

Chair
The Cabinet Economic and Development Committee

BIOSECURITY STRATEGY FOR NEW ZEALAND: GOVERNANCE AND STRUCTURAL ARRANGEMENTS

Proposal

1. *This paper is one of a suite of four papers reporting on the Government's response to the finalised Biosecurity Strategy for New Zealand. It proposes new governance arrangements to ensure a single strategic direction for biosecurity, and end-to-end management of the biosecurity system.*

Executive Summary

2. Biosecurity functions contribute to a range of government outcomes, encompassing health, environment, economic and social/cultural. A comprehensive process has been operating over more than two years to find ways of improving the contribution biosecurity makes to these outcomes. This process has found that weak governance arrangements are impeding further evolution of the biosecurity system. There is a clear need to re-orient the biosecurity system so that it delivers equally for all outcomes.
3. I propose that the Chief Executive of MAF be given responsibility for end-to-end management of the biosecurity system, and that a new strategic function and other mechanisms be established to support a whole-of system approach. A key reason for placing biosecurity functions within MAF is that much of New Zealand's biosecurity expertise and infrastructure already resides within that organisation. I am confident that MAF can expand its biosecurity expertise to contribute also to human health, conservation and marine outcomes.
4. A number of mechanisms are proposed to support the expansion of MAF's biosecurity mandate. The key first steps will be the establishment of a Ministerial Committee and a Chief Executive's Forum to develop the overall strategic direction for biosecurity, and monitor system performance. Other important mechanisms will include a Central/Regional Government Forum, and a Biosecurity Council reconstituted as a stakeholder advisory group.
5. Building the capability to give effect to these changes will take a number of years. Establishing the new governance mechanisms and the strategic function can happen quickly, and I am seeking funding now to make this happen. Over the medium term, however, MAF will need to undertake a significant development programme to give effect to its new biosecurity mandate. The Deputy CE of MAF is leading the development programme, and is preparing a development plan for establishing the new structures, capabilities and systems necessary to support a whole-of-system focus. MAF will need to build a biosecurity culture that engenders trust, encourages openness, recognises all interests, and facilitates constructive engagement across the system.

6. It will take time for MAF to transition to its new responsibilities. I intend that the MAF CE will assume an immediate leadership role for biosecurity, but that accountabilities will not be formally transferred until MAF has developed the necessary new capabilities, and a review of output and funding arrangements has been completed. There may also be a case for agencies other than MAF to continue undertaking some biosecurity functions. The MAF CE is able to delegate responsibilities to another chief executive under section 41 of the State Sector Act. I envisage that the CE MAF will make decisions on specific delegations as part of the change management process, in consultation with the CEs Forum.

Background

7. Biosecurity responsibilities in New Zealand are currently shared between central government, regional government and industry groups. There are four central government biosecurity agencies: Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF), Department of Conservation (DOC), Ministry of Fisheries (MFish) and Ministry of Health (MoH). These agencies are collectively responsible to the Minister for Biosecurity for the delivery of national-level biosecurity programmes, and their activities are co-ordinated by MAF's Biosecurity Authority. Regional councils and industry groups are variously involved in delivering pest management programmes for their regions and sectors.
8. The development of strategic biosecurity policy is co-ordinated by the Biosecurity Council, which advises directly the Minister for Biosecurity. The Council has an independent chair, and comprises the CEs of MAF, DOC, MFish, MoH, Ministry of Research Science & Technology, Te Puni Kōkiri, Ministry for the Environment, and the Environmental Risk Management Authority. The Director of MAF's Biosecurity Authority, and a representative from each of the primary production sector, environmental organisations and regional councils, are also members.

Comment

Weaknesses in current arrangements

9. A comprehensive process involving central government, regional government and non-government stakeholders has been operating over more than two years to find ways of improving the contribution biosecurity makes to New Zealand. This process has consistently found that weak governance arrangements are impeding further evolution of the biosecurity system. Weaknesses identified include poor overall leadership, fragmented accountabilities, inconsistent approaches and systems, and poor inter-agency co-ordination (between and within the different levels of Government). There is no commonly agreed set of priorities and objectives, and monitoring and review of system performance is limited.

Revised departmental accountabilities

10. Biosecurity functions contribute to a range of government outcomes, encompassing health, environment, economic and social/cultural. There is a clear need to re-orient the biosecurity system so that it delivers optimally for all desired outcomes. This will require strengthening strategic leadership, and ensuring more cohesive end-to-end management (i.e. pre-border to pest management). I propose a number of changes to ensure that these key elements feature in future biosecurity governance and organisational design.

11. Officials have looked at several organisational options. They consider, and I agree, that the most appropriate organisational form is a government department. The alternatives - a Crown owned entity or state owned entity – would be too far removed from ministerial control.
12. It was not immediately clear how responsibilities should be organised amongst government departments to best provide the increased emphasis on strategic leadership and end-to-end management sought. The current arrangements, whereby accountability for biosecurity is dispersed amongst four separate agencies, makes the balancing of priorities difficult. The result has been the weaknesses identified above.
13. Biosecurity comprises three broad categories of activity: strategic, regulatory, and service delivery. There are strong synergies and a need for close liaison between these functions. Placing responsibility for them in a single organisation with a whole of biosecurity mandate would greatly assist in clarifying accountabilities, ensuring coherent direction setting, and integrating systems and processes. I therefore consider that one organisation should be given overall responsibility for biosecurity in New Zealand.
14. Officials have considered several departmental options: creating a new ministry, placing the functions within the Ministry for the Environment, or extending the existing biosecurity role of MAF. On balance, I propose that the Chief Executive of MAF be given responsibility for end-to-end management of the biosecurity system, and that a new strategic function be established within MAF to ensure a ‘whole-of-system’ approach. This strategic function, and other mechanisms to support whole-of system biosecurity, are discussed in more detail below.
15. A key reason for placing biosecurity functions within MAF is that much of New Zealand’s biosecurity expertise and infrastructure already resides within that organisation. MAF has delivered high quality terrestrial biosecurity programmes for many years, and it already provides some core biosecurity services on behalf of other agencies (including border control, surveillance and incursion response). I am confident that MAF can expand its biosecurity expertise to contribute also to human health, conservation and marine outcomes. The alternative - placing biosecurity outside of MAF - could result in duplication of some functions, disruption to processes, and ongoing complications in terms of boundary issues. There would also be risks of a drop in performance during what could be a significant, disruptive and expensive period of change.

Defining ‘end-to-end’ biosecurity

16. It is important to clarify how the proposed new governance arrangements will impact on the accountabilities of the MAF CE and other CEs with biosecurity interests. I expect that the CE MAF will be accountable to the Minister for Biosecurity for managing an end-to-end biosecurity system. This would include strategic, regulatory, decision-making and service delivery functions for health, environmental, economic and social/cultural outcomes to which biosecurity contributes. Other chief executives will support the MAF CE by contributing to the formulation of strategic goals for the biosecurity system, and monitoring the capability and performance of the system against the outcomes specified. This will necessitate MFish, DOC and MoH retaining capability to provide input on biosecurity risks to their interests. I also envisage that the CE MAF will delegate some functions to other CEs where this would lead to effectiveness or efficiency gains.

17. It is worth expanding on the extent to which end-to-end biosecurity encompasses pest management. Pest management includes long-term actions aimed at eradicating, containing and controlling pests that have become established in New Zealand. Pest management accounts for over half of the overall expenditure on biosecurity, and activities are variously undertaken by central government, local government, industries and individual landowners.
18. The current pest management roles of central and local government are at times muddled, and there is a lack of communication and co-ordination. Under the new arrangements, I will expect MAF to take a more active pest management role. This does not mean that MAF will take on the existing pest management responsibilities of agencies such as DOC, Animal Health Board or individual landowners. Nor is it being proposed that funding for delivery of pest management programmes should be moved to Vote Biosecurity (e.g. from Vote Conservation). Rather, MAF's new pest management role will involve such responsibilities as ensuring that agency roles are clear, that there are no gaps in accountabilities, that pests are being managed at the appropriate (national or regional) level, and that legislative tools are appropriate for the full range of necessary actions.

Ensuring a 'whole-of-system' focus

19. A number of mechanisms are proposed to support the expansion of MAF's biosecurity mandate. These mechanisms are designed to ensure that the new arrangements are given the best possible opportunity to deliver true 'whole-of-system' biosecurity. The key first steps will be the establishment of:
- a Ministerial Committee for Biosecurity;
 - a Chief Executive's Forum; and
 - a new strategic biosecurity function inside MAF.
20. Other important mechanisms will be:
- a reconstituted Biosecurity Council;
 - a Regional Council/Central Government Forum; and
 - possibly an Industry Forum.

Ministerial Committee for Biosecurity

21. Because biosecurity contributes to a wide range of Government goals, several Ministers have a direct interest in the performance of the biosecurity system. I propose to convene a standing Ministerial Committee for Biosecurity to oversee such things as the development of annual plans, review of system performance, and prioritisation of new initiative bids. The committee may also be convened to consider issues of major cross-sectoral importance, such as significant incursions.
22. I envisage that the Committee would meet at least twice per year, and that it would comprise the Ministers of Biosecurity (lead), Agriculture, Conservation, Fisheries and Health, and the Associate Minister for Biosecurity. Other Ministers (for example the Minister of Research, Science and Technology and the Minister of Māori Affairs) could be invited to participate from time to time depending on the nature of issues under consideration.

Chief Executives' Forum

23. Although biosecurity responsibilities will be consolidated around the CE MAF, the CEs of DOC, MFish and MoH will retain a direct interest in the strategic direction and performance of the biosecurity system. It is important, therefore, that these CEs remain closely involved in decisions on significant biosecurity issues.
24. I intend that a CEs Forum be immediately established, with membership comprising the CEs of MAF, DOC, MFish and MoH. Terms of reference for this forum are attached as Appendix 1. Until a process that supports the continuous improvement in the biosecurity relationship with Maori is implemented (a 'Maori responsiveness strategy'), the CE of Te Puni Kōkiri will sit on the Forum. CEs from other agencies may also be asked to contribute from time to time.
25. The purpose of the CEs Forum will be to support the MAF CE in the delivery of end-to-end biosecurity, and its members will be accountable for working together to achieve this purpose. The forum will develop the overall strategic direction for biosecurity, and monitor the performance of the biosecurity system. This will include, for example, contributing to the preparation of the MAF Statement of Intent as it relates to biosecurity, prioritising biosecurity-related new initiative bids, developing a biosecurity research strategy, and implementing a Maori responsiveness strategy. As the CE responsible for end-to-end biosecurity, the CE MAF will lead the Forum and ensure its effective operation.

Strategic function

26. A clear finding of the Strategy is that leadership and strategic direction for biosecurity is lacking. The establishment of a strategic biosecurity function within MAF is seen as critical to the successful implementation of the new biosecurity system. This new function will provide advice to the CE MAF and the CEs Forum on direction setting, priorities, capabilities, system performance, and relationships with Maori, both during the implementation phase and beyond.
27. It is agreed by all CEs that the strategic function must be genuinely and visibly 'whole-of-system', and not captured by sector interests. MAF will actively recruit marine, conservation and health expertise as necessary, either directly or by offering long-term secondment opportunities to MFish, DOC and MoH. MAF will also ensure a cross-sectoral approach is taken during Statement of Intent and other planning processes. This will help to ensure that biosecurity-related marine, conservation and human health objectives are fully integrated with agriculture, horticulture and forestry objectives.
28. The MAF CE will determine the final form and location of the strategic function as part of a thorough MAF organisational change management process. In determining the location of the function, the MAF CE will be seeking to ensure that it is neither captured by regulatory and delivery interests, nor so distant from these interests that effective influence is precluded. The MAF CE has committed to consult with other CEs and the SSC on the establishment of the strategic function, and to ensure that it has their confidence.

Stakeholder participation

29. A broad range of non-government stakeholders is directly involved in biosecurity, or has an interest in its outcomes. These stakeholders have engaged constructively during the development of the Biosecurity Strategy, and their ongoing inclusion in the biosecurity system is seen as fundamental to its future success. Several mechanisms are proposed to ensure that stakeholders have meaningful participation opportunities.

A reconstituted Biosecurity Stakeholders Council

30. The Biosecurity Council advises the Minister for Biosecurity, and was established to co-ordinate the development of strategic policy advice. The membership of the Council is broad, and members were appointed on the basis of ensuring a comprehensive range of interests is represented. The creation of a strategic function within MAF requires rethinking the role and membership of the Council.
31. I propose that the Biosecurity Council be reconstituted as a stakeholder advisory committee, with a role to provide independent advice to the Minister for Biosecurity on the performance of the overall biosecurity system. This proposal would result in a more effective separation between executive accountability (to be co-ordinated by the CEs Forum) and stakeholder interests. The reconstituted Council would also provide a first line of communication with stakeholders on strategic direction setting and significant policy issues.
32. The Minister for Biosecurity would appoint the membership of the Council, including an independent chair who would meet regularly with the MAF CE. The strategic function within MAF will provide a secretariat for the Council, and co-ordinate its activities. I envisage that the Council would comprise no more than ten members, encompassing the following interests:
- primary production;
 - Māori;
 - regional councils;
 - environment;
 - health;
 - marine;
 - research;
 - transport (including ports and airports); and
 - tourism.

Central Government/Regional Council Forum

33. As providers of pest management services, regional councils are a critical component of the end-to-end management of biosecurity. They have consistently expressed dissatisfaction about a lack of transparency in central government biosecurity decision-making, and their inability to influence decisions that impact on their responsibilities.
34. I propose that a Central/Regional Government Biosecurity Forum be established as a means of involving regional councils in strategic direction setting, particularly as it relates to decisions at the boundaries of central and regional government responsibility. Such a forum would increase the transparency of decision-making, and ensure alignment of central and regional government work programmes. It would be serviced by MAF, and roles and functions would be set out in terms of reference agreed with the MAF CE.

Industry forum

35. A strong relationship between the biosecurity system and those industries with an interest in biosecurity outcomes is vital. Industry is both a contributor to biosecurity, and is impacted upon by biosecurity decisions. The reconstituted Biosecurity Council will provide industry members with a direct line of advice to the Minister, but it is also necessary that industries have a relationship with MAF as the end-to-end biosecurity manager.

36. MAF and other agencies already have a number of industry consultation committees and fora. I intend that the usefulness of these groups be reviewed during the implementation phase, and that consideration be given to establishing a single Industry Forum (either to replace or complement existing groups). The purpose of such a forum would be similar to that of the Central/Regional Government Biosecurity Forum – i.e. to advise on strategic direction setting as it relates to decisions at the boundaries of central government and industry responsibility.

Developing biosecurity capability

37. Building the capability (skills and competencies, information, systems and processes, performance measures and structures) to give effect to the Strategy and the concepts outlined in these papers will take a number of years.
38. The changes to put in place the new governance mechanisms and to establish the strategic function can happen quickly. These will be important first steps, as they will guide and participate in the design and development of the future biosecurity system. I envisage that the strategic function will initially consist of ten full time equivalents (FTEs) - one manager, eight analysts (including secondees), and a support person.
39. The *Systems and Capabilities* paper identifies a number of initiatives that can be commenced in the current or following financial year. Over the medium term, however, MAF will need to undertake a significant development programme to give effect to its new biosecurity mandate.
40. The Deputy CE of MAF is leading the development programme, and is preparing a development plan for establishing the new structures, capabilities and systems necessary to support a whole-of-biosecurity focus. MAF will need to build a biosecurity culture that engenders trust, encourages openness, recognises all interests, and facilitates constructive engagement across the system. It will also be necessary to ensure that MAF's Mission Statement and Statement of Intent are fully aligned with its broader biosecurity role.
41. The development programme is at an early stage, and it will be several weeks before the development plan can be finalised. The CE of MAF will consult with the SSC and report to the CEs Forum by 30 September 2003, and the Ministerial Committee by 31 October 2003, on his intended change process. This report back will include a process and timeline for such things as setting up the various new committees and fora, establishing the strategic function, reviewing accountability documents, delegating functions to other agencies, and preparing biosecurity new initiative bids for the 2004/05 Budget round.
42. I am seeking immediate funding for the costs of preparing the development plan and undertaking initial organisational redesign. This work should be substantially completed by the end of 2003. I expect that funding will also be required in the current year, and certainly in 2004/05 and beyond, for implementation of the development plan.

Transitional arrangements and delegations

43. It will take time for MAF to transition to its new responsibilities, and it will be important to ensure that the performance of the biosecurity system is not put at risk during the change process. I intend that the MAF CE will assume an immediate leadership role for biosecurity, but all accountabilities will not be formally transferred until MAF has developed the necessary new capabilities, and a review of output and funding arrangements has been completed. This will be worked through as part of the MAF development programme outlined above. In the interim, biosecurity agencies will retain their existing functions and resources.

44. In the longer term, there may also be a case for agencies other than MAF to continue undertaking some biosecurity functions. The MAF CE is able to delegate responsibilities to another chief executive under section 41 of the State Sector Act. Any delegated biosecurity functions would need to be undertaken within the frameworks and processes developed to ensure end-to-end management of the biosecurity system.
45. Decisions on the delegation of functions will be based on a case-by-case assessment. Functions would be delegated where this would result in a more effective and efficient achievement of the desired outcomes. Examples of where this may be the case include where the context is significantly different, different knowledge, expertise or relationships are required, or where critical mass or expertise does not exist within MAF and cannot be readily transferred.
46. I envisage that chief executives will make decisions on specific delegations as part of the change management process. MFish, DOC and MoH all expect that some functions will be delegated. For example, it is intended that MFish will be delegated its existing marine biosecurity functions at least until the Ocean's Policy process outcomes are clear, and the MAF internal change process is complete.

Votes: Biosecurity

47. Currently each of the four biosecurity agencies is funded through its own Vote: Biosecurity. There is a question as to whether this vote structure will remain the most appropriate way to administer resources under the revised governance arrangements. The Treasury will lead a review of the biosecurity vote structure as part of the implementation phase, and will co-ordinate a report back to the Ministerial Committee in time for any changes to be incorporated into Budget 2004/05.

Financial Implications

48. The cost of establishing and maintaining the new strategic function in MAF is estimated at \$1.600 million (GST inclusive) per annum. This is based on an average annual cost per full time equivalent of \$0.160 million. It is proposed that additional funding of \$1.333 million (GST inclusive) be made available in 2003/04 (\$1.600 million pro-rated for 10 months of the year), and \$1.600 million (GST inclusive) in 2004/05 and outyears.
49. MAF estimates it will also require \$1.718 million (GST inclusive) during the current year to purchase specialist change management advice and begin implementing its development programme. \$0.300 million (GST inclusive) is available to offset part of this cost as a result of an expense transfer from 2002/03. It is therefore proposed that new funding of \$1.418 million (GST inclusive) be provided in 2003/04 only. Additional funding will be sought for the development programme in 2004/05 and beyond.

Human rights

50. The proposals in this paper are consistent with the Human Rights Act 1993.

Legislative implications

51. This paper has no legislative implications.

Regulatory impact statement

52. A regulatory impact statement is not required.

Gender implications

53. There are no gender implications associated with the proposals in this paper.

Publicity

54. There is considerable public and industry interest in New Zealand's biosecurity programmes. I intend to announce publicly the Cabinet's decisions in relation to this suite of Cabinet papers at a joint public press conference with the Chair of the Biosecurity Council when the Biosecurity Strategy is released.

Consultation

55. The following departments have been consulted during the preparation of this paper: The Treasury, Department of Conservation, Ministry of Fisheries, Ministry of Health, Ministry for the Environment, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Te Puni Kōkiri, New Zealand Customs, the Ministry of Research, Science and Technology, the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, the Ministry of Economic Development, and the State Services Commission. The Chair of the Biosecurity Council and the Environmental Risk Management Authority have also been provided with a copy.

Recommendations

56. I recommend that the Committee:

Governance and organisational arrangements

1. **note** that, although New Zealand has one of the world's best biosecurity programmes, there are significant weaknesses with its governance arrangements, including poor overall leadership, fragmented accountabilities, inconsistent approaches, and poor inter-agency co-ordination;
2. **agree** that the accountability arrangements for biosecurity be reorganised by giving the Chief Executive of MAF accountability for end-to-end management of the biosecurity system;
3. **note** that, once the new arrangements are fully implemented, the CE MAF will be accountable to the Minister for Biosecurity for strategic, regulatory and service delivery functions, from pre-border through to pest management, that contribute to health, environment, economic and social/cultural outcomes;
4. **agree** that MFish, DOC and MoH should retain sufficient capability to enable them to contribute to the formulation of strategic goals for the biosecurity system, monitor the performance of the system against the outcomes specified, and provide advice on biosecurity risks to their interests;
5. **note** that MAF's new role in relation to pest management will not mean it taking on the existing pest management responsibilities of agencies such as DOC, but that rather it will involve such things as ensuring roles are clear, that pests are being managed at the appropriate (national or regional) level, and that legislative tools are appropriate;

Ensuring 'whole-of-system' focus

6. **invite** the Minister for Biosecurity to convene a standing Ministerial Committee for Biosecurity, comprising the Minister and Associate Minister for Biosecurity, and the Ministers of Agriculture, Conservation, Fisheries and Health, to oversee the biosecurity system;
7. **agree** that a CEs Forum be established, comprising the CEs of MAF, DOC, MFish and MoH, with a purpose to develop the strategic direction for biosecurity, and monitor the performance of the biosecurity system;
8. **agree** that a new strategic biosecurity function be established in MAF to provide advice to the CE MAF and the CEs Forum on direction setting, priorities, capabilities, system performance, and relationships with Maori;
9. **agree** that the existing Biosecurity Council be reconstituted as a stakeholder advisory committee, with a role to provide independent advice to the Minister for Biosecurity on the performance of the overall biosecurity system;
10. **agree** that MAF should establish a Regional Council Biosecurity Forum, with a purpose to participate in strategic direction setting at the boundaries of central and regional government responsibility;
11. **note** that MAF will give consideration to establishing an Industry Forum, with a purpose to participate in strategic direction setting at the boundaries of central government and industry responsibility;

Change management

12. **note** that the Deputy CE of MAF is leading a significant development programme to give effect to MAF's new biosecurity mandate, and that this will involve establishing new structures, capabilities and systems designed to support a whole-of-biosecurity focus;
13. **note** that the cost of this development programme during 2003/04 is estimated at \$1.718 million (GST inclusive), but that MAF has \$0.300 million (GST inclusive) available to offset this cost from within its existing baseline;
14. **direct** the CE MAF report to the CEs Forum by 30 September 2003, and the Ministerial Committee by 31 October 2003, on the proposed development programme, including on a timeline and process for setting up the various new committees and fora, establishing the strategic function, reviewing accountability documents, delegating functions to other agencies, and preparing biosecurity new initiative bids for the 2004/05 Budget round;
15. **direct** the Treasury, in consultation with MAF, MFish, DOC and MoH, to lead a review of biosecurity vote structures, and to report back to the Ministerial Committee in time for any changes to be incorporated into Budget 2004/05;
16. **note** that, although the MAF CE will assume an immediate leadership role for biosecurity, all accountabilities will not be formally transferred until MAF has developed the necessary new capabilities, and that in the interim biosecurity agencies will retain their existing functions and resources;

17. **note** that, in the longer term there may be a case for agencies other than MAF to continue delivering some biosecurity functions, and that in such cases the MAF CE is able to delegate responsibility for certain functions to another CE;
18. **note** that MFish will be delegated its existing marine biosecurity functions at least until the Ocean's Policy process outcomes are clear and the MAF internal change process is complete, and that the MAF CE, in consultation with the CEs Forum, will make decisions on other specific delegations as part of the change management process;
19. **note** that the State Services Commission will be consulted during the change management process, as the changes will impact on CE accountabilities, organisational structures and departmental performance;

Funding implications

20. **note** that the summary of initiatives is as follows:

<i>Vote Biosecurity: Agriculture and Forestry</i>	\$million, GST inclusive – increase (decrease)					
Departmental Output Expenses:	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	Outyears
Establishing new strategic function	1.333	1.600	1.600	1.600	1.600	1.600
Initial implementation of development programme	1.418	-	-	-	-	-
Total impact	2.751	1.600	1.600	1.600	1.600	1.600

21. **approve** the following changes in appropriations to put into effect the decisions in recommendations 8 and 13 above, with a corresponding impact on the Government's operating balance:

	\$million – increase (decrease)						
<i>Vote Biosecurity- Agriculture and Forestry</i>	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	Outyears	GST
<i>Output class</i> Biosecurity Policy Advice and Co-ordination (funded by Revenue Crown)	2.751	1.600	1.600	1.600	1.600	1.600	Incl
Total operating	2.751	1.600	1.600	1.600	1.600	1.600	

22. **direct** officials from MAF and the Treasury to report back to the Minister for Biosecurity and the Minister of Finance with final costings prior to incurring any new expenses under the appropriations in recommendations 20 and 21;
23. **agree** that the changes to appropriations in recommendation 21 be included in the 2003/04 Supplementary Estimates and that, in the interim, the expenses be met from Imprest Supply.

Hon Jim Sutton
Minister for Biosecurity

APPENDIX 1:

BIOSECURITY CHIEF EXECUTIVES FORUM - TERMS OF REFERENCE

Purpose

The purpose of the CEs Forum is to provide advice and support to the CE MAF, who will be accountable for the end-to-end management of the biosecurity system. The forum will:

- develop the strategic direction for biosecurity so as to ensure that biosecurity contributes optimally to all desired outcomes;
- monitor the performance of the biosecurity system;
- ensure clarity of roles, accountabilities and responsibilities; and
- improve the performance of the overall biosecurity system.

Responsibilities

The forum will advise on such things as:

- the strategic direction for biosecurity in New Zealand, including identifying significant and emerging issues, specifying outcomes, establishing priorities, identifying research needs, and advising on resource requirements;
- roles, responsibilities and accountabilities, including on any delegated functions;
- evaluation and monitoring performance against the outcomes specified;
- the capability of the biosecurity system;
- prioritisation of biosecurity budget bids;
- the Biosecurity Act and its relationship with other legislation;
- high-level risk management frameworks;
- significant and controversial issues, including major incursions;
- international biosecurity-related obligations; and
- stakeholder liaison.

Accountabilities

The CEs of MAF, MFish, DOC, and MoH will be accountable to the Minister for Biosecurity for working together to achieve the purpose of the Forum. As the CE accountable for end-to-end biosecurity, the CE MAF will:

- ensure the effective operation of the forum;
- provide advice on behalf of the Forum to relevant Ministers (this will not restrict any other chief executive from providing independent advice);
- ensure information is provided and exchanged openly; and
- ensure delivery of the biosecurity programme in line with agreed strategy.

The CEs of MFish, DOC, and MoH will support the MAF CE by contributing to the formulation of strategic goals for the biosecurity system, and monitoring performance of the system against the outcomes specified. The CEs of MFish, DOC, and MoH may also be delegated responsibility by the CE MAF for the delivery of certain biosecurity functions.