

## DISCUSSION PAPER: OUT-OF-SESSION 1/2013

### Implementing the Deed – Issues Arising

#### Recommendation

The participants of the GIA Biosecurity Forum and the wider industry group, as potential Deed Signatories, are asked to review the issues arising from the September 2013 Forum and provide comment on the actions that are proposed by the IGB to address them.

Specifically, please:

1. Confirm that the issues raised and discussed at the Forum have been captured in the following tables;
2. Agree to the processes that are proposed to address these issues.

A summary of discussion is in the Feedback report, together with other Forum materials in the news section of the GIA website at [www.gia.org.nz/news](http://www.gia.org.nz/news). The Feedback includes the questions and answers raised on the day.

Comments should be forwarded by email to the GIA Secretariat on [secretariat@gia.org.nz](mailto:secretariat@gia.org.nz) by 17 January 2014. They will be compiled and a report will be provided to participants at the second Biosecurity Forum in February/March 2014.

#### Introduction

The first GIA Biosecurity Forum was convened in Wellington on 5 September 2013. It was open to all potential Deed Signatories.

A concurrent session allowed communications experts from industry and the GIA Secretariat to consider communications needs related to the GIA Deed.

Around 40 participants raised a number of issues in response to presentations and the discussions that followed. These have been consolidated into six work themes.

Outcomes, actions, proposed processes and responsibilities for resolving these issues are proposed for each theme.

## Issues and proposed actions

The following issues have been consolidated from the Forum discussion by the Secretariat.

<b>Theme 1: Establishing and managing financial obligations</b>		
<b>Outcome</b>	Policies and processes for establishing and managing Deed financial obligations [ <i>Deed ref. section 5</i> ], including cost shares and cost recovery, are endorsed by potential Deed Signatories for use in developing OAs, and published in the GIA Handbook.	
<b>Proposed actions</b>	<b>Process</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Process for determining beneficiaries and their shares</li> <li>. Aligning cost-share categories with public vs private benefit</li> <li>. Public vs private benefit; impact analysis</li> <li>. Assigning cost-shares to multiple industries</li> <li>. Fiscal caps – policy, application, amendment</li> <li>. Link with legal processes for cost recovery from non-Signatories</li> <li>. Develop agreed policy Rights and obligations of Signatories exiting a cost-shared response</li> <li>. Establish agreed policy for cost-recovery from Deed Signatories</li> <li>. Cost-recovery model and processes</li> </ul>	<p>Various.</p> <p>This stream of work would benefit from the formation of a joint working group coordinated by the Secretariat under the authority of the IGB.</p> <p>Some elements will draw on previous work undertaken by MAF and industry, and others will require pre-thinking by both government and industry.</p>	<p>Joint policy and systems development – cost-sharing. All signatories coordinated by the Secretariat.</p> <p>MPI – cost recovery policy and processes.</p>

<b>Theme 2: Developing and applying a Signatory accountability framework</b>		
<b>Outcome</b>	Policies and processes for defining the minimum commitments in the Deed [ <i>Deed ref. section 3</i> ] are established and agreed by potential Deed signatories and the processes for 'holding to account' [ <i>Deed ref. s3.1.1e</i> ] and reporting performance outcomes of the Signatories are agreed and published in the GIA Handbook.	
<b>Proposed actions</b>	<b>Process</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Defining minimum commitments; agreeing 'appropriate'; timely fulfilment of commitments</li> <li>. Accountability of parties on minimum commitments</li> <li>. Identify the mechanism for 'holding to account'</li> </ul>	Options developed jointly with coordination by the Secretariat under the authority of the IGB.	All signatories coordinated by the Secretariat.

<b>Theme 3: GIA response model</b>		
<b>Outcome</b>	The national biosecurity response model integrates industry as joint-decision-makers consistent with the intent and provisions of the Deed and is published in the GIA Handbook. Associated training material is available on the GIA website. This model represents the default response arrangements that may be varied in an OA by agreement of parties to that Agreement.	
<b>Proposed actions</b>	<b>Process</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Operating rules of OA and where there is no OA</li> <li>. The role of the Chief Technical Officer and the response decision-makers</li> <li>. GIA response model</li> </ul>	<p>The processes and systems for a response under the Deed are under development by MPI. The initial priority is to adapt existing response processes to integrate industry partnership and develop training material for industry representatives who will participate in response decision-making.</p> <p>More generic elements of response including operating rules will be included in the Operational Agreements Template that is under development.</p>	The IGB, on behalf of potential Deed Signatories, should be satisfied that the response provisions of the Deed can be implemented.

<b>Theme 4: Communications to assist implementation of the Deed</b>		
<b>Outcome</b>	Potential Deed Signatories are supported in their member consultation activities relevant to securing mandate, by the GIA communications framework and relevant material/collateral.	
<b>Proposed actions</b>	<b>Process</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<i>Communications framework/systems</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. GIA website</li> <li>. Communications workshop</li> </ul>	The GIA Secretariat's senior Communications officer will work with industry and MPI collaborators to develop systems and content to meet the needs of potential signatories.	GIA Secretariat.
<i>Content</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Communications messaging and collateral – positioning GIA as a legitimate and necessary part of risk management</li> <li>. Collating examples as case studies to demonstrate the value of the GIA</li> <li>. Explicit statement on the commencement of response cost-sharing in 2016</li> <li>. Explicit statement on Deed obligations re OAs</li> <li>. Provide guidance on financial implications of signing</li> <li>. Guidance on mandate – to sign the Deed, to sign an OA</li> <li>. Establishing a representative body for the GIA</li> <li>. Cabinet process and time table</li> </ul>		

**Theme 5: Strategic engagement on international and import standards**

<b>Outcome</b>	New Zealand's biosecurity system underpins biosecure trade.	
<b>Proposed actions</b>	<b>Process</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Develop processes for more strategic input into international standards that reflects New Zealand's biosecurity status and priority outcomes.</li> <li>. Review, and as necessary revise, IHS processes to ensure consistency with the Deed.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Forward the issues identified at the forum to the strategy area of the MPI Standards group.</li> <li>2. Request advice on processes and timelines for engaging with Deed Signatories on the development and application of international standards and import health standards.</li> </ol> <p>Note: there may be existing mechanisms for progressing this work.</p>	MPI.

**Theme 6: Delivering Deed outcomes**

<b>Outcome</b>	The biosecurity roles and functions are defined for organisations with a strong interest in biosecurity that do not meet the legal requirements for signing the Deed.	
<b>Proposed actions</b>	<b>Process</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Clarify the role of Federated Farmers, Horticulture NZ, Regional Councils, R&amp;D providers etc. in the GIA</li> <li>. Develop and endorse guidelines for allocating Secretariat resources</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The IGB will consider potential role of organisations that have a key role in the wider biosecurity system but are unlikely to meet mandate requirements.</li> <li>2. A proposal will be provided to potential signatories at a Biosecurity Forum.</li> <li>3. The Deed Governance Group will formally endorse any interim arrangements after it is established.</li> </ol>	IGB.