Survey of stakeholders in the animal/pet feeds sector: Research Summary







Methodology



Colmar Brunton web survey distributed via email



32 completed the survey ('respondents') from a range of businesses



Survey: 6 – 26th June, 2013

It should be noted that industry associations felt that this survey would not be relevant for small SMEs and single-person businesses.
Furthermore some of the industry associations contain a number of businesses that are not involved in animal feeds (for example, the Seafood Standards Council). Because of this, it is not possible to determine the size of the 'relevant stakeholder population'.

Key insights

Access to information

1. 16 of the 32 or 50% of respondents say it is difficult to find specifications relevant to their business. When asked how this could be improved, respondents mention improvements to the website and making the requirements for different product areas clearer. Some also say they are struggling to find the time to understand compliance requirements.

Guidance material

- 1. 29 of the 32 or 9 in 10 of respondents know a lot or a moderate amount about legal requirements and codes of practice for their organisation generally speaking stakeholders involved in more than 5,000 tonnes of production/supply are more likely to know 'a lot'.
- 2. The ACVM Act is the most difficult Act to interpret. 16 of the 32 or 50% of respondents say they find ACVM guidance material difficult to understand (whereas two-fifths find guidance material for the Animal Products Act and the Biosecurity Act difficult to understand).
- 3. The majority of respondents think that MPI documents provide the right amount of detail. However, a significant group (around a third) think there is not enough information, particularly in the Codes of Practice (36% thought there was not enough information in Codes of Practice).
- 4. 16 of the 32 or 50% of respondents find difficulty understanding what is mandatory versus guidance information particularly in the Guidelines and Code of Practice.

Suggested changes

- 1. Clarifying mandatory versus guidance material and making information easier to find on the website are the most important information priorities for respondents (two-thirds of respondents identified these issues as something that MPI should focus upon).
- 2. Just over half think that MPI should focus on making it easier to contact the right person at MPI comments from respondents suggest that this contact should have expertise on relevant guidance matters.
- 3. Almost nine in ten respondents say that information about sampling and testing needs further explanation.

Safeguarding feed supply

- When asked to identify the 'top-three' issues which are important for safeguarding the feed supply in New Zealand, the most common answers include: tighter regulations and standards for imports, compliance checks, enforcing standards, and biosecurity and chemical contamination.
- 2. The 'top three' priorities for improvement identified by respondents are: labelling, the establishment of feed standards, and hazard identification.