

## FORUM DISCUSSION PAPER

### Feedback on the Operating Model for the GIA Secretariat

*February 2014*

#### Recommendation

Participants of the GIA Biosecurity Forum 2014/1 are asked to consider the feedback provided by seven organisations on the out-of-session discussion paper (3/2013) circulated in October 2013. The consolidated feedback from potential Deed signatories on the proposed operating model for the GIA Secretariat is in Attachment 1. This feedback has been analysed and is summarised in this paper.

Forum participants are asked to review the feedback and summary, and:

1. Confirm that they agree with the principles where feedback indicated common agreement or common disagreement, and
2. Confirm their agreement or otherwise to accept the remaining principles subject to the modifications proposed in the consolidated feedback in Attachment 1.

Potential signatories that are not able to attend the Forum, and potential signatories wishing to provide their feedback in writing, are asked to send any comments to the Secretariat ([secretariat@gia.org.nz](mailto:secretariat@gia.org.nz)) by 19 March 2014.

#### Additional comment from the IGB

The IGB thanks those organisations that provided feedback on the discussion paper.

The IGB notes that there are several matters that may require a specific focus to achieve the agreement of potential signatories to a common set of principles for the operating model, including the boundaries around the Secretariat as a facilitator, appropriate and transparent resourcing, authority and accountability (particularly between the DGG and Secretariat) and communications roles.

The IGB also notes general comments provided by a number of organisations that Forum participants should also consider.

#### Introduction

The final Deed makes reference to the role and function of the GIA Secretariat but is not highly prescriptive of its duties. The Secretariat role is to facilitate the implementation of the partnership described in the Deed.

The GIA Secretariat has been operating since October 2012 under the guidance of the IGB. With the commencement of the Deed, the Secretariat will be accountable to Deed Signatories through the Deed Governance Group for the performance of its responsibilities. It is required to base some, but not all, of its activities on those of this Group. However, the Deed also requires the Secretariat to facilitate the negotiation and drafting of Operational Agreements and to work with OA Signatories to facilitate delivery of agreed outcomes.

The Secretariat provides a repository for shared knowledge, presumably through administrative processes to develop and capture policy, best practice and knowledge accrued through operation of the Deed that achieve better biosecurity outcomes.

It also has a role in the reconciliation and collection of costs and payments associated with response activities.

The proposed operating model for the Secretariat in Attachment 2 was developed by the IGB for consideration by potential Deed Signatories. Operating rules will be drafted when the model preferred has been agreed. The proposed model has taken into account comments on the draft Deed and their handling by the Joint Working Group.

## **Summary**

### All agree

- Independent
- Capacity and capability set by DGG against work plan, agreed budget
- Manager appoints and manages staff
- Facilitating – policy and processes to implement the Deed for DGG
- Handbook and website
- Administration as directed by the Deed, DGG, Deed processes
- Organise the Biosecurity forum

### All disagree

- 11m: Other services in an OA
  - No other services relevant to OAs – pick all up in 11l
- 11p: Establish and maintain processes to ensure consistency and efficiency in OA development
  - A register of OAs
  - Repository of processes and guidance to facilitate consistency – not doing, not developing processes
- 11q: Develop communications material for Signatory member engagement
  - Limit to developing generic communications material about how GIA functions that is common to all signatories and potential signatories
  - Secretariat focus should be neutral

### Agree with modification

- Secretariat as a neutral facilitator under the authority of the DGG – no authority to command Signatory action
- No role in OA and Deed delivery
- DGG agrees work plan, budget, key result areas, scope of information exchange, knowledge capture
- DGG and MPI agree resourcing available to the Secretariat
- Frequency of review of performance, staff performance, capacity and capability, reporting
- Any role in monitoring GIA and accountability to be determined when developing these processes

## **Attachments**

Attachment 1 Consolidated comments on the proposed operating model of the GIA Secretariat.

Attachment 2 Proposed GIA Secretariat Operating Model.

## Consolidated comments on the proposed operating model of the GIA Secretariat

	Principles	Organisation name	Agree/ disagree	Alternative proposal	Submitter's explanation and/or comment
1	Independent entity	B+LNZ, NZPork, MPI, DairyNZ, DINZ	Agree		<u>Note MPI</u> : If the reporting is to the DGG, where does indemnity sit?
		MIA			This is a matter for negotiation between the Crown and industry. Mia already operates some models in which it provides secretariat functions on behalf of government agencies (MPI, MBIE, etc) and industry, so independence is not necessarily something that would add value to the functioning of the GIA. Indeed, it would be considered that there are strengths in having management/secretarial functions lie with industry-good associations. That said, we look forwards to clarification of the role of MPI and the GIA Secretariat.
2	Facilitates/drives implementation of the partnership	Deed			
3	Acts for all Signatories	Deed			
4	Role and function review by 30 June 2017	Deed FF		Its role and function will be reviewed by the Deed Governance Group (DGG) by 30 June 2017 "or earlier if needed"	Consistent with the Deed Keep open the option of reviewing earlier if there are changes in policy etc.
5	Accountable to the DGG	Deed			
		FF		Delete DGG	With reference to point 4.
6	Funded by MPI to	Deed			

	Principles	Organisation name	Agree/ disagree	Alternative proposal	Submitter's explanation and/or comment
	31 December 2019				
7	Annual performance assessment by DGG	B+LNZ, MPI, DairyNZ	Agree		<p><u>Note MPI:</u> Need to ensure performance assessment fits with the State Services Commission's (SSC) guidelines on governance and management - particularly as the Secretariat is funded by the Crown. This may require an independent assessment.</p> <p><u>Note DairyNZ:</u> As the role of the secretariat is also to provide some services to non-signatories the DGG should take into account a broad range of views in assessing the secretariat performance against delivery to those outcomes as well.</p>
		MIA	Premature		Seems common sense, but it does seem to be "jumping the gun" somewhat to be considering the technicalities of when the Secretariat is assessed by the DGG before industry has entered into negotiations with the Crown.
		NZPork	Unsure		More clarity required as to nature and extent of proposal if conducted annually.
		DINZ	Disagree	Formal assessment to be biennially by DGG	Formal assessment is resource intensive; anticipated activity of the secretariat does not justify DDG expending this resource annually at expense of dealing with substantive issues; however, <i>personal</i> annual performance appraisal of any Secretariat Manager should nevertheless be done by DDG or a committee thereof
8	Capacity and capability appropriate	B+LNZ, MPI, DairyNZ, DINZ	Agree	<u>Note DINZ:</u> ...Define frequency of review in interests of certainty for DGG members who need to resource their own	<u>Note MPI:</u> There is a need to consider the resource and funding implications of this. With MPI funding the Secretariat until 2019, MPI may need to reprioritise funding from elsewhere to ensure the Secretariat has the appropriate capacity and capability to fulfil its function. A

	Principles	Organisation name	Agree/ disagree	Alternative proposal	Submitter's explanation and/or comment
	Review by DGG			membership and therefore be able to predict time commitments	clear work program from DGG will assist in identifying funding and resource needs within and outside the Secretariat. <u>Note NZPork</u> : But unsure how this sits with Deed clause 4.2.4 – which gives MPI authority to determine appropriate level of resource for the role? <u>Note DINZ</u> : Periodic review should take place not more than every 2 years and not less than every 5 years
		MIA			Should be determined by industry and Crown in negotiations.
9	The Manager appoints and monitors staff	B+LNZ, NZPork, MIA, MPI, DairyNZ, DINZ	Agree		<u>Note MIA</u> : It would be odd for a manager not to appoint and monitor performance of staff, but this is a matter that should probably be considered when industry and the Crown negotiate. <u>Note MPI</u> : This is subject to MPI's HR recruitment and performance processes.
10a-f	Responsibilities	DairyNZ, B+LNZ			<u>Note DairyNZ</u> : Any extension of the Secretariat's functions beyond those outlined in the deed should require a specific approval process to manage potential for scope creep. <u>Note B+LNZ</u> : Agree but with proviso that extension of responsibilities beyond those stipulated should require clear authorisation from DGG to prevent scope creep
11a	Annual work plan and budget	NZPork, MPI, DairyNZ	Agree		<u>Note NZPork</u> : Perhaps particularly in the short term the functions of the Secretariat should take account of feedback from GIA fora and other consultation to ensure perspective of potential signatories is also reflected. For example, our discussions with other industries on Discussion Paper 1/2013 <i>Implementing the Deed</i> –

	Principles	Organisation name	Agree/ disagree	Alternative proposal	Submitter's explanation and/or comment
					<p><i>Issues Arising</i> indicate concern that the Secretariat's function should not involve specifics of OAs which should appropriately be negotiated between industry and MPI.</p> <p><u>Note MPI</u>: MPI must approve budget for the work plan given financial implications. The operating model should therefore clarify how the annual work plan of the Secretariat will be prioritised, as there are a lot of activities that are non-discretionary (i.e. required by the Deed).</p>
		B+LNZ	Agree but	Change of language to remove impression of DGG as 'rubber stamp'.	
		DINZ		<p>...prefer that "The Sec will prepare-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. a draft annual work plan in light of any direction given by the DGG; and</li> <li>. a budget for DGG approval"</li> </ul>	<p>Annual work plan should mainly be to carry out what the DGG wants focus on (cf clause 4.1.3(b) of Deed), so written this way encourages the DGG to clarify its objectives for the year and communicate them to the Secretariat.</p> <p>Also, prefer language of 'draft annual work plan' and 'for DGG approval' rather than 'annual work plan' and 'endorsement' to properly reflect that the DGG is not just a rubber-stamping group (cf clause 4.1.5(a) of Deed).</p>
11b	Define key result areas	NZPork, MPI, DairyNZ	Agree		<u>Note MPI</u> : requires more definition of core functions
		B+LNZ	Agree but	Key result areas must be agreed by DGG	
		DINZ	Disagree	"Propose key result areas by which the Secretariat's delivery of the annual work	Cl. 4.1.5(b) gives DGG job of monitoring Secretariat's delivery of work plan; Secretariat should not be setting its own KPIs, rather this is decision of DGG.

	Principles	Organisation name	Agree/ disagree	Alternative proposal	Submitter's explanation and/or comment
				plan may be monitored, for the DGG's approval"	
11c	Regular progress reports	B+LNZ, NZPork, MPI, DairyNZ	Agree		<u>Note MPI:</u> The operating model needs to specify how often and when the Secretariat is required to update the DGG of work progress. This involves identifying communication channels and feedback loops to ensure transparency of work progress and delivery.
		FF		Replace "Regular" with "monthly"	To specify when reports are due
		DINZ	Agree but	...define frequency of regular progress reporting for tighter resource forecasting by DGG members of their own input and that of Secretariat	Suggest that progress reporting be done no less frequently than annually and no more frequently than quarterly (at DGG's election)
11d	Policy and processes developed	B+LNZ, NZPork, MPI, DairyNZ, DINZ	Agree		<u>Note MPI:</u> Requires more definition of role. Is this related to the Deed only vs all policy and processes related to GIA? Any policies developed need to be consistent with Cabinet decisions. <u>Note DairyNZ:</u> Note however that in GIA early days, important policies and processes should take a broader consultation process (i.e. With prospective signatories as well).
11e	Policies and processes in Handbook and web site	B+LNZ, NZPork, MPI, DairyNZ, DINZ	Agree		<u>Note MPI:</u> Requires more definition of policy and processes to be hosted on website/ handbook – any privacy matters will also need to be considered.
11f	Advice to the DGG	Deed			



	Principles	Organisation name	Agree/ disagree	Alternative proposal	Submitter's explanation and/or comment
11g	Performance review processes	B+LNZ, NZPork, MPI, DairyNZ, DINZ	Agree		<u>Note NZPork</u> : Within context of our comment on 7. Above <u>Note MPI</u> : More clarity is required on whether this associates to the Deed or all GIA performance activities. All such performance and review processes will need to align with SSC guidelines.
11h	Administration processes	B+LNZ, NZPork, MPI, DairyNZ, DINZ	Agree		<u>Note MPI</u> : requires more definition – Deed or all GIA administration activities
11i	Coordinate collation of cost information	Deed			
11j	Facilitate calculation of response activity cost etc.	Deed			
11k	Organise the Biosecurity Forum	B+LNZ, NZPork, MPI, DairyNZ, DINZ	Agree		
		FF		Replace “organise” with “oversee”	A big ask to actually organise
11l	Services to enable negotiation of an Operational Agreement	NZPork, DairyNZ	Agree		<u>Note NZPork</u> : Agree, but doesn't necessarily align with Deed clause 4.2.4; either in terms of resource; or decision of MPI to determine role of Secretariat.
		MPI		Propose this is on an as required basis, when the negotiating parties consult with Secretariat for advice should difficulties arise. However, formal facilitation services outsourced to	The Deed refers to facilitating role. This needs to be clearly defined and understood. A broad interpretation may have financial implications on MPI to resource the Secretariat until 31 December 2019. An OA centres on a commercial negotiation between MPI and GIA Signatory(s). Post the two pilot trial operational agreements, negotiations for OAs will occur

	Principles	Organisation name	Agree/ disagree	Alternative proposal	Submitter's explanation and/or comment
				specific facilitation service providers rather than have the capacity within the Secretariat.	at ongoing intervals for industry-specific pieces of readiness and response activity. OAs will therefore become part of BAU operations and any third party involvement (e.g. GIA Secretariat) should only be sought if neutral advice is deemed necessary between the negotiating parties.
		B+LNZ	Agree but	This excludes any implementation or maintenance of operational plans <del>unless requested by a Signatory and agreed in the Secretariat work plan by the DGG</del>	A valuable role of the Secretariat will be to assist with negotiating OAs. However, Implementation of operational plans substantially expands the scope of the Secretariat and should be explicitly excluded.
		DINZ		Change exclusion to "This excludes any maintenance of operational plans unless ..."	Proposed exception suggests that DGG can agree that the Secretariat may have a role in implementation of operational plans; implementation is only for the signatories, never the Secretariat.
11m	Other services in an OA	DairyNZ	Agree		However also see role for secretariat in engaging with potential signatories/non-parties in facilitating operational agreements (this is probably an unintended exclusion from the deed as JWG did not have a view on whether secretariat could only facilitate OA's for those parties who had signed the deed).
		B+LNZ	Agree but	Provide other services that assist the development <del>and delivery</del> of Operational Agreements by agreement between the Secretariat and the parties	Secretariat must have no role in delivery
		NZPork	Disagree		11l is appropriate, but not 11m. This clause is too vague

	Principles	Organisation name	Agree/ disagree	Alternative proposal	Submitter's explanation and/or comment
					– what would it incorporate? Also inappropriate to have at discretion of Secretariat and parties.
		MPI		Propose this is on an as required basis, when required by the parties. OA parties may consult with Secretariat for advice should difficulties arise. However, formal facilitation services outsourced to specific facilitation service providers rather than have the capacity within the Secretariat.	The Deed refers to a facilitating role. This needs to be clearly defined and understood as a broad interpretation may have financial implications on MPI to resource the Secretariat until 31 December 2019. Because an OA contract between MPI and GIA industry partners will become part of BAU, it is not deemed necessary for the Secretariat to have an operational involvement.
		DINZ		Change to “Provide other services that assist the development of Operational Agreements”.	1. “other services <i>to assist delivery</i> of O.A.s” is too vague” to be sure not to contravene principle that the Secretariat is not a delivery agent. 2. Parties need not agree that Secretariat may provide other services to assist <i>development</i> of OAs (vagueness as to what ‘other services’ can encompass doesn’t really matter where facilitation is the service): as long as the service is in the DGG approved work plan and budget, this is bread and butter stuff for Secretariat
11n	Work with Signatories to deliver OA outcomes	DairyNZ	Agree		
		B+LNZ	Agree but	Reword to remove ‘ensure’	Remove implication that DGG / Secretariat has authority to command action by signatories.
		NZPork	Disagree		Stick to Deed clause 4.2.2b. Secretariat can’t ‘ensure’ delivery.

	Principles	Organisation name	Agree/ disagree	Alternative proposal	Submitter's explanation and/or comment
		MPI		Propose this is on an as required basis, when required by the parties.	As above.
		DINZ		Paraphrase wording of deed itself (cl. 4.2.2b): "To support delivery of agreed outcomes between Operational Agreement Signatories, facilitate ongoing engagement between them on readiness and response activities."	Proposed wording, with emphasis on ensuring delivery, purports to give DGG greater powers than it has/should have
11o	Knowledge capture for continuous improvement	B+LNZ, NZPork, DairyNZ, DINZ	Agree		
		MPI	Disagree	Secretariat act as repository as required.	Needs to clearly define what this means in practice as could easily become a sizeable operational role with financial implications, if broadly interpreted.
11p	Establish and maintain processes to ensure consistency and efficiency in OA development	B+LNZ	Disagree	Maintain a register of OAs, the OA template and guidance to facilitate efficiency and consistency of process and negotiated Agreements	A register and template may be useful but neither the consistency of process nor content of negotiated agreements is appropriately the concern of the Secretariat.
		MPI		Consult as required by the Deed Signatories. Secretariat act as repository of processes for in inaugural OA development.	Process for OA development is a role for MPI and GIA industry partners. The Deed refers to a facilitating role. This needs to be clearly defined and understood as a broad interpretation may have financial implications on MPI to resource the Secretariat until 31 December 2019.

	Principles	Organisation name	Agree/ disagree	Alternative proposal	Submitter's explanation and/or comment
					Because an OA contract between MPI and GIA industry partners will become part of BAU, it is not deemed necessary for the Secretariat to have an operational involvement.
		DairyNZ		Delete "and negotiated agreements"	Operational Agreements are a matter between the parties; the GIA secretariat role to facilitate consistency of negotiated agreements is not therefore appropriate. For consistency also with 11I which says the secretariat has no role in implementation or maintenance of operational plans and therefore would be not be well placed to determine whether these agreements are being operated in a consistent manner. Further note that each OA negotiation is going to be unique to the parties so this provision should not raise expectations that one-size-will-fit-all.
		DINZ		Remove "and negotiated Agreements" from end of suggested principle	Agree that register is useful for facilitating consistent processes but disagree that there should be any presumption of consistency of <i>content</i> in OAs to strive for
		NZPork	Disagree strongly		Value of GIA is in industries and MPI negotiating tailored agreements for biosecurity improvement. An OA template is inappropriate, though consistency around process matters would be of assistance plus a register of OAs.
11q	Develop communications material for Signatory member engagement	B+LNZ	Disagree	Rework to reference only material about how GIA functions.	High risk that Secretariat adopts advocacy role in promoting GIA when focus should be neutral. Also risk that involvement of GIA Secretariat acts to reduce transparency about provenance and drivers for GIA. Consultation with producers about GIA is a key function of industry good organisations rather than the Secretariat.

	Principles	Organisation name	Agree/ disagree	Alternative proposal	Submitter's explanation and/or comment
		NZPork			Industry communications will be industry specific – not a role for the Secretariat although generic explanation for industries to draw on is helpful.
		MPI		On an 'as required' basis by the Deed Signatories.	Needs to be clearly defined what this means in practice. A broad interpretation of such a role may have financial implications on MPI to resource the Secretariat until 31 December 2019. How will this comms differ from MPI's comms support?
		DairyNZ		Redraft to be about developing generic communications material.	We see it as the role of each organisation to lead communication to its stakeholders and their engagement. The way proposed, this could become a significant drag on Secretariat resources – the ability to communicate to levy payers is a key function of a levy funded organisation and this should not be outsourced to the Secretariat. However we would support the GIA secretariat role in developing communications material that would be common to all signatories/potential signatories.
		DINZ		"Develop communications material on role of GIA in the New Zealand biosecurity framework to assist potential deed signatories in their appraisal of the GIA value proposition".	Principal responsibility for comms with members rests with potential signatory; risk is that secretariat takes on sales role when it should be neutral. Acceptable for secretariat to produce generic material on how GIA works for use by all potential signatories that a specific one can adopt verbatim or adapt as necessary to fit its sector
11r	Enable information exchange	B+LNZ, NZPork, DairyNZ, DINZ	Agree		
		MPI	Disagree		Needs to clearly define what this means in practice so a broad interpretation doesn't result in financial implications

	Principles	Organisation name	Agree/ disagree	Alternative proposal	Submitter's explanation and/or comment
					to resource the Secretariat until 31 December 2019. Sensitive/confidential issues relating to a particular signatory's interests will need to be considered from a 'legal privacy' perspective, before releasing information, so industries are adequately protected
11s	Participation in accountability processes agreed by Signatories	NZPork, DINZ	Agree		
		B+LNZ	Agree but	Include wording to be specific that this applies only to processes explicitly agreed to by all signatories that are then to be subject to the processes, i.e. defined as part of operational agreements	
		MPI	Disagree	On an 'as required' basis by the Deed Signatories.	Need to more clearly define what this means. Meeting respective minimum commitments for example on engagement across the Biosecurity system is a responsibility for each Deed Signatory.
		DairyNZ		Delete or reword to make it about overseeing implementation of the commitments in the Deed – i.e. the commitment that signatories "Hold themselves accountable to their GIA partners for their performance in managing the biosecurity risks that are their responsibility. This means that the Signatories	As proposed, this function only applies if signatories agree further accountability processes. We hold the view that the deed already establishes a level of accountability. It is unclear through what process any further accountability mechanisms might be developed and until such time as that issue is resolved we can't agree what the secretariat function should or should not be on this issue.

	Principles	Organisation name	Agree/ disagree	Alternative proposal	Submitter's explanation and/or comment
				are answerable to each other and have an expectation of account giving. It does not confer instructional authority on the Signatories to whom account is being given".	

General comments		
Issue	Organisation	Submitter's explanation and/or comments
Simplify the operating model Additional function for the Secretariat to advise DGG on the performance of the GIA	KVH	Proposed operating model is too detailed and needs to be simplified into a single terms of reference document noting that roles 1, 3 and 4 are not roles; an additional function should be to provide advice to the DGG on the performance of the GIA as a whole.
Clarity of role of the Secretariat	Dairy NZ/DCANZ	The role of the Secretariat compared to that of MPI needs to be clearly differentiated.
Engaging with non-signatories	FF	To what extent will the Secretariat need to take a specific role in engagement with non-signatories either to get them to sign up to GIA or in the case of non-signatory beneficiary being named/claimed in the negotiation of OA. For example, if, as the bees organisation, small seed industry as a non-signatory beneficiary, would/should it be the Secretariat's responsibility to facilitate discussion between the relevant signatories and the identified non-signatory beneficiary?
Too soon to detail operating rules	MIA	Before very detailed (and potentially inexhaustible) list of rules and tasks of the Secretariat be undertaken, it is important to focus on how MPI will begin negotiation with industry on GIAs. We are concerned that the "cart is getting ahead of the horse", and that rules and processes are being designed and approved before our industry has begun negotiations on a Deed (or indeed, developed a value proposition for our members)



Technical roles of the Secretariat	MIA	There are a number of requirements for reporting and coordination by the Secretariat that are proposed. These all, on the face of it, seem eminently practical. However, the substance needs to be decided in negotiations between MPI and industry groups. Some of the proposed rules, such as “Services to enable negotiation of an OA” seem very sweeping, and are properly a matter for determining in negotiations between industry and MPI - the Secretariat getting itself involved in actual negotiations could place the Secretariat in an impossible position. One of the attractive things about a GIA is that it can be tailored precisely to meet the needs of MPI and industry, so the exact nature of the secretariat will probably vary according to the Deed. It may be, for example, that small industries with a disease limited to that small industry need a Secretariat with fairly full powers because the industry lacks lot of capability – in contrast, a Secretariat for a Deed for FMD will be dealing with fairly large and capable industry groups, so the requirements of the Secretariat will be more to coordinate.
Drafting rules for the Secretariat is premature	DINZ	Producing draft rules for a Secretariat is premature to stakeholders determining the need for, and if so, high level role and purpose, of a Secretariat. Only once these things are agreed is it appropriate for rules to be drafted governing how that purpose is to be effected. Feedback is provided without prejudice to this point.
Limitation of scope of activities of DGG and Secretariat.	DairyNZ	To manage scope creep the Rules/Models might include a section outlining what is out of scope for those bodies – this would offset the otherwise inclusive and potentially inexhaustive list of tasks/roles that are ascribed to these bodies.
Clarity about prioritisation processes	DairyNZ	The Secretariat's potential role as scoped here is large. There remains a lack of clarity in the model about how prioritisation between different projects and processes will take place, particularly around negotiation and implementation of operational agreements. We seek further information on how prioritisation is to be managed as we see scope for conflict between signatories and between signatories and non-signatories in terms of vying for limited Secretariat resources. We also seek information on how GIA DGG prioritisation will be informed by the availability of MPI resources as a signatory to meet those commitments (for example in the development and implementation of operational agreements). We do not see it as the role of the DGG to be determining where limited MPI resources should be targeted and while the

		Deed is clear that the Governance Group does not have authority over resources of signatories/non-signatories, it may indirectly set the agenda for the use of both secretariat and MPI resources in its ability to set the business plan (which will have inherent trade-offs).
--	--	--

**Attachments**

Attachment 1    Proposed GIA Secretariat Operating Model

## **Proposed GIA Secretariat Operating Model**

The operating model of the Secretariat can be summarised in the following principles:

### **Role**

1. The GIA Secretariat is independent of government and the industry organisations it serves.
2. It actively facilitates and, where necessary, drives the implementation of the partnership described in the GIA Deed.
3. It acts in the interests of all Signatories [*Deed ref. 4.2.1*].
4. Its role and function will be reviewed by the DGG by 30 June 2017 [*Deed ref. 4.2.5*].

### **Governance and administration**

5. It is accountable to the Deed Governance Group (DGG) for the effective and efficient performance of its responsibilities [*Deed ref. 4.2.3*].
6. It is funded by MPI until 31 December 2019 [*Deed ref. 4.2.4*].
7. Its performance is formally assessed annually by the DGG.
8. The capacity and capability of the Secretariat is appropriate to deliver its responsibilities and functions and will be reviewed periodically by the DGG to this effect.
9. The Secretariat Manager is responsible for appointing and monitoring the performance of Secretariat staff.

### **Responsibilities**

10. The Secretariat's responsibilities as outlined in the Deed [*Deed ref. 4.2.2*] include, but are presumably not limited to:
  - a. Facilitating the negotiation and drafting of Operational Agreements between Signatories.
  - b. Facilitating ongoing engagement in readiness and response activities between Operational Agreement Signatories, in support of delivering agreed outcomes.
  - c. Supporting and advising the Governance Group in its responsibilities as described in this Deed.
  - d. Developing policies and procedures for approval by the Governance Group.
  - e. Providing a repository for shared information.
  - f. Calculating activity costs and payments for consideration and agreement by the relevant Signatories.

### **Functions**

11. The Secretariat will:
  - a. Prepare an annual work plan and budget for DGG consideration and endorsement
  - b. Identify key result areas for the Secretariat as the basis for monitoring delivery of the work plan

- c. Provide the DGG with regular progress reports on delivery of the work plan and expenditure updates against agreed budget [*Deed ref. 4.2.2d*]
- d. Develop policies and processes that facilitate effective implementation of the Deed, for DGG approval
- e. Ensure that policies and processes are available to all Signatories, generally in the Handbook and via the GIA website
- f. Provide advice to the DGG on its responsibilities and support its operation [*Deed ref. 4.2.2c*]
- g. Participate in annual performance and review processes instituted by the DGG
- h. Administer Deed processes including the arrangements for organisations to sign the Deed, contact lists, withdrawal notifications [*Deed ref. 4.4*] and any other duties described in the DGG Operating Rules or as directed by the DGG
- i. Facilitate the collation of information on costs incurred in a biosecurity response, as agreed by the affected Signatories in the response plan budget [*Deed refs. 4.2.2f; 5.2*]
- j. Coordinate the calculation of the total cost of the activity and any amounts due from one Signatory to another for consideration and agreement by the Signatories
- k. Organise the biannual Biosecurity Forum on behalf of the DGG, including coordinating the agenda, speakers, discussion/issues papers, reports and actions arising from each Forum
- l. Coordinate and/or provide facilitation services to enable the negotiation of an Operational Agreement, at the request of the parties [*Deed ref. 4.2.2a*]. This excludes any implementation or maintenance of operational plans unless requested by a Signatory and agreed in the Secretariat work plan by the DGG
- m. Provide other services that assist the development and delivery of Operational Agreements by agreement between the Secretariat and the parties
- n. Work with OA Signatories to ensure that the readiness and response outcomes agreed in respective OAs are delivered [*Deed ref. 4.2.2b*]
- o. Capture, record and curate readiness and response experience gained through implementation of the Deed - for future reference and as the basis for continuous improvement of the Deed processes [*Deed ref. 4.2.2e*]
- p. Maintain a register of OAs, the OA template and guidance to facilitate efficiency and consistency of process and negotiated Agreements
- q. Develop communications material in consultation with potential Deed Signatories, to assist their engagement with members on signing and implementing the Deed to achieve better biosecurity outcomes
- r. Enable communications between Signatories for information exchange on matters relevant to achieving better biosecurity through the GIA
- s. Support any accountability processes that may be agreed by Deed Signatories. [*Deed ref. 3.1.1e*]