



TRUDEAU & ASSOCIATES
ADVISERS TO MANAGEMENT

National Livestock Identification System ('NLIS')

**Record of Proceedings:
Strategy Review and Development Workshop
(Sheep and Goats)
4 March 2015**

Workshop Participants in confidence

Table of Contents

Section Title	Page
• Foreword and Introduction	3
• The Tagging and Traceability of Sheep and Goats in a Dynamic, Multi-Party, Multi-Variable System	6
• The National Livestock Identification System (Sheep and Goats): The Things that Work, with a few Caveats	8
• The National Livestock Identification System (Sheep and Goats): The Weaker Points	10
• The National Livestock Identification System: Paths to Improved Performance (Sheep and Goats)	12
• Appendix A: Workshop Preparatory Notes	22
• Appendix B: Workshop Preparatory Notes	27



Foreword and Introduction

About this Document

1

This document records the outcomes of a workshop held on 4 March 2015 in Sydney under the auspices of the National Livestock Identification System ('NLIS').

About the Workshop

2

The workshop had one key goal: to devise the best response possible to the challenge of tagging and tracking sheep and goat mobs in as consistent and as close to universal a manner as possible.

3

More specifically, the structured and facilitated discussions sought to:

- **Affirm** the overarching intent and operating principles of the NLIS (sheep and goats), when considered against the backdrop of the entire production chain
- **Identify** those matters and principles that meet with ready acceptance on the part of the represented interest groups, along with those that, by contrast, meet with either opposition or ambivalence. In the latter instance, the focus was to be on understanding as clearly as possible the nature of the issues involved and their importance or effect on the wider production chain)
- **Explore**, in regard to the issues involved, the nature of possible solutions; or, where a way forward remained elusive, the nature of approaches or paths to solutions that warrant further examination
- **Agree** the immediate next steps in the issue resolution process, the design of solutions and their implementation.

Workshop Participants in confidence

4

For the record, the preparatory notes issued to participants and the workshop agenda are reproduced at Appendix A and B respectively.

About Confidentiality and the Spirit of the Workshop

5

In a large forum made up of representatives from the many organisations with an interest in the question of sheep and goat tagging, the notion of confidentiality may seem somewhat out of place.

6

Nonetheless, it is fair to state that the record of the deliberations that took place on the day is intended for judicious *internal* use by the represented organisations. The document and its contents are neither intended for reproduction, in whole or in part, nor for dissemination outside the circle of represented organisations. For these reasons the document is classified as being for the sole use of '*workshop participants in confidence*'.

7

Furthermore, readers of this document are asked to respect the spirit in which the discussions took place. Specifically that:

- The workshop was a forum convened for parties with a direct interest in the management of the tagging of sheep and goats under the NLIS
- The deliberations were intentionally structured to create an open, non-partisan and non-judgemental space for the airing of views
- The exchanges that took place were to be respectful and civil, however strongly-held the opinions or difficult the topic.

8

The views expressed in this Record of Proceedings should therefore be treated in accordance with that spirit and as a continuing work in progress.

National Livestock Identification System

Record of Proceedings – Strategy Review and Development Workshop (Sheep and Goats):
Wednesday 4 March 2015

Workshop Participants in confidence

Structure of the Document

9

Aside from this Foreword and Introduction, the document is divided into four sections that set out:

- A description of the underlying structure of the dynamic environment in which the reflection on tagging and traceability takes places
- A summary of those elements of the present approach that work satisfactorily, recalled at the workshop and in this document to put the issues discussed in perspective
- An overview of the remaining process and protocol -associated weak points in regard to sheep and goat traceability
- A discussion of the open pathways to performance enhancement in matters of tagging and traceability of sheep and goat mobs.

BENOIT TRUDEAU
Managing Director,
Trudeau & Associates
31 March 2015

5



The Tagging and Traceability of Sheep and Goats in a Dynamic, Multi-Party, Multi-Variable System

Starting from the top: First Principles

1

Resolving issues in a multi-party, multi-variable, dynamic system should begin with affirming some first principles as the foundation upon which to devise worthwhile solutions.

Ensuring Traceability through Tagging in the NLIS

2

Under the NLIS, where sheep and goats are concerned, bi-directional traceability of movements along the production continuum is both a necessity and a dynamic affair driven by two sets of considerations that ‘book-end’ the chain and define its purpose:

- First, biosecurity, with its concerns for disease management and the associated, regulation-backed, animal management requirements
- Second, trade, with its commercial imperatives and the associated requirement for quality assurance and certification.

3

The active participants or ‘agents’ along the production chain are many. They include:

- At the very front of the chain, the producer
- At the opposite end, the abattoir or port (in the case of live exports)
- Between them, a host of diverse way-stations, from agricultural shows to saleyards, feed lots, depots and the like.

National Livestock Identification System

Record of Proceedings – Strategy Review and Development Workshop (Sheep and Goats):
Wednesday 4 March 2015

Workshop Participants in confidence

The Mob as Unit

4

Along that chain and its various way-stations, sheep or goat mobs represent the tagged, traceable unit whose movements are logged in the NLIS database.

5

At present, the tracking of mobs occurs through two complementary means:

- Visual identification
- Paper-based support documentation.

6

The tracking system and the underlying conceptual framework are national in outlook. Universality of approach and consistency of practice are its intended hallmarks, even if differences in practice can be found – differences often driven by jurisdictional interpretations or priorities.

7

The discussions that took place during the workshop:

- Took the points above as essential reference marks
- Focussed on the non-vendor bred segment of the sheep and goat population as its particular target.



The National Livestock Identification System (Sheep and Goats): The things that work, with a few caveats

General

1

Any effort to improve an existing construct or system should first acknowledge those elements of the system that already work well, so that subsequent improvements do not compromise these positives, their integrity, their operation and their sustainability over time.

2

With that in mind, we note as follows:

- The traceability principle is the cornerstone of the system. Traceability obligations (through the supply and validation of information) apply throughout the chain, without exception.
- In the main, the obligations in question manifest at four key points (i.e. physical venues or locations) in the chain: on the producer property; at the sale yard; in depots; and at the abattoir or the port.
- As it stands, tags are present on the vast majority of animals that enter the chain. As a practice, tagging enjoys a high degree of compliance (~95%-98%).
- Vendor declarations are generally completed and presented. This statement is particularly true for transactions involving sale yards and processors as actively monitored environments. It is less accurate in the case of property-to-property transactions, where compliance will vary according to the degree of sophistication and professionalism of the parties involved. It can also be said that, where small properties and hobby farms are concerned, compliance is more likely to be weaker there than in larger, more commercially-oriented concerns.

National Livestock Identification System

Record of Proceedings – Strategy Review and Development Workshop (Sheep and Goats):
Wednesday 4 March 2015

Workshop Participants in confidence

Fewer issues present with vendor-bred stock. Many, if not most, occur in respect of non-vendor bred stock.



The National Livestock Identification System (Sheep and Goats): Weaker Points

Vendor Declarations

1

While vendor declarations are completed and provided, a number of subsidiary issues subsist that affect the reliability and integrity of the information fed into the NLIS.

2

While the following comments were couched in general terms, they have particular weight for non-vendor bred stock. Specifically, we note that:

- The accuracy of the information contained in declarations is questionable. Forms are, on occasion, only partly completed. And the readability of the information can be poor, leading to guesswork when comes the time to enter data into the system. That notwithstanding, the vast majority of declarations are duly signed.
- The availability and use of different (i.e. successive) versions of the declaration form adds to risk of error and to perceptions of process discontinuity.

10

NLIS Business Rules

3

While NLIS business rules are written with national and uniform application in mind, the examination of actual performance reveals differences in the following:

- The monitoring and management regimes
- The resourcing of those regimes and
- The disincentives and penalties applied between jurisdictions.

4

By and large differences arise from various causes that include variations in State legislation (reflecting divergent priorities); differences in interpretation that translate to some elements being treated as more important than others; and 'enhancements' made for either of the two previous reasons.

Workshop Participants in confidence

5

Variations in practice fragment what are meant to be a single, universal national approach to, and system for, the identification and tracking of sheep and goat mobs. Fragmentation in turn poses a threat to the integrity of that system and thus to the ultimate reliability of the information it holds and generates.

NLIS Database

6

The NLIS database is designed to act as the ‘single point of truth’, i.e. the true reference mark or standard.

7

The integrity of the database can be affected at three key points:

- As noted earlier, through the uneven quality of data submitted for entry into the system
- Through variations in input practices: data input requirements may not be properly understood (e.g. data entry as an obligation rather than an optional activity – an obligation that must moreover be fulfilled to a schedule and in a consistent manner from one occasion to the next)
- Through inconsistencies in practice, typically associated with the more informal or casual transactions that take place, such as property-to-property transactions or those that take place at agricultural shows and fairs.

Funding

8

The effectiveness of the NLIS sheep and goat identification and tracking protocols and procedures is premised on two essential funding-related factors:

- First, an adequate level of resourcing (i.e. manpower)
- Second, a facilitating support infrastructure (in the form of technology and physical assets/facilities).



The National Livestock Identification System: (Sheep and Goats) Paths to Improved Performance

Four Cornerstones of Successful Performance Enhancement

1

Sustained improvements in the operation of the present system will rest on five pillars:

- Commitment to the process and its sound operation
- Cooperation and mutual support between the key agents in the operation of the process across the length of the chain (i.e. unity of purpose, approach and action)
- Consistent and uniform sharing of information (and feedback) between these key agents and the producers
- Monitoring of adherence to the process and its requirements, and
- Enforcement of agreed, universal standards in respect of it.

12

Eight Pathways to Performance Enhancement

2

Workshop discussions produced a number of suggestions for performance improvement in matters of mob tagging and tracking under NLIS.

3

These suggestions have now been structured into a set of nine measures directed at performance improvement. While each of the nine measures is likely to prove beneficial in its own right, it is far better that they be considered as complementary steps, i.e. as part of a *package* of mutually supportive and re-enforcing initiatives.

Workshop Participants in confidence

4

The nine measures address:

- Better vendor declarations
- The validation of producer readiness (i.e. an ‘early-warning system’)
- Engagement through education and feedback
- Improving behaviours through incentives and disincentives
- Active policing
- Sheeting the responsibility home: the facility and its ability to operate
- Mandatory transaction tagging
- Improvement in P2P transactions
- Better information validation along the chain.

Pathways to Performance Enhancement 1:

Better Vendor Declarations

5

Efforts to enhance vendor declarations and reduce inaccuracies are underway in two parallel and complementary directions:

- First, the standardisation of the forms to be used for non-vendor bred declarations. This initiative should see implementation in calendar year 2015.
- Second, the move to a paperless environment and process. The project is at prototype stage (i.e. the system has been trialled through a pilot). An industry initiative under the auspices of SafeMeat, the effort involved is now to be accelerated and implemented as a matter of priority.¹

6

Adoption of the new paperless system will be supported through the Livestock Production Assurance Program as part of the producer accreditation process.

7

In that regard, the importance of the Livestock Production Assurance Program as a change agent and a means of promoting among producers a better understanding of their role as sellers of goods into the food chain (i.e. as *food* producers) cannot be underestimated. As tool for education and as the prime accreditation channel, the program is an essential

¹ A paper-based process will prevail until successful implementation of the paperless version. A cut-off date for the use of paper forms has yet to be set.

Workshop Participants in confidence

contributor to efforts designed to improve the performance of the system and adherence to its requirements.

Pathways to Performance Enhancement 2:

Validation of Producer 'Readiness'

8

The process by which a producer books a delivery of sheep or goats offers an early opportunity for:

- Confirmation that the producer's mob is 'transfer-ready', i.e. that (a) the animals involved are duly tagged and (b) that the associated documentation is both accurate and complete
- Education, if the producer is unaware (or insufficiently aware) of his or her obligations in the matter
- Warning of consequences in those cases where a producer may resist the tagging and documentation requirements (or is known to be a frequent or serial offender against them).

Pathways to Performance Enhancement 3:

Engagement through Education and Feedback

9

Disincentives should be applied only when producers (and others agents along the chain) have repeatedly failed to heed advice and requests for improved adherence to tagging and traceability-driven protocols.

10

Engagement with producers should have two priorities: education about the protocols and procedures in question, along with the sharing of relevant background information (e.g. biosecurity-inspired animal management practices); and feedback about performance.

11

Information about producer performance in matters of tagging (whether that performance is good (positive re-enforcement) or bad (threat of penalties)) should be used in LPA accreditation-related dealings with the producers.

Workshop Participants in confidence

Pathways to Performance Enhancement 4:

Improving Behaviours – Incentives and Disincentives

12

At present, behaviours within the system remain uneven in terms of their quality. The aim must be to achieve highly consistent performance across the entire set of participants – a set that includes all producers, from hobby farmers and small to medium concerns to large enterprises as well as feedlots and high-level traders.

13

As part of that effort, particular emphasis is to be placed on property-to-property transactions, which have so far proven to be the weakest and poorest-performing type of transaction in the system.

14

Whatever the transaction type however, much of the success of the effort will depend on the effective transmission of information and the education of producer groups about the operation of the system and their obligations to it.

15

Information communicated about the operation of the NLIS (and the role and responsibilities of producers in it) should be uniform and consistent, using messages that are straightforward and plain-spoken, professional in nature, informative in content and aligned to quality assurance and sound biosecurity protocols.

15

16

Furthermore, messages should make plain that, while there are *obligations* that attach to the traceability of traded animals – obligations that entail the investment of a certain amount of effort and care on the part of the producer, there are equal (if not ultimately greater) *benefits* from participation and adherence to the protocols in question. In that respect, messages should articulate clearly both incentives for compliance with protocols and disincentives for those who fail to respect them.

17

Under NLIS co-ordination, a range of stakeholders will be called upon to assist in this information sharing and education process. They include:

- State farming organisations
- The livestock biosecurity network
- Peak industry bodies (e.g. Wool Producers, Sheep Meat Council)
- Organisations such as the NLIS, the MLA and AHA
- Stock and station agents

Workshop Participants in confidence

- State departments
- The Livestock Production Assurance Program ('LPA')².

18

In looking to the future, we recognise that:

- Best efforts to the contrary, a measure of on-going, residual non-compliance will have to be addressed; and that
- Disincentives will thus inevitably form part of the performance enhancement 'toolkit'.

19

The principles of behaviour modification require that for behaviours to be modified, disincentives (i.e. 'penalties') for non-compliance be (a) measured, insofar as they put education first and penalty second (such as would be the case in a 'three-strike' system); (b) have sufficient effect that they deter repeat offending against the rules; and (c) are consistently applied along the entire chain and across jurisdictions.

20

By way of illustration, some of the sanctions or measures taken against serial re-offenders could include:

- The rejection of stock presented for sale if it is found to be non-compliant
- The placing of the non-compliant stock to the back of the day's sale queue
- The imposition of fines for non-compliance and penalties for costs incurred in handling non-compliant stock.

21

Whatever their form, penalties for non-compliance must be available. While no one participant in the process will take on the policing of its good operation, system-generated information must provide the basis for one of two groups to take action against repeat offenders – either State authorities via (harmonised) regulations or industry, through some of its programs.

22

The examination of possible disincentives that answer to the requirements set out above, along with the framing of specific options for review and consideration, will be undertaken by the SafeMeat Council.

² Through its accreditation powers and provisions

Workshop Participants in confidence

Pathways to Performance Enhancement 5:

Active Policing

23

The presence of authority and the fear of offending against it have proven time and again to be effective deterrents against wrong-doing: the police car lying in wait for speeding drivers and the unpredictable prospect of breath-testing are but two examples of this. One path to performance/behavioural improvement in matters of tagging could see the use of government inspectors at saleyards (in preference to third-party contractors, whose 'range of activity' would be more limited and less mobile).

24

While the preferred way would be that of self-regulation based on appropriate education and the use of warnings in cases of dereliction, it remains that stronger forms of deterrence are likely to be necessary to bring about 'conversions'.

25

In that respect, the presence of inspectors at saleyards would serve a number of purposes besides deterrence, including:

- Auditing of system performance at the location
- On-going education of parties regarding tagging and traceability protocols and procedures
- Appropriate intervention and problem resolution, when cases of non-compliant mobs present.

17

26

To be successful a policing system of this kind would require adequate funding for appropriate resourcing. Moreover, site visits by the inspectors would have to be:

- Regular (i.e. sustained over the longer term)
- Performed on a rolling basis across locations
- Well targeted for maximum effect.

27

To carry weight and act as a strong disincentive, penalties imposed (typically for repeat offending) would have to be meaningful, i.e. costly to the offender, however 'cost' may be defined in this context.

Workshop Participants in confidence

Pathways to Performance Enhancement 6:

Sheeting the Responsibility Home

28

An important principle in sheeting home the responsibility for the enforcement of tagging protocols and procedures post-producer involvement (and the penalty for failing to do so at any subsequent way-station along the chain) is to target the facility (e.g. a sale yard, a feed-lot, a depot or an abattoir) and its licence to operate.

29

Making adherence to the tagging protocols a condition of the grant, maintenance or renewal of an operating licence is a powerful tool in the enforcement arsenal. Used wisely, it is likely to prove one of the more compelling behaviour modification instruments available.

Pathways to Performance Enhancement 7:

Better Management of P2P (property-to-property) Transactions

30

We have noted earlier that P2P transactions, particularly where they occur in smaller farms and less professional environments, are often poorly recorded (or not recorded at all) and thus represent a gap in the integrity of the system. It is a gap that should be closed, difficult and effort-intensive as that task may prove.

18

31

The first step in the effort to close the gap should be one of definition: what is a true P2P transaction? What are exceptions to that definition? For instance, an auction on a property does not constitute a P2P transaction as the event is deemed to come under yard sale rules by proxy.

32

Various means of simplifying P2P reporting are under active consideration. They include:

- The uploading of non-vendor bred stock declarations directly to the NLIS database as images –a technique that could also be used in saleyards, depots and abattoirs, and one that would form an integral part of the wider move to a paperless system
- The development of a suitable mobile phone app for recording the transaction.

Workshop Participants in confidence

33

Whatever the approach taken, P2P transactions are to be brought into the fold and made an integral part of NLIS protocols.

Pathways to Performance Enhancement 8:

The Bolder Step – Mandatory Transaction Tagging

34

In a system in which the traceability – and the integrity of that traceability – are overarching requirements, two choices offer: the listing of all PICs in a mob of non-vendor bred sheep, which presents particular difficulties; and the ‘transaction tagging’³ of every animal in the mob, an approach that allows the tracking of provenance with greater reliability and, once adopted, is expected to enhance database quality and integrity.

35

Of the two avenues above, ‘pink’ or ‘transaction’ tagging is the preferred option – and one that also aligns with EU requirements. Introducing the practice of pink tagging and overseeing its successful adoption will require that the rationale for the move be clearly articulated, along with its consequences and implications; and that a proper, detailed implementation plan be drawn up to guide the introduction of the practice.

[Note: AMIC has requested that its opposition to this proposal be formally recorded.]

19

Pathways to Performance Enhancement 9:

Better Information Validation along the Entire Chain

36

The participation of all sectors along the production chain is an essential condition of the integrity of the system and of its operation to NLIS requirements. Nothing short of that will guarantee system integrity.

37

For the operation of the system to attain the desired level of performance in respect of tagging and traceability (sheep and goats), the following improvements should come into effect:

- A better (i.e. an equally, evenly and consistently-shared) understanding of the rationale for tagging and accurate mob movement tracing
- A better (i.e. equally, evenly, consistently-shared and committed) sense of purpose in maintaining and supporting the integrity of the system

³ Also referred to as ‘pink tagging’

National Livestock Identification System

Record of Proceedings – Strategy Review and Development Workshop (Sheep and Goats):
Wednesday 4 March 2015

Workshop Participants in confidence

- An enhanced tagging and tracking process for non-vendor bred stock
- Standardised NLIS reporting methodologies and associated requirements
- The introduction of transaction tagging

[Note: Refer to the earlier statement on AMIC’s opposition to this last proposal (see item 35)]

38

In that respect, all way-stations along the chain – and the participants active in those way-stations – share (according to their mandates and powers) in the wider responsibility of ensuring that the system as a whole supports the following activities:

- Monitoring of mob movements (i.e. checking of tagging and documentation)
- Reporting on general system performance
- Engaging with the mob-transferring party to ensure obligations are understood
- Auditing adherence to tagging and tracking protocols and procedures
- Enforcing of the same protocols and procedures through targeted measures
- Managing the consequences of errors and ‘mis-feeds’ into the chain (i.e. the handling of corrective or remedial logistics triggered by mobs that do not meet tagging and documentation requirements).

20

Record of Proceedings:

Beyond the Workshop

39

The matters raised in the workshop and the suggested pathways to improved performance (as reflected in this document) are to form the basis of further reports and consultations among interested parties, including:

- NLIS Advisory Committee (meeting of 22 April 2015)
- SafeMeat (meeting of 30 April 2015)
- Agriculture Senior Officials’ Committee (AGSOC, September 2015 meeting).



National Livestock Identification System

Record of Proceedings – Strategy Review and Development Workshop (Sheep and Goats):
Wednesday 4 March 2015

Workshop Participants in confidence

Appendix A:
Workshop Preparatory Notes

**National Livestock Identification System
Strategy Review and Development Workshop
(Sheep and Goats)
Wednesday 4 March 2015, 0900 - 1530**

Preparatory Notes

Purpose of the Notes

1

The notes are intended to assist those taking part in the NLIS (Sheep and Goats) strategy review and development workshop of Wednesday 4 March 2015 to prepare for the conversations that will take place during the five sessions set out in the Proposed Agenda.

Purpose of the Workshop

2

With its eye on performance across the entire value chain, NLIS wants to raise present performance levels in respect of requirements surrounding the compliance of sheep and goat movements through the supply chain. While the importance of tagging, documentation and database recording is generally acknowledged as a matter of principle, application of the associated requirements is uneven and open to material improvement. The 4 March workshop is a unique opportunity for participants to jointly frame a strategy that will improve the effectiveness of the current mob-based NLIS.

3

The workshop will examine the nature of the issues that stand in the way of that goal and, wherever possible, find either solutions to the issues in question or paths toward their eventual resolution. The workshop is intended as an exercise in the construction of acceptable solutions.

4

To that end, the thread of the day's conversations will consider four matters and articulate as best as possible the views participants hold about them. It will:

Workshop Participants in confidence

- **Visit and affirm** the overarching intent and operating principles of the NLIS when considered against the backdrop of the entire sheep and goat production chain
- **Identify** those matters and principles that meet with ready acceptance on the part of the represented interest groups, along with those that, by contrast, meet with either opposition or ambivalence. In the latter instance, the focus will be on understanding as clearly as possible the nature of the issues involved and their importance or effect on the wider production chain)
- **Explore**, in regard to the issues involved, the nature of possible solutions or, where a way forward remains elusive, the nature of approaches or paths to solutions that warrant further examination
- **Agree** the immediate next steps in the issue resolution process, the design of solutions and their implementation.

Spirit of the Workshop

5

The workshop is first and foremost a consultative and constructive exercise that will have a direct and material effect on the approach to be taken toward the more effective implementation of NLIS (Sheep and Goats).

6

In that context, the active participation of workshop attendees is a condition of the success of the policy development and implementation effort. The importance of engagement will be re-enforced on the day both by general invitation as well as through active questioning by the facilitator.

7

While informal, the discussion will seek to elicit as much information as possible in the available time. Some of it is therefore likely to be 'rapid-fire' information gathering. Otherwise the reflection will be primarily concerned with the generation and capture of constructive ideas and approaches that will assist parties to deal with present compliance inhibitors.

Workshop Participants in confidence

The Agenda

8

The agenda for the workshop is the companion document to these Preparatory Notes. Through five structured sessions that move from the general to the particular and the factual to possible solutions, the reflection it proposes will visit each of the matters mentioned earlier, before closing with a short session on the next steps in the solution development process.

The Facilitation

9

The facilitator has three key responsibilities. They are to:

- Lead and steer the discussion on the various topics to productive outcomes that are as clear and specific as possible, questioning and challenging participants along the way
- Ensure that the discussion progresses in a (relatively) orderly manner across the agenda, ensuring that each topic receives due attention within the total timeframe
- Map the flow of the conversation and extract from it their substance, so that a proper and faithful record of proceedings can emerge from the group's deliberations and be put to good use in articulating the strategy.

10

Participants should be aware of the following about the workshop and its facilitation:

- The facilitation style will be active: the meeting answers directly to the facilitator who leads it.
- The workshop will be concerned with the generation of ideas, the exploration of concepts and the voicing of questions and issues of direct and material relevance to the matter at hand. It will look to the future and strive for positive, constructive momentum. The day's effort is, after all, about solutions.
- This discussion will seek to define, affirm (or confirm) as many of the building blocks that will give the NLIS tagging policy a better-working form. Once acquired, these building blocks or key concepts will form an integral part of the future approach.

National Livestock Identification System

Record of Proceedings – Strategy Review and Development Workshop (Sheep and Goats):
Wednesday 4 March 2015

Workshop Participants in confidence

- To repeat an earlier point: it is foolishness to entertain the thought that all questions and issues will be resolved in a six-hour workshop. Time and complexity are hard adversaries. The workshop is a step in a reflection process and follow-through there will be.
- There is no rank in the room among participants: the focus rests entirely on the exploration and development of ideas of direct relevance to the subject. Participants are invited to the workshop *because* they have a direct interest in its outcomes. Their contribution is not only invited: it is expected. There are no spectators.
- Expect robust discussion, under the facilitator’s leadership and direction. He will seek out opinions, ask for clarification, question, challenge and test arguments. To paraphrase the sporting line: participants are invited to ‘play’ the ideas as hard as their convictions warrant, but never the man.

11

In short, participants and facilitator attend in order to contribute to as effective a reflection as possible surrounding the central question: how to devise the best response possible the challenge of sheep and goat tagging, in a consistent and as close to universal manner as possible. As facilitator, I look forward to earnest, forthright and productive exchanges on the day.

25

General Arrangements

12

Please note that, in the interests of a sustained discussion and as a courtesy to others, participants will be asked to refrain from using mobile phones, iPads and other personal communication devices in session time.

With thanks – and much anticipation,

BENOIT TRUDEAU

Managing Director
Trudeau & Associates

24 February 2015

National Livestock Identification System

Record of Proceedings – Strategy Review and Development Workshop (Sheep and Goats):
Wednesday 4 March 2015

Workshop Participants in confidence

Appendix B: Workshop Agenda

**National Livestock Identification System
Strategy Review and Development Workshop (Sheep and Goats)
Wednesday 4 March 2015, 0900 - 1530**

Proposed Agenda

0900	WORKSHOP OPENS	
0900 - 0915	Welcome and Opening Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ian Feldtmann • Benoit Trudeau, Facilitator
0915-0930	Session 1	<p>The overarching purpose of the NLIS and its application to sheep and goats:</p> <p>Facilitated Discussion</p> <p>A short discussion designed to affirm the general intent and operating principles of the NLIS against the backdrop of the complete production chain for relevant animal species.</p>
0930-1030	Session 2	<p>The NLIS in operation as it applies to sheep and goats: What works? What does not?</p> <p>Facilitated Discussion</p> <p>Various efforts notwithstanding, application and implementation of NLIS-driven sheep and goat movements in Australia remains uneven and decidedly ‘patchy’.</p> <p>Working against the backdrop of the entire supply chain, the Session 2 discussion will probe the strengths and weaknesses associated with the application of the mob-based NLIS: what parts of the system work? Which don’t? Why?</p> <p>The conversation will endeavour to put as much precision and structure as possible to the issues identified.</p>
1030-1050	Morning Break	

Proposed Agenda (continued)

<p>1050-1215</p>	<p>Session 3</p> <p>Facilitated Discussion</p>	<p>The NLIS-driven movement of sheep and goats: Finding a way forward (Part 1)</p> <p>Taking the key themes that the Session 2 discussion will have generated, the Session 3 conversation will focus its attention on the future and, more specifically, the identification and exploration of ways forward.</p> <p>The discussion will strive to look constructively at approaches and measures that could prove the needed tipping point for the long-term realisation of the policy: what might be suitable inducements or incentives – i.e. the potential ‘game changers’ when it comes to the adoption of better, more consistent practices as they apply to sheep and goats?</p>
<p>1215-1230</p>	<p>Summation</p>	<p>Summarisation of the morning’s discussion: key comments, points of agreement and remaining differences</p>
<p>1230-1315</p>	<p>Lunch Break</p>	
<p>1315-1430</p>	<p>Session 4</p> <p>Facilitated Discussion</p>	<p>The NLIS-driven movement of sheep and goats: Finding a way forward (Part 2)</p> <p>Session 4 will progress the work begun during the previous session.</p> <p>Where solutions (i.e. ways forward) cannot readily be found, the discussion will endeavour to identify the path one might take in order to arrive at a solution.</p>

Workshop Participants in confidence

Proposed Agenda (continued)

1430-1445	Short Afternoon Break	
1445-1520	Session 5 Facilitated Discussion	Immediate Next Steps: What process from this point on? Session 5 will aim to define the remaining steps in the reflection on the movement of sheep and goats, and on the solution development process.
1520-1530	Second Summation and Closing Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Benoit Trudeau, Facilitator• Ian Feldtmann
1530	WORKSHOP CLOSES	

Please note that, in the interests of a sustained discussion and as a courtesy to others, participants will be asked to refrain from using mobile phones, iPads and other personal communication devices in session time.

