



Dairy for life

Industry Good Practice

How could we use it in a Plan Change?

June 2015

Industry Good Practice – Are we talking the same language?



- Good Management Practice
- Industry Audited Self Management System
- Outcome focused
- Farm and business specific
- Risk based
- One to one
- Continuous Improvement and behaviour change



Advantages of Industry GMP Systems

- 
- Flexible – in a region, catchment, FMU and to a farm e.g. waterway programme in Taranaki, water use in Waikato, regulatory requirements in Tukituki.
 - Leveraging existing spend and resources – behaviour change is expensive
 - Risk based approach and one to one support, specific, relevant and targeted
 - Faster and cheaper
 - Less bureaucracy

Challenges to Address

- How do we give regulators and the community confidence farmers are doing what they say they are?
- How do we promote the positive without always being measured by the worst performer?
- How do we design a system that doesn't get redesigned to an implementation nightmare.



What not to do

- Tack additional regulation on to an Industry System and create a monster – becomes high cost and low value to everyone especially a farmer
- Focus on Farm Environment Plans – it's a product - FEPs are not behaviour change.
- Ignore the process – who did a risk assessment? Set actions? Who will review? What is the support? What is the consequence? How is success measured?



What to do

- **Build on existing systems - or risk replicating and undermining them**
- **Give a carrot – industry will respond**
- **Acknowledge the success and have trust and confidence in farmers**
- **Don't design for the worst performer but acknowledge the tail and leave for regulators**
- **Look at history – what has produced the most success? Regulation or industry initiatives ?**

What Policy Instrument – Policy D Plus

- Will incorporate a Industry Audited Self Management Scheme.
- It is anticipated this scheme will contain:
 - minimum standards,
 - at least annual inspection,
 - one-one support, audit and verification
 - be approved by WRC and audited regularly

Policy D	Policy D Plus
All farms require a resource consent	All farms not participating in a WRC approved IASM scheme require a resource consent
All farms must do a farm plan	All farms will meet scheme minimum standards or do a farm plan to outline how and when they will meet standards OR they obtain a consent
Farm Plans will be measured by WRC – how many ? what actions?	Farmers submit their IASM reports and farm plans to WRC when requested
Farm Plans will be monitored and enforced by WRC	WRC will audit an IASM scheme and/or a sample of participating farmers. WRC monitor and enforce consented activities

Policy Selection Criteria



Policy Selection Criteria		Policy D Plus
Supported by clear evidence	<i>Take an evidence based and knowledge based approach (including Matauranga Maori)</i>	Partly – will allow a risk based approach that can adapt to a individual farm or catchment. Is more flexible as doesn't require a Plan change to include additional issues
	<i>Prioritise efforts to achieve catchment solutions</i>	Yes – risk based approach at all levels
Realistic to monitor, implement and enforce	<i>Able to be measure monitored and reported</i>	Yes – farmers report to Council to maintain a favourable activity status
	<i>Implementable and technically feasible</i>	Yes - already being implemented
	<i>Administratively efficient</i>	Yes - very
Optimise economic, social and economic outcomes	<i>Aim for cost effective solutions</i>	Yes – builds on existing industry investment, resource is sent to where change is needed
	<i>Provide confidence and clarity for current and future investment</i>	Yes
	<i>Provide realistic timeframes for change</i>	Potentially
Allows for flexibility and intergenerational land use	<i>Foster innovation</i>	Yes
	<i>Encourage positive actions being taken</i>	Yes – risk based approach
	<i>Allow for change and review as new information and issues arise</i>	Yes – ISAM can change quickly and easily and is designed on continuous improvement
	<i>Provide flexibility of future land use (including the return of Treaty settlements and multiple Maori owned land)</i>	Yes – potential for industry to drive efficiency and headroom for new entrants
	<i>Take account of complexity and difference between farming systems and farm enterprises</i>	Yes - one on one support to an individual farm and its unique challenges

Industry Good Practice

- do you think these systems should be in the Plan at all, and if so,
 - - **Yes we need to build on the success and investment**
- should they be in there as purely voluntary systems
 - **For Dairy they are not voluntary but they are risk based**
- or voluntary with incentives
- -**The Plan can give a regulatory incentive – Permitted Activity**
- or should there be some form of requirement for everyone to have a plan
- - **Not a generic FEP but a risk based, farm specific plan working to continuous improvement**
- what sort of auditing or monitoring or performance standards you would envisage
- - **Extensive within the programme – WRC could audit the industry and or a farmer selection**
- what would be the role of WRC and the role of industry bodies.
- - **Industry drives change with clear accountability, WRC remains the regulator**
- There may be current examples in this or other regions you could cite as to how this has been incorporated in Plans.
- **Tukituki, Horizons, Waikato**

Questions?

