

**Report from**

# **Biosecurity Act amendment workshops**

**22 and 26 February 2010**

**Wellington and Auckland**

**Table of contents**

**Contacts for the Biosecurity Act amendment project: .....3**

**Introduction.....4**

**Context.....4**

**Executive Summary .....5**

**Comments from the workshops .....7**

*Overall, whole of biosecurity system.....7*

*Border agencies .....7*

*Importer obligations.....8*

*Clearing risk goods .....9*

*Post clearance management.....10*

*Import standards .....10*

*Transitional facilities .....11*

*Craft risk management .....12*

*Marine .....13*

*Enforcement and compliance .....13*

*Information sharing.....14*

*Pest management .....15*

*Readiness.....17*

*Government and industry agreements.....17*

*Compensation.....21*

*Farms on line .....21*

**Follow-up Actions .....22**

**Participants.....23**

*Wellington, 22 February 2010 .....23*

*Auckland, 26 February 2010.....24*

## Contacts for the Biosecurity Act amendment project:

### Web:

<http://www.biosecurity.govt.nz/biosec/pol/biosecurity-act-review>

or [www.biosecurity.govt.nz/](http://www.biosecurity.govt.nz/)

Biosecurity in New Zealand *Tiakina Aotearoa* /

Policy, Laws and Agreements /

scroll down to *Relevant Legislation*

and click on *Review of Key Parts of Biosecurity Act 1993*

### Postal:

Biosecurity Act Review  
Policy and Risk Directorate  
MAF Biosecurity New Zealand  
P O Box 2526  
WELLINGTON 6140

### Email:

[BiosecurityAct@maf.govt.nz](mailto:BiosecurityAct@maf.govt.nz)

## Introduction

1. This report covers two workshops where MAF Biosecurity New Zealand officials met with a cross-section of external biosecurity stakeholders, on 22 February 2010 in Wellington and 26 February in Auckland. The participants are listed at the end of the report.
2. The body of this report is the comments made by stakeholders at the workshops, sorted into topic areas. The comments may have come from the discussion group flip charts, when discussion groups reported back to the whole workshop or from discussion in the workshop as a whole. Similar ideas from different sources have been retained. Ticks indicate points repeated during discussion group report back.
3. The Executive Summary is MAF Biosecurity New Zealand's take on each workshop, as tested with the participants at the close of that workshop.

## Context

4. The Minister for Biosecurity has asked MAF to prepare proposals to amend the Biosecurity Act.
5. MAF Biosecurity New Zealand decided to undertake a targeted consultation with a cross-section of groups most interested in biosecurity, so that the proposals for change could take into account their interests and concerns.
6. The workshops in February 2010 followed a round of workshops in November 2009. At the November workshops MAF Biosecurity New Zealand shared their initial thoughts on changing the Biosecurity Act and asked for comments and feedback.
7. Based on feedback received at the workshops, written submissions and further analysis, MAF then developed more detailed proposals for change. A paper setting these out was circulated to participants prior to the February workshops.
8. The February workshops were for MAF Biosecurity New Zealand to hear stakeholders' reactions to the proposed changes; are they on the right track, can they work in practice, and any fish hooks to watch out for in the detail.
9. Comments made at the workshops and afterwards in writing would be treated as submissions by the Biosecurity Act amendment project team.
10. The next time external stakeholders have an opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the Biosecurity Act is expected to be when the bill reaches the Select Committee stage of consideration by Parliament. If the project proceeds favourably, the Select Committee hearings could occur late in 2010 or early 2011.

## Executive Summary

11. From Wellington, there was a general theme of "fine in theory but what about the detail".
  - a Border
    - more and earlier information - supported
    - outcome standards ok in theory - need to see them for real though
    - strong domestic stakeholder support for importer obligations - some concern from importers as to how they will work/be applied etc
    - ok to have a broader range of intervention tools at the border but MAF shouldn't move away from inspection too much or too quickly.
  - b Marine
    - some support for extending powers to the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) but questions around constitutional legalities and practicalities of enforcement out in the EEZ.
  - c Enforcement
    - strong support for getting tougher on non-compliance.
  - d Farms on Line
    - questions around rights of access and use of the data.
  - e Government and industry agreements
    - questions around the operation of the levy mechanisms
    - mandate of the industry associations involved and how those not members of associations would be dealt with
    - questions around whether the Crown will really be bound by the agreement.
  - f Pest management
    - support for simplification of the current legislative processes
    - Crown should be bound as a good neighbour
    - use of infringement fines should be investigated.
12. From Auckland, MAF Biosecurity New Zealand also heard support for the proposed changes and that maintaining confidence in the biosecurity system must remain paramount.
  - a Border
    - General support for simplifying goods and clearance processes as long as there is no reduction in biosecurity protection
    - Importance that stakeholder confidence in the system is maintained
    - Non-commercial players are also a risk and need to be considered
    - Importer obligations should not be unreasonable but should also not be too easy - the current defences look too generous
    - Support for clearer import health standards and flexibility so that they can be kept up to date
    - Support for pushing risk management offshore

- Concerns around resourcing
  - Craft management standard ok - will need to be developed carefully.
- b Marine
- Good to extend control to the EEZ.
- c Enforcement
- Strong support for getting tougher
  - Some of the proposed defences look too generous
  - Ability to suspend transitional facilities supported - although should not be the first point of call.
- d Farms on Line
- Questions around access to and use of data.
- e Treaty of Waitangi
- Appropriate Treaty clauses need consideration.
- f Government industry agreements
- Need to be clear about the line between importer liabilities and domestic stakeholder liabilities
  - Good to focus on readiness
  - Questions around levies and how these will be applied; who will pay - particularly in industries with large numbers of people who are not members of industry associations.
- g Pest management
- Strong support for streamlining.

## Comments from the workshops

Overall, whole of biosecurity system	
Comment	Workshop
Border - maintaining confidence in the system is key, flexible and pragmatic ✓	Auck
Biosecurity Act a good act - permissive, flexible, don't undermine by making more onerous cumbersome	Auck
Definition of "unwanted organism" - should not only be up to chief technical officer (CTO) to determine. CTO should be required to consider non-government view.	Auck
General comment * - important to maintain people's confidence in biosecurity system	Auck
? Incursions either through the ports or human practices. Ngati Whatua have a response coordinator and can respond within 24 hrs. Mana whenua iwi sector – migrants bring their own indigenous crafts and practices to NZ. Several negotiations with other indigenous populations wanting to bring in their practices. Have had hui.  MAFBNZ: Hadn't heard before. Will follow- up separately.  Barry O'Neil: MAFBNZ relationships iwi and guardians seem to Barry O'Neil to be operating successfully. Tainui accord. Inform whether need legislative change.	Auck
? Earlier workshops - great feedback and progress has been made. Response to last workshops that was circulated – some areas not addressed. Maybe outside the Act? But clarify if addressed in some way. For example the balance between trade and biosecurity for MAF. Transparency of processes. Compliance resourcing . Border / post border. SPS / Biosecurity Act and how could be addressed.  MAFBNZ: Some definitely not in the law. Some of those not in bill are, for example, because the Government's decisions are elsewhere. The policy framework for trade is one example of this. Resourcing will never be in the Biosecurity Act itself. Will explicitly respond about what not covered in the bill.	Wgtn
? Why bundle border and post border?  MAFBNZ: Opportunism while bill going through. Getting Parliament time is precious. Also, we will be able to present as a cross system package.	Wgtn
<b>Border agencies</b>	
Integrated border agency? No - cooperative approach between agencies, JBMS	Auck
? New Biosecurity Act – meshing in with other legislation with border responsibilities. Other departments legislation will also mesh back.  MAFBNZ: Yes but focus here on biosecurity. E.g – opportunity to place duty on importers. Use same definition as Customs uses – consistency across govt. Customs rethinking their Act as well. Food bill – general duty when bringing in food – consistent? Aiming for agencies to collaborate so seamless across Acts for importers.	Wgtn
Moving toward having one service provider at the border ✓	Auck

<b>Importer obligations</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Workshop</b>
Duty of care in AWA (Animal Welfare Act) not easily enforceable. ?A concern in this area?	Wgtn
Ministry of Health agree with approach	Wgtn
Need suitable incentives for good businesses and bad businesses and needs to be enforceable.	Wgtn
Need to make sure that there are not too many outs. For example, vegetable seed industry receives unsolicited imports and not many options for alternatives.	Wgtn
Will we be able to identify these people (importers), i.e. different companies, cf NZFSA registered importers?	Wgtn
Risk profile for goods and importers	Wgtn
Emphasis / responsibility earlier in the chain	Wgtn
What does "duty" really mean?	Wgtn
Duty to require information - at 200 mile limit? - how would you search etc?	Wgtn
Obligations on imports	Wgtn
Definition of "importer"	Wgtn
Offence provisions will be much easier if border agencies / legislation are aligned.	Wgtn
Also easier for importers to understand their obligations	Wgtn
What's in it for the importers? - "good" importer rewarded through fewer inspections and "bad" importers penalised - "pinging" non-compliance through new offence.	Wgtn
Duties of importers - very broad - hard for imports to comply?	Wgtn
How will importers know what they need to do? Can "best industry practice" be specified in Act?	Wgtn
Shifting responsibility on to importers - with associated higher penalties for non-compliance.	Wgtn
Is it fair to put responsibility on importer? - Can they control others in chain e.g. transporters, brokers - Customs and Excise Act - Customs broker is responsible - importer needs to set up robust system - defences to offences - not too easy	Wgtn
Place financial penalty (insurance) on risk exacerbator: duty, tax, insurance targeted, tax on importers. Govt industry agreements don't reach to imports. Oil pollution levy administered by Maritime New Zealand is an example of a mechanism. This is supported by an international treaty. \$ used for biosecurity response ("Lloyds insurance")	Auck
Importer obligation - defences are too generous therefore makes obligation too weak. Ignorance is not an excuse.	Auck
Importer duty - risks vary for different ports. Risks can transfer between goods, i.e. insects came from another good nearby for which importer not responsible	Auck
Incentivising good behaviours and penalising bad behaviour	Auck
Supported by good information / education	Auck
√√√	Wgtn
Value chain	Wgtn
Disqualify importers?	Wgtn
Responsibility earlier in chain	Wgtn
Identifiability of importers? Suggestions to define welcomed. Commercial and all others?	Wgtn
A register? Cost and manageability	Wgtn
Incentives?	Wgtn
Enforceable	Wgtn
Liability? - absolute not possible	Wgtn

Clearing risk goods	
Comment	Workshop
Non-commercial importers as well	Auck
Goods without an IHS - general support. But are these goods normally inspected anyway?	Wgtn
Non-risk goods - run the risk of developing an ad hoc approach.	Wgtn
Need to have good information backing up import health standards / procedures - also can learn from previous data.	Wgtn
Criteria and rules to inform chief technical officers decision where there is no import health standard.	Wgtn
How will MAF find the hitchhikers on non-risk goods?	Wgtn
Will this allow all clearance decisions to be set in policy - maybe for the wrong reasons? - Inspectors must still be satisfied that goods do not post risk.	Wgtn
Visual inspection is still a valuable tool and must be retained where necessary.	Wgtn
Will clearance procedures react to changes, e.g. climate change?	Wgtn
Need assurances about what inspections will remain, e.g. baggage inspection - industry is very keen on retaining 100% inspection - industry must understand exactly what will be happening at the border * - should define what will be done for which goods, so stakeholders can have certainty*	Wgtn
*Don't want to be accepting risk into New Zealand*	Wgtn
[Reference paragraph] 3.4 - visual inspection - enforcement of obligations on importers	Wgtn
What's changed with imports since Act was drafted? Why is MAF unable to inspect everything as required by the Act?	Wgtn
Less visual inspections, more risk profiling - some concerns.	Auck
Good to reduce hold ups at wharves	Auck
Concerns over reduced visual inspection.	Auck
? Risk management near ports – this legislation allow risk management e.g. inspection of every passenger?  MAFBNZ: At moment not directly covered in bill – believe not necessary. An example, x-rays viewed during transit – key issue is departure authority giving New Zealand MAF the X-rays, because of their privacy requirements. Act will provide for intel, sharing info in some situations. Already started to introduce – Auckland – lane A – 100% x-rays but less risk examination and info on the spot. Working on risk profiles of 96% compliant passengers so they can have a different experience.	Auck
? Market research shows less visible activity, e.g. inspection, less compliance.  MAFBNZ: Yes – greater pressure on monitoring and measurement – underneath and react if changes.	Auck
? Overseas exporters – MAF has limited ability to influence. NZ fresh produce exports – able to shut down pathway if for example a pack-house continually let stuff through, that pathway could be shut down. Apply to imports?  MAFBNZ: Yes but under the Act – legal obligation is in NZ and on importers.	Wgtn
? Clearances at transitional facilities: people other than inspectors clearing low risk goods?. Goods that go to transitional facilities are all risk goods?  MAFBNZ: Want to cover if goods in a transitional facility but nothing found on them – and want to tie up legality of clearance. Need to change status of goods without tying up inspector. Efficiency.	Wgtn
Still keep visual inspection and front line presence.	Wgtn
Other tools in tool box supported	Wgtn
Compliance and co-management agreements - a code of practice approach? Outcome in std, system / importer, goods	Wgtn
√	Wgtn
Less visual inspection -> manage risk off-shore √ - need confidence in certification and systems	Auck

Post clearance management	
Comment	Workshop
Post-clearance conditions: will this work? Once it gets beyond the importer there is no control over it. Grapes does work but garlic probably wont.	Wgtn
Need more information about the types of issues to be considered for post-clearance conditions in developing import health standards	Wgtn
Challenges re "cleared" status of goods	Wgtn
Who could propose this tool be used?	Wgtn
Another tool for the tool box: Used only when feasible	Wgtn
Complicated from compliance point of view e.g. chain of custody.	Wgtn
Post clearance conditions - are these to enable enforcement?	Wgtn
Ability to control?	Wgtn
OK provided it doesn't weaken the push to manage risk offshore	Wgtn
Useful addition to toolbox	Wgtn
Compliance complicated	Wgtn
Who proposes?	Wgtn

Import standards	
Comment	Workshop
Influence on international standards. New Zealand is unique - NZ must be brave and make standards to protect New Zealand. Our risk profile is difference from others. Those countries surrounded with ocean are different from countries with land neighbours.	Auck
Import health standards (IHS) - really like the idea of outcome standards [as an option]. Need - to tell you what tools and measures can be used in or attached to the IHS. - flexibility and rapid means to say what is approved system appropriate to outcome.	Auck
Regional Council - good to have off-shore controls; outcome standards encourage importers to seek good controls.	Auck
Importers can't always control off-shore activities.	Auck
MAFBNZ: We want to encourage importers to do what they can to influence supply chain.	
More use of awareness campaigns overseas (e.g. with Tourism New Zealand)	Auck
Need info on how risk is reduced at various points (e.g. in a flow chart)	Auck
Big support for pushing the management of risk off-shore (off-shore treatment and inspections)	Auck
Import health standards need to be of good quality, e.g. clear	Auck
Pushing the management of risk off-shore requires a good level of assurance.	Auck
Industries need to be able to have input into border standards	Auck
Fresh produce: e.g. flowers: important for MAF not to over-react	Auck
* Non industry risks, e.g. collectors are far more risky	Auck
Pathway monitoring - really random?	Auck
Sea containers - needs more effort - pathways: need to rethink which are risks and which aren't	Auck
Overall, we want to simplify trade and travel while maintaining risk management - flexibility and pragmatic - profiling is the key with random audits - interventions and changes to the law need to be resourced adequately (e.g. audits) - downstream / system resource implications also to be considered - reducing duplication of MAF and Customs and other border agencies (Trade single window)	Auck
New import health standards for sea containers requires Quarantine Declaration, 100% clean containers (or 6 sides inspection without declaration) - this is not practical or reasonable and will clog the system * - contrary to all consultation and previous documents released.	Auck
Outcome import health standards - "effectiveness" rather than reliability	Wgtn
Outcome IHSs - support for flexibility to make minor changes .	Wgtn

Import standards	
Comment	Workshop
? Amend act for import health standards, simpler etc?  MAFBNZ: Yes, legal advice to amend Act so can put outcome in standard and tools to meet target level in associated document – want greater clarity that allowed to do that. Used vehicles already going down this path.	Auck
? Process for regulatory review of import health standards?  MAFBNZ: No. Much rather get to point where don't need as much review. Outcome standards should be more stable and measures change underneath standards. Not intending to commit to regular review – litigation risks. Aim for longevity of standards.  ? Will you review existing old standards?  MAFBNZ: Yes over time. A challenging area for us.	Auck
? MAF changes to offshore treatments such as methyl bromide or irradiation so importer can have more confidence and mitigate actions if New Zealander finds a bug on banana?  MAFBNZ: That is the direction of travel – wont mandate any one method. Outcome standard will say something like “Your risk good must not have this pest” – variety ways to achieve. Methyl bromide is a specific problem – it is a very effective and major biosecurity tool for which a similarly effective alternative has yet to be identified. Use of irradiation is being picked up but it is expensive and there is consumer concern. Point is – levels of protection can be met in variety of ways. Country or area freedoms, production systems or post production. Heading for future - measures outside standard – MAF will still work with industry to identify options.	Auck
? IMO etc to develop standards?  MAFBNZ: Yes – especially bio-fouling – looking to create international standards so New Zealand not out of step. Good work in IMO.  Barry O’Neil: In general should start with international standard where they exist – so work to make them work for New Zealand. This is a better route to go down because the rest of world also operating to that standard. When New Zealand goes above the international standard things get difficult, we are challenged and export systems aren't set up to meet our requirements. Focus on international standards meet our needs.	Auck
Rule setting: WTO -> MAF -> industry confidence in rules, - law has to work in practice - duties on landowners and producers	Wgtn
Effectiveness of measures √√	Wgtn
International standards - New Zealand is unique island group and we need to be forthright about that	Auck
√	Auck
However we do need flexibility and keep up to date	Auck
Collect fees at point of application	Auck
Funding for off-shore controls? Especially craft	Auck

Transitional facilities	
Comment	Workshop
Transitional facility operators	Wgtn
Need to tighten up on transitional facilities. Support proposals.	Auck
Transitional facilities - good to have suspensions but should give warning first.	Auck
Customs example for licensing people (e.g. transitional facility operators)	Auck

Transitional facilities	
Comment	Workshop
? Too many transitional facilities in New Zealand. Is the number of transitional facilities being considered e.g. increasing requirements?	Auck
MAFBNZ: Number of transitional facilities an issue. Type and level of experience hugely variable. An exercise currently underway with revised standard and many already dropping out. With the introduction of this requirement, we expect more will drop out. Also the proposed new fee for being a transitional facility will put a bit more acid on transitional facility operators.	
MAFBNZ: The number of transitional facilities is a difficult issue. As a govt agency, MAFBNZ can't limit the number of enterprises. We can only ensure that the facility and its operation meet the required standard. We are reviewing our regime and putting into the Act more incentives to comply. Hope will result in improved on-going compliance and that the higher hurdle will result in less facilities over time.	
Felt that infringement fines should come before suspension in the scale of escalating responses	Auck

Craft risk management	
Comment	Workshop
Ship sanitation inspection regime for WHO - how will this dovetail with the Craft Risk Management Standard?	Wgtn
Definition of craft include oil rigs?	Wgtn
Fast moving vs slow moving craft	Wgtn
Practicality issues - no dry dock for oil rigs in New Zealand. - training requirements before anybody sets foot on an oil platform.	Wgtn
Scope - vessels starting in NZ territory	Wgtn
Foreign fishing vessels operating in NZ - extension to domestic?	Wgtn
Compliance and enforcement - how to resource	Wgtn
How to regulate domestic movement of craft e.g. for pest management	Wgtn
Regulating industry vs recreational craft	Wgtn
Already providing 48 hours in advance reporting. Needs to be very careful about what is feasible for particular craft, e.g. spray holds of aircraft.	Auck
Coastal movement - YES	Auck
Ballast water - convention is 2016 - practicality of compliance? - how to enforce?	Auck
Managing arrival of craft in remote places.	Auck
Concerned that there could be additional levels of risk management for aircraft (in particular)	Auck
Question of craft going through Cook Strait? (not covered)	Auck
Use of international standards supported	Auck
? Craft std. Air – disinsection of hold and baggage. Sea – hull?	Auck
MAFBNZ: Will operate like import health standards for goods? Currently can't classify craft as risk good. Clarify craft have risks as well as goods and how to manage.	
? Craft but not the contents. 12 hours rule to provide info. Current bill deal with e.g. for sea containers?	Wgtn
MAFBNZ: management of risk goods on vessel is different from management of the vessel itself. Developing craft risk management because ship or plane can't be defined as risk goods. Will pick up ballast water and bio-fouling eventually.	
Info – 12 hours to provide info =- what if don't ?	Wgtn
√	Auck
Existing platforms	Auck
Different types of craft	Auck
Coastal movement	Auck

<b>Craft risk management</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Workshop</b>
Ballast water	Auck
Difficulty of controlling risks during transit. Who is responsible for cross contamination from neighbouring goods e.g. during transshipment?	Auck

<b>Marine</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Workshop</b>
General support for marine	Wgtn
Marine - gaps in terms of marine surveillance and marine incursion response - local government and pest management links: responsibilities not clear	Auck
Can the Biosecurity Act extend to New Zealand's exclusive economic zone? How does the Law of the Sea affect BSA jurisdiction in exclusive economic zone (EEZ)?	Wgtn
What does "vessel operating" in the exclusive economic zone mean? Oil? Aquaculture? - e.g. "sailing" isn't necessarily raising biosecurity risk.	Wgtn
Exclusive economic zone extension - support. But if vessel passing through then not subject to requirements. This is a weakness. If in the exclusive economic zone then should comply e.g. of reporting system "I am in your area"	Auck
Govt needs to adequately fund / resource off-shore controls; new marine measures will help improve craft standards.	Auck
Exclusive economic zone - more collaboration needed * - Information sharing is key	Auck
? Do the marine changes affect seabed mining and similar?	Auck
MAFBNZ: Mining itself is not part of biosecurity but the material they dump on sea bed is of biosecurity concern. This change will give us greater powers. Currently control 13 miles out. This proposal in future will control 200 miles out so we can manage the biosecurity risks more effectively.	
? Marine changes - Law of the sea and jurisdiction 200 miles?	Wgtn
MAFBNZ: Previous govt worked on a bill about the exclusive economic zone. Policy was signed off but bill didn't get through the system so moved biosecurity provisions to this bill. How far can you go to manage environmental impact? Recognise exclusive economic zone but interested to see what MFAT to say about these proposals.	
DoC supports this.	Wgtn
In practice?	Wgtn
Vessels operating in NZ e.g. in transit	Wgtn
Movement of craft around the country e.g. recreational. Creating areas of freedom to enable market access for exports e.g. Aujeszky's disease	Wgtn
Practicality? Scope, industry training requirements, enforcement, resourcing.	Wgtn
Focus on biosecurity risks that are higher than the background risk. ?MAF, "No intention to capture in-transit"?	Wgtn
Marine - ✓ but how in practice?	Auck
Resourcing to ensure the new tools work	Auck
Resourcing for craft arriving in remote locations?	Auck
Transiting craft should also tell us so we are aware of them	Auck
Border [change proposals] should ease things up	Auck

<b>Enforcement and compliance</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Workshop</b>
Enforcement provisions important - but need commitment from MAF to use them.	Wgtn
Needs to be responsive; one thing leads to another.	Wgtn
Clarity about duties and consequences	Wgtn

Enforcement and compliance	
Comment	Workshop
Response / consequence escalates as severity / frequency of breach increases.	Wgtn
What about removing right to import, as a sanction for repeated non-compliance? - registered importers? (cf registered exporters) - licensed brokers (although high admin costs and Customs have had problems with this) - possibly have less extreme sanction e.g. stand down time	Wgtn
Threshold for prosecution = need to be fair to importers	Wgtn
Good to catch repeat importer failures.	Auck
Resourcing of enforcement - will new tools be used?	Auck
Need to target repeat offenders and deliberate non-compliance	Auck
Transparency around penalties	Auck
Collection of MAF fees.	Auck
? Enforcement – where failure – incursion and pest management – come back on importer and exacerbator?  MAFBNZ: To prosecute need a relatively clear link between incursion and importers – if can prove didn't meet std can prosecute. Also possible to take a civil damages case if don't meet standards. See paper re civil liability similar to Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act – more readily available if link between breach and loss.  In general not trying to come in with heavy penalties or actions if didn't know or genuine mistake. Want to use for deliberate circumvention of system. Balance – if import health standard was met and incursion – review standard.	Auck
? What if importer or supplier screwed up and made a mistake?  MAFBNZ: Always incredibly difficult to establish link between bug in park and specific import consignment.  A difficult area – if believe importer compliant and managing supply chain – don't want to chase them. But if importer has NOT taken reasonable steps then might be chased. If bug gets in, then domestic and government have to work out what to do.	Auck
People need to understand the escalating consequences	Wgtn
Give infringement offences to pest management agencies	Wgtn
Simplify enforcement and infringement and escalation options	Wgtn
FYI, a minor amendment of Biosecurity Act 2009 to increase infringement fines for passengers, to come into force late 2010.	Wgtn
Offence provisions - would they weaken the obligations?	Auck
Target deliberate and repeat offenders ✓ and be transparent	Auck

Information sharing	
Comment	Workshop
Trade Single Window / info sharing: once you give information to "Government" all [agencies of government] should be able to use it.	Auck
Acknowledge commercial sensitivities	Auck
? Proposed information about passengers and cargo – consistent with Customs. Not new. Makes sense. Border agencies working together towards joint border management system.  MAFBNZ: absolutely trying to align with Customs. Customs may also have to change some things. Border agencies in future have to collectively agree information requirements in advance. For example, the definition of importer will be the same.	Auck
Sharing information within government as a whole, respecting commercial sensitivities	Auck
✓✓	Wgtn

Pest management	
Comment	Workshop
MAF's role in pest management - MAF tends to abdicate its responsibility when it gets too hard.	Wgtn
Favour regional council leadership role	Wgtn
What role does DoC have as a landowner - rating for Crown landowners?	Wgtn
Clover root weevil and cattle tick - examples where this doesn't work.	Wgtn
Regional council role - what does "support" mean? If funding could be problematic.	Wgtn
General duty for post-border?	Wgtn
Support review of pest management strategies - both add, remove and 10 years.	Wgtn
Support using regulations to ensure consistency.	Wgtn
Infringement notices for pest management strategies - align with Resource Management Act compliance / enforcement tools.	Wgtn
Expectations for cost benefit analysis - long time frames, biological systems	Wgtn
[Raise] threshold for board of inquiry for pest management strategy.	Wgtn
How to manage risks of no action e.g. what is nature of pest, its impacts: if diffuse [impacts], how to manage?	Wgtn
Support for simplifying pest management strategy process in simple cases	Wgtn
2 projects [Future of Pest Management & BSA amendment] need to work together - urgency of work to make connections	Wgtn
Terminology: - regional strategies not regional council strategies => owned by region, reflect regional priorities	Wgtn
Mix of tools important, i.e. other tools exist to manage pests	Wgtn
Gatekeeper role: best fits with MAF? - part of leadership role. Not a committee - OK to get advice, then decide	Wgtn
Importance of Crown behaving like any other landowner (in "good neighbour" sense) -> opportunities for Crown being aligned with other landowners - means Crown should consider true costs of being landowner Opportunities e.g. - Crown being seen to be part of community - greater efficiencies from integrated and aligned management	Wgtn
Incremental improvement OK.	Wgtn
"Middle range" options in pest management. E.g. use of infringement notices by regional councils.	Wgtn
Whether detail will be ready to go	Wgtn
May not do it all now. But allow system to evolve in right directions (i.e. don't lock in too much prescription).	Wgtn
Concern that Act review and the Future of Pest Management project have different objectives - Is there time for input from the Future of Pest Management project to be ready for legislative change?	Wgtn
Site-led pest management is important change - bigger focus on protecting biodiversity.	Wgtn
National pest management strategies are good in theory by not in practice, now.	Wgtn
How does the Future of Pest Management project deal with production pests that councils aren't too concerned with?	Wgtn
? Would pest management strategies go into human health issues?	Wgtn
MAFBNZ: Ministry of Health has primary responsibility although MAF will deal with vector.	
Pest management should be part of a private individual's public liability insurance. - Question of what the insurance cost would be. - Talk to industry. Determine major risk and use private insurance to set level e.g. \$50 million. Govt contribution beyond this. - ?Do we know enough about the risk and impacts to insure? - Need to get \$ up front, this is the key. Example of how slow response was over varroa because of parties squabbling over who pays and what to do. NZ can't afford time delay.	Auck
Most imports come into Auckland. It is unfair to load up Auckland Regional Council with \$ of response as the whole of new Zealand benefits from the "Port of Auckland". We need to look after the wider (national) funding base.	Auck
Need to have clarification of roles in pest management between MAF, councils and landowners.	Auck

Pest management	
Comment	Workshop
Primary producers would contribute to control if / as pest found on my property. Not enough to acknowledgement of cost of pest control spray programmes etc in terms of national contribution.	Auck
Need to reduce hurdles for pest management for small industries and specific pests, e.g. could reduce consultation required.	Auck
Regional Council in favour of binding Crown.	Auck
Proposed - amend Act to required regional council / unitary authority to put in place regional pest management strategy if specified criteria apply.	Auck
Terrestrial, freshwater and marine environment - should apply to all three.	Auck
Support streamlining regional pest management strategy process.	Auck
Crown and regional councils to be good neighbours.	Auck
Align Act to Future of Pest Management proposal.	Auck
Responsiveness to smaller isolated areas	Auck
Pest specific to one crop vs a general feeder - who pays and who is involved?	Auck
Marine and freshwater pests - who pays?	Auck
Some industries can't afford any more charges	Auck
Support for streamlining processes	Auck
Support	Auck
Regional councils: should be supported as delivery agencies for national outcomes	Auck
? Consistency issue between regional councils?	Auck
Minister exemption power for pest management strategy? Big questions - address when regional pest management strategy developed?	Auck
MAF needs to be more involved here	Auck
Externalities should be better assessed in pest management strategies	Auck
Regional councils <b>need</b> to be lots more involvement in pest management	Auck
* Important to streamline the process	Auck
Focus on changes will improve competitiveness of NZ products	Auck
? Principles fine but putting into practice in Act? Enough time?	Wgtn
MAFBNZ: Enabling in Act. Detail in regulation.	
Follow-up comment: Will be interesting to see how having regulations works. Haven't had it before in this area.	
When developing or reviewing, the rigour expected for the cost benefit analysis is difficult to achieve given the long time frames and biodiversity dealing with	Wgtn
Raise the threshold to hold a board of inquiry.	Wgtn
How will the opt out work?	Wgtn
Simplify process requirements in line with organism priority	Wgtn
Must catch this opportunity to put right, not a big window ✓	Wgtn
Regional strategies (cf council strategies) - reflect regional community - a key point of difference	Wgtn
Other tools	Wgtn
Important that the Crown is bound in regional strategies, good neighbour requirement - opportunities for the Crown: become part of community, increase efficiency, will make transparent the true cost of land ownership	Wgtn
MAF's leadership - as a gatekeeper - accountable for decisions - GM organisms?	Wgtn
Duties of other parties with respect to pest management strategies, e.g. landowners and industry	Wgtn
Pathway and site management ✓	Wgtn
Insert a general duty for land owners with respect to pest management strategies and MAF to use provisions if there.	Wgtn

<b>Readiness</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Workshop</b>
National standards => surveillance by industry	Wgtn

<b>Government and industry agreements</b>	
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Workshop</b>
Uncertainty of funding / benefit for government industry agreements	Wgtn
Ability to pay for government industry agreements? Discriminates against emerging industries.	Wgtn
Government industry agreements - ahead of ourselves. Too early to comment on specific changes to the Act because negotiation on the principles is still under way.	Wgtn
How can small industries afford levies? Especially if several incursion responses => several levies simultaneously?	Wgtn
"Willing" industries is key	Wgtn
Levies: how can they meaningfully be imposed for small industries	Wgtn
Mandate issue is important - how do you know who is in industry - what about very small industries and 1 [umbrella] industry body	Wgtn
Levy design - all need to pay	Wgtn
May need power to create register	Wgtn
Levy as a means of helping to co-ordinate industry	Wgtn
General concern over how much can be afforded. Other levies already in place.	Wgtn
Potential linkage with Environmental Protection Authority and national standards e.g. prevention of disease in aquaculture.	Wgtn
Aquaculture - already doing surveillance in industry codes of practice.	Wgtn
How to make joint decisions in cases where one side has reservations? Tensions between industry and government priorities - industry's focus will tend to be more narrow.	Wgtn
Will this be real joint decision-making?	Wgtn
What's to stop Government from changing the rules?	Wgtn
Still need Cabinet's approval, as well as MAF's?	Wgtn
What if industry prefers to not respond, to the detriment of national interest?	Wgtn
Farmers etc need to understand that there is a point where Government will not want to respond without industry contribution.	Wgtn
Currently works in forestry industry (information government industry agreements)	Wgtn
*Government and industry have different ideas of "good outcomes" *	Wgtn
Government would need to contribute more according to level of public good.	Wgtn
Industry will tend to more aggressive response - Government has shown it can make the hard decisions though.	Wgtn
Industry believes that responses are Government responsibility.	Wgtn
Doesn't MAF already have levy powers? What is the purpose of specific Government industry agreements amendments?	Wgtn
*Some industry groups will never be able to get mandate for cost-sharing.*	Wgtn
Government must come out and state that it wont be contributing for industry to understand need - open	Wgtn
*Like that funding supports what is important*	Wgtn
Industry must be convinced of benefits	Wgtn
Some favour government industry agreements not private insurance.	Auck
Good part about government industry agreements is that they look at preparedness, not just response. When parties come to the table they may bring resources and expertise etc rather than just \$. E.g. - manpower - time - effort which all related to industry \$\$.	Auck
Key that plans have to be binding in a government industry agreements. Also binding the Crown via pest management strategies.	Auck
Need to acknowledge import / export intrinsic link - exporters need to contribute as well.	Auck

Government and industry agreements	
Comment	Workshop
Support government industry agreement proposals	Auck
Joint decision-making must be real. Agreement needs to be legally binding on all parties including the Crown.	Auck
Good to have overall steering committee. Government industry agreements to resolve issue between parties. Needs to be able to act fast.	Auck
Support levies after event / response taken.	Auck
Increased iwi involvement / better recognition of Treaty.	Auck
Need to ensure that legislation recognises partnership agreements e.g. with iwi	Auck
Supply chain participants should not be required to contribute (public good)	Auck
Poultry Industry Assn of NZ and Egg Producers Federation support government industry agreements and interested to see the detail.	Auck
Readiness activities crucial for good responses	Auck
<p>? Sharing costs when no industry body but industry affected?</p> <p>MAFBNZ: Difficult – will try to identify industry body willing to do a deal. Arrangements designed to encourage orgs to coalesce.</p>	Auck
<p>? User pays is the popular phrase. User is the importer of the risky goods. Those users should pay and biosecurity tax that doesn't need to be punitive to trade. Or insurance. Rather than have a big pot of money – insure based on perceived or actual risk based on riskiness.</p> <p>MAFBNZ: Importer tax gets into SPS issues. Insurance – once obligations clear might get insurance market appear. NZ immature insurance market. Might see develop.</p>	Auck
<p>? MAFBNZ contact insurers?</p> <p>MAFBNZ: Rather than a levy to build up a rainy day fund, government is the banker and levy refunds the industries portion of up front cost.</p>	Auck
<p>? Industry penalised for failure of MAFBNZ or importer. Rather than put onus on industry who did nothing.</p> <p>MAFBNZ: Counter view – New Zealand biosecurity is a risk management system and those industries benefit from trade. Can't extend obligations too far, it wont work. If can't link back to specific activity, how much effort do you throw at it? What's it worth to you as industry and us as government? When just government pay – much pressure on government to do everything but a different dynamic when industry sharing cost. For example, one incursion first proposal \$9m with 50 % chance of success, government turned down. Proposal reviewed, cost less than \$2m and and still 40% chance of success.</p> <p>MAFBNZ believes government industry agreements will cost government more to ensure response capacity and readiness. At moment, when an incursion, industry always wants it nuked and say not detected fast enough. But having to work out together what is highest risk and smartest way to do surveillance and response. Also opens up for smart compensation options. For example recent equine flu outbreak in Australia – if same movement controls in New Zealand, compensation – NZ \$50 million but if agree to 1 weeks quarantine with no compo for everyone then a different proposition for owners. Opportunities.</p>	Auck
<p>? Industry penalised for failure of MAFBNZ or importer. Rather than put onus on industry who did nothing. Continued:</p> <p>Lindsay Burton – not many incentives for domestic New Zealand industries to actively participate in biosecurity risk management in our business. Most sit back and hope surveillance and response. If share – change behaviours by both. Need to recognise some cost sharing in ad hoc basis previously. Want to move to managed. In real world. What do we really value going forward.</p>	
<p>? Fairness when an industry identified as beneficiaries but don't believe a real threat and others do and want eradicated and looking to levy? A grey hole. Court action?</p> <p>MAFBNZ: Agreements wont work if gets into that situation. MAF would have to show who beneficiaries. Also response not efficient if industry wouldn't have responded. If industry says nothing, MAF takes it that the pest is not a concern for that industry. [Going to court to include] free loaders would be a measure of last resort. Key message is don't want to go there.</p>	Auck

Government and industry agreements	
Comment	Workshop
<p>? Problem building up fund – importer tax?</p> <p>MAFBNZ: Tax has to be clear with purpose and amount. Not aware of any other countries have done successfully. WTO rules say can recover costs for managing risk at border. If levying for beyond the border at the border becomes a WTO issue.</p> <p>Example of oil pollution levy in case a spill. Resources on the day may not be enough. Everyone pays equally for increased raised for protection for economy. Oil levy – applied to all international ships. Oil pollution levy is under an international convention. Biosecurity would have to have same for domestic and border.</p>	Auck
<p>? MAFBNZ: What is it reasonable to expect importer to do to meet their obligations? And what is it reasonable for industry to do to meet its beneficiaries?</p> <p>The example of the varroa mite response – when incursion into top of SI – first proposed response method too expensive for government. Industry v2 much cheaper and only slightly reduced chance of success – with government and ministers agreed. Programme didn't succeed but shows government will come to party for more marginal programmes if industry meets part way.</p> <p>Barry O'Neil – could also have affected original varroa. Changed behaviour. General surveillance in place but didn't know how long it would take to find varroa. As it happened, took 2 years. Industry this our # 1 and must find in 6 months, can then move to question, what surveillance required to detect and is it affordable?</p> <p>At moment – false sense of security re surveillance. Already paying through tax and not necessarily getting good value. Want to move balance – get better surveillance and reduce costs of response.</p> <p>Varroa mite a good example of where you might get multiple beneficiaries.</p>	Auck
<p>? How decide if an industry should be involved now?</p> <p>MAFBNZ: When new pest is detected MAF does an impact analysis, what is it, what will it do, crops it will eat. From those impacts MAF does an economic impact analysis, what will be the effect on economy, who is affected, who are the likely beneficiaries of any response action. Our process is to consult in time available. Even though an industry may not be ready to spend the costs involved. We apply a very simple test – whether we hear from industry or not – MAF assumes that if we don't hear from an affected industry, they are not concerned.</p> <p>MAFBNZ: Under the government industry agreements proposal, if an industry hasn't signed up but MAF thinks a response justified and thinks this industry should help pay and if Cabinet agrees, then we will levy and work with the industry.</p> <p>Lindsay Burton – in situation where one industry wants respond and others not, say dairy respond but meat and wool sitting on hands – dairy would also pressure.</p>	Auck
<p>? Paper clear – between MAF and primary production industry agreements. Extend to service industries as well?</p> <p>MAFBNZ: Not exclusively primary production but also want to manage impacts through the chain so don't want to prescribe legislation. Typically will start with primary. Also what is most efficient way to collect the levy? Possibly pass on costs thought chain.</p> <p>Stewart Milne – spot at table for joint decision-making will provide most value extending the chain.</p>	Auck
<p>? Pay to play concept, a barrier to useful engagement to full involvement?</p> <p>MAFBNZ: Pay to play – a Crown principle from beginning. Changes behaviour. Skin in the game. Consulted also an option but if you want to be at the table.</p> <p>Many industries nervous and value proposition not clear – MAF working with main industry bodies – so model that they can take forward to board to sign off. To show value. Some responses will always be Crown 100% - e.g. when environmental pest and human health.</p>	Auck

Government and industry agreements	
Comment	Workshop
<p>? Skin in the game – several lands coming back to tribe from DoC. Issue, constantly only being consulted but not getting skin in the game. Especially when transfer already settled or already discussing with DoC how to do go about co-management of reserves – if not mentioned into pest management and other enabling legislation – hard to put into claim settlement. Therefore want alignment of processes.</p> <p>The people, clean green and mana whenua are what in unique about new Zealand. Realise will have to put up money so industry impact on what we getting back. They are our farms too. Pest management is though regional councils and with Auckland Regional Council (ARC) about to disappear without a process for us to input, our ability to implement this stuff with Crown marginalised.</p> <p>MAFBNZ: Issues you raised bigger than biosecurity. Would be good if you could consider how we can work better with Ngati Whatua so able to work through biosecurity ones with you.</p> <p>We are working towards a new framework for biosecurity for New Zealand. Many people involved in biosecurity. Many issues. Regional councils and also other groups such as Waikato Tainui. Issues on the table whether we agree doing enough directly with Ngati Whatua – help – how engage? Secondly, how to manage when in co-management arrangement? Trying to work through.</p> <p>? In Bay of Plenty are working with Maori for Rotorua lake pests.</p> <p>MAFBNZ: Kauri response also working with Maori. Models starting but very early days.</p> <p>? Noted but not reflected in these documents.</p>	Auck
<p>? Nursery and Garden Industry Assn doesn't represent the whole industry. For example, suppliers to flea markets. How collect levy from non-NGIA?</p> <p>MAFBNZ: Agree that definitely want levy to cover all. May be model under Commodity Levies Act.</p>	Wgtn
<p>? Imports / importers involved in agreement?</p> <p>MAFBNZ: Probably not within definition because have to demonstrate a benefit. Using varroa as an example, bee keepers are beneficiaries but so too are the pastoral and horticultural industries.</p>	Wgtn
<p>? Incursion response – transition to long term management if can't eradicate – how manage?</p> <p>MAFBNZ: Want to hear from you about that. Link to pest management or expand scope of government industry agreement? In the draft agreement – parties agree a response plan. If fail to achieve objective, they could agree new objective or go to pest management. At moment, MAF is keener on the government industry agreement route because of processes involved with pest management strategies.</p>	Wgtn
<p>? Horticulture had many incursions last year. Incursions could layer up so that industry's ability to afford is jeopardised.</p> <p>MAFBNZ: Pest management strategies were meant to be for more than one pest but that didn't happen. The scenario of multiple incursions might be better going for a government industry agreement.</p>	Wgtn
Smaller organisations? ✓	Wgtn
Practical questions about the machinery	Wgtn
A useful coordinating tool	Wgtn
Affordability?	Wgtn
Detail ready for legislation?	Wgtn
Legislation may be too limiting - allowing for evolution may be OK	Wgtn
Mandate? - umbrella group for several small organisations?	Wgtn
How to manage risks if impacts diffuse (across many)	Wgtn
What happens if \$ cap is reached but not the objective?	Wgtn
Bind the Crown so truly joint	Wgtn
Funding security over the long term? Preference that use the Biosecurity Act to set levies. Levies under the Commodity Levies Act are less reliable.	Wgtn
Ensure legal niceties are stitched up e.g. mandate to represent	Wgtn

Government and industry agreements	
Comment	Workshop
Treaty partnerships - on ground resources and can activate very quickly but need avenue for indigenous people to provide input	Auck
Introduction of plants valued by other cultures, e.g. Tongan, Samoan, Taiwanese, Korean - MAF treats as ordinary plants - Ngati Whatua o Kaipara emphasise that not in home environment and may not grow the same, also consider effect on native plants and other valued plants already here.	Auck
Funding of biosecurity effort - a duty tax going into a response fund	Auck
? Sequencing issues – agreements – legislation. Similar to pest management strategies?	Wgtn
MAFBNZ: Details thrashed out underneath enabling [Biosecurity Act] legislation.	

Compensation	
Comment	Workshop
Compensation - application to uncleared goods?	Wgtn
? Compensation – timeliness for making claims matched by timeliness of payment as well?	Wgtn
MAFBNZ: Yes. When MAF takes a long time to pay compensation [after all the information is available] – we do pay interest. Some claims take a long time because there isn't enough information supplied to verify and with passage of time.... Also, some claims are exceedingly complex.	
Does it apply to uncleared goods?	Wgtn

Farms on line	
Comment	Workshop
Farms on line - surely it must be compulsory	Wgtn
Does Farms on line contain land use information? (Yes - key point of added value) Where will it come from?	Wgtn
Farms on line - how to ensure accuracy of rating information?	Wgtn
Farms of line. Too many databases - need coordinated role. What is it being used for? \$\$ yet another database. People will be suspicious about what information could be used for, i.e. don't trust control of information.	Auck
Farms on line - privacy implications very important - regional councils providing information of Director-General requiring ACTION: check the right way to do this	Auck
? AgriBase is commercially driven – didn't feel inclined to share our information because cost money to get back. Suggest quid pro quo.  MAFBNZ: Looking at it. MAF needs this clause.	Wgtn
? Will [the database] be maintained with complete set of what being farmed on that property?  MAFBNZ: Anticipate the data being updated approximately one third a year which is better than we have now.	Wgtn
? Public access for industry aggregate info?  MAFBNZ: Yes. Your personal information will also be available.	Wgtn
? Everyone who grew a crop for pest management purposes?  MAFBNZ: Maybe – difficult to differentiate from sending them a sales brochure.	Wgtn
? Animal Health Board would be interested in obtaining names and addresses of occupiers.  MAFBNZ: Should be OK provided for purpose of pest management.	Wgtn
Will have land use data (a value add of rating information)	Wgtn
Likely to be updated on 3-yearly rotation. Better than current.	Wgtn

## Follow-up Actions

Stakeholders: any further comments in writing by 12 March to Biosecurity Act email address.	
MAFBNZ: follow-up separately with Jane Sherard about Ngati Whatua / MAFBNZ partnership	Auck
MAFBNZ: explicitly to respond to all points made in report from last workshop (November 2009) if not covered in BSA amendment.	Wgtn
Farms on line: check the right way to obtain and share information, especially between regional councils and MAF.	Auck
Import standards: need information on how risk is reduced at various points in import process, e.g. in a flow chart.	Auck

## Participants

<b>Wellington, 22 February 2010</b>	
Animal Health Brd	Nik Hancox
AsureQuality Limited	Andrea Murray
AWE LIMITED	Mike Hodgkinson
Customs	John Wech
Deer Industry New Zealand	Lindsay Fung
Dept of Conservation	Philip Bell
Environment Canterbury	Stephen Hall
Environment Southland	Richard Bowman
ESR	Don Bandaranayake
Federated Farmers	John Hartnell
Federated Farmers	Mark Ross
Greater Wellington Regional Council	Davor Bejakovich plus 2
Greater Wellington Regional Council	Ewan Kersall
Heinz Watties	Karen Riddell
Imports consultant	Justin Downs
Market Access Solutionz Ltd	Nikki Johnson
Marlborough District Council	Alan Johnson
Meat Industry Association	Dan Coup
New Zealand Grain and Seed Trade Association	Ann Harper
New Zealand Seafood Industry Council (SeaFIC)	Bruce Chapman
Nursery and Garden Industry Association (Gardening New Zealand)	John Liddle
Nursery and Garden Industry Association (Gardening New Zealand)	Ian Gear
NZ Equine Health Association	Trish Pearce
NZ Forest Owners Assn	Glen Mackie
NZ Fresh Produce Importers Assn	Kevin Nalder
Petroleum Exploration and Production Association	John Pfahlert
Pip Fruit New Zealand	Mike Butcher
Port Companies of NZ	Barrie Saunders
Summerfruit NZ	Marie Dawkins
Te Ohu Kaimoana	Francene
MAF	Lin Da Teoh
MAF Biosecurity New Zealand	Barry O'Neil
MAF Biosecurity New Zealand	Andrew Harrison
MAF Biosecurity New Zealand	Chris Baddeley
MAF Biosecurity New Zealand	Colin Holden
MAF Biosecurity New Zealand	Douglas Birnie
MAF Biosecurity New Zealand	Elizabeth Stoddart
MAF Biosecurity New Zealand	Fleur Matthews
MAF Biosecurity New Zealand	Geoff Daniels
MAF Biosecurity New Zealand	Holly Foran
MAF Biosecurity New Zealand	Lucy Saunders
MAF Biosecurity New Zealand	Victor Walker
<b>Apologies, Wellington</b>	
Arab Horse Breeders Society	Gabrielle Deuss
AWE LIMITED	Simon Knapman

<b>Wellington, 22 February 2010</b>	
Business New Zealand	Phil O'Reilly
DHL GLOBAL FORWARDING (NZ) LTD	Donna Yarrall
Equine Health Assn and Arab Horse Breeders Society	Gabrielle Deuss
ESR	Dave Slaney
ISS McKay NZ	Morris Van Voornveld
Ministry of Health	Andrew Forsyth
NZ Veterinary Assn	Wayne Ricketts
The Sustainability Council	Simon Terry
Veterinary Council of New Zealand	Janet Eden, Registrar
Waikato - Tainui Claims and Environment Group	Cheri van Schravendijk

<b>Auckland, 26 February 2010</b>	
Auckland International Airport Ltd	Mike Clay
Auckland Regional Council	Jack Craw
Beca	Peter McGregor
Beca	Jaishika Singh
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand	Stewart Milne
CMA CGM & ANL (NZ) Ltd	Peter Trent
Conference of Asia Pacific Express Carriers	Denise McCamish
Customs Brokers and Freight Forwarders	Rosemarie Dawson
Customs Brokers and Freight Forwarders	Trevor Duxfield
DHL NZ	Reg Kissun
Environment Bay of Plenty	John Mather
Environment Bay of Plenty	Sarah Omundsen
FedEx New Zealand & Pacific Islands	Mathew Koshy
Fonterra	Lindsay Burton
Future of Pest Management	Helen Atkins
Hamburg Sud New Zealand Limited	Niel Arnesen
Hamburg Sud New Zealand Limited	Michael Beck
Hapag Lloyd Shipping	Peter Turley
Jevic	Euan Philpot
MISC Agencies (New Zealand) Ltd	Barbara Glowinski
MISC Agencies (New Zealand) Ltd	Diana Mexsom
Ngati Whatua Nga Rima o Kaipara Trust	Jane Sherard
NYK Line (New Zealand) Limited	Lucia Martinez
NZ Customs	Terry Brown
NZ Flower Growers Assn	Chris Smellie and Nancy Beck
NZ Orchid Growers	Dave Beck
Poultry Industry Assn of New Zealand etc	Vanessa Wintle
Port of Auckland Ltd	Perry D'Souza
Premium Flowers NZ Ltd	Lance Straker
Racing Board (New Zealand Bloodstock Airfreight)	Greg Northcott
Rural Women of NZ	Wendy McGowan
Te Runanga-a-iwi o Ngati Kahu	Victor Holloway
Tomorrow's Cargo Logistics Grp	Garth Wylie
MAF	Lin Da Teoh
MAF Biosecurity New Zealand	Barry O'Neil
MAF Biosecurity New Zealand	Colin Holden
MAF Biosecurity New Zealand	Douglas Birnie
MAF Biosecurity New Zealand	Elizabeth Stoddart

<b>Auckland, 26 February 2010</b>	
MAF Biosecurity New Zealand	Fleur Matthews
MAF Biosecurity New Zealand	Geoff Daniels
MAF Biosecurity New Zealand	Lucy Saunders
MAF Biosecurity New Zealand	Victor Walker
<b>Apologies</b>	
Air Pacific	Jeanette Carleton
Beca	Bruce Neville
ISS-McKay; NZ Manager / Cruise Services	Douglas Colaco
Ngati-Rehua-Ngatiwai ki Aotea	Lynette Hoey, Resource Rep
Plant and Food Research Ltd	Philippa Stevens
Plant and Food Research Ltd	Angelene Holton
Poultry Industry Assn of New Zealand etc	Michael Brooks
Rural Women of NZ	Marie Appleton
Waikato - Tainui Claims and Environment Group	Cheri van Schravendijk