

Feedback

The following is the consolidated feedback from 22 evaluation sheets returned by Forum participants:

Venue

The venue was considered excellent by 15 of the participants. A further five considered it just right. One requested a venue on the ground floor and another found parking difficult.

Food

The food was considered excellent by 8 participants. Of the 6 that considered the food could be better, most felt that it could have included healthier options such as fruit or sushi. Pies were not a popular option with this group.

Program

The main program was considered to be just right by 19 of the participants, with three considering it excellent. Three of the four participants who provided feedback on the communications workshop considered that it could have been better. One felt it was rather vague and unfocussed. Another was not sure that it works to have the comms session within the forum considering it may get more relevant people if it was to stand alone.

Presentations

The majority felt that the presentations were just right (15). Five considered them excellent, one felt they could have been better citing that some were too long and detailed, and lacked a clear connection to the GIA.

The following comments were provided on the presentations:

- Make sure the program is not padded out with topics that don't have obvious nexus to GIA eg. Organism ranking system
- Ensure copies of presentations are available to attendees
- 1 – 2 presentations from different sectors on their program or things working for them – we learn from each other
- Good interaction – need to keep on encouraging debate etc.

Program content

Nineteen participants considered the program content was relevant and useful. Two said maybe, and another did not respond.

Comments on the program content recorded were:

- The emerging risk system was less relevant given technical biosecurity people had already heard about this in an earlier workshop
- It was a bit of a mixture with some duplication from previous meetings
- A couple of new attendees took the discussion back to issues have been long addressed
- There has been a lot of progress

Suggested improvements:

- Recognition and documenting all questions asked that didn't get clear answers
- Clarity around direct integration of presentations with GIA
- Bringing 'newbies' up to speed – how?
- As GIA progresses, it would be good to workshop new/innovative ways to respond, undertake readiness activities

Forum length

Results were varied (10 maybe, 9 no, 3 yes) with many commenting that a day is long but is acceptable if the agenda is relevant. The early finish was appreciated by some. A new representative suggested that half a day would be enough with clear 'asks' of industry. What do we do as next steps? Where are the gaps?

Forum purpose

Fifteen participants were clear on the purpose of the Forum, one was not and six were not sure. One commented that it would be useful to have some documented goals from the forum with aims that targeted outcomes

Intending to attend the next Forum

Eighteen indicated that they will attend in February/March 2014. One noted that attendance may be contingent on whether their organisation was moving to sign the Deed.

Agenda suggestions

Operational Agreements

- Discussion of model Operational Agreements
- Draft OA template available, how might it be completed
- Update on specific OAs
- Operational agreement content and development
- OA case studies, reports on how people have dealt with tricky issues
- Operationalising the OA at an industry level
- Operational Agreements – exorcising the devils in the details

Learning from experience - progress towards implementation of the Deed

- Answers to questions raised today
- Progress on GIA – where is it at, Cabinet progression, who has signed, issues etc.
- Update on signatories, governance group etc.
- Feedback from industries on consideration of the Deed and mandate issues – opportunity for industries to share experiences on thorny issues eg. Governance arrangements etc.
- Consultation lessons – learning from other industry groups
- Update from early adopter industries
- Industry experiences – value propositions to join GIA, opportunity to learn from each other
- Value proposition – building business cases (case studies?)
- Australian (industry) speaker on their experience of their GIA equivalent

Deed policy and processes

- Multi-industry agreements especially fiscal cap, in-kind
- Views, options, examples on cost/resource sharing
- Update on handbook processes and policy

Specific elements of the wider biosecurity system

- How GIA could assist market access ie. Will MPI negotiate post-response market access conditions?
- Improvements in the biosecurity system eg. Passenger slippage survey, border performance assessment and reporting
- Review of responses – what worked, what didn't
- Top biosecurity risks as viewed by industries and MPI detailing partnership processes and working on coordinating industry groups for shared threats.

Questions asked at the Forum [NOTE those with * require answers/action]

Who decides the beneficiaries?

Government and affected signatory industries will decide.

Beneficiaries are described in the Deed (ref. 7.1 – the Glossary).

A decision-making process is needed.

Cost sharing is based on impact.

The Deed Governance Group role is limited to governance of the Deed.

Cost recovery

This is in the Biosecurity Act and any decisions to recover costs using the legislated powers are subject to normal judicial review processes.

The underlying decision/reasoning for establishing a levy to recover costs from non-Signatory beneficiaries is linked to the beneficiary analysis undertaken by MPI and affected Signatories.

Assigning industry shares

There are based on and are relative to the scale of benefits from the activities undertaken

Who pays when MPI uses the Biosecurity Act to recover costs?

The levy to recover costs is required to operate in the efficient way, which means it is most likely to be applied at a grower level.

The Crown as the ultimate arbiter

This role does not rest with the Crown. However the Crown will determine when it will cost recover and from whom. The latter is informed by agreement between MPI and affected industries on who the beneficiaries of an activity are.

Public vs private benefit

Discussion on this in Operational Agreements

MPI minimum commitments - Minimum commitments for MPI in the Deed are very broad eg. 3.2.2 A. If competencies are not in place before the Deed is signed, will they be established before cost sharing begins, or will they be cost shared?

Minimum commitments are not a shareable cost. If they are negotiated as part of an OA, they are shareable.

There could be provision for minimum commitments in OAs including agreement on what they are and how they are being met.

*** Accountability of parties on minimum commitments. Who will judge this?**

Clarify – ‘consistent with international obligations’ in Deed principles

New Zealand has international treaty obligations for pest reporting and risk-based biosecurity measures that it must meet. NZ cannot create a perception or realise inconsistency with international obligations as a result of Deed-related engagement. However, there may be opportunities to review or demand higher than international standards, where technically justified, given New Zealand’s freedom from many pests and diseases.

Noted that international standards are often based on presence rather than absence (and maintenance of absence). A framework could be created for better engagement at an earlier stage to avoid situations in future.

When will the Deed be approved by Cabinet?

The deadline is the end of this year but it is hoped to achieve approval by 31 October 2013.

A draft paper has been prepared. Treasury is neutral and officials are assisting the development of the paper.

Can industries develop a representative body specifically for GIA purposes?

Yes, but discuss with MPI. Organisations would need to consult with their membership on such a proposal and reflect this in their mandate submission.

Will organisations be required to spend more than their fiscal cap?

The fiscal cap cannot be exceeded without the agreement of the industry organisation. This is reflected in Operational Agreements.

*** Clarify about if cost recovery will be pursued from members of an industry organisation that has decided to exit or not be part of a response**

- Will government recover costs from signatory industries that have reached their fiscal cap using the Biosecurity Act?
- In a response – will the response cease if an industry reaches its fiscal cap and chooses not to increase it?
- If a signatory exits a response, what ongoing liability do they have if the response continues?
- Do they continue to accrue costs as a beneficiary if others decide to continue the response?
- Can industries that reach their fiscal cap veto others? Clarify that others can decide to go on. What role does the exiting party have?
- What compulsion is there on Deed signatories to keep paying even if they have met their fiscal cap?

Clarify that they should not accrue further costs except those committed to before they met the fiscal cap (this was the intent of the JWG)

Operating rules of OA and where there is no OA

These will be developed for the handbook.

What message is KVH giving to its growers?

The rules have changed, there are opportunities for better biosecurity outcomes

*** Is there any clarity around the role of the Chief Technical Officer and the response decision-makers?**

*** What role do Federated Farmers and Horticulture NZ have in the GIA?**

GIA response model

Secretariat to circulate comms material on the response model and seek nominations to test the model. Mike Butcher nominated himself for this task.

Communications - * What is the role of GIA and how is it represented within the 'biosecurity story'?

Focus should be on using language that growers will understand to describe the Deed

Reflect that biosecurity challenges can be managed through partnership – focus on better biosecurity outcomes. Business risk management is also a useful hook for growers. Increased awareness is a two-edged sword – can create concerns about the border.

*** Participants want the GIA website to go live (even without the Deed), including resource materials that may assist industry organisations in progressing with mandate and development of OAs.**

Communicators proposed another meeting in conjunction with the next Forum on a specific topic.