

Report on the GIA Biosecurity Forum 2014/I

Information paper March 2014

The GIA Biosecurity Forum was held on 5 March 2014 in Wellington. Seventy-eight representatives from industry and government attended (see [Attachment 1](#)).

This report highlights key points of discussion at the Forum, including the consensus reached on the recommendations in the pre-circulated papers (see [Attachment 2](#) for the list of papers). It also notes where follow up actions are required. It is not intended to be a minute of the meeting.

The presentations made on the day are listed in [Attachment 3](#) and are available to view on the [GIA website](#).

Presentations and sessions

Welcome from the Director General, MPI

Martyn Dunne, the new Director General of the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) welcomed delegates to the Forum. He wants MPI and industry to work together effectively, and he sees GIA as the mechanism to achieve that. He stated “In my experience, whether it be in leadership or operational area, it relies on two people to create an outcome. And working together effectively in this scenario, within the GIA Deed ... it is absolutely empirical, and it is absolutely vital that we share. That we share information, intelligence, that we share the work that we are doing and the responses to any incursions that might come our way.”

Mr Dunne emphasised that the vigilance that is required for our biosecurity can not be handled by MPI alone. He said to delegates: “We need the assistance and support of all you.”

Feedback on GIA discussion papers

Three papers summarising feedback on GIA discussion papers were circulated to delegates in advance of the Forum. Lois Ransom, GIA Secretariat Manager, presented a summary of the feedback then invited further comments and discussions on the next steps.

Issues arising

Lois noted that feedback on the issues arising from the 2013 Forum raised some fundamental concerns about what guidance is needed and what it should look like, the need for the Secretariat, and the role of the DGG.

Industry delegates indicated that they do see a need for guidance to provide for consistency, but that it needs to allow for flexibility to cater for the needs of individual industries. MPI

delegates noted that guidance was important to provide a common understanding and allow for simple and transparent processes. They supported the call for guidance that provided a framework but allowed for a flexible approach. It was noted that too much diversity in approach from industry organisations would be difficult for MPI to manage. Ms Ransom acknowledged that there was a balancing act, and that any guidance should seek to find an appropriate balance between enabling consistency and allowing flexibility.

Both industry and MPI delegates supported the need for a Secretariat, noting it had a role as a mediator when required between MPI and industry, and also a role in communicating to industry organisations. Delegates also supported the DGG, suggesting its role should be to preserve the integrity of the Deed, but not get into detailed negotiations around OAs.

DGG operating model

Delegates generally agreed with the Secretariat's analysis of feedback. It was noted that:

- If there is an independent chair, there should be provision for a vice chair. It could be difficult to find an independent chair (if called for) if no provisions were made for remuneration
- Voting systems needed to allow for equity between members
- Non-signatory participation in the Forum was acceptable, but the proposal to allow associate members to observe or be represented on the DGG was not resolved and needs more consideration

The operating model will be revised and additional detail added before it is reissued as a consultation paper and subsequently provided to IGB for approval.

Secretariat operating model

Delegates generally agreed with the Secretariat's analysis of feedback. The operating model will be revised as a terms of reference and reissued as a consultation paper, before going to IGB for approval.

Operational agreements

MPI is piloting processes for negotiating Operational Agreements (OAs) with the equine industry and industries affected by fruit fly. Barry O'Neil (KVH) and Trish Pearce (NZ Equine Health Association) presented on their experiences to date, and why they have decided to go down the path of negotiating OAs. Both commented that their organisations had a clear intention to sign the Deed, and this was not dependent on agreeing a final OA.

Both KVH and the NZ Equine Health Association want to be more proactive in biosecurity activities. Both talked about OAs as providing them with more certainty of response – both in terms of whether there will be a response and what it will look like. Ms Pearce noted that resourcing is always a concern and that the framework of an OA can provide more options, through identifying where industry can provide resources.

The role of industries that could be affected by an OA but that were not involved in its development was questioned. Delegates involved in the fruit fly OA responded that they are establishing an interim council to develop the OA and ensure that the interests of industries that may be affected by fruit fly are taken into account. In agreeing to keep the council to a

manageable size, the number of organisations who could take part must be limited, but this can be balanced by communicating openly with industries that were not directly represented on the Council.

Financial arrangements

Adam Benseman, GIA Secretariat, introduced the proposal to convene a joint working group to develop guidance for establishing cost-shares and fiscal caps. Initial reaction from industry on the need for guidance was mixed, with some supporting and others challenging the need for guidance. MPI representatives supported the need for guidance, noting it would feed into the negotiations for OAs.

When questioned about why it is proposed that the Secretariat facilitate the joint working group for financial arrangements but not for the response model, Ms Ransom (GIA Secretariat Manager) replied that facilitating the financial guidance fits with the Secretariat's role to facilitate the GIA partnership. As the response model relates to current MPI processes, it is more appropriate for MPI to lead that process.

The general consensus of the delegates was to support the proposal for a joint working group. There was also agreement that the guidance needed provide a framework to enable consistency, but that it also needed to allow an appropriate level of flexibility in application.

Potential signatories were asked to provide nominations for the group to the Secretariat by 10 March, and comments on the draft principles and terms of reference by 19 March.

How the Australians work under partnership arrangements

Representatives from Animal Health Australia and Plant Health Australia, Eva-Maria Bernoth and Rod Turner respectively, introduced how government-industry biosecurity partnerships work in Australia, and the lessons they have learnt along the way.

Key messages for New Zealand included:

- The animal and plant sectors have different experiences of response – with plant responses being more frequent and longer lasting
- Deed arrangements can provide certainty about what will be done, who will do it, and who pays – this improves the effectiveness of responses
- Response processes need to be consistent across all industries, as government is a common party to all responses
- Industry knows industry best, government knows government best. Respecting that leads to better outcomes
- Training is critical, people must know what they need to do
- Avoid being too detailed in response planning, as this can slow responses when organisms behave in an unexpected manner
- Control of documentation is important – sloppy wording can lead to expensive legal advice, having a professional maintenance team (be it the Secretariat or something else) is important

GIA response model

Amelia Pascoe, Business Analyst at MPI, introduced the proposal for MPI to lead the development of a GIA Response Guide by a joint working group. Signatories are entitled to partake in joint-decision making for any new responses that start after they have signed. The purpose of the Guide is to outline how industry and government would make joint decisions in response. This would occur within the existing response system.

Industry representatives questioned if this would duplicate material that should be in an OA. The Secretariat, AHA and PHA representatives advised that it is desirable to have one response system to provide an overall, generic framework for managing responses. MPI representatives noted that the guidance is needed for signatories who do not negotiate OAs.

Delegates agreed with the proposal for a joint working group, they also agreed with the requirements outlined for the guide and the terms of reference for the group.

The proposed process was agreed with the inclusion of a step that enabled IGB to approve the guide before it is published.

Delegates were asked to provide their nominations for the JWG to the Secretariat by 10 March, and additional feedback on the paper by 19 March.

MPI and GIA

Andrew Coleman, Deputy Director General of Compliance and Response at MPI, took the opportunity to share with delegates his thoughts on how things had moved on with GIA over the last year. Then we had no Deed, and the legislation did not mention GIA. Now we have a Deed approved by Cabinet – this is an important, tangible document to enable industry and government to work together on biosecurity. Mr Coleman restated MPI remains committed to GIA. He acknowledged that we all have questions that need to be worked through – particularly about resources and priorities. He sees GIA, not about ‘us’ and ‘them’ but about ‘we’ – government and industry together – and it is we who will make GIA work.

Mr Coleman acknowledged that culture change is needed both within MPI, at all levels, and industry to make GIA work. In response to a direct question about resources, he said it was time to think about resources beyond the individual organisations. For example, MPI can draw on expertise from over 15 government agencies to help develop its response arrangements, and the Biosecurity Capability Network enables access to thousands of individuals.

Minimum commitments

The commitments in the Deed are the means for delivering Deed outcomes. Delegates were asked to consider their organisations’ activities and how these could contribute to meeting the Deed outcomes.

An administrative oversight resulted in the wrong section of the Deed being given to delegates to discuss (3.1 instead of 3.2). Nonetheless, the resulting discussion revealed that there is a wide range of relevant activities already being undertaken by industry organisations. These include:

- Maintaining and making use of communications networks and databases for contacting growers/farmers, researchers and service providers
- Identification and assessment of biosecurity risks, research programmes
- Programmes aimed at risk management including, awareness and education programmes
- Developing pest management strategies, preparedness programmes, best practice guides
- Responding to Import Health Standard consultations.

Mandate and eligibility

Loretta Mamea, Policy Analyst at MPI, provided a brief overview of the process and requirements for signing up to the Deed. Delegates raised their questions and concerns on establishing their eligibility and securing mandate to sign the Deed with a panel made up of representatives from organisations that are working through signing up, and MPI. The panel members were Trish Pearce, NZ Equine Association; Frances Clement, NZ Pork; Louise Cook, MPI.

A key concern from industry organisations was what was required to show they had mandate from their sectors. Did they need a percentage of votes or agreement from a certain proportion of their membership? A representative from NZ Pork commented they are weighting the feedback from their members using stock numbers. They are seeking mandate in two steps – first to sign the Deed and then to develop any OA for joint readiness work. Using grower support for the Commodity Levy would not be sufficient unless GIA was specifically discussed in the levy proposal, as industry organisations need to specifically discuss GIA with their members. Industry organisations need to be sure that their members understand what is being committed to. Further guidance related to demonstrating mandate would be useful.

The MPI representative on the panel explained that an organisation would probably not be allowed to represent only a subset of their members in GIA, for example, where an industry organisation had members growing multiple crops, but growers of only some of those crops wanted to join. She also reemphasised that signatories must be a body corporate. Industry organisations need conceptual plans to demonstrate how they will meet their financial obligations – for example, that they will use a levy or draw on existing funds. A government loan is available as a last resort, but industry organisations must have a biosecurity levy in place to be able to access this option (even if the Biosecurity levy is set at a rate of zero until an incursion occurs).

Engaging in the wider biosecurity system

The Deed and the revised Biosecurity Act 1993 enable greater engagement by Deed Signatories on the wider biosecurity system to further develop and enhance it (clauses 3.1 of the Deed). Delegates were asked to identify the outcomes they are seeking from engagement in the wider biosecurity system, and critical points in the system that they considered would benefit from collaboration to improve biosecurity outcomes.

Delegates highlighted the need to understand the big biosecurity picture, and not just readiness and response. They considered that this would be achieved through:

- Industry understanding the risks across the system (pre-border to post-border) and how they are measured at each point
- Common (industry and MPI) understanding of the reality of the extent to which risks can be managed at each location
- Mutual prioritisation of risk between MPI and industry

Resulting in

- Confidence that biosecurity risks are being managed to a 'high' level
- Moving risk off shore
- Ensuring biosecurity risk do not get here

Critical areas of the biosecurity system for priority action were identified by participants and they were asked to vote for their top four issues. The three issues recording the most votes were collated into themes of:

- Intelligence, information and risk identification
- Import Health Standards process
- Border/system performance and confidence in the system

Summary of follow up actions

- Organisations to nominate representatives for joint working groups (financial arrangements and response guide) by 10 March
- Organisations to provide any further written feedback on the following discussion papers by 19 March:
 - Feedback on the operating model for the Deed Governance Group
 - Feedback on the operating model for the GIA Secretariat
 - Guidance on financial arrangements under GIA
 - A guide to managing responses under GIA
 - Purpose and outcomes of the Biosecurity Forum
- MPI to facilitate the joint working group for developing a GIA response guide.
- GIA Secretariat to facilitate the joint working group to consider guidance for cost sharing and setting fiscal caps
- GIA Secretariat to redraft operating models for the Secretariat and DDG and reissue as a discussion paper
- GIA Secretariat to facilitate further discussions between industry and MPI on OAs and the mandate and eligibility process
- GIA Secretariat to update the eligibility and mandate Q&As on its website to incorporate the questions asked at the Forum
- GIA Secretariat to revise the biosecurity system diagram based on feedback from delegates
- GIA Secretariat to draft a discussion paper proposing a framework for industry and government to engage in the wider biosecurity system through GIA

Feedback

Overall, feedback on the day was constructive and positive.

There was a suggestion that MPI and industry propose agenda items closer to the next Forum. Another suggested that there should be a report on tangible progress/outputs so that overall momentum is retained.

Suggestions to improve the day included:

- Questions too complex for allocated session time. Have less questions and more time for discussion
- More clarity needed before each session and how the required output will be used. There was confusion during some of the group sessions
- Try to get a better mix of MPI/industry at each table
- Too many participants for meaningful discussions – not everyone spoke up and some industries were more heavily represented than others
- Cleaner more precise presentations
- More detail and less consultation for issues that have already been discussed and received feedback provided
- Order of content – wider biosecurity session could have usefully gone first
- If decisions are needed, provide all discussion papers longer in advance to allow participants to gain a clear view from their stakeholders
- More nuts and bolts discussions, time spent largely repeating papers (expectation is papers should be read)
- Use forum to discuss the IGB's response to feedback
- Include more clarity on how the GIA is to proceed

Delegates suggested the following topics should be addressed at future forums:

- Input sessions from industry
 - Where industry is at and challenges they are facing
 - How industry has developed value propositions
 - Continued examples of Operational Agreement development
 - Lessons learned overall
- Mandate
 - More information, examples and clarity on obtaining mandate
 - Associate membership
- Wider biosecurity system
 - MPI to clarify IHS process
 - Acceptable risk at the border
 - Pre-border engagement
- Response
 - Response guide update from Joint Working Group
 - Training in the response system (in the future)
- Financial implications
 - How is compensation dealt with
 - Non-signatory financial input in readiness and response
 - Cost-share and fiscal cap update from Joint Working Group

Forum attendees

Animal Health Australia

Eva-Maria Bernoth

Aquaculture New Zealand

Colin Johnston

Beef+Lamb NZ

Chris Houston

Better Border Biosecurity

David Teulon

DairyNZ

Denis Packer

Kimberly Crewther

Deer Industry New Zealand

Catharine Sayer

Lindsay Fung

Equine Health Association

Denis Scott

Federated Farmers

Mark Ross

Nick Hanson

John Hartnell

Fonterra

Chris Morley

Lindsay Burton

Foundation for Arable Research

Nick Pyke

GIA Secretariat

Adam Benseman

Lois Ransom

Sarah Vaughan

Horticulture NZ

Peter Silcock

Kiwifruit Vine Health

Barry O'Neil (by phone, for presentation only)

Market Access Solutionz

Stephen Ogden

Meat Industry Association

Paul Goldstone

Meat Industry Association

Philip Houlding

Ministry for Primary Industries

Amelia Pascoe

Andrew Coleman

Bex Ansell

Brendan Gould

Chris Baddeley

Craig Hughes

David Hayes

David Talbot

David Williams

Doug Miller

Graham Burnip

Hilary Kendall

Karen Pugh

Katherine Clift

Kathryn Healy

Libby Clifford

Loretta Mamea

Louise Cook

Martyn Dunne (for presentation only)

Matthew Stone

Steve Gilbert

Stuart Rawnsley

Veronica Herrera

Barney Stephenson

Vicki Compton

Wayne Bettjeman

National Beekeepers Association

Brian Lancaster
Daniel Paul
Ricki Leahy
Roger Bray
Stephen Black

NGINZ

John Liddle

NZ Avocado

Jen Scoular

NZ Citrus Growers

Nikki Johnson

NZ Equine Health Association

Patricia Pearce
Simon Cooper

NZ Fresh Produce Importers Association

Kevin Nalder

NZ Grain & Seed Trade Assoc

Thomas Chin

NZ Racing Board

Marty Burns

NZ Winegrowers

Philip Manson

NZ Pork

Frances Clement

Onions New Zealand

Jayant Master
Matthew Spence
Michael Ahern

OSPRI

Peter Alsop

PIANZ

Kerry Mulqueen

Pipfruit NZ Inc

Alan Pollard

Plant Health Australia

Rod Turner

Potatoes NZ Inc

Andrea Crawford
Champak Mehta

Strawberry Growers NZ Inc

Clive Kerrison

Summerfruit NZ

Marie Dawkins

TomatoesNZ

Helen Barnes

**Vegetables NZ and Process
Vegetables NZ**

John Seymour

List of pre-circulated papers

The following papers were circulated to delegates before the Forum. They formed the basis of discussion in several sessions.

- Feedback on the operating model for the Deed Governance Group (Discussion paper)
- Feedback on issues arising from Biosecurity Forum 2013-I (Information paper)
- Feedback on the operating model for the GIA Secretariat (Discussion paper)
- Guidance on financial arrangements under GIA (Discussion paper)
- A guide to managing responses under GIA (Discussion paper)
- Purpose and outcomes of the Biosecurity Forum (Discussion paper)

Forum presentations

The following Powerpoint presentations given at the Forum are available on the GIA website:

- Talking shop: Feedback on the GIA discussion papers, Lois Ransom, GIA Secretariat
- Making it work: Operational agreements, Barry O'Neil, KVH
- The equine industry view: Operational agreements, Trish Pearce, NZ Equine Health Association
- What's it worth? Cost sharing and fiscal caps under GIA, Adam Benseman, GIA Secretariat
- Australia's Emergency Animal Disease Response Agreement, Eva-Maria Bernoth, Animal Health Australia
- Tricks of the trade: Australian plant industry perspective, Rod Turner, Plant Health Australia
- Who ya gonna call? A model for responding to biosecurity incursions, Amelia Pascoe, MPI
- GIA: Demonstrating eligibility, Loretta Mamea, MPI
- NZ's biosecurity system, and Andrew Coleman, MPI

In addition to the above, Martyn Dunne and Andrew Coleman gave verbal presentations related to MPI and its perspectives on GIA.