

# THE HIGH PRIORITY ORGANISMS PROJECT

## Executive summary

A series of three workshops held to clarify the problems to be addressed in the high priority organisms (HPO) project, the purpose of the project and the approach to it. Consideration of the problem identified five groups of issues that the project should address:

1. Poor prioritisation of MAFBNZ effort in a number of areas leading to inefficiencies;
2. The probability that MAFBNZ is carrying out the wrong interventions leading to ineffectiveness;
3. The current set of overlapping lists of organisms have significant defects yet are used in part to inform and judge MAFBNZ performance
4. Stakeholders aren't clear about what MAFBNZ can and will do and have expectations that are not achievable; and
5. MAFBNZ is susceptible to lobbying for interventions against lower risk organisms by interest groups.

As a result the purpose for the project was defined as "To develop a transparent, easy to use, responsive set of tools (e.g. criteria, databases, business systems, etc) that are used consistently across MAFBNZ to:

1. Assist in prioritising the allocation of resources across the biosecurity system;
2. Assist decision-making in reaction to new events or new information;
3. Improve interactions with stakeholders; and
4. Inform the Unwanted Organisms register and notifiable organisms lists.

A proposed approach to the project has been developed.

The report also recommends a different approach to nomenclature as the designation HPO potentially leads to confusion and lack of clarity about MAFBNZ's accountabilities and work planning. Grouping of organisms rather than a prioritised list is likely to be more achievable and more useful. Appropriate and timely involvement of stakeholders is critical to the success of the overall project.

## Contents

THE HIGH PRIORITY ORGANISMS PROJECT .....	1
Executive summary.....	1
Contents .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Nomenclature .....	4
What is the problem? .....	6
Poor prioritisation of MAFBNZ effort in a number of areas leading to inefficiencies because;.....	6
MAFBNZ may be carrying out the wrong interventions leading to ineffectiveness because staff;.....	6
The current set of overlapping lists of organisms have deficiencies: .....	6
Stakeholders aren't clear about what MAFBNZ can and will do and have expectations that are not achievable because;.....	7
MAFBNZ is susceptible to lobbying for interventions against lower risk organisms by interest groups because; .....	7
Purpose of the Project .....	8
Introductory Comment.....	8
Purpose.....	8
Implications of classification of organisms .....	9
Approach to the Project .....	11
Introductory Comment.....	11
Breakdown of proposed work plan (High Level) .....	11
Other points raised in the workshops that should feed into the project. ....	14
Introductory comment.....	14
Issues to be addressed in developing a set of criteria to define HIOs include:.....	14
Issues in creating prioritisation criteria include: .....	15
Issues in applying prioritisation criteria include:.....	15
Difficulties that could be raised by creating a set of HROs these include:.....	16
Other unresolved issues include: .....	16
Other issues with defining HROs .....	16
Acknowledgements.....	17
Appendix – Terms of Reference .....	18

## Introduction

Based on a survey of senior MAFBNZ managers it is widely perceived that there are a number of interrelated issues that will be resolved if a set of high priority organisms (HPOs) is identified. This project was established to develop such a list and the systems needed to support its creation and maintenance. A preliminary set of workshops was set up to clarify the problems to be addressed in the project, the purpose of the project and the approach. This report is the outcome of the three workshops held. There was general agreement on most of the key issues but some remain unresolved and will need to be explored further as the project unfolds. *As an external facilitator I was also asked to express personal views in this report. Some of these were not fully discussed or agreed during the workshops. They are shown in italics.*

It very quickly became apparent that the term HPO was confusing. Its significance depends on whom it is a priority for; therefore we recommend not developing a 'single' high priority list. *Indeed it may be helpful to rename the project, which appears to be about clarifying what MAFBNZ is prepared to be accountable for and developing better tools for tactical and strategic work planning, rather than specifically identifying HPOs.*

It also became apparent that a prioritised list based on impact or even risk would be very controversial and could generate a lot of wasted effort by focusing debate and consultation on ranking. *Some form of grouping of organisms into a number of categories such as high, medium or low is more likely to be achievable and yet still be useful.* The size of the list, the number of categories or the number of organisms in each category was not within the project scope but even within MAFBNZ there is a wide range of views. These issues should be resolved as the purpose of classifying organisms becomes more explicit as the project develops.

## Nomenclature

The project team agreed that organisms should first be classified solely on impact (assessed across all biosecurity values) creating a list that should be referred to as High Impact Organisms (HIOs). Assessing impact on values is therefore the initial filter for prioritisation.

A second filter, based on consideration of the likelihood of establishment of HIOs in New Zealand in the absence of biosecurity interventions - would then create a list, or groups, of high risk organisms (HROs). *It was noted that incursions of some organisms can cause significant harm and should be prevented but the underlying objective must be to prevent establishment which would cause far more harm without this focus failure to prevent an incursion could be catastrophic.*

However, the amount of priority assigned to each organism would depend on a regular and systematic review based on criteria that include:

- The likelihood of encountering the organism at the various intervention points in the biosecurity system given current interventions;
- The likely effectiveness and efficiency of current and potential interventions;
- Possible stakeholder issues (*raised as an issue after the workshops- in my opinion stakeholder issues should addressed when assessing impact criteria and when assessing likelihood rather than as third bite at the cherry*); and
- Any other relevant criteria (strategic fit and barriers to success have been suggested but not discussed).

By applying these prioritisation criteria to the HRO list or groupings the Planning committee could determine the priorities for each business group. This should ensure that there is a streamlined end-to-end approach to the management of high-risk organisms. This approach would also accommodate those business groups that do not prioritise solely on an organism basis.

This process would thus identify organisms that require urgent review of biosecurity interventions to enhance either/or effectiveness and efficiency. They may be either HROs that are being inadequately mitigated or lower risk organisms that are being excessively mitigated. However, referring to them as HPOs will cause confusion and also conflict with those HROs that are being well managed, and thus would have low priority in any system enhancements but retain a high priority for on-going exclusion.

*This apparent conundrum can be resolved if it is accepted and communicated that HROs are the primary focus of MAFBNZ interventions. A new term such as Priority Review Organisms (PROs) would be required to complete the hierarchy of designations.*

An alternative view is that the term High Priority should refer to a zero baseline calculation of mitigation rather than being specifically applied to *new* work. Organisms requiring urgent review would not be specifically designated.

*My recommendation would be to follow the HIO/HRO/PRO hierarchy and the rest of this report follows that convention. In my view a relatively small subset of HROs should also be identified as those that MAFBNZ must continue to exclude based on the magnitude and degree of irreversibility of their impacts. It may not be necessary to give this group a unique name. In a sense these are the organisms that the biosecurity system has been built around, while most other organisms are excluded because of the generic benefits of these systems.*

## **What is the problem?**

Five areas of problems to be addressed, at least in part, through this project were identified.

### **Poor prioritisation of MAFBNZ effort in a number of areas leading to inefficiencies because;**

- There is no common MAFBNZ view on highest risks to NZ;
- There is no agreed basis across all stakeholders for considering and balancing impacts on values;
- Staff can't know priorities so don't know how to determine level of response or intervention points which:
  - Leads to slow decision making;
  - Leads to inefficient resource allocation (including externally contracted services such as science research and operational services);
  - Leads to reactive versus proactive actions; and
  - Leads to poor communications both within and external to MAFBNZ.

### **MAFBNZ may be carrying out the wrong interventions leading to ineffectiveness because staff;**

- Don't know whether or how much to intervene;
- Don't know which interventions will be most effective;
- Are not being handling emerging potential HROs (e.g. Colony Collapse Syndrome, Abalone Viral Ganglioneuritis, Equine Influenza, etc) systematically;
- Are not coordinating interventions across directorates; and
- Have no process for assessing and reducing interventions against lower priority organisms.

*Interventions must be particularly effective against HROs, while efficiency is also important also it becomes much more so when considering interventions against lower risk organisms*

### **The current set of overlapping lists of organisms have deficiencies:**

- They have poorly defined purpose, poor criteria for maintenance and poor accessibility for stakeholders;
- Yet they are used in part to judge MAFBNZ performance because;
- There are too many of them;
- Their current meaning and purpose is unclear;
- There is a lack of criteria for inclusion/exclusion;
- They don't provide a comprehensive repository of all relevant information;
- There is a lack of clarity about list ownership;
- They don't address business needs;
- They don't consistently include common names and lack other useful information or links to other relevant data;

- They are poorly documented and maintained;
- They don't support international obligations;
- There is no list of things that aren't high priority or that we don't need to worry about (not evaluated or evaluated and rejected); and
- They have gaps in focus (e.g. marine, freshwater, etc).

**Stakeholders aren't clear about what MAFBNZ can and will do and have expectations that are not achievable because;**

- There are no clear criteria for determining intervention priorities;
- Decisions are seen as ad hoc in the absence of criteria;
- There is no clarity or transparency about rationale for trade-offs;
- There is no clarity or transparency about what MAFBNZ will or will not do;
- There is a lack of information about which are the highest risk organisms;
- Consultation processes are poor and lack focus;
- There is no consistent and up-to-date to basis for stakeholders to measure MAFBNZ performance. Thus failure to intercept or manage organisms is seen as MAFBNZ failure, even if these are low risk organisms;
- There is a lack of stakeholder engagement on HROs on an across- MAFBNZ coordinated basis; and
- Current lists taken to imply priority.

**MAFBNZ is susceptible to lobbying for interventions against lower risk organisms by interest groups because;**

- There is no clear priorities or rationale to justify MAFBNZ decisions which:
  - Leads to challenges to MAFBNZ prioritisation; and
  - Leads to interventions directed at low risk organisms that divert staff and resources from more important biosecurity tasks.

## Purpose of the Project

### Introductory Comment

While there was agreement on the need for, and practicality of developing a group of highest risk organisms against which a top slice of resources would be devoted, there was unresolved debate over whether, or the extent to which, the criteria could be used to allocate resources over the rest of the system. One view was that the system could be used widely; the other was that its use would probably be limited to the highest risk group.

*The underlying concern here was that most work is currently directed against organisms that probably wouldn't make the top 100 but are nevertheless important. It was argued that the potential impact and risk of a constant stream of new organisms, and the changing risks for previously assessed organisms, drive workloads far more than top 100 organisms, which were largely accounted for in current interventions. In my view the issue here is the distinction between the list and the criteria. The project should be able to develop effective tools for improving effectiveness and efficiency across the biosecurity system. A list of HROs will be a small but significant part of that.*

### Purpose

To develop a transparent, easy to use, responsive set of tools (e.g. criteria, databases, business systems, etc) that are used consistently across MAFBNZ to:

- 1. Assist in prioritising the allocation of resources across the biosecurity system by;**
  - Providing focus for annual work-planning and for adjusting biosecurity interventions;
  - Providing focus for external surveillance to assess changing likelihood;
  - Identifying areas of inadequate/excessive capacity and capability;
  - Providing a basis to measure system performance;
  - Enabling coordination of effort and interventions across directorates;
  - Enabling gaps to be identified and proactively addressed; and
  - Enabling MAFBNZ to balance values.
  
- 2. Assist decision-making in reaction to new events or new information by;**
  - Providing focus for some interventions such as pathway targeting, surveillance and incursion response;
  - Providing a focus for evaluating other relevant data such as interception records, pest risk analyses;
  - Providing a tool that evaluates priority compared to other work, and whether to do more work or intervene;
  - Facilitating quicker decision-making; and
  - Enabling MAFBNZ to better identify gaps in information, to inform decisions about how much uncertainty to accept, whether to do more work, and in what areas.

### **3. Improve interactions with stakeholders by;**

- Working with them to develop the criteria and system for classifying organisms;
- Making the outcome of applying this system and the implications of the outcome explicit and transparent;
- Using these criteria in any consultations and in making decisions on new/emerging organisms;
- Avoiding *ad hoc* decisions by the consistent use of criteria;
- Making the application of criteria in making decisions fully transparent;
- Recognising that the fact that hindsight trumps foresight needs to be managed as an issue affecting public perceptions;
- Reducing unrealistic expectations of MAFBNZ interventions by publishing the set of organisms that are assessed as failing to achieve HRO status with reasons (criteria scores)\*; and
- Restraining lobbying by special interests groups for priority in biosecurity interventions by:
  - Making explicit those organisms that will and will not be targeted by MAFBNZ; and
  - Making explicit the criteria that will need to be addressed in any application for priority.

### **4. Inform the Unwanted Organisms register and notifiable organisms lists.**

*\*There was a strong view that this objective, and several others, would require MAFBNZ to undertake the impossible task of working through tens of thousands of organisms (see section 4). In my view the majority of stakeholders are likely to be satisfied with quite short lists in addition to the criteria. For the huge bulk of risk organisms that have not, and never will be assessed, there should need to be good evidence that they were not being adequately addressed by existing interventions before they become MAFBNZ priorities.*

### **Implications of classification of organisms**

*The following paragraph has not been considered by the team and is not fully agreed.*

Biosecurity legislation and policies currently refrain from establishing minimum outcome-based standards for reduction, readiness and response actions associated with organism-based classification systems, leaving such decisions to nominated decision-makers. Policies and processes focus on how the decisions are made, and what contextual information should be considered. More explicit, robust and transparent listing mechanism may carry expectations of more explicit associated outcome standards e.g. guaranteed exclusion from New Zealand or eradication if detected (see hypothetical examples below). This needs to be carefully considered and communicated early in the project so that decision-making accountabilities are retained and stakeholder expectations managed.

### **Hypothetical examples of outcome-based standards associated with lists:**

A set of guaranteed organisms – MAFBNZ will prevent\* from establishing (agreed subset of critical HROs)

- Priority group for maintenance and review of interventions across Directorates

A set of best endeavour organisms – MAFBNZ will lead efforts to try and prevent establishment (assessed as non- critical HROs or unassessed organisms)

- Not directly addressed but covered within generic interventions across the biosecurity system

A set of low priority organisms – MAFBNZ will not target but they will be included in pathway interventions - no post-border interventions by MAFBNZ (assessed as LROs)

- Sectors may wish to plan for their own post-border responses

*\*Most team members were not comfortable with this statement and preferred words that expressed best endeavours. In my view MAFBNZ is not going to get much support for a statement that says, “We will try to stop top HROs from establishing in NZ.” I am also convinced that there will be strong stakeholder expectations once HROs are identified, along the lines of these hypothetical examples. Implicit in the creation of a set of HROs is the stakeholder expectation that MAFBNZ is making a commitment that the most important of these organisms will be given special attention to prevent them establishing in NZ.*

## Approach to the Project

### Introductory Comment

There was a high level of agreement in the team on the next steps for the project. The approach is staged in logical steps and lends itself readily to project management.

*However, there was a key unresolved issue in this project outline. That is precisely how and when to engage with stakeholders. In my view MAFBNZ does not have the mandate to develop even draft criteria without stakeholder input and there is even likely to be strong reaction against MAFBNZ facilitating the process of developing them. However, MAFBNZ will need to provide leadership, administrative and secretariat support and provide for facilitation. Applying the criteria to develop the set of HIOs is also going to need very specific stakeholder participation.*

*The extent to which stakeholders should be involved in developing the list of HROs and of PROs was also not agreed. There was general agreement that the assessment of the likelihood of unmitigated establishment be agreed with stakeholders. However, there was cautious agreement that the development of the list of PROs, for work-planning priorities, derived from applying all criteria would not require consultation. In my view the extent of consultation required will be largely based on how much trust there is of MAFBNZ to transparently follow agreed processes and criteria. Open and extensive early engagement is more likely to result in MAFBNZ being left alone to get on with the subsequent job.*

### Breakdown of proposed work plan (High Level)

**Phase 1:** Articulate agreed purpose of the project:

- Scope what it means, what it doesn't, document key messages, relationship to other projects/lists, who is it for, explicit assumptions; and
- Scope Decision: Impact, Risk or Priority.

**Phase 2:**

1. Intelligence gathering: Learn from others – pest management, MAF policy, other country/department prioritisation systems etc

2. Develop criteria for the High Impact Organism List:

- Input from experts: measurement, balancing criteria
- Analyse and consult with stakeholders to:
  - Develop 'draft' criteria considering outcomes sought based on 4 values
  - Develop possible weighting process
  - Agree how to deal with uncertainty
- Workshop and/or test draft criteria with internal and external stakeholders (covering a range of perspectives and values not organisation focussed)
- Test the tool to evaluate priority / importance of organism at any point in the system

3. Develop prioritisation criteria for determining priorities, including:
  - Likelihood of encounter
  - Likely effectiveness or opportunity of current and potential interventions
  - Strategic fit
  - Any other relevant criteria
4. Create a long list of organisms that will be evaluated against impact criteria:
  - Unwanted organisms register
  - Stakeholders
5. Develop a Communications Plan
  - Who owns the list, process for updating 'hub' for new info The purpose
  - The value / benefits
  - What it does
  - What it doesn't do
  - Engaging MAFBNZ
    - Regular updates of directorates
    - Project team mix across directorates
    - Testing by focus groups
    - Actively informing MAF of project and at key points throughout
    - Signalling work impacts at business group level
    - MAF need to know what to say externally / implications of project
    - Project email address
    - Web business group
6. Engage external stakeholders
  - Suite of info tools e.g. Website, Biosecurity magazines
  - External focus group to test ideas etc
  - Targeted consultation with government and sector organisations on criteria
  - Stakeholder expectations
  - Biosecurity summit
  - NZ Biosecurity Institute, NETS conf July, BMACC, Minister, Cabinet, B3, CE Forum.

### **Phase 3**

7. Create the High Impact Organism List (need criteria in 2 agreed first)
  - Triage long list
  - Use criteria to populate draft list of things that are not in NZ (organism or groups of organisms) with internal and external experts
  - Check on criteria – test with stakeholders
  - How to gather information
  - What level of information is required
  - Ensure that wider uses of the list / criteria / process is used throughout MAFBNZ
  - Crank the handle

8. Business framework (the relationships between all lists will need to be established before this work begins):

- Gap analysis, performance management
- Input to decision-making
- Need to consider other factors when prioritising work plans
- Testing the process and validating outputs
- Reviewing use plus purpose of other lists
- The process to gather info e.g. how often, who, how to maintain the list (i.e. review and update procedures)
- Update policy on Unwanted Organisms

## **Other points raised in the workshops that should feed into the project.**

### **Introductory comment**

Inevitably in three days of brainstorming, workshopping and feedback generated a lot of valuable insights and observations related to, but not directly relevant to the task at hand. These points have all been captured under the following headings as a resource to inform the next stages of the overall project.

### **Issues to be addressed in developing a set of criteria to define HIOs include:**

- There is no agreement across all stakeholders on how to take account of impacts on all values in determining priorities and whether it is appropriate to develop a single consolidated score;
- There is a need for a mechanism to take account of public concern (including outrage issues);
- There needs to be guidance about how to apply criteria consistently and allow for uncertainty;
- There needs to be agreement about a value/score for impact below which organisms are excluded from HIOs;
- There need to be criteria and procedures for reviewing and maintaining the set of HIOs and for determining the size of the set;
- There need to be agreed processes for dealing with uncertainty; and
- The process needs to be parsimonious, while achieving a robust technical framework.

*In my view it is unlikely that the high impact criteria could be used for day-to-day front-line decisions. However, they should be valuable in deciding on whether to mount an initial urgent response to unclassified organisms that are emerging, undergoing a significant change in likelihood or have just been detected by the biosecurity system. They will be too subjective for marginal decisions but will be a critical tool for informing debates with the full range of stakeholders. Criteria will not be capable of replacing subjective technical evaluation but should objectively guide that evaluation and ensure that non-technical issues are considered appropriately.*

*My concern is that these criteria will create an illusion of objectivity while being firmly rooted in subjectivity – thus there will need to be a consensus-generating step in their application.*

*As they will be quite subjective it will be critically important to apply them consistently and transparently. The application of a set of criteria, even if it is developed with extensive stakeholder input, will still be controversial and is likely to cause stakeholder outrage (response to imposed threat) if it is not handled fairly. If*

*MAFBNZ is able to develop stakeholder trust in the strategic application of the criteria it is much more likely to be trusted to apply those same criteria in an urgent operational setting.*

### **Issues in creating prioritisation criteria include:**

- How to take account of some complex interactions between factors that potentially contribute to risk and priority:
  - The likelihood of encountering the organism at various points of intervention;
  - The effectiveness of current intervention measures; and
  - The opportunities for improved risk management through more or different interventions.
- How to manage uncertainty in assessing risks (impact times likelihood of arriving in NZ without intervention) posed by HIOs.
  - Science and knowledge gaps;
  - Uncertainty used as an excuse for inaction (Cf Decision Making criteria);
  - Precaution is used differently by different agencies – no whole of government approach;
  - Behaviour of an organism in one ecosystem is a poor predictor of behaviour in another;
  - Uncertainty may bias decisions towards organisms that have been more fully studied; and
  - Currently there is no system actively seeking new information to address uncertainty.

### **Issues in applying prioritisation criteria include:**

- The sheer size of the lists of organism to potentially be considered and prioritised (over 15,000 UOs, up to 1.5 million plant pests globally) defies common sense. Some basis for triaging lists will be required;
- Deciding how best the list can be made to actively assist with MAFBNZ resource allocation, i.e. a list of organisms is of far less use than a list of organisms that can be reordered to show which organisms can be best mitigated by e.g. targeted surveillance post border;
- The creation of a standardised set of impact criteria would also allow MAFBNZ to maintain a list of organisms deemed to have the potential for unwanted harm i.e. the Unwanted Organism Register. It will also be possible to use the criteria for determining the impact of non-organism specific issues, e.g. the impact of a response option.

## **Difficulties that could be raised by creating a set of HROs these include:**

- Because they don't include established pests in NZ they may skew overall biosecurity interventions;
- The risk of diverting effort from concentrating on pathways and groups of organisms to focussing on single organisms;
- Potentially alienating some sectors whose sector-based HROs don't appear in the overall NZ HRO set;
- The list itself is will not determine which interventions will be most effective but can be used to allocate resources to an appropriate analysis that will;
- Creation of an expectation that MAFBNZ will prevent HROs from crossing the border rather than being managed at the most effective points of intervention;
- Lack of clarity about how MAFBNZ will manage interventions for all non-HROs;
- May create over-reliance on MAFBNZ to manage HROs and discourage stakeholders from managing their own risks; and
- Public/stakeholder concern is likely to focus on HROs, this is where they will expect MAFBNZ to provide guarantees and perform.

## **Other unresolved issues include:**

- What is the precise relationship between high impact organisms and organisms “of national significance”? *There was a view that HIO was essentially interchangeable with “nationally significant” and therefore that MAFBNZ would lead a response if one arrived in NZ. A view that there may be other criteria than HIO status for national significance was not fully resolved.*
- Exactly how this will fit with SIRWG agreements?
- What is the role for EROC in HIO maintenance?
- How large should the set of HROs be?
- Should, and how, should organisms be ranked in a list, or grouped in categories (such as high medium or low)?
- How many and how large should any subsets of HROs be?
- Precisely how and to what extent will the set(s) of HROs determine allocation of resources and effort by MAFBNZ across the biosecurity system?

## **Other issues with defining HROs**

- The set of HROs may include groups of organisms rather than just single organisms e.g. vesicular diseases of ungulates, fruit flies, vector mosquitos, terrestrial snakes, recombinant GMOs, etc.
- Assessment of impact is relatively stable. Creation of a defined set of impact criteria, and a list of “High Impact Organisms” is a logical and necessary first step.
- Considerations of unmitigated likelihood is less stable than impact so will need more regular review, (potentially resulting in “High Risk Organisms”)
- Consideration of risk management options (potentially resulting in “Priority Review Organisms” is least stable and would require most frequent review to establish the current set of organism-based work priorities for MAFBNZ).

- Likelihood and risk management options should inform directorates in developing annual work programmes from the HRO set.
- There should be an explicit statement of “low importance” i.e. assessed non-HROs.
- The business owner/s for the system and, potentially, for particular variables (e.g. likelihood values = Risk Analysis) need to be clearly identified. The role within the system of the Operations Management Committees needs to be explored.
- New information needs to be gathered and considered continuously.
- HROs should be considered at a specific point in planning cycle.
- Because the set of HROs needs to be dynamic and regularly updated there is a need to see ‘date stamps’ for current information about each HRO.
- Resourcing for all supporting activities, e.g. maintenance of criteria and lists, must be secured at a senior level. The ‘prioritisation decision support tool’, the supporting information repository and processes should be owned by defined individuals of sufficient seniority to ensure that requests for information, etc, are complied with in a timely manner.
- Creating a standardised set of impact criteria would also allow MAFBNZ to maintain a list of organisms deemed to have the potential for unwanted harm i.e. the Unwanted Organism Register.
- It will also be possible to use the criteria for determining the impact of non-organism specific issues, e.g. the impact of a response option.

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to sincerely thank all the project team for the spirit and effort they put in to the project. It was really helpful to have open and constructive participation from all and very timely responses to circulated documents. I found it particularly gratifying as an old biosecurity hand to spend time with a newer generation of biosecurity workers. I was also very pleased to be involved in this project, which I believe is very relevant to improving the performance of New Zealand’s biosecurity system.

## **Appendix – Terms of Reference**

Terms of reference for Phase 1 HPO Project Facilitator

### **Context**

The context of the High Priority Organisms (HPO) project is fully outlined in the following documents, which have been provided to the consultant:

- \* CPORT
- \* HPO Initiation Survey
- \* MAFBNZ Executive Leadership Team briefing
- \* HPO Project Brief and Plan
- \* Straw-man conceptual prioritisation framework

### **Purpose**

To lead the HPO project team in the development of a report to ELT on "problem, purpose and approach" through a series of facilitated workshops, organised with the assistance of Matthew Stone and Deirdre Haines.

### **Outputs**

1. A plan for three full day workshops to achieve the following:
  - a. Define the problem/s that the HPO project is intended to address
  - b. Define the purpose of the HPO list developed as the key deliverable of the project
  - c. Outline broad options for the approach to the project, and recommend
2. Facilitation of three full day workshops.
3. A write-up of each workshop, developed from minutes taken (Deirdre Haines).
4. A report summarising the consultant's views on problem, purpose and approach to the HPO project.

### **Resources**

MAFBNZ supplies the following:

- \* Access to Matthew Stone for discussions during planning, assistance during delivery, and review of workshop write-ups and the final report.
- \* Deirdre Haines as minute taker for the workshops.
- \* Meeting rooms, lunch and teas for the workshops.

### **Time**

Aim is to complete workshops and submit report by 30 April 2008.