

The Senate

---

Rural and Regional Affairs  
and Transport  
Legislation Committee

---

Primary Industries Levies and Charges  
Collection Amendment Bill 2016 [Provisions]

April 2016

© Commonwealth of Australia 2016

ISBN 978-1-76010-409-2

This document was prepared by the Senate Standing Committee on Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport and printed by the Senate Printing Unit, Department of the Senate, Parliament House, Canberra.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Australia License.



The details of this licence are available on the Creative Commons website: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/au/>.

# Membership of the committee

## Members

Senator the Hon Bill Heffernan, Chair

New South Wales, LP

Senator Glenn Sterle, Deputy Chair

Western Australia, ALP

Senator Joe Bullock (to 13 April 2016)

Western Australia, ALP

Senator Sean Edwards

South Australia, LP

Senator Alex Gallacher (from 18 April 2016)

South Australia, ALP

Senator Rachel Siewert

Western Australia, AG

Senator John Williams

New South Wales, NATS

## **Secretariat**

Mr Tim Watling, Secretary  
Mr Nicholas Craft, Principal Research Officer  
Ms Bonnie Allan, Principal Research Officer  
Ms Erin Pynor, Senior Research Officer  
Ms Trish Carling, Senior Research Officer  
Mr James Gillard, Research Officer  
Mr Michael Fisher, Administrative Officer

PO Box 6100  
Parliament House  
Canberra ACT 2600  
Ph: 02 6277 3511  
Fax: 02 6277 5811  
E-mail: [rrat.sen@aph.gov.au](mailto:rrat.sen@aph.gov.au)  
Internet: [www.aph.gov.au/senate\\_rrat](http://www.aph.gov.au/senate_rrat)

# Table of contents

<b>Membership of the committee .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>List of recommendations .....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>Chapter 1.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Overview of the bill .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Referral of the inquiry .....	1
Conduct of the inquiry.....	1
Acknowledgement.....	1
Structure of report.....	1
Background.....	1
Overview of provisions .....	3
Statement of compatibility with human rights .....	6
Consideration by Parliamentary legislative scrutiny committees .....	6
<b>Chapter 2.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Key issues.....</b>	<b>7</b>
Introduction .....	7
General support for the bill.....	7
Key issues .....	9
Committee view.....	15
<b>Appendix 1 .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Submissions received.....</b>	<b>19</b>



# **List of recommendations**

## **Recommendation 1**

**2.45** The committee recommends that the Senate pass the bill.

## **Recommendation 2**

**2.46** The committee recommends that the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources continue to consult with Research and Development Corporations and representatives of the agricultural industry as it implements the regulatory and administrative framework associated with the measures contained in the bill.

## **Recommendation 3**

**2.47** The committee recommends that the Minister for Agriculture and Water Resources table a response to the Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee's report tabled in June 2015: *Inquiry into the industry structures and systems governing the imposition and disbursement of marketing and research and development levies in the agriculture sector.*





# Chapter 1

## Overview of the bill

### Referral of the inquiry

1.1 On 17 March 2016, the Senate referred the Primary Industries Levies and Charges Collection Amendment Bill 2016 (the bill) to the Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Legislation Committee for inquiry and report by 12 May 2016.

1.2 The bill would amend the *Primary Industries Levies and Charges Collection Act 1991* (the Act) to allow the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources to provide levy and charge payer information to additional rural research and development corporations and industry service bodies (RDCs) and to the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). Recipients would be able to use the information for purposes including developing levy payer registers, publishing statistics and performing their functions.

1.3 The bill would make consequential amendments to the *Dairy Produce Act 1986* (Cth) and the *Australian Meat and Live-stock Industry Act 1997* (Cth) to repeal limitations on the use of levy payer information by dairy and meat and livestock RDCs.

### Conduct of the inquiry

1.4 The committee advertised the inquiry on its webpage calling for submissions by 8 April 2016. The committee also wrote to a range of organisations and individuals likely to have an interest in the matters covered by the bills, drawing their attention to the inquiry and inviting them to make written submissions.

1.5 The committee received 35 submissions, as listed in Appendix 1. Submissions were published on the committee's inquiry webpage. The majority of submissions offered full or broad support for the bill.

### Acknowledgement

1.6 The committee thanks the organisations and individuals that made submissions to the inquiry. This work has informed the committee's deliberations.

### Structure of report

1.7 This report consists of two chapters. This chapter provides background information and an overview of the bill. Chapter 2 discusses key issues raised by submitters.

### Background

#### *Senate inquiry*

1.8 The Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee (references committee) conducted an inquiry into the industry structures and systems

governing the imposition and disbursement of marketing and research and development levies in the agriculture sector, and tabled its report in June 2015.<sup>1</sup>

1.9 The references committee heard that the current legislative framework provided by the Act only permits the collection of levy payer information in relation to the dairy and wool industries.<sup>2</sup>

1.10 The Act permits the department to collect levy payer information, including the amount of levies paid, from the intermediaries and to pass it on to the relevant RDC to conduct a poll. Under subsection 27(3) of the Act an authorised person (who is appointed by the Secretary of the department to serve as a collection authority) may provide the following to an eligible recipient:

- the name, address and ABN of any person who has paid, or is liable to pay, the wool levy; and
- details relating to the amount of the wool or dairy levy that the person has paid, or is liable to pay.<sup>3</sup>

1.11 Many submitters and witnesses to that inquiry called for a database of levy payers in other agricultural industries, and the committee was referred to a number of reports recommending the establishment of an electronic database.<sup>4</sup>

1.12 The references committee discussed a number of challenges that would be encountered if a levy payer database were established. This included that:

- in some industries growers' involvement is often sporadic or short-term (for example raspberry, black berry and boysenberry growers); and
- a very large proportion of beef industry farms have an annual value output of less than \$50 000, which accounts for about 4 per cent of all levies paid.

1.13 Nevertheless, the references committee formed the view, based on evidence from submitters, that a levy database should be pursued in order to promote accountability in the levy system. The committee also considered a range of other issues and made seven recommendations. Most relevant to this bill is the first recommendation:

---

1 Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee, *Inquiry into the industry structures and systems governing the imposition and disbursement of marketing and research and development levies in the agriculture sector*, June 2015.

2 This section draws upon the committee's work in the Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee, *Inquiry into the industry structures and systems governing the imposition and disbursement of marketing and research and development levies in the agriculture sector*, June 2015, pp 21-23.

3 See also subsection 27(3A) of the *Primary Industries Levies and Charges Collection Act 1991* (Cth).

4 See, for example, Marsden Jacob Associates, *Grain Research and Development Corporation: Independent Strategic Governance Review: Final Report*, July 2014, p. 6.

The committee recommends that the *Primary Industry Levies and Charges Collections Act 1991* be amended, consistent with subsections 27(3) and 27(3A), to enable the collection and distribution of levy payer information which will allow the creation of levy payer databases for all agricultural industries that pay agricultural levies. The committee further recommends that levy payer databases be established within two years of legislative amendment.<sup>5</sup>

1.14 The committee welcomes the government's proposal to implement the references committee's recommendation.

## Overview of provisions

1.15 The bill would amend the Act to permit the department to provide levy and levy payer information to the rural research and development RDCs for the purpose of developing levy payer registers.<sup>6</sup>

1.16 The bill comprises two parts within Schedule 1: the first contains the main amendments and the second contains consequential amendments. The significant amendments are discussed below.

### **Part 1: Items 1 – 6**

#### *Item 1*

1.17 Item 1 proposes to amend paragraph 27(1)(a) of the Act to permit the continued distribution, upon request, of the name and address of the person or body that lodges levy returns with the department to RDCs and industry representative bodies. The department notes in the Explanatory Memorandum that it does not hold the contact details of all levy or charge payers. Indeed, it only receives the contact details of those who lodge levy returns with the department: often corporations or other intermediaries.<sup>7</sup>

#### *Item 2*

1.18 Item 2 repeals subsections 27(3), (3A) and (4) of the Act. These subsections relate specifically to the wool and dairy industries and it is proposed that they be superseded by the amendments outlined below.<sup>8</sup>

#### *Item 3*

1.19 Item 3 proposes to insert two new clauses in the Act: 27A and 27B. Clause 27A describes the types of information that may be given to an eligible recipient by an authorised person. This includes:

---

5 Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee, *Inquiry into the industry structures and systems governing the imposition and disbursement of marketing and research and development levies in the agriculture sector*, June 2015, p. 74.

6 *Explanatory Memorandum*, Primary Industries Levies and Charges Collection Amendment Bill 2016, p. 2. (Hereafter, 'Explanatory Memorandum'),

7 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 7.

8 For a detailed discussion see *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 8, paragraphs 11- 14.

- the name, address, contact details and Australian Business Number of any person who has paid, or is liable to pay, levy or charge on an agricultural product: and
- details relating to the amount of levy or charge that the person has paid, or is liable to pay in relation to an agricultural product.

1.20 The Secretary of the department may also determine, by legislative instrument, that other details relating to the production or processing of a collection product may be released to an authorised person.<sup>9</sup>

1.21 The Explanatory Memorandum clarifies that:

This section of the Bill provides for the separate amounts of several different levies or charges paid, or payable, but a single levy or charge payer to be provided to an eligible recipient. For example, where a single grower produces and pays a levy on potatoes and onions, the relevant RDC would receive information on the separate amounts of levy paid for both commodities.<sup>10</sup>

1.22 Under proposed subclause 27A(2) current rural RDCs and the ABS would meet the definition of 'eligible recipient'. Levy payer information could only be given to the relevant RDC in relation to the particular agricultural product upon which a levy had been paid.<sup>11</sup>

1.23 Clause 27B sets out the circumstances where this information may be used by a RDC. In broad terms, an RDC would only be able to use the information it received under Clause 27A for a prescribed purpose. These would include to:

- maintain a register of levy payers or charge payers;
- maintain a register of those who are entitled to vote;
- publish de-identified information of a statistical nature;
- perform its functions under a law of the Commonwealth;
- perform its functions under a contract or other agreement between the Commonwealth and a RDC; or
- determine whether a person is eligible to be a member or shareholder or a RDC.

1.24 The ABS would be authorised to use levy payer information to perform any of its functions under its enabling legislation.<sup>12</sup>

1.25 Subclauses 27B(4), (5) and (6) would limit the secondary disclosure of levy payer information. Such disclosure would only be permitted where approval is

---

9 Clause 27A(3).

10 Explanatory Memorandum, p. 8.

11 Explanatory Memorandum, p. 9.

12 *Australian Bureau of Statistics Act 1975 (Cth)*; *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 9.

granted, in writing, by the Secretary of the department. If approval is granted, that information would only be permitted to be used for one of the following:

- an R&D [Research and Development] activity;
- marketing activities<sup>13</sup>;
- biosecurity purposes; or
- National Residue Survey Purposes.

1.26 In the Explanatory Memorandum the department provided two examples of circumstances where the Secretary might permit secondary disclosure of information:

Such circumstances could include provision of information to an information technology company engaged by an RDC for data management services. The Secretary could also allow an industry representative body to access levy payer information to consult on amendments to a levy or consult on an RDC's R&D plan, for example.<sup>14</sup>

1.27 These provisions would not prevent the disclosure of personal information to an individual to whom that personal information relates, as provided for in the *Privacy Act 1988* (Cth).

#### *Items 4, 5 and 6*

1.28 Item 4 would amend the Act to state that the powers discussed above in clauses 27A and 27B of the bill are powers that the Secretary cannot delegate.

1.29 Item 5 proposes to insert subclause 29(1A). This amendment would permit the Secretary to delegate the power to approve secondary disclosure of levy payer information (under subclause s27B(4)) to a departmental officer at or acting at SES Band 1 or 2 level.

1.30 Item 6 contains application provisions. Information given to eligible recipients under subclauses 27A(1)(a)-(c) of the bill must include information given in relation to the financial year in which the bill commences, or in a later year.<sup>15</sup>

#### **Part 2**

1.31 Part 2 proposes consequential amendments to the *Dairy Produce Act 1986* (Cth) and the *Australian Meat and Live-stock Industry Act 1997* (Cth) to repeal limitations on the use of levy payer information by these RDCs.

1.32 Item 8 contains a savings provision to ensure that a body declared under section 60 of the *Australian Meat and Live-stock Industry Act* prior to the

---

13 Both 'R&D activity' and 'marketing activities' have the meaning found in the *Primary Industries Research and Development Act 1989* (Cth).

14 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 9.

15 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 10.

commencement of Schedule 1 will continue to be subject to Division 5 of Part 3 of that Act.<sup>16</sup>

1.33 In relation to the dairy industry, item 10 would ensure that any information provided to Dairy Australia prior to the commencement of Schedule 1, will continue to be subject to section 8 of the *Dairy Produce Act 1986*.<sup>17</sup>

### **Statement of compatibility with human rights**

1.34 The Explanatory Memorandum contains a statement of compatibility with human rights.<sup>18</sup> The statement advises that the bill engages the right to protection against arbitrary and unlawful interferences with privacy articulated in Article 17 of the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*. This right is subject to permissible limitations where they are authorised by law and not arbitrary.

1.35 The statement argues that the limitations on the right to privacy are lawful and are not arbitrary. This is because:

- both the RDCs and the ABS are subject to the Australian Privacy Principles.<sup>19</sup>
- the bill would not provide for levy payer information to be used for political purposes, and, indeed, sets out limited circumstances where this information can be used; and
- the bill would only permit secondary disclosure of information contained on a levy payer register where permission is granted in writing by the Secretary of the department.<sup>20</sup>

1.36 The department concludes that the bill is compatible with the right to privacy because 'the limitations' provided in the bill 'are reasonable, necessary and proportionate'.<sup>21</sup> The committee agrees with this conclusion.

### **Consideration by Parliamentary legislative scrutiny committees**

1.37 The committee recognises the important work undertaken by other Parliamentary committees responsible for considering draft legislation.

1.38 Neither the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Human Rights or the Senate Standing Committee for the Scrutiny of Bills has reported any concerns in relation to the bill.

---

16 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 10.

17 *Explanatory Memorandum*, p. 10.

18 *Explanatory Memorandum*, Statement of Compatibility with Human Rights, p. 5.

19 *Privacy Act 1988* (Cth), Schedule 1.

20 *Explanatory Memorandum*, Statement of Compatibility with Human Rights, p. 6.

21 *Explanatory Memorandum*, Statement of Compatibility with Human Rights, p. 6.

# Chapter 2

## Key issues

### Introduction

2.1 This chapter outlines the key issues identified by submitters. Overall, submitters to the inquiry welcomed the bill and supported the key elements of the bill. As discussed in Chapter 1, many of these submitters also participated in the references committee's inquiry into levies tabled in 2015, and through that inquiry called for the establishment of a levy payer register for each agricultural industry.<sup>1</sup> The references committee responded to the evidence provided by submitters and recommended the establishment of a levy payer register of the kind contained in the bill. A small number of submitters raised concerns about aspects of the bill. The committee has listened to these concerns and addressed them below.

### General support for the bill

#### *Benefits of creating a levy payer register*

2.2 A large number of submitters outlined to the committee the many benefits that would arise from the creation of a levy payer register. Support came from both Research and Development Corporations and peak industry groups.

2.3 The Council for Rural Research and Development Corporations offered strong support for the bill, submitting that:

The Council of Rural RDCs fully supports the principles of open, transparent and accountable processes for informing and engaging with levy payers. This Bill enables the establishment and use of levy-payer registers which in turn will mean the RDCs can have accurate, up-to-date information about levy payers. The Council supports the Bill being passed.<sup>2</sup>

2.4 NSW Canegrowers Council and Sunshine Sugar explained how the changes proposed by the bill would benefit the sugar industry. While Sunshine Sugar and all sugar cane growers in NSW pay a mandatory levy to Sugar Research Australia (SRC), less than a third of these have membership in the SRC. The current legislative framework permits SRC to deal only with its members. As a consequence SRC is not able to share information directly with the majority of levy payers. NSW Canegrowers Council Inc. and Sunshine Sugar submitted that:

---

1 Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee, *Inquiry into the industry structures and systems governing the imposition and disbursement of marketing and research and development levies in the agriculture sector*, June 2015.

2 Council for Rural Research and Development Corporations, *Submission 14*, p. 2.

This, in our view, significantly impedes their capacity to effectively engage with their levy payers and to align research and investment to industry priorities. We believe that the amendments as proposed would allow SRA to better achieve its overall objectives resulting in improved returns to our growers and contribute to a more profitable, competitive and sustainable sugar cane industry in NSW.<sup>3</sup>

2.5 Sugar Research Australia (SRA) offered full support for the bill and noted that the proposed reforms would enable SRA to properly consult with levy payers and ensure that its planning and investment decisions align with the needs of the industry.<sup>4</sup>

2.6 Grain Producers Australia, who have called for the measures contained in the bill since 2013, described the proposed reforms as a 'key to providing grain producers with a strong link' with the RDC.<sup>5</sup> The Grains Research & Development Corporation also supported the bill in general terms.<sup>6</sup>

2.7 The Cotton Research and Development Corporation (CRDC) explained that a levy payer register would:

[S]trengthen CRDC's capacity to consult with cotton farmers on their R&D priorities, improve the distribution and extension of research results as well as receiving feedback on CRDC's performance.<sup>7</sup>

2.8 The Tasmanian Farmers and Graziers Association welcomed the bill, submitting that giving 'RDCs access to producer information will increase the ability of these bodies to distribute information in a more efficient and timely manner'.<sup>8</sup>

2.9 Many other submitters provided similar praise for the measures contained in the bill.<sup>9</sup>

---

3 NSW Caingrowers Council Inc. and Sunshine Sugar, *Submission 9*, p. 1.

4 Sugar Research Australia, *Submission 2*, p. 1. See also Richmond River Cane Growers Association, *Submission 1*, p. 1.

5 Grains Producers, *Submission 25*, p. 1.

6 Grains Research & Development Corporation, *Submission 17*, p. 1.

7 Cotton Research and Development Corporation, *Submission 19*, p. 1.

8 Tasmanian Farmers & Graziers Association, *Submission 18*, p. 1.

9 For example, Sheepmeat Council of Australia, *Submission 8* Australian Pork, *Submission 11*; Agforce, *Submission 20*, p. 1; Cattle Council of Australia, *Submission 33*; The Australian Wine Research Institute, *Submission 22*; WA Grains Group Inc, *Submission 28*; Horticulture Innovation Australia, *Submission 29*.



*Benefit of sharing de-identified information with the Australian Bureau of Statistics*

2.10 The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) welcomed the bill, observing that it 'has the potential to open up new opportunities for improving the quality and availability of agricultural statistical information for the benefit of both government and industry' and would support the Government's Public Sector Data agenda.<sup>10</sup>

2.11 The Council for Rural Research and Development Corporations supported the proposal to share information with the ABS, observing that:

High quality statistical information about agricultural production in Australia and the number of active enterprises has also been an issue of concern for some time. Making information available as appropriate to support the functions of the Australian Bureau of Statistics, consistent with the government's Public Data Policy Statement, is also expected to help improve this situation.<sup>11</sup>

2.12 Dr Lindsay Campbell of the Faculty of Agriculture and Environment at the University of Sydney also supported the proposal to share information with the ABS.<sup>12</sup>

**Key issues**

2.13 While the majority of submitters supported the changes proposed by the bill, some submitters expressed concern with aspects of the bill, and a small number rejected the bill altogether.

*Request for further detail*

2.14 Some submitters, while generally supportive of the bill, asked for further detail. For example, more information was requested about: how the information about levy payers might be shared by peak industry bodies and councils; the degree of consultation required by RDCs; and the method by which levy payer information would be collected.<sup>13</sup>

2.15 The department advised that it is working closely with RDCs and industry representative bodies to develop detailed guidance so that the agricultural industry

---

10 Australian Bureau of Statistics, *Submission 10*, p. 1.

11 *Submission 14*, p. 2.

12 Dr Lindsay Campbell (private capacity), Faculty of Agriculture and Environment, the University of Sydney, *Submission 3*, p. 1.

13 See, for example, Australian Macadamia Society, *Submission 23*, p. 2; Apple and Pear Australia Limited, *Submission 21*, p. 2; Grains Research & Development Corporation, *Submission 17*, p. 2; Voice of Horticulture, *Submission 27*.

would have explicit guidance on how the levy payer database can be used, how the data should be stored and protections that should be in place.<sup>14</sup>

2.16 The committee considers that these details that would be worked through by the department with stakeholders as the administrative arrangements are established following passage of the bill through the parliament.

### ***Expansion of the scope of the bill***

2.17 Dr Lindsay Campbell suggested that the bill could go further and enable RDCs to share levy payer information with each other and the ABS. This would be particularly useful given that most farms in South Australia are mixed enterprise farms.<sup>15</sup>

2.18 Grain Producers Australia and Australian Macadamia Society, among others, called for levy payer information to be shared on an ongoing basis, to ensure that the levy payer register is always up-to-date.<sup>16</sup> This would be particularly useful in the case of a biosecurity emergency.

2.19 The department advised that it anticipates levy payer information would be distributed to eligible recipients annually. However, the timing would 'be negotiated with each of the RDCs as a levy payer register is established'.<sup>17</sup> The bill in its current form does not anticipate sharing data between RDCs, however the ABS would be able to disaggregate data between different RDCs.

### ***Privacy concerns***

2.20 Some submitters expressed concern at the impact the bill could have on personal privacy.<sup>18</sup> FLAG Australia submitted that disclosure of personal or corporate levy payer information should not occur without the prior permission of the levy payer.<sup>19</sup> WA Farmers similarly called for levy payers to be able to opt out of disclosure to the ABS.<sup>20</sup>

2.21 The department advised the committee that it has commenced consultation with RDCs and industry representative bodies to develop detailed guidance to provide

---

14 Department of Agriculture and Water Resources, *Submission 31*, p. 1.

15 Dr Lindsay Campbell (private capacity), Faculty of Agriculture and Environment, the University of Sydney, *Submission 3*, p. 1.

16 Grain Producers Australia, *Submission 25*, p. 1. Australian Macadamia Society, *Submission 23*, p. 2; Apple and Pear Australia Limited, *Submission 21*, p. 2.

17 Department of Agriculture and Water Resources, *Submission 31*, p. 2.

18 See, for example, Office of the Privacy Commissioner New South Wales, *Submission 35*, p. 1.

19 FLAG Australia, *Submission 6*.

20 WA Farmers, *Submission 16*.

clarity on 'how the data can be used, who can use it and for what purpose'.<sup>21</sup> In particular, this guidance would:

...set out the governance arrangements for how the data is stored, used and protected in line with the Australian Privacy Principles. It will also be informed by the existing arrangements and experience from the two RDCs (Australian Wool Innovation and Dairy Australia) that already have levy registers in place.<sup>22</sup>

2.22 The department informed the committee that it is working on governance principles to ensure that personal information is protected. These principles are likely to include:

- protection of commercial-in-confidence information and personal information in accordance with the Australian Privacy Principles and common law confidentiality;
- provision of data to recipients only for permitted purposes on a case-by-case basis;
- information provided to an industry representative body must be stored separately to the membership contact list (to prevent the use of the list for non-permitted purposes); and
- levy payers who are contacted by industry representative bodies must have the option to easily opt out of receiving further communications.<sup>23</sup>

2.23 The ABS specifically addressed privacy concerns, explaining its established track-record of protecting personal information:

In accessing and using the levy data to generate agricultural statistics, ABS will draw on its strong established culture of protecting the data that it holds, which is further supplemented by legislative obligations under the *Privacy Act 1988* and the *Census Statistics Act 1905* to protect information from misuse and unauthorised access or disclosure.

In conclusion, the ABS supports the proposed amendments to the legislation. As an organisation with significant expertise in working with administrative data and a long history of protecting the confidentiality and privacy of respondent's data, ABS is well-positioned to draw the value out of this data in a safe way for both government and industry.<sup>24</sup>

2.24 The explanatory memorandum states that where the Secretary has approved secondary disclosure of levy payer information to an industry representative body, the

---

21 Department of Agriculture and Water Resources, *Submission 31*, p. 1.

22 Department of Agriculture and Water Resources, *Submission 31*, p. 1.

23 Department of Agriculture and Water Resources, *Submission 31*, p. 2.

24 Australian Bureau of Statistics, *Submission 10*, p. 1.

'administrative arrangements will enable levy payers to choose to opt-out and not receive information'.<sup>25</sup>

2.25 The committee considers that the measures proposed by the department and the ABS's experiences in handling personal information are an adequate response to the privacy concerns raised. While it is reasonable to allow levy payers to opt out of communications from industry representative bodies, it would defeat the purpose of the bill to enable levy payers to opt out of communications from the relevant RDC.

### *Use of levy payer information for political purposes*

2.26 A few submitters rejected the proposal for the Secretary to authorise disclosure of levy payer information to third parties, particularly to peak industry bodies. These submitters feared that levy payer information may be used by peak industry bodies for the purpose of conducting political campaigns. For example, FLAGS Australia expressed concern that peak industry bodies could misuse the levy payer register for this purpose.<sup>26</sup> United Stockowners of Australia expressed similar concerns, specifically about the Cattle Council of Australia.<sup>27</sup>

2.27 As discussed in Chapter 1, clause 27B of the bill sets out the purposes for which an eligible recipient would be able to use levy payer information provided to it under clause 27(1) of the bill. This clause does not include political purposes. Any use of levy payer information would be in contravention of the proposed clause. The explanatory memorandum specifically states that the bill 'does not provide for levy payer information to be used for agri-political purposes'.<sup>28</sup>

### *Cost of creating a levy payer register*

2.28 Voice of Horticulture and others sought further information about the costs of establishing a levy payer register.<sup>29</sup>

2.29 The department noted that each RDC would need to consider the potential benefits against the 'significant investment that is required'.<sup>30</sup> Evidence presented to the References Committee earlier in this Parliament suggested that for some RDCs the creation of a levy payer register would be relatively inexpensive and straight

---

25 *Explanatory Memorandum, Primary Industries Levies and Charges Collection Amendment Bill 2016*, p. 3 (Hereafter 'Explanatory memorandum')

26 *Submission 6*.

27 *Submission 4*.

28 Explanatory Memorandum, *Statement of compatibility with human rights*, p. 6.

29 Voice of Horticulture, *Submission 27*, p. 2.

30 Department of Agriculture and Water Resources, *Submission 31*, p. 2.

forward.<sup>31</sup> Of course this would not be the case for all RDCs, the proposals contained in the bill offer RDCs the opportunity to create a levy payer register. There is no obligation to do so.

### ***Concerns by some peak industry groups***

2.30 While many peak industry supported the bill<sup>32</sup>, others rejected the measures proposed and submitted that if passed, the changes would diminish the important role that peak organisations perform as a conduit between levy payers and RDCs.

2.31 For example, in the view of Onions Australia, organisations like itself have been elected as representatives by levy payers who do not wish to deal with RDCs. Onions Australia reported that it was 'extremely concerned' by the proposed amendments to permit the department to provide levy and charge payer information to RDCs for the purposes of developing levy payer registers.<sup>33</sup> Similar concerns were expressed by the Voice of Horticulture and AusVeg.<sup>34</sup>

2.32 The committee recognises the important role that peak organisations perform, particularly in providing a link between levy payers and RDCs. However, the purpose of the bill is not to diminish the role of peak organisations. Rather, the bill is directed at giving levy payers more of a say about how their levy funds are spent. To achieve this goal, RDCs need to know who their levy payers are.<sup>35</sup>

### ***Concerns of the Australian Dairy Farmers and Dairy Australia***

2.33 Australian Dairy Farmers and Dairy Australia supported the general policy objective of the bill. However, both organisations rejected the proposed constraints on the Dairy Australia's disclosure of levy payer information.<sup>36</sup> The *Dairy Produce Act 1986* (Cth) does not currently contain any restrictions on the secondary disclosure of information. The submission called for amendments to the proposed secondary disclosure provisions to 'avoid introducing inefficiencies and restrictions in current operational activities'.<sup>37</sup> The submission identified two circumstances where Dairy Australia does not currently need to request permission from the Secretary, disclosure to:

---

31 Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee, *Inquiry into the industry structures and systems governing the imposition and disbursement of marketing and research and development levies in the agriculture sector*, June 2015, p. 23.

32 For example, Woolproducers Australia, *Submission 15*.

33 Onions Australia, *Submission 5*, p. 1

34 Voice of Horticulture, *Submission 26* and AusVeg, *Submission 27*.

35 Explanatory memorandum, p. 2.

36 *Submission 12*, p. 2. Australian Dairy Farmers Ltd is the peak advocacy body for the dairy industry. Dairy Australia Ltd is the industry's RDC.

37 Australian Dairy Farmers and Dairy Australia, *Submission 12*, p. 2.

- a share registry in order to compile voting entitlements for an Annual General Meeting; and
- a third party for an operational purposes, such as to a mailhouse, in order to update levy payers.<sup>38</sup>

2.34 The dairy industry was also concerned that clause 27B(6) of the bill might limit the Secretary's ability to authorise disclosure:

Under the new regime it would not be possible for Dairy Australia to disclose information to third parties without the consent of the Secretary of the Department. If consented to, a third party could then use the information for one of the purposes permitted under new section 27B(6). There is no provision for the Secretary to permit additional uses not listed in section 27B(6), for example a share registry using the information for the purposes of determining voting entitlements for an AGM.<sup>39</sup>

2.35 The Explanatory Memorandum explicitly deals with the dairy industry's concern about secondary disclosure in relation to clause 27B(6), noting that the secretary may permit disclosure: 'of information to an information technology company engaged by an RDC for data management services, or to an industry representative body for consulting levy payers on R&D plans or demonstrating industry support for a levy proposal'.<sup>40</sup> The explanation suggests that it would be open to the Secretary to approve disclosure for the purposes of a kind that Dairy Australia is likely to want to disclose to a third party.

2.36 The committee considers that that the proposed changes do not impose an unreasonable limitation on Dairy Australia's disclosure of levy payer information. Dairy Australia would simply be required to request approval from the Secretary in order to disclose levy payer information to a third party. This is a reasonable limitation and would ensure that all RDCs are subject to the same constraints in relation to the use of levy payer information.

### ***Lack of penalties within the bill***

2.37 Some concern was expressed about the absence of penalties in the bill for misuse of levy payer information. For example, if the database were used for a political campaign.<sup>41</sup>

2.38 The department submitted that compliance with the limitations on the use of levy payer data contained in the bill could be achieved by a robust governance

---

38 Australian Dairy Farmers and Dairy Australia, *Submission 12*, pp 3-4.

39 Australian Dairy Farmers and Dairy Australia, *Submission 12*, p. 4.

40 Explanatory Memorandum, p. 3. See also, p. 9, paragraph 27.

41 FLAGS Australia, *Submission 6*; United Stockowners of Australia, *Submission 4*.

framework. The department provided two examples of 'alternative mechanisms' to encourage compliance:

This could include, for example, incorporating requirements in the government's individual RDC funding agreements or, in the case of misuse by an industry representative body, the option of pursuing legislative and regulatory change to remove the body's legislated role in the research and development system.<sup>42</sup>

### **Consultation**

2.39 Some submitters were dissatisfied with the level of consultation undertaken by the department.<sup>43</sup> For example, Cotton Australia submitted that:

The levy system is built on a strong partnership between the Australian Government and our levy paying growers, so we are disappointed that this Bill which introduces significant, although not unwelcome changes to our industry, was not subject to consultation with ROs [Representative Organisations].<sup>44</sup>

2.40 The department's submission does not outline the consultation process it followed in developing the bill. However, the proposed measures enjoy widespread support, and were considered by the references committee during its earlier inquiry. The bill provides a high level framework to enable the establishment of levy payer registers and most of the detail would be in the administrative arrangements. The department has advised that it 'has started consulting with RDCs and industry bodies' in relation to the development of detailed guidance for these organisations.<sup>45</sup> The committee trusts that the department would continue to focus on consultation with relevant stakeholders as it works to implement the bill – if passed – and associated administrative arrangements.

### **Committee view**

2.41 The changes proposed by the bill would enable Research and Development Corporations (RDCs) to better communicate with all levy payers in a particular industry, not just those growers who are members of the RDC. The ABS would also have access to de-identified data. This bill is the first step toward improving the systems governing levies in the agriculture sector.

2.42 The committee is pleased to see that the government has given close attention to the Senate Rural and Regional Affairs References Committee report into the industry structures and systems governing the imposition and disbursement of

---

42 Department of Agriculture and Water Resources, *Submission 31*, p. 2.

43 See, for example, Grain Producers Australia, *Submission 25*, p. 1; Grain Growers, *Submission 32*.

44 Cotton Australia, *Submission 34*, p. 2.

45 Department of Agriculture and Water Resources, *Submission 31*, p. 1.

marketing and research and development levies in the agriculture sector, tabled in June 2015.<sup>46</sup> In particular, the committee is delighted that recommendation 1 of that report is encapsulated by the bill.

2.43 That report was presented to the Senate on 30 June 2015. The government is required to table a response to parliamentary reports of this kind within three months of presentation. The government still has not responded to the references committee's report. The committee looks forward to further action by the government in response to the references committee's six other recommendations.<sup>47</sup>

2.44 The committee notes that submitters to this inquiry overwhelmingly support the bill. Some issues of concern have been raised by some submitters, for the reasons outlined above, the committee accepts the evidence of the department that they will be resolved in due course. The committee also notes the department's undertaking to continue to consult with stakeholders. The committee welcomes this assurance and will monitor the department's implementation of the new administrative and legislative framework, if the bill is passed.

### **Recommendation 1**

**2.45 The committee recommends that the Senate pass the bill.**

### **Recommendation 2**

**2.46 The committee recommends that the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources continue to consult with Research and Development Corporations and representatives of the agricultural industry as it implements the regulatory and administrative framework associated with the measures contained in the bill.**

### **Recommendation 3**

**2.47 The committee recommends that the Minister for Agriculture and Water Resources table a response to the Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee's report tabled in June 2015: *Inquiry into the industry structures and systems governing the imposition and disbursement of marketing and research and development levies in the agriculture sector*.**

---

46 Senate Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee, *Inquiry into the industry structures and systems governing the imposition and disbursement of marketing and research and development levies in the agriculture sector*, June 2015.

47 President's report to the Senate on government responses outstanding to Parliamentary Committee reports as at 1 December 2015, available online: [http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary\\_Business/Committees/Senate/Government\\_responses](http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Government_responses) (accessed 14 April 2016). This document also provides a history of the President's practice of presenting a list of outstanding committee reports to the Senate on p. 2.



**Senator Bill Heffernan**  
**Chair**



# Appendix 1

## Submissions received

<b>Submission Number</b>	<b>Submitter</b>
1	Richmond River Cane Growers Association
2	Sugar Research Australia
3	Dr Lindsay C. Campbell
4	United Stockowners of Australia
5	Onions Australia
6	Flag Australia
7	Australian Grape and Wine Authority
8	Sheepmeat Council of Australia
9	Sunshine Sugar & NSW Canegrowers Council
10	Australian Bureau of Statistics
11	Australian Pork
12	Australian Dairy Farmers & Dairy Australia
13	Australian Sugar Industry Alliance
14	Council of Rural Research and Development Corporations
15	Woolproducers Australia
16	WAFarmers
17	Grains Research and Development Corporation
18	Tasmanian Farmers & Graziers Association
19	Cotton Research and Development Corporation
20	AgForce Grains Limited
21	Apple & Pear Australia Limited
22	Australian Wine Research Institute
23	Australian Macadamia Society
24	Lexcray Pty Ltd
25	Grain Producers Australia
26	AUSVEG
27	Voice of Horticulture
28	WA Grains Group
29	Horticulture Innovation Australia
30	Animal Health Australia
31	Department of Agriculture and Water Resources
32	GrainGrowers
33	Cattle Council of Australia
34	Cotton Australia
35	NSW Privacy Commissioner

