

Da kiwi bloke and da bureaucrat

Kelloggs Rural Leadership Course Project

Due: Ages ago
Presented: November 2006 to fellow Kelloggers
Prepared: Mark Illston, Minda Hills
R D 6 Taihape
Email: Illston@actrix.co.nz



What have they in common?

1. Executive Summary

Farmer actions to reduce the effects of Bureaucracy and Bureaucrats on our lives.

Farmers, business 'persons' and citizens *appear* to be confronted with more and more rules and regulations that are affecting the way in which we live our daily lives and operate our business activities.

The word "*appear*" is difficult to quantify unless one of these new Rules and Regulations has a direct impact on your life.

Rules and regulations are created by politicians and enforced by bureaucrats.

In this presentation I will explain to you'

- What bureaucracy is
- What causes bureaucracy
- What we can do to reduce the effects on our lives
- What can we do to reduce the number of rules and regulations.

Farmers have not got a good relationship with the New Zealand voting public. There is becoming a wider gap of misunderstanding about farming and farmers. It is unfortunate that once most city families had a cousin on the farm now there is no common bond and the level of understanding is getting less year on year.

If you can not spend the time to understand all of the Rules and regulations that are affecting your life and business then pay for and empower a person or organization to do the job on your behalf

We as farmers are going to have to take the initiative to attempt to breach the communication divide and give more young New Zealanders a taste of the enjoyment of country life.

It will be very unlikely that many of them will want to stay and make a career of farming but to experience farm life is to have some understanding.

Farmers the problem is in your hands, what are you going to do this week to make contact with the city folk and attempt to give some understanding to the wider community? It's not their fault that they are wrong.

2. Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary
2. Table of Contents
3. Rules & Regulations = Bureaucracy
4. Reasons and Causes
5. The Process
 - 5.1 The People
 - 5.2 The Action
6. The Reaction & Result
7. Making a difference
 - 7.1 Federated Farmers
 - 7.2 Better Understanding
 - 7.3 Breaking down barriers
 - 7.4 Building alliances
 - 7.5 Owning the problem
 - 7.6 Key rules when dealing with organisations
8. Conclusions & Recommendations
9. References
10. Appendix

3. Rules & Regulations = Bureaucracy

Each year New Zealanders are being faced with new Rules and Regulations that affect their daily lives. For the most part they have no discernable affect.

My interest in rules and regulations is coming from the slow but steady affect they are having on my social and my working life.

What was once a stroll into the local store to pick up some gelignite to help with digging a couple of holes in the shell rock is now such a big hassle it is no longer done. Now a licence is needed that costs and must be continually renewed. Locally there are no shops that handle the gelignite any more because of the costs of regulation and storage. The reasons for rules and regulations did not come about because people were getting hurt; they came about because a person in authority decided wisely that gelignite is dangerous. (Clever dick) It is dangerous to people who don't know how to handle it, but used with care by experience people it is safe. The experience now has to come from a book at school which is no substitute for practical experience.

Why use this example you may ask?

This is about what was once personal responsibility. Now what happens is a written examination is performed, the boxes are ticked and it will become somebody else's responsibility

Rules and regulations have increased as the size of our communities has increased. The persons who are elected to control often have limited experience and their subordinates often no or less understanding in the practical field they are responsible for.

4. Reasons & Causes

There is generally a reason for the 'debate' prior to the introduction of new rules and regulations.

An example is child gets mauled by a dog. More incidents of this nature occur in a short period of time. There is a consensus of opinion that the incident is not good and something should be done to stop dog attacks. Other examples are.

- Teenage drivers doing wheelies in their cars.
- CO2 emissions into the atmosphere
- Rivers silting up and cause flooding
- Manawatu river polluted by dairy factory
- The media use strong emotive language and get sales of newspapers from the incident. Pressure is brought to bear on one or many government MP's to DO SOMETHING.

Or a private members bill

- Sometimes the reason that a politician is in government is because they have an agenda to do something that 'they deem' as necessary for the betterment of society as they know and have experienced it.

5. The Process

5.1 The people

The persons responsible in our society for making rules are called politicians. The people they use to make and search out rules are usually called BUREAUCRATS.

The English dictionary defines a Bureaucrat as 'an official who is seen as following guidelines rigidly'
The barman at the local refers to them as those ***** *****

The system that has been set up to sanction the work of these persons is called a BUREAUCRACY.
The Hutchinson's Encyclopaedia defines bureaucracy as 'an organization whose structure and operations are governed to a high degree by written rules and a hierarchy of offices; in its broadest sense all forms of administration, and in its narrowest, rule by officials

What has been occurring in our society is that we are getting more bureaucrats that are writing rules and regulations in an attempt to safe guard the worst case scenario.

The issue for farmers and small business with bureaucracy is it often takes labour away from what we recognize at the time as being essential work. In the small business sector employing less than 5 staff the compliance costs have been estimated to cost \$3,500 per employee. Generally it is the time factor of the self employed as well as the cost.

5.2 The action

Process: Bills become acts and law *take section from NZ legislation*

NZ has a number of different forms of processes which include:

- Bills
- Regulations
- ACTS

For more information visit:

- www.pco.parliament.govt.nz/legislation/legislationtypes.shtml
- www.pco.parliament.govt.nz/legislation/faq.shtml
- www.ps.parliament.govt.nz

The process of a bill is

- discussion is sought from interested and affected parties or industry representative groups
- drafts are prepared
- submissions are called for with a fair time frame
- a bill is prepared
- the bill is rigorously tested for effects
- the bill gets first reading
- bill gets second reading
- the bill becomes an Act of Parliament

6. The Reaction & Result

2. Public debate occurs in the media and at the local (which is a dying centre of discussion, due to good drink driving laws which saved lives and non smoking laws which the locals are still debating at the local that less and less people are coming to)
3. Once the public make enough fuss about an issue the unpopular media attention becomes enough for the politician or cabinet to recommend an inquiry.
- 4.
5. A committee that is appointed by the government is usually convened in one of three ways.
 - a. The government selects the people they know will give them the answer that they want; for example the outgoing Electricity Commissioner. (Name the man)
 - b. they select a more equal panel of friend and foe but then only allow them to operate within the terms of reference which gives a very similar answer to a' above OR
 - c. they invite and select a group of industry knowledgeable people and support them with the PCO team

Effect on politicians

Result of the reason' the reaction.

1. Why it goes off the rails. . (article re Charlie Petersons speech) *Some parts of Charlie's speech were taken out of context as a good political writer would have known they would be*

Egos

Don't do due diligence

Don't seek practical opinions

Don't do due diligence

Pressure groups get involved for their own benefit and highjack the process. The dog micro-chipping law, initially both NZ veterinary association and NZ Kennel Assoc were involved but when it was made evident that the councils were going to be the keepers of the records the Kennel Association stopped barking.

How good law is made.

Reference book McDowell and Webb, The New Zealand Legal System.

Get book out and check for rules

Identify the issue

Draft a proposal in consultation with those affected

Discuss the proposal

Draft a proposal and check for outcomes

Check for unintended outcomes

Answer the question. Will the bill have the desired outcome with minimal negative consequences?

5.3 The Result

An Act of parliament that attempts to define actions that should be carried out by those vested with the responsibility.

How local govt must attempt to interpret acts and comply with the law' is often tested in court.

Councils have some small leeway as to how much enforcement is given to a particular law, what is good for the city is not always practical for the smaller town. The problem arises when an accident occurs or an audit is done by a higher authority to see if the council is complying with the act then the well intentioned bureaucrat in the smaller town is hung out to dry by the bigger authority.

Exception we have seen to this was recently in Taranaki when a local single station policeman took lifesaving equipment to an accident site, and was deemed to have an illegal limit of alcohol on board. Result was a court case in which the policeman was acquitted, I would hope that a word to the policeman concerned would have resulted in the same result and saved time money and effort to catch or rehabilitate serial offenders.(I am not condoning drink driving but the consequences of a conviction far outweighed the punishment in my opinion.

The Carterton District Council had an issue with restaurateurs putting their tables on the footpath. Rather than a new by-law is being drawn up discussions were had with all concerned to the effect that at this stage the footpath is clear enough but restaurateurs are attracting customers for themselves and other local businesses. This was considered a very desirable outcome for all concerned. The result was what was intended. This result was obtained using diplomacy and understanding by the bureaucrat's involved.

7. Making a difference

Moving forward it is important for the Primary Sector to learn and understand how to make a difference.

7.1 Federated Farmers

The farmer industry groups need to be fully funded and committed to dialogue with industry bodies so that common ground can be found.

Farmers do not have the voting numbers so we are going to have to work smarter and that costs in planning, advocacy and money.

Federated farmer's president Charlie Pederson's 10 percent over 10 years speech is about owning the problem. See article

Since this speech more of the debate is about the speed and not about the fact that farmers are being seen to own the problem.

Web page that shows the 685 bills currently in the pipeline
Pick out three different bills and their likely implications

7.2 Better Understanding

Farmers need to understand that ~~unless they~~ ^{need to} stand up for themselves and create a better understanding with those that make the regulations and rules that aid their business.

7.3 Breaking down the Barriers

Farm stays are one of the ways that some understanding is being transferred to the voters.

Most farmers live in paradise. The problem occurring is that we can be allocating ourselves less and less time to enjoy where we live.

Not to encourage your son or daughter to do the piss on the electric fence trick or chase their townie whanau with an eel, because they are going to be making laws later in life and they are not going to forget. They will try to get even.

Alliances are as simple as having the whanau for a few days during the school holidays. They love being towed behind the ATV on a wool sack full of hay. They love every minute until someone picks on the thistle patch.

7.4 Building Alliances

Some bureaucrats are listening and trying to make positive change, but many are not.

John Wallaart, Injury Prevention Programme Manager, ACC has a back ground in a larger NZ private company. He has been active in seeking input from affected parties and had on site practical experiences in his attempt to understand the problem fully.

It is my understanding that he has got empathy with the various Industry boards that he is responsible for.

One of his problems and dilemma at the moment is children getting killed and INJURED on ATV's.
What are we going to do??

Ultimately if we as farmers do not instigate safety changes they are going to be forced on us. One of the problems he recognises is that ATV accidents are also occurring on lifestyle blocks. The cost to individuals is huge (lose of life or severe injury).

In most instances we have had very constructive dialogue, when we have been getting negative responses I feel it is usually been a case of personal ego's or political agenda's. Nitrogen on hill country is a farmers business. End of story? NO.

7.5 Owing the problem

There has been a Hill Country steering committee established to monitor and steer the use of nutrients and promote debate on scientific grounds regarding hill country farmers applying nitrogen.

Currently the group is chaired by Mark Illston.

This was our attempt to own the issue and show that regulation would not be needed.

The committee was formed soon after the dirty dairying campaign was launched by fish and game (to the detriment of New Zealand globally I feel)

As farmers we felt that we could not afford to have negative publicity about our use of Nitrogen. We had a small 10 hectare trial at the Harvey monitor farm on which we applied 400 kgs of nitrogen per hectare. Some negative publicity did occur but we had good liason with most of the media and letting them know what we were doing and keeping them informed about the MEASURED effects of the trial. .

The Regional Council staffs were also invited to attend meeting so they could interact with farmers first hand. On this board we have contact with

- Farmer owned fertilizer companies
- Regional councils,
- Fish and Game,
- Forest & Bird
- & many other NGOs (non government organisations).

Both parties were pleasantly surprised that they had the same intentions.

Are we guilty of becoming a bureaucracy?

Our attempt is to 'commit to informed debate on factual evidence and steer the factions onto the same table where it is their firm belief that they have very much the same agenda'. They do not know of any farmer that is not in accord with having good quality water, the debate is what is good quality and how much of it.

They will be steering our group to become the wise Nutrient use group. They are aware as farmers that phosphates are also having an effect on water quality.

One of the time consuming projects they had was when they were audited to see if they were following good procedure. The cost to them was large and the cost to the auditing body was greater. But the bureaucrats went away with all of the boxes ticked.

7.6 Key rules when dealing with organisations

There are a number of key rules that should be used when dealing with an issue.

(a) Collin Patterson

This page has discussions with Collin Patterson from Dominion Post

The Dominion Post runs an article that helps the general public to identify the individual person who is responsible in a bureaucracy in an attempt to bring public pressure to bear where and individual has been unsuccessful.

In discussions with Collin Patterson from the Dominion post his rules prior to writing the article are

- 1 the complaint is received
- 2 it is investigated
- 3 the problem is identified
- 4 the person responsible for fixing the problem is identified
- 5 the officials response and deadline to fix the problem is reported
- 6 the problem is followed up and more pressure or acknowledgement is given.

Initially the article went very well and some co-operation was received from the bureaucracy concerned now they are increasing reluctant to give the names to the Dominion

(b) Simon Power MP for Rangiteki

Simon Power has some rules that he follows.

Take notes of the discussions, you don't know when you may have to refer to them.

Take name and details of the person you are dealing with.

Get contact details, direct dial and e-mail.

Identify the issue clearly

Find out who is responsible for the action or decision.

Get deadlines. When is the issue going to be resolved?

Find out who the persons immediate superior is.

(c) Additional resource

A book by Deidre Kent,

“Campaigning to Influence Government Decisions and Public Attitudes” has on pages 33 to 37 an article “Attracting Media Attention”. Have some key points in gaining media attention.

8. Conclusions & Recommendations

Bureaucracy is part of every person's lives on a daily basis; so much of it goes mostly unnoticed. It is only when we receive the attention of some unwanted law that affects us and regulates us to change what, where or how we operate that we notice a law change or amendment.

Farmers are good at getting on with the job at hand and leaving others alone in their cities. It is no longer an option we must act to protect our way of life and heritage for future generations.

For the primary sector to move forward in a positive manner we need to:

1. Own the problem and drive the changes, before those that don't know that they don't know, drive the changes on us
2. Resource and staff Federated Farmers so they can react pro-actively to any negative events or issues that might have an influence on our business and way of life
3. Break down the barriers at every opportunity. It is an unfortunate reality that the decision makers, their colleges and their families have so little understanding of realities and enjoyment that we experience in our everyday lives. Experiences dictate our understanding and our response.
4. Build alliances with other people, organization groups. There are far too few farmers and getting less. Unless we build our alliances we will be ~~voted~~ out of business, to the detriment of ourselves, families and communities who co-exist with us. Contractors Federation, Building Federation. Business NZ, Small farmer Association
5. When dealing with organizations especially Government get from them;
 - the persons name,
 - their direct contact details
 - document your conversation with times and dates
 - who is their boss, who is responsible for decisions if they are notIf you don't have joy inform them you are also contacting their superior.
6. Pie in the sky stuff but,. Wouldn't it be great if a person who wanted to work in the Ministry of Agriculture first had to do a 3 or 6 month practical course on farm. WOW and refresher courses as well. If we begin mentioning this as a possible solution now it may becomes a politicians idea and acted on in ten years time.

History tells us that the pen is mightier than the sword

If u can't beat them join them

9. References

Books

A book by Deidre Kent,

“Campaigning to Influence Government Decisions and Public Attitudes” has on pages 33 to 37 an article “Attracting Media Attention”.

Reference book McDowell and Webb, The New Zealand Legal System

Website

www.fedfarm.org.nz

www.pco.parliament.govt.nz/legislation/legislationtypes.shtml

www.pco.parliament.govt.nz/legislation/faq.shtml

<http://www.ps.parliament.govt.nz/en-NZ/PB/>

People

John Wallaart MBA,DBS, Dip Mgt, Dip Chem, Dip OH & S Mgt
ACC Injury Prevention and Client Services Programme manager

Colin Wright CEO for Carterton District Council

Cathrine Petry; Federated Farmers policy advisor

Simon Power: Member of Parliament for Rangitikei.

Collin Patterson: Dominion Post

10. Appendix

Kate Dunn, Dominion Post

From: Katie Dunn (DPT) [Katie.Dunn@dompost.co.nz]

Sent: Friday, 10 November 2006 3:20 p.m.

To: 'illston@actrix.co.nz'

Subject: Kiwisaver article

The information in this e-mail is confidential and is intended solely for the addressee. Unless you are the named addressee (or authorised to receive it for the addressee) any unauthorised disclosure, copying, distribution or other use is prohibited.

Publication: TDP **Date:** 31 Oct 2006 **Page:** A 9

Headline: Kiwisaver changed in last-minute U-turn

Author:

Subjects: FINANCE;INVESTMENT;SUPERANNUATION ()

Section: NEWS **Sub Section:** NATIONAL

THE Government did a last-minute U-turn on the design of the Kiwisaver scheme against the advice of officials, unions and others, Cabinet papers have shown.

In August, Finance Minister Michael Cullen revealed the final shape of the Government's workplace retirement savings scheme.

The changes made included allowing homeowners to divert part of their contribution into paying off their mortgage, though companies providing the Kiwisaver scheme did not have to offer that option. This brought criticism from National MPs, who said it would dilute the purpose of Kiwisaver _ to build retirement savings.

Papers gained by National MP Craig Foss under the Official Information Act showed that others _ including Cabinet _ shared similar concerns.

In February, acting on advice, the Cabinet agreed mortgage diversion was unworkable and too complex.

Cabinet minutes said it was agreed in "light of feedback from unions, retirement groups and mortgage providers, Kiwisaver members not be given the option to divert their savings contributions to repay the mortgage on their principal residence".

Officials warned that mortgage diversion would tip the balance toward Kiwisaver becoming a home-buying scheme and undermining long-term savings.

But in July, at the request of Dr Cullen and Revenue Minister Peter Dunne, Cabinet agreed to the mortgage diversions, with the details to be sorted out in regulations yet to be written.

The changes were announced shortly after the decision and were included in legislation passing through Parliament at the time.

Mr Foss said the changes were a mess which was typical of Labour's "cavalier attitude to parliamentary processes and advice".

Mr Dunne said Cabinet had initially rejected a proposal to allow 100 per cent of Kiwisaver contributions to be diverted to mortgage repayments, but a proposal to allow 50 per cent had been accepted.

"Independent actuaries have described it is a masterly way to enable people to save for their retirement and service their mortgage at the same time.

"It has also been warmly embraced by scheme providers and banks.

"The only critic now of Kiwisaver is the National Party," Mr Dunne said. NZPA

Massive increase in Govt bureaucracy

Wednesday, 9 August 2006, 6:15 pm
Press Release: New Zealand National Party
Gerry Brownlee MP
National Party State Services Spokesman

9 August 2006

Massive increase in Govt bureaucracy

A 64% increase in space leased by Government departments since 1999 and a 95% rise in policy and admin staff shows how bloated the bureaucracy has become, says National Party State Services spokesman Gerry Brownlee.

"This massive increase in space, calculated by National's researchers, flows from a massive increase in the number of penpushers.

"In six years Labour has ensured the bureaucracy has occupied the equivalent of 15 rugby fields of new office space.

"In total, the amount of space leased by Government departments and Crown entities has increased from 226,124 sq metres to 371,547 sq metres.

"That's the equivalent of 37 rugby fields - up from 22.

"At the same time, the cost of these leases has risen by almost two-thirds - 72.6% - from \$36 million to \$62 million.

"This is 15 rugby fields full of penpushers. This is driven by a Government obsessed with forming committees, writing reports and launching strategies.

"Other figures show the number of staff employed in a policy or administrative role by the public sector has almost doubled from 3,171 to 6,213 people since 1999 - an increase of 95%.

"Policy analyst numbers have also nearly doubled since 1999, from 1,047 to 2,064.

"None of these people are front line staff, so not one new teacher, one new doctor or one new police officer. They are all back office staff.

"The public want value for money from their taxpayer dollars, not more bureaucrats."

ENDS

Health bureaucracy out of control, says Ryall

Monday May 22, 2006
By Martin Johnston

District health board bureaucrats have increased in number by 23 per cent since Helen Clark's Administration came to power and now cost taxpayers more than \$500 million a year.

Government answers to National Party questions show an increase of 1786 managers and administrators since 1999 - and a cost rise of 35 per cent since 2001.

National's health spokesman Tony Ryall, who released the figures yesterday as part of a campaign trying to show the health system as inefficient under the Labour-led Government, said the bureaucracy was growing "out of control".

The figures were in addition to 1100 Ministry of Health staff.

Mr Ryall said they showed the bureaucracy was too big, "while far too many people are forced to wait an unfair amount of time for operations - if they get them at all".

"When you've got thousands of patients being culled from waiting lists, you don't need to be employing more and more managers and administrators."

Acting Health Minister Damien O'Connor said that because the increase in the number of health board bureaucrats, at 23 per cent, was less than the 77 per cent increase in health spending under Labour-led governments, efficiency had actually increased.

"The cost of doing the business of administering that money properly is less than 5 per cent of the total health budget. That is still very reasonable."

But Mr Ryall said this reasoning was a "nonsense argument", because much of the extra health spending, like the pay increase for district health board nurses, had increased health spending without providing extra services that required additional administration.

And increased spending on widened primary health care subsidies would require few extra staff.

"The standard here is what the Government said ... [that] there would be fewer bureaucrats and there are more."

Prime Minister Helen Clark said in 1999, when in opposition, that the health system had too many bureaucratic layers; Labour was looking for savings from the bureaucracy.

"Rebuilding a simple relationship between one central government health agency and the district health boards by removing the Health Funding Authority will free up tens of millions of dollars for high-priority health spending."

Figures on the public health payroll released by the Government last year showed that the greatest proportional increases in the preceding five years had been in the numbers of nurses and doctors.

GROWING BUREAUCRACY

* In 1999, district health boards employed 7883 full-time equivalent managers and administrators.

* 2005: 9669.

* 2000/01 management/administration personnel costs: \$379.4 million.

* 2005/06: \$513.7 million (forecast).

Source: Government answers to National

http://www.nzherald.co.nz/section/story.cfm?c_id=1&ObjectID=10382883

There is useally (useally) a good reason for a regulation to be made

FEDERATED FARMERS OF NEW ZEALAND (INC)

Charlie Pedersen

President, Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc)

Address to the National Council of Federated Farmers

7 November 2006

Museum of Te Papa Tongarewa, Wellington

Welcome to your National Council meeting.

Under our constitution, this council is the highest decision-making body of the Federation.

Your time here over the next two days is highly valued and much appreciated by the membership.

On behalf of members, thank you for attending this important event in the Federation's diary.

The 40-member council comes together this time every year to set the future direction for the Federation, to approve our budgets and strategy, discuss topical events, and hear from relevant speakers.

The last time I spoke to you was at our annual conference in July.

You will know that my speech at that conference touched off much debate because it dared to criticise the misguided actions of extreme environmentalists.

Some of the misinformed debate following my July speech formed the basis of my second speech on agriculture and the environment, which I made at the Wellington Club in September.

In that speech, I addressed some of the myths around farming and environmental sustainability.

One of these myths is that farmers do NOT care about the environment and are NOT worried about the downstream effects of farming.

I want to re-iterate for the benefit of those who haven't been listening that farmers DO care about the environment and they ARE concerned about the downstream effects of farming on the environment.

However we don't need to feel too embarrassed, as cities and towns modify and influence the environment far more than farms ever have. But this is no excuse for us farmers to shirk further improvements. We lead by example and our positive environmental efforts have always spoken louder than the words of our critics.

So the next time your farming sector is criticised by the spokesperson for some group, ask: 'what has their group done for the environment but to point the finger and complain?'; ask 'how much of their own money have they ever spent on improving the environment?'

New Zealand farmers have and will continue to spend their own money on improving the environment; money they have earned proudly without being propped up by taxpayer subsidies or

while hiding behind protectionist trade policies.

Farmers and researchers are without doubt making progress on reducing the environmental impact of agriculture. But more progress is needed.

What do I mean by environmental impact?

There are many definitions, but today I will limit it to nutrient loss from farms, the issue which seems to spark the most debate when water quality is being discussed.

It makes perfect economic sense for farmers to reduce the loss of inputs from their farms and to efficiently convert nutrients and energy into products to sell.

Loss of nutrients into aquifers and waterways not only impacts on the environment but represents a loss from the production system and a loss from the farm's bottom line.

Fertiliser is a major expense on our farms. Keeping nutrients on farms means improved productivity and improved profitability, which is good for farmers, good for rural communities, good for the environment, and great for the national economy.

Farmers are constantly adapting their farming methods. And nowhere is that adaptation more obvious than their efforts to limit nutrient loss.

There are a range of tools and farming methods available today which did not exist only a decade ago.

Let's look at some of the tools and methods that farmers are using already.

1. Eliminating stock from waterways and wetlands.

Keeping farm animals out of and away from waterways reduces the amount of soil and nutrients running into streams. New Zealand farmers are unique for taking these steps compared to other farmers around the world. For intensive farms there has been much progress in keeping animals and their effects out of waterways. Farmers are fencing, building bridges and culverts, and maintaining and planting riparian margins, thus reducing the opportunity for contamination.

2. Nutrient Budgeting.

Research shows that some farms have more nutrients than plants can take up, which means that there is a risk of these nutrients being lost and wasted. Nutrient budgeting can save money and assist farm planning. Used together with soil test results a nutrient budget can help assess requirements, and can allow for targeted nutrient application to places where they are most needed. Using the "Overseer" model developed here for New Zealand farms ensures better nutrient management and reduces the risk of nutrient losses into waterways, protecting water quality and stream life.

3. Nitrogen Inhibitors.

Nitrogen inhibitors hold nitrogen in soil and help to prevent losses. They were introduced into New Zealand about three years ago and their uptake has been steady. Nitrogen inhibitors have a good future, especially in some areas where nutrient loss is difficult to prevent.

There are many environmental initiatives with which Federated Farmers' has been instrumental. They include Spreadmark, a system designed to ensure that the application of fertiliser is accurate both in terms of placement and quantity, regional action teams to encourage the collaborative approach to solving problems of environmental sustainability, the clean streams accord, the Landcare Trust and the Sustainable Environmental Management Strategy.

I am confident that in the next 10 years we will be seeing many more initiatives as farm systems continue to evolve and as more tools and options become available, and are test run and fine tuned

by farmers.

Today I want to challenge members of Federated Farmers. I would like to set our members apart from other farmers and I see effective environmental stewardship as a key point of difference.

The Federation has a long and proud history of helping our members to be leading edge

Through our member advice service we have invested heavily in making sure they have the tools and knowledge to be good employers. Through the Agricultural Health and Safety Council, we have worked to help our members deliver safer work environments for themselves and their staff.

We have also campaigned to get more government and levy funds directed to on-farm environmental research.

Today the Federation is adding to its portfolio of proactive environmental initiatives with our "10 In 10" campaign.

I want every member to commit to reducing their farm's environmental impact, in the form of nutrient loss, by 10 percent over the next 10 years. For our part the Federation will ensure information is readily available to our members to help them achieve this aim.

"10 in 10" is proof of our continuing environmental commitment.

Federated Farmers has never paid lip service to the environment. Our actions over time show our commitment. The Queen Elizabeth Trust, the Landcare Trust and the Farm Environment Awards Trust were born out of this very organisation.

We are committed to helping our members achieve "10 in 10".

The knockers will have a go at our campaign. They will point out that measuring nutrient loss is difficult and they will question how we will police our initiative.

Without a doubt this is a challenge and we will be looking to local and central government to develop better monitoring systems to record our progress.

With the Federation's proven information networks and with improved linkage with scientists and researchers, "10 in 10" can be achieved.

Federated Farmers members have already clearly demonstrated that they are constantly evolving their businesses and adapting to the economic, social, and environmental changes. This is just one more step on the path of true sustainability.

Critics will say that 10 percent is not enough, and 10 years is too long. Let them talk while we act. Farming will have moved towards further reducing its impact on the environment, while our detractors sit in their ivory towers and talk. "10 in 10" is acknowledgement that we do have an impact on the environment and that we should reduce this impact.

People may ask us how we came up with the 10 percent target? Firstly, because it should be achievable by our members – there's no point setting up our members to fail. Secondly, and most importantly, this is not about the number: this is about creating a mindset of reducing nutrient loss. I would prefer farmers focus on the ways to reduce nutrient loss, rather than a number which is currently hard to measure or police.

In throwing down this challenge to the Federation and its 17,000 members I also throw down a challenge to the researchers, and extension providers, to identify other affordable ways for farmers to reduce the environmental impacts of their activities, while at the same time increasing

productivity.

Capping agricultural productivity is unthinkable in a country where every New Zealanders standard of living depends on our continued success.

I also challenge councils to look at helping farmers with information and to demonstrate flexibility. I certainly do not want councils to take the "10 in 10" campaign and use it to dream up unaffordable rules and restrictions in their district and regional plans. Rules and regulations will stifle the innovation we need to continually improve environmental performance. Councils can help with meaningful measures that indicate improvement as it happens.

I challenge councils to achieve balance and to resist allowing themselves to be captured by the extreme environmentalists and some NGOs. Some councils have adopted rules and regulations that are not science based. Such rules put economic viability at risk. Councils and environmentalists should always remember that a farmer that is in the red cannot possibly be green.

Are there things that central government could put in place to encourage up-take of these technologies? The answer is yes.

It's getting the regulatory environment right so that farmers have the confidence to invest in improved farm management systems.

It's about getting compliance costs down, reforming the RMA, and overhauling local government funding.

The government can do much more to assist us. Only long-term research, measurement and monitoring is going to show the most effective initiatives in any catchment. We need to be able to accurately measure our improvements, to showcase and compare the best tools so as to develop the best systems.

As for nutrient sensitive lakes, let's turn our scientists' attention to overcoming this problem. We are told that the nutrients entering lakes have taken 50 years or more to arrive, so making changes now is likely to take 50 years or more before we see any benefit.

It seems there may be other options for reducing the impacts of nutrients on lakes. Maori have already shown this can be done through the harvest of fresh water mussels, koura, rapu, water cress and tuna (eel). It may be more efficient to harvest nutrients in these ways and create a win-win situation that is culturally, environmentally and economically beneficial.

Open minds are essential if we are to succeed. Today I ask you to support me in the Federated Farmers "10 in 10" campaign.

"10 in 10" is more than numbers which cannot be easily measured. It's about harnessing a mindset that already exists, and showcasing it with the "10 in 10" goal.

New Zealand's farmers on average are well ahead of the rest of the world in terms of their environmental record. The "10 in 10" campaign reiterates our commitment to continued improvement, and for that improvement to happen during continual development and sustained profitability on New Zealand farms.

New Zealand is regarded as one of the best environments in the world. That is in no small part because of the systems that New Zealand farmers have developed.

"10 in 10" is asking that the nation acknowledge our work so far and take confidence in our promise to find new ways to do better so that all New Zealanders can be proud of and enjoy our country's environmental status. I ask that you all work towards this goal. ENDS

THE JOY OF LOBBYING



**Campaigning to Influence Government Decisions and
Public Attitudes**

DEIRDRE KENT

HB WILLIAMS MEMORIAL LIBRARY



601570635

NZ

324.4
KEN

ATTRACTING MEDIA ATTENTION

*Oh sing unto the Lord a new song
Psalm 33*

*There is only one thing worse than being talked about. And that is not being talked about.
Oscar Wilde*

*Then felt I like some watcher of the skies
When a new planet swims into his ken*

On First Looking into Chapman's Homer by Keats

*All great truths begin as blasphemies
George Bernard Shaw*

Those involved with public interest campaigns must take their case to the people. The way to do this is through the media, because unless you work the media, politicians can and will ignore you. It is by attracting media attention that you will have an advantage over any other groups with the opposing point of view. Organisations and trade associations who shy away from media attention, preferring to work quietly or in the shadows will not have the advantage of having the public on their side.

To put your on the political agenda you need to take your case to the media. Otherwise politicians can safely ignore you. Effective pressure groups put their issues repeatedly in the public's view.

Media coverage is critical to good campaigning, for without it you might as well talk to yourself. If we take the definition of power as something someone else wants or fears, then those who attract media attention have power. When you go to visit a politician, the politician is very aware of your power. Fortunately media power is not dependent on the size of your membership.

A common reason for slow progress by a public interest group is that they are afraid or distrustful of the media. You simply have to come to terms with the media, learn to trust them - or at least on most occasions, and learn to work with them. Otherwise you will be sitting around for decades. The media holds the key to success or failure at changing public opinion for without it you can't change public attitudes, public behaviour or help get better laws.

While the media needs lobbyists who have something newsworthy to contribute, certain papers, especially those with conservative traditions or ownership, avoid lobbyists like the plague. But the media needs lobbyists for comment, just as they need politicians for their daily bread. If the Greenpeace energy spokesperson wasn't available to provide an opposite viewpoint to publicity that we needed ten more Clyde dams, the radio would have an unbalanced story.

The media describes and records what is new, and that means unusual - crowds, events, celebrities, elite-for-a-day people, human interest, conflict, sport, racing,

accidents, murders, wars, tragedies, business, television, underdog stories. Somehow you have to get in amongst all this.

So how do you get into the media? Lets answer some questions.

How often can you release media statements?

There are two schools of thought about how many media statements you should put out. One argues that you should only put out statements when you have something really significant to say and in that way the media will take you seriously. The other argues that you should put out as many as you like and the media will pick up the ones they think significant.

I come from the latter group of thinkers. I believe that many very credible politicians have put out press releases every day and still remain very credible. Its just that the media gets to know which camp you are in and treats you accordingly.

But Des Wilson, a most respected campaigner in UK, and author of the book. *The A-Z of Campaigning* said of his campaign to get lead out of petrol that they won a campaign with only four press releases. These releases were all big ones, including the alarming results of research.

Or you can issue press releases at the rate of three or four a week. This steady drip feed works because although few statements will be carried, the reporters will note you are there, and what you are saying. Then if a story comes from overseas they will use you for comment. Your name is familiar to them and you are easily available. So the statement may not be used in the manner you could forecast.

How do I increase the likelihood that my statement will be carried?

The main rule is that you must have something newsworthy to say. It must be novel. You must have a reason for your statement, a new angle, a new peg on which to hang a story. Use concrete images, fresh, alive language. Use metaphors and similes.

You simply have to find ways of making your issue fresh. Best of all you must do something - like have a

meeting, conduct a survey, write a letter, calculate new statistics, present awards, run a petition, organise a street march or abseil up a building. Remember it is very hard to get into the major dailies in Auckland and Wellington.

Go and visit the journalist who covers your subject personally so that you establish a relationship. Then send your faxes direct to them.

They won't carry your story if you just repeat the beliefs of your organisation. It's a yawn for them to be told that the Home Schooling Association is in favour of home schooling or that the Maori Congress believes there are still many grievances to be settled. So be specific. If you say the Maori Congress wants another \$1.5 million to get Maori voters onto the roll, that is a new angle.

Remember your idea of newsworthiness is not necessarily the same as the idea of the media. Even the most experienced activists and politicians have difficulty in predicting which statements will be carried and which will be ignored. Many brilliant and newsworthy statements often drift casually into the waste paper basket of the chief reporter with scarcely a sneer. But you have to take the good with the bad.

The exception is that some local newspapers will go on campaigns and will report a campaigners viewpoint even if there are few people in the organisation.

How do I release my statement?

Unless you are releasing a major report and can control the timing, most statements these days are issued by faxes, often sent from a computer, sent any time of the day or night. It's quicker and cheaper. Don't send them by E-mail.

It wasn't always like that. Mary Woodward formerly of the Christchurch branch of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament told a peace conference what it was like forty years ago. 'I remember getting on my bike in Ilam with my typewriter in my basket, writing a statement with Elsie Locke, taking it to the Press by 12 midnight and biking home at 12.30 pm. It would be in the paper the next day.'

Keep your lists of media outlets and journalists and update them all the time. If you are sending it from your computer, phone the journalist to say it has been sent.

Is there more than one sort of media statement? Yes. There are two basic types of media releases, position statements and reactive statements.

a. *Position statements* are made when you release the results of a survey, public opinion poll, organisational decision or a major report. For example the Family Planning Association does a survey on teenage sexuality and releases the results, four pages, perhaps to the media.

Because it is uniquely your information, you can control the timing and content of this release and the media statement can be seen by many members of

the organisation. You can sit on an important release for months so that you can get maximum impact at an appropriate time in the future. You can release one section every week for six weeks if you like.

b. The second type is the *reactive statement*. Many successful campaigners and politicians specialise in reactive statements. You have to be an opportunist in the best sense of the word. If things go right, you can ride the tide of a breaking story and make great progress. Someone else does something and you react. But case you must do so within 24 hours of the original event. You can't run your statement past many people in your organisation, you will be lucky to find one of them at home before the statement needs to be sent. Don't let the organisation put too many constraints on the spokesperson or they will simply stop doing it. If you are a member of an organisation, be of practical help to the spokesperson if possible. Sometimes the spokesperson needs a member or supporter to supply them with a copy of a press clipping made by someone else.

Judgement is required for reactive statements. If you are a real campaigner you will not miss these perfect chances. As you develop more confidence with your issue, be it sexual abuse of children, crime prevention, homosexual law reform, eutrophication of rivers, or violence on television, you will see your issue popping up almost everywhere. But don't do it too much, and above all never compare the seriousness of your issue with other issues. Don't say 'drunken driving is getting too much attention, Hepatitis C is more important.' It is bound to backfire.

Everyone who has been given the authority to speak on behalf of their organisation will make mistakes from time to time. Politicians can't always tell the reporter to hold on while they consult their colleagues. Politicians and pressure group spokespeople will botch it up occasionally because their opinion has not been checked out by their colleagues. Try to use reactive statements to effect. It works.

How should the statement read?

Read the newspaper carefully and copy the format they use. Note how the summary of the story is always contained in the first sentence. Start with the most important ideas, then elaborate and add to the information, ending with the least important as copy is cut from the bottom. First hook them in by saying who and what, then give some background of who said it, then ask where, when, why, how, what now.

Mix the direct speech and indirect speech. Use official logoed paper. Always put your name and all your contact phone numbers at the bottom. Use double spacing if you can and don't make it too long. Don't use too many ideas, keep the statement clear and focused.

Let your personality show by using interesting language. Don't run the flavour extractor over your copy! If you work for an organisation don't send your statement to too many people beforehand because it may be emasculated and end up dead boring. Yes get one or even two people to check it but be careful.

Symbolism is all important so be careful to frame the issue in your terms.

But I can't trust reporters, they always get it wrong.

Sorry you are going to have to develop some trust in reporters. Soon you will be able to tell the professionals from the amateurs, and it is the professionals you can trust. Phone the reporter after you have sent your statement to them with their name on it. Reporters are mostly very approachable and no one screens the calls they receive so its easy to get through.

Be helpful to the journalist, it is well worth the effort. Suggest other people to be interviewed, even your opposition, and give them their contact numbers. People who are effective are those who get to know journalists. A good campaigner ends up thinking like a journalist.

While it is important to be have a healthy degree of paranoia about journalists, good campaigners speak carefully and slowly on the phone to a print media journalist, checking all the way that the message is received accurately. They end up by checking the journalists name and saying they would appreciate further contact. If you are accurately and sympathetically reported, phone the journalist and tell them how good their journalism was, especially if it was a sensitive story. Give them feedback. It won't be long before you can get a real sense for being wary of a novice reporter who needs nurturing or a relatively useless old hack that won't produce a good story.

Should I change the format for TV, radio or press?

Print media is more likely to carry your statement if it is accompanied by a photo of the person making the statement or some other photo. This is especially the case for suburban newspapers. If you are in doubt, phone the reporter before you go to the trouble. Radio statements are generally shorter and contain shorter sentences. But you can use the same statement for each. If you are aiming at TV think in terms of the images they can use and suggest them to the reporter.

If you are doing a public opinion survey at a public place, don't wait until you have completed the survey before you tell the TV, as unless they film you conducting the survey they will shy off. We once made the mistake of forgetting to inform the television before we interviewed Air New Zealand travellers about smokefree flights. So we missed the possibility of TV coverage.

What if I am in a hurry?

Its perfectly legitimate to release your statement to just one source. But try to tell them that they are the only recipients, it might make it more likely to be used. And if you are making a reactive statement and you are really pressured for time, you can just phone one radio station. Don't send statements to Sunday papers on a Friday as it won't meet their deadline.

What if I am really in doubt?

Phone your favourite reporter and ask for advice. But don't expect any particular reporter take up your issue again and again. They have their professional standards

to keep and don't want to get known as favouring any particular issue. Journalists can even give you advice about your campaigning strategy. Once when we were having difficulty making progress with the campaign to have the Auckland Surf Lifesaving Association adopt a healthy sponsor rather than Winfield, a journalist suggested we get the Auckland Hospital Board to join our campaign. It was a brilliant suggestion and it worked like a charm.

What if I get misrepresented?

Phone the reporter and talk to them personally. Ignoring minor errors will win you friends, but if you think something is quite serious let them know you quite firmly that are a bit annoyed. If it is really serious, then write to the editor outlining your grievance, and if you are not satisfied with that send your correspondence to the Press Council with a covering letter. If the Press Council decides in your favour the decision must be printed in the original paper. But use the Press Council sparingly. You can also write a letter to the editor correcting a false impression. It's quicker.

If you are dissatisfied with how you are treated by TV or radio, complain directly to them in writing and if you have no joy, complain to the Broadcasting Standards Authority, PO Box 9213, Wellington.

When should I embargo a statement?

Very rarely. If you tell the media not to use your statement before a certain date, it can get lost on the journalist's desk and never used. Only do it with very important official reports or if you have an overseas visitor coming who is releasing material new to New Zealand and you want the reporters well briefed. Otherwise put 'For Immediate Use' on your statements.

Should I ever visit the chief reporter or the editor?

In smaller centres you should know a lot of the staff and follow their writing. But in the cities you could ask for an interview with the editor if you have a serious concern. We once took two professors and a cancer expert to see the editor of the NZ Herald to ask him to take the issue of tobacco disease more seriously, as his editorials had never favoured tobacco control legislation.

Do you always have to send statements to the news desk?

No. Sometimes your first contact could be through the photographer and a phone call to the Head of Illustrations might be the start of a story. Ask the person at the desk of the Chief Reporter for advice.

You should also know some of the feature writers and send a copy of your statement to their department. Sometimes its the sports reporter, the business reporter, a cartoonist that you want.

Who do I send my statement to?

A list of major news outlets is listed in the appendix, but remember you have to add your specialist journals for your subject. You should also compile a local media list for local stories.

Is there an occasion when I should just tip off a journalist?

Yes. News happens when someone does something. But unless the media is told, it will not be published. You can't expect journalists to be psychic. When a group of Mt Eden citizens decorated the side of Mt Eden with the large letters 'MMP' no one would have heard about it had not an ally phoned the New Zealand Herald. A photographer arrived and hundreds of thousands of Herald readers saw the photo of the handiwork the next day, complete with comments from both sides of the campaign for electoral reform. Since the City Council removed the letters within twenty four hours, the action would have been a total failure had not this person informed the Herald.

What if the radio phones me for an interview?

Great! Don't panic, help them. Remember they think in terms of the next news bulletin so it may be appropriate to ask them about their deadline. Try to answer their questions as soon as possible. Put everything else on hold while you answer their questions - after all this is your raison d'être - to get media coverage. It's best if you have learnt some short catchy phrases which are the verbal equivalent of bumper stickers. Be sure of what you really want to say and say it even if it doesn't quite match the question. If you really want more time, tell the journalist you will phone them back but do it soon.

How many spokespeople should our group have?

One, with two others as emergencies. And try to make sure the spokesperson is not already a spokesperson for another group or the members of the two organisations get a bit irritated as the two issues are linked in the public mind and this is confusing. For instance the spokesperson for the Rationalists Society should not also be spokesperson for the Voluntary Euthanasia Society. Don't change speakers too often either. The media prefers continuity and this is also best for your group. You get more coverage that way.

Is there any best or worst time for releasing statements?

Lots of people now know about using a Sunday for releasing statements and it can still be a winner because journalists are looking for variety amongst the weekend news of accidents and fires and overseas news. Try to avoid Friday afternoon - its a dead period.

Ring Wellington radio news in the weekend, especially on Sunday night.

What if my statement doesn't get carried?

Don't fret. Try again, preferably in another way. The media gets dozens every day from pressure groups. Someone else may pick up the story and put a new slant on it. When GALA (Group Against Liquor Advertising) put out a statement to say that 14-17 year olds in NZ were consuming \$1 million worth of alcohol a week, the press and radio carried it widely but not the television. But shortly afterwards there was an item on TV about 11-12 year alcohol addicts being treated on an island off Invercargill. The story had been initiated by a Christchurch TV reporter, who possibly had heard the radio or read about GALA's revelation of the facts in the papers.

Sometimes it is sheer bad luck. Your story might be swamped by a major air crash or a major event in government. If the Prime Minister sacks the Minister of Finance or a Princess Diana is killed in a car crash the same day your major report comes out, then that is just your bad luck. Everything else will pale into insignificance and you might re-release your wonderful news later.

There are three main reasons for failure in media coverage - either you didn't obey the rules above or you were the wrong person to make the statement or it was just bad luck.

Half the job of pressure groups is to persuade 'authorities' make statements. You just gradually work to make your issue more mainstream. As a special interest group, you can't go on making the same statements and expect to get reported. The media would have carried your statement if it had been said by someone else. A statement by the Cancer Society on pesticide contamination of food will make news because it is newsworthy whereas if the Toxins Actions Group made the same statement it could be totally ignored.

If you are feeling really paranoid about being neglected, phone your favourite journalist and ask for advice on getting more coverage. Just be puzzled, don't blame!

I am not sure I can bear the spotlight of media attention

Now you are getting honest. It is not always easy and your group should acknowledge the personal cost of being a spokesperson for a cause. Either you should have personal support to live with this exposure, or someone else should have the job.

Many people, in possession of a lot of knowledge about issues, are too shy or too unsure of themselves to bear the spotlight of media attention. But even the shyest people can master the art of the media if they know their facts. Helen Clark is an excellent example.

One of the continuing tragedies is that there are many academics or government servants who have a lot of important knowledge at their fingertips and could make a significant contribution debate on the country's policies, yet they don't speak publicly of their concerns. They sometimes say they have not been asked for their opinions, yet the media doesn't even know they are there. It is irresponsible to sit on knowledge which should be translated into policy. Cot death campaigners had to extract vital research information from a Health Department doctor, who had known the information for years.

There are also many who just need the training and practice to put out media statements. Once they start to develop confidence there will be no stopping them. It would also help if there were brownie points in their system for being an advocate! Sometimes their funding body objects.

Are there any rules for giving radio interviews?

Answer questions directly at first - 'Yes', 'no', or 'That's rubbish', if the interviewer is attacking you by being a

devil's advocate. Then elaborate. Try not to let reporter get you on the back foot.

Before you are interviewed, try reading the three page sheet of 'answers to awkward questions' that you have prepared. Practise by having people in your organisation play the interviewer and ask them to give you a really hard time.

When should a public interest group use radio talkback?

Quite a lot. Talkback is an important forum for politics and should not be ignored. Monitoring talkback is an ideal job for your at-home supporter to do. Since your spokesperson can't always listen, get your supporters to report on what is happening. Alert your members to opportunities to contribute. Start with hosts that are not too hostile to your issue, then move to the others.

What are the rules for giving TV Interviews?

Remember they will edit out almost all you say, because there is so little space in a TV story. So rehearse your lines and say the important thing more than once. Prepare for the interview by thinking what you want to get across. Say it simply and if possible use pithy quotes or nine second media grabs eg 'There are no winners in stranger adoptions' or 'Alcohol problems are not about morality, they are about mortality'. Sometimes a journalist wants to put words in your mouth and that can be OK or not. If you know your issue, remember that, and take confidence from the fact that you know this issue better than other people, that is why they are asking you for comment. They need you for their story. Just adapt to the occasion and trust your judgement and your relationship with an experienced journalist.

Also think about environment in which you will be filmed, but make no assumptions. Remember the backdrop is entirely the journalist's decision. Co-operate and make it easy for them while trying not to get trapped into anything which is incompatible with your organisation's image.

What rules are there for writing letters to the editor?

The best summary I know for this is one put together by Professor Bill Saunders of Perth:-

1. Use this medium a lot as it is the best read section of the newspaper. People who write to

papers are very valuable members. Treasure them.

2. Make your point quickly and concisely, avoiding a long or rambling introduction.

3. Use your title (if applicable) and your groups name to give the letter more credibility.

4. Avoid offensive or accusatory language.

5. Stick to one subject per letter.

6. Write about subjects that are still newsworthy; if you can use a recent news event or article as a hook for making your letter timely.

7. Don't assume readers will know what you are writing about. Give enough background so people without your knowledge will be able to follow the arguments.

8. Be consistent if you are planning a write-in campaign. Disagreement between letters from the same group will erode your credibility quickly.

9. Avoid form letters as no newspaper wishes to be part of an organisations propaganda effort.

10. Be sure your letter concentrates on the local angle of the issue.

Cliff Turner used to obey all the rules above and gets his letters published often. Here is an attention grabbing letter, an example of the brilliance of this veteran campaigner:

Sir - You reported that consideration is being given to bringing a charge of manslaughter against a company which supplied shellfish to a woman whose twin babies died because she ate shellfish during her pregnancy. Presumably this is because the shellfish supplier allegedly knew that this product was potentially dangerous when he released it for sale.

According to a Department of Health publication, Drug Statistics 1992, 4000 New Zealand died as a result of using tobacco and 1000 died as a result of consuming alcohol. These figures are for 1989.

The tobacco and alcohol industries are well aware that their products bring premature deaths to many of the users of the products. When are we to see prosecutions for manslaughter brought against them?

Cliff Turner