to participate in these fora can do so. Biosecurity Act sets out legislated process, considerations for decision-maker and consultation requirements.Under Section 23 (1) of the Biosecurity Act, the process of making an import health standard begins with an analysis of the risks associated with importing a class or description of goods. Section 23 (3) of the Act describes the requirement for draft standard consultation, which routinely includes consultation on the analysis or assessment of risk that informed the development of that standard. The Chief Technical Officer is required to consult persons representative of those who have an interest in the standard. In this context this will include relevant GIA Partners, and other stakeholders. |
|  |  | IHS implementation (issuance of permits, development of export plans, reviewing effectiveness of phytosanitary measures, equivalence determinations, advice to inspectors for clearance decisions, CTO directions) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Pathway assessment prior to trade starting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Pathway assurance visits of exporting country compliance with IHS and export plan requirements, audits of treatment and quarantine facilities, checking export assurance and certification system,  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Operational and Facility Standards, eg, for sea containers, air containers, aircraft, vessels, places of first arrival (air and sea ports) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Work with stakeholders to facilitate compliant importation of goods |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Border interventions**Education and auditing to encourage compliance. Inspecting to verify compliance and taking action to manage non-compliance |
|  |  |  | **Key biosecurity activities under each layer of the system** | **Current levels of engagement** | **COMMENTS** |
|  |  |  |  |  | Engagement with stakeholders  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Engagement with GIA Partners |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **MPI Responsible Owner(s)** | **MPI led** | **Industry led** |  | **Inform** | **Network** | **Co-operate** | **Collaborate** | **Partner** |  |
| Director, Border Clearance Services |  |  | Manage biosecurity clearance of people, goods and craft via the passenger, mail, cargo, craft and transitional facility pathways. Includes: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | * Managing inspection and clearance processes on- and off-shore. Includes training of personnel and accreditation of transitional facilities.
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | * Performance measurement and reporting
 |  |  |  |  |  | Includes Border Clearance summer performance reporting  |
|  |  | * Information sharing
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | * System improvement initiatives (innovation)
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | * Education to encourage compliance with legislation, regulations and standards
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | * Audit and assurance to measure and report on compliance …
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | * Managing non-compliance
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Surveillance**General and targeted programmes to detect harmful pests and diseases |
|  |  |  | **Key biosecurity activities under each layer of the system** | **Current levels of engagement** | **COMMENTS** |
|  |  |  |  |  | Engagement with stakeholders  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Engagement with GIA Partners |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **MPI Responsible Owner(s)** | **MPI led** | **Industry led** |  | **Inform** | **Network** | **Co-operate** | **Collaborate** | **Partner** |  |
| Director, Diagnostic & Surveillance Services |  |  | General programmes to detect harmful pests and diseases in the terrestrial and aquatic environments |  |  |  |  |  | Maintaining or improving the capacity to recognise and rapidly report the detection of any unwanted organism is a minimum commitment under the Deed for all GIA Partners – clause 3.2.1 (b) Promoting early reporting of unwanted organisms to MPI is a GIA industry partner minimum commitments under the DeedCollaborate/partner where agree a joint priority and subject to an Operational Agreement (OA). |
|  |  | Targeted programmes to detect harmful pests and diseases in the terrestrial and aquatic environments |  |  |  |  |  | Collaborate/partner where agree a joint priority and subject to an OA - surveillance is in scope of activities that can be agreed under an OA |
|  |  | Investigation, assessment and management of immediate risks associated with suspect unwanted pests and disease, risk goods, and new organisms (under HSNO) |  |  |  |  |  | MPI is responsible for all decisions, actions and costs in the Investigation phase, but will undertake any necessary communications required to achieve these ends.Rapidly notifying potentially affected GIA Partners when a suspected unwanted organism is detected in New Zealand is a minimum commitment under the GIA Deed – clause 3.2.2 (b). The GIA DGG - endorsed Response Guide explains what this means in practice. In summary, MPI will give a heads-up about the investigation to affected GIA Partners where:* There is confirmation or strong suspicion of a significant biosecurity issue or risk
* Publicity associated with the investigation is likely due to industry or media interest

Where there are risks of publicity before completion of an investigation, MPI and GIA Partners will agree how best to manage these risks – including any pre-emptive communication requirements, timing and responsibilities.Where MPI confirms a remaining biosecurity risk at the end of an investigation, MPI and affected GIA industry Partners will make a joint-decision on whether or not a response should be activated.Note: MPI is actively working on standardising internal processes and procedures to improve transparency and consistency for rapid notification and joint decision-making following completion of an Investigation. A working group involving industry Partners and others (eg, DOC) has also been set up to ensure the needs of all key parties/participants are met. Once confirmed as fit-for-purpose, a training and induction plan will be agreed and implemented. |
|  |  | Maintenance of national reference laboratories |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Diagnostics for surveillance, investigation/validation, and import/export testing |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | International and domestic reporting on changes in New Zealand’s biosecurity status  |  |  |  |  |  | Promoting awareness and use of mechanisms to report changes in New Zealand’s biosecurity status is a minimum commitment under the Deed for all GIA Partners - clause 3.2.1(c)MPI will advise affected stakeholders (including GIA Partners) of any proposed change in biosecurity status before trading Partners, and before going public.  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Readiness**Regular testing of the biosecurity system’s capability to respond |
|  |
|  |  |  | **Key biosecurity activities under each layer of the system** | **Current levels of engagement** | **COMMENTS** |
|  |  |  |  |  | Engagement with stakeholders  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Engagement with GIA Partners |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **MPI Responsible Owner(s)** | **MPI led** | **Industry led** |  | **Inform** | **Network** | **Co-operate** | **Collaborate** | **Partner** |  |
| Director, Readiness & Response Services |  |  | Develop, and implement prioritised readiness strategies and plans. Monitor and measure effectiveness through GIA governance. |  |  |  |  |  | GIA Partners will Collaborate/Partner where they agree the activity is a joint priority and it has been made subject to an Operational Agreement (OA).Being aware of the industry biosecurity profile and taking measures to manage the biosecurity risks that industry is best placed to manage is a minimum commitment under the Deed for GIA industry Partners – clause 3.2.3 (a)As a first step, MPI and new GIA industry Partners will work together to develop a biosecurity profile for the sector. Purpose to collate and capture key industry information that can be used to support a range of biosecurity activities. Provides an overview of the sector for those MPI staff with little background knowledge, and a basis for MPI and the sector to work together in partnership and discuss ways of achieving better biosecurity outcomes.  |
|  |  | Development and maintenance of capability and capacity to respond to biosecurity incursions. Includes people, systems and tools.  |  |  |  |  |  | Collaborate/partner where agree a joint priority and subject to an OA. |
|  |  | Maintenance of the National Biosecurity Capability Network, including National Response Training for registered members |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Invest in specific readiness projects. For example, research for improved tools, diagnostics, detection capabilities; development of response plans; response exercises.Commitment to joint readiness projects under GIA are documented in Operational Agreements. |  |  |  |  |  | GIA Partners will Collaborate/Partner where they agree the activity is a joint priority and it has been made subject to an Operational Agreement (OA). |

|  |
| --- |
| **Response**Responding to detected harmful pests and diseases |
|  |  |  | **Key biosecurity activities under each layer of the system** | **Current levels of engagement** | **COMMENTS** |
|  |  |  |  |  | Engagement with stakeholders  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Engagement with GIA Partners |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **MPI Responsible Owner(s)** | **MPI led** | **Industry led** |  | **Inform** | **Network** | **Co-operate** | **Collaborate** | **Partner** |  |
| Director, Readiness & Response Services |  |  | Lead responses to organisms or goods that pose a biosecurity risk |  |  |  |  |  | GIA Partners will Collaborate/Partner where they agree the activity is a joint priority and it has been made subject to an Operational Agreement (OA). Includes joint decision-making and cost-sharing for responses via Response Governance. Refer GIA DGG-endorsed Response Guide for more info. Note: If there is no pre-agreed Operational Agreement, a Rapid Operational Agreement will be developed as a matter of urgency following a joint decision between MPI and GIA industry Partners to activate a response. Default clauses (including for cost-shares and fiscal caps) in the Rapid Operational Agreement template will likely apply until specific arrangements have been negotiated.MPI minimum commitments under the GIA Deed include:* Urgently establishing preliminary response arrangements consistent with Deed requirements and any OAs that may be in place, including initiating decision-making, cost sharing and impact/risk analysis processes – clause 3.2.2 (c)
* Managing trade and market access issues arising from the detection of the unwanted organisms, and meeting international reporting obligations – clause 3.2.2 (d)
* Representing the interests of non-Signatories and other stakeholders, including Māori - clause 3.2.2 (e)
* Facilitating access for industry GIA Partners to Crown Loans (or similar), as a last resort, to fund response commitments – clause 3.2.2 (f)

GIA industry partner minimum commitments under the GIA Deed include:* Working with MPI to integrate industry into response delivery programmes and processes
* Raising awareness of response arrangements described in the MPI response procedures and policies
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Pest and disease management**National, regional and industry actions to manage established pests and diseases |
|   |
|  |  |  | **Key biosecurity activities under each layer of the system** | **Current levels of engagement** | **COMMENTS** |
|  |  |  |  |  | Engagement with stakeholders  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Engagement with GIA Partners |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **MPI Responsible Owner(s)** | **MPI led** | **Industry led** |  | **Inform** | **Network** | **Co-operate** | **Collaborate** | **Partner** |  |
| Director, Readiness & Response Services  |  |  | Lead and coordinate pest, disease and pathway management programmes for nationally significant issues |  |  |  |  |  | Affected stakeholders can Collaborate/Partner where they agree the activity is a joint priority |
|  |  | Lead system improvement projects, including improving alignment of policy and regulation and improving access to pest management tools and best practice |  |  |  |  |  | Affected stakeholders can Collaborate/Partner where they agree the activity is a joint priority |
|  |  | Oversee the implementation of national pest management plans delivered through standalone management agencies, e.g. KVH (Psa), OSPRI (TB). |  |  |  |  |  | Affected stakeholders can Collaborate/Partner where they agree the activity is a joint priority |
|  |  | Support regional or industry led programmes to develop system wide capability |  |  |  |  |  | Affected stakeholders can Collaborate/Partner where they agree the activity is a joint prioritys |

###