



## **Feedback summaries**

---

**March 2014**

# This session

---

## What we want...

- ❖ Understanding issues impacting Deed implementation – from consultation
- ❖ Noting comments from the IGB and moving forward
- ❖ Agreeing principles to guide operating models and guidance for implementation

## A session in three parts

- ❖ Issues arising from the first Forum
- ❖ Deed Governance Group operating model
- ❖ GIA Secretariat operating model

# This session - outcomes

---

## Outcomes sought

- ❖ Resolution of fundamental issues:
  - Do we need a Secretariat?
  - Do we need a Deed Governance Group?
  - Do we need guidance? On what? To achieve what?
- ❖ Clear guidance for the Secretariat and IGB on their roles and operations
- ❖ Common understanding by potential Signatories of processes needed to deliver Deed outcomes

# Issues arising from the first Forum

---

## General comments

- ❖ Clear processes without over-complication or prescription – to the extent necessary to support efficiency and efficacy
- ❖ Focus on delivering biosecurity outcomes
- ❖ Ensure potential signatories are engaged in development of implementation guidance
- ❖ Operating model – is a GIA Secretariat and Deed Governance Group needed? Shifting common processes to MPI
- ❖ Better explanation of exacerbator cost-share

# Issues arising from the first Forum

---

## Theme 1 – Finance arrangements

- ❖ Keep it simple
- ❖ Common principles vs specific detail (negotiated in an OA)
- ❖ Use a working group to reflect the joint commitments
- ❖ Clarify non-signatory liabilities and their management

# Issues arising from the first Forum

---

## Theme 2 – Signatory accountability framework

- ❖ Important to some sectors
- ❖ Application across the wider biosecurity system vs negotiation in Operational Agreements
- ❖ Does accountability apply to minimum commitments?
- ❖ Are minimum commitments included in OAs?
- ❖ Agreed OAs could be a foundation for other OAs to generate consistency – removing the need for an accountability framework

# Issues arising from the first Forum

---

## Theme 3 – GIA response model

- ❖ Response provisions must be appropriate to implement – usable
- ❖ OA template – a starting point
- ❖ National biosecurity response system – government responsibility
- ❖ MPI has legal response obligations outside of the Deed
- ❖ The Biosecurity Act 1993 has specific decision making provisions for the Chief Technical Officer
- ❖ The response model should be negotiated in OAs

# Issues arising from the first Forum

---

## Theme 4 – Communications to assist implementation

- ❖ Communications needs vary by organisation
- ❖ Secretariat role in communications is addressed in the Secretariat operating model
- ❖ Industry organisations communicate with their members
- ❖ Secretariat communications activities are unnecessary



# Issues arising from the first Forum

---

## Theme 5 – International and import standards

- ❖ Enhanced engagement on standards would benefit from industry input
- ❖ Biosecurity outcomes are achieved through appropriately implemented, monitored and assessed delivery of policies and standards - this is a minimum commitment
- ❖ The role of industries in policies and standards should not negatively impact on principled, science-based engagement with overseas regulators
- ❖ Policy setting is broader than Deed signatories

# Issues arising from the first Forum

---

## Theme 6 – Delivering Deed outcomes

- ❖ Distinguish signatories from non-signatories
- ❖ Signatories take on legal commitments and liabilities through Deed rights and obligations
- ❖ Non-signatories should have no input into Deed governance or other areas, where they have no obligations
- ❖ Non-signatories are for MPI to manage
- ❖ Arrangements to accommodate those who can't sign (but are important in biosecurity) as well as those who choose not to sign
- ❖ The Forum should have open membership

# Issues arising from the first Forum

---



## 1. Any further comments re:

- ❖ Need for guidance
- ❖ What this looks like
- ❖ Need for the Secretariat
- ❖ Role and function of the Deed Governance Group

## 2. Comments on the IGB response

# DGG Operating Model

---

## General comments

- ❖ Too soon for DGG rules
- ❖ IGB has no role in approving matters affecting Signatories substantive rights and liabilities
- ❖ DGG has a role in measuring the performance of the GIA as a whole
- ❖ DGG should have financial delegation and authority over the Secretariat budget
- ❖ Observers at meetings, with agreement of the Chair
- ❖ Is provision of an independent Chair needed?
- ❖ Is there any need for a Vice Chair?

# DGG Operating Model

---

## General comments

- ❖ Funding for an independent Chair/Vice Chair – from Secretariat budget, not cost-shared
- ❖ Revisit date for transition from TDGG to DGG at the Forum (based on progress of industry organisations to sign the Deed)
- ❖ Associate members and links with research providers to improve biosecurity outcomes

# DGG Operating Model

---

## All agree

- ❖ DGG has no legal status (check)
- ❖ No role in negotiation of OAs or responses
- ❖ No financial delegations – or should it?
- ❖ No remuneration of the Chair, Chair does not alternate between government and industry
- ❖ Appoints and monitors performance of the Secretariat Manager
- ❖ Delegates are authorised by their organisation, have equal status
- ❖ Additional meetings – as required. IGB meets every 4 – 6 weeks
- ❖ Meetings and decision-making provisions accepted

# DGG Operating Model

---

## Agree with modification

- ❖ Suggested modification of principles by DINZ – consistency, principles
- ❖ Operating rules must not be inconsistent with the Deed
- ❖ Only Deed Signatories participate in the DGG
- ❖ One representative each, with an alternative
- ❖ Sufficient meetings to ensure effective governance
- ❖ Quorum is defined as a separate principle
- ❖ Operating rules need to cover voting, ensuring equity across members
- ❖ Allow for formation of an Executive Committee and working groups – relevant to DGG role

# DGG Operating Model

---

## All disagree

- ❖ Cost sharing of any Chair/Vice Chair remuneration that might be agreed
- ❖ Voting, proxy voting principles. These are operating rules

## Unresolved issues

- ❖ Is a Vice Chair needed?
- ❖ Is provision for an independent Chair needed?
- ❖ Associate membership – generally accepted in principle – for those ineligible to sign but important to biosecurity outcomes. Needs more work



# DGG Operating Model

---



1. Agree the agreed
2. Resolve the unresolved
3. Get direction on finalising the model through agreeing what will be modified

**Next steps** – revise for IGB endorsement?

# Secretariat Operating Model

---

## Key principles

- ❖ Secretariat as a neutral facilitator under the authority of the DGG
- ❖ No role in OA and Deed delivery
- ❖ DGG agrees work plan and budget
- ❖ DGG and MPI agree resourcing available to the Secretariat
- ❖ Frequency of review of performance, staff performance, capacity and capability, reporting
- ❖ Benefits in consistent processes – Secretariat facilitation of these
- ❖ Any role in monitoring GIA and accountability to be determined when developing these processes

# Secretariat Operating Model

---

## General comments

- ❖ Premature to define the role of the Secretariat
- ❖ Delivery – as an independent entity – in MPI or alternative
- ❖ Clearly define the role of the Secretariat in relation to DGG, OAs and non-signatories, consistent with the Deed
- ❖ Turn these principles into Terms of Reference
- ❖ Indemnity

# Secretariat Operating Model

---

## 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

# Secretariat Operating Model

---

## 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

# Secretariat Operating Model

---

## 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

# Secretariat Operating Model

---



1. Agree the agreed
2. Resolve the unresolved
3. Get direction on finalising the model through agreeing what will be modified

**Next steps** – revise as Terms of Reference for IGB endorsement?