



## **SUBMISSION**

**Senate Inquiry into the Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness, in particular with respect to foot-and-mouth disease.**

**AUGUST 2022**

## Re: Senate Inquiry into the Australia's biosecurity measures

Thank you for providing Grain Producers Australia with the opportunity to submit our members' views into the Senate the Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References Committee's inquiry into the Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness.

### Terms of Reference

1. *Adequacy of Australia's biosecurity measures and response preparedness, in particular with respect to foot-and-mouth disease and varroa mite;*

GPA has been an active participant in the national management response to the [Varroa Mite detection in NSW](#), as per our responsibilities as a member of Plant Health Australia and as a signatory to the Emergency Plant Pest Response Deed (EPPRD). In these response processes GPA has attended regular, ongoing meetings to engage with PHA and the relevant agencies and the effected plant industry groups, through the necessary management committees, to monitor and respond to the situation, and communicate with our members and professional experts, as needed. GPA's main role has been identifying the specific impacts on growers and conducting technical assessments to process and determine funding allocation requirements. GPA has found these processes to be adequate, in relation to meeting our formal representative obligations for all levy-paying grain producers (see attached flow-chart on GPA's representative responsibilities).

GPA has not had any direct involvement in formal emergency management activities in response to the recent threat of Foot Mouth Disease and Lumpy Skin Disease. However, the overwhelming public and political reaction to the potential impacts, not only on Australian farmers and industry, but also the national economy and for rural communities, has created heightened awareness among our members on the critical importance of biosecurity and the need for greater and more urgent action. This has created opportunities among GPA's State Farming Members to share information and communications about the potential impacts on grain producers, from these animal diseases, to help with preparedness activities. Many grain producers are also livestock producers and have used the current FMD and LSD situation to better understand the relevant impacts and what proactive steps they can take, to implement enhanced biosecurity protections within their own farm businesses. Information sharing opportunities such as webinars with relevant experts have also been provided for growers by multiple member groups and agencies, including [one by PHA](#), with Animal Health Australia. During recent field day events, GPA continued to collaborate with PHA's Grains Farm Biosecurity Officers, noting a high level of engagement with growers and the general community, in particular by providing access to important resources such as [farm-gate biosecurity signage](#), and biosecurity planning information/advice. GPA is also aware that while the public's current focus on biosecurity is related to two major animal health threats, in reality a plant health disease could arrive before any of these, and therefore complacency is never an option. That's why we continue to engage with our members actively on biosecurity, to do all we can to keep Australia free of such pests and diseases which pose significant threats for the Australian grain producers, our industry, rural communities and businesses, and the national economy.

2. *Response to and implementation of previous reports into biosecurity*
3. *And related matters.*

GPA is acutely aware of the increasing need to take more decisive action with increased investment into biosecurity protections, not only at the border to prevent pests and diseases from entering Australia to start with, but also to minimise the risks, spread and actual impacts on-farm. These incursions have the potential to devastate individual growers, regional communities and our economies, and the national economy. GPA's views are shaped by an understanding of the importance of strong biosecurity systems to safeguard market access and protect the reputation of our grower members for producing high quality grain products. GPA also has an acute understanding of, and concern about, the growing movement of people and products across the globe and the increasing complexity of trade pathways. In particular the [growing sea container trade](#) is also escalating biosecurity risks, especially carrying greater risks of hitchhiking pests such as Khapra beetle which have the potential to severely impact market access.

COVID-19 has clearly demonstrated that the major social and economic impacts of such minute risks, of which there are many for the grains sector, with priority ones [identified by experts](#), are real and the next crisis imminent. That's why biosecurity must be taken more seriously by all levels of government,

industries and individuals. When it comes to biosecurity, more can always be done, and we need to remain vigilant, in order to properly protect individuals and the public good. The first response from our grower members is that they don't want any of these threats arriving here in the first place.

However, the legislative/regulatory frameworks and shared funding management responsibilities and funding models which underpin our preventative and reactive measures, are highly complex. Recent reviews and reports into the national biosecurity system, such as the Australian National Audit Office [report](#) of June 2021, the 2017 *Craik Report* and those by the [reviews](#) completed by the Inspector-General of Biosecurity, acknowledge these interconnected complexities. These inquiries also identify many of the current and future challenges, and proposed solutions. A common theme that continues to emerge is that the gaps in management responsibilities are real, and the risks are growing, but funding levels remain inadequate, in order to meet the size and scale of the modern and future task. Investment into preventative measures, and use of modern technologies, are also increasingly recognised as opportunities to improve protective measures, and intervention and early identification programs.

A recent [report](#) in particular by the former Inspector-General of Biosecurity, Rob Delane, the *'Robustness of biosecurity measures to prevent entry of khapra beetle into Australia'*, is of particular interest to Australian grain producers. The report raises concerns about the threat of hitchhiker pests for the \$13 billion grains sector, which should be recognised by the Committee Inquiry. The report's executive summary highlights multiple challenges in relation to the Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment's response to recent khapra beetle detections – in particular an incident in 2018 where khapra beetle was identified in a sea cargo container carrying plastic beads, a commodity that does not pose a biosecurity risk and is not normally associated with khapra beetle. Despite the container being fumigated several times, khapra beetle located in the door seals were still alive.

The report's executive summary said, "as also seen in numerous Inspector-General reviews, the department continues to struggle with fundamentals that go to its regulatory maturity. The department's understanding and effective use of the Biosecurity Act 2015 remains a significant weakness, as is its understanding of the control frameworks and their relative effectiveness. With the level of investment already expended on khapra beetle, and significant investment to come, a roadmap of where the department is going and how its different elements will support the future preventative biosecurity system – and not just for khapra beetle – should already be in place but is not."

GPA's biosecurity [advocacy](#) acutely recognises tougher preventative measures with appropriate resourcing is needed to protect growers, rural communities and the national economy against the social and economic impacts of devastating pests and incursions such as Khapra beetle, which could cause an estimated \$15.5 billion damage over 20 years and loss of access to important grain export markets.

GPA has advocated for the introduction of a levy on all imported containers entering Australia, in response to these escalating demands and complex challenges, as per the below policy extract.

"Currently the largest biosecurity risk vector for Australian plant industries are imported products and the containers used to transport them. Those imposing the risks upon the Australian plant industries need to be making a greater contribution towards the costs of surveillance, eradication and management of biosecurity."

GPA's advocacy and engagement on this policy request has also included direct representations to the former Minister for Agriculture. Whilst GPA has [supported](#) and welcomed funding announcements by the former Federal Government on enhanced biosecurity preventions, this has been tempered with our repeated requests for a container levy, to help deliver a more equitable funding model which improves shared responsibility and accountability. For example, an April 2021 media release, welcoming additional sea container measures to manage the risks of Khapra beetle incursion into Australia, quoted the views and calls by GPA Western Grower Director and current Chair, Barry Large, on this request.

*"Whatever we can do to stop khapra coming into Australia should be done – we are khapra free and our markets value that", said Mr Large. Mr Large said, "when it comes to biosecurity, we all know it is far cheaper to stop things at the border than manage it post-border".*

*GPA welcomes the investment from the Government and welcomes improvements to Australia's border biosecurity systems. GPA are strong advocates for the need to implement a levy on all incoming*

containers. The levy would provide additional funding to support Australia's biosecurity systems to keep pace with the international container movements.

Mr Large said, "This investment highlights the need for a container levy to ensure importers are contributing towards the costs of supporting our biosecurity activities. Containers are a major vector for serious pests coming into Australia. It is no longer acceptable the industries importing products and putting our national biosecurity at constant risk are not funding biosecurity activities."

Australian plant industries, particularly farmers, contribute substantial biosecurity levies. "We also cover the costs imposed on Australian industries by the Department through the fully cost recovered export certification system", said Mr Large.

Despite GPA raising these concerns about the need for a better funded and focused response effort to support the prevention of khapra beetle, and other biosecurity risks, the former government's response on the container levy was extremely disappointing. A letter from PHA members on this matter (also attached) expressed shared concerns among plant industry members at the ongoing funding inequity.

"The plant industry sectors are not the 'risk creator' yet pay for the eradication of risks created by importers to the industry, while the 'risk creators' – the importers and/or container owners/operators - are not paying any share of the eradication costs", it said.

GPA is one of 39 plant industry groups that constitute the Plant Industries Forum. The Forum's Chair, Nathan Hancock, recently wrote to Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry and Emergency Management, Senator Murray Watt, on behalf of these industry groups, outlining the key issues on biosecurity strategy and funding. This letter highlighted concerns that biosecurity funding for the plant sector has fallen to unsustainable levels along with a lack of transparency in State Agency reporting. It also called on the Federal Government to take "every measure possible" to ensure plant biosecurity is adequately funded by all jurisdictions and the Commonwealth. The letter says plant industries represent a combined annual value to the Australian economy in excess of \$43.2 billion, with growth in the sector set to contribute significantly to agriculture's [goal](#) of becoming a \$100 billion industry, by 2030. GPA also attaches this letter, and highlights the below section, to support our submission.

#### *Transparency in biosecurity*

*Plant Industries are calling on all Agriculture Ministers to acknowledge governments have failed to implement critical recommendations, in support of plant biosecurity, made in every biosecurity review (state and commonwealth) since Nairn released the Australian Quarantine a shared responsibility report in 1997. When Beale reported in his 2008 review, One biosecurity: a working partnership, almost identical issues were identified 10 years after Nairn and this has been replicated in the Craik 2017 review of the Intergovernmental Agreement on Biosecurity (IGAB), Priorities for Australia's biosecurity system.*

*Significantly, many of these reports failed to clearly identify the declining capacity and capability across the plant biosecurity agencies as successive governments simply defunded agricultural agencies to support other initiatives.*

*The time has come to address this issue head on, our \$43.2 billion Plant Industries are under severe threat as are our natural and built environments due to under resourcing by consecutive governments. An important recommendation of the Craik report was the requirement for reporting performance publicly to provide more transparency of the activity and investment by each jurisdiction. Plant Industries expect this to be further expanded to require that funding be broken into plant, animal, invasive species and animal welfare categories within the biosecurity investment.*

GPA recognises the Commonwealth Biosecurity Strategy 2030 has been released, focused on the increasingly complex and challenging biosecurity threats, and supports its approach to continually strengthen the system to meet challenges as they emerge, to boost resilience and shared responsibility.

#### **GPA Biosecurity Background and Recent Advocacy/Engagement Activities**

GPA has long-standing responsibilities under federal legislation representing all of Australia's levy-paying grain producers, while developing and advocating policies along with our State Farming Members, to boost profitability and sustainability. This includes representing growers on biosecurity protections and emergency response management activities, as a member representative of [Plant Health Australia](#). These biosecurity responsibilities also complement GPA's other roles under federal

legislation acting for levy-paying growers on; industry RD&E to the Grains Research and Development and Corporation; and market access/chemical use to the National Residue Survey.

As members of PHA and in acting as the signatories to the Emergency Plant Pest Response Deed (EPPRD), with committee roles such as the National Management Group, GPA's biosecurity responsibilities for all Australian grain producers include:

- biosecurity planning and implementation at both on-farm and national levels.
- liaising with state and federal governments on trade issues
- funding and supporting biosecurity initiatives
- participating in national committees and response efforts in an emergency through the National Management Group and committees.

GPA's Strategic Plan supports stronger biosecurity measures for growers and industry, in relation to product integrity. This includes strategies to; promote pest surveillance, monitoring and control; ensure grains are considered in preventative mitigation strategies, border measures and strategic threat responsiveness; the National Management Group's formation of responses to incursions including ongoing surveillance and management; and broadening the funding base of compulsory biosecurity levies to include all grain imports (i.e. levy on sea containers imported into Australia) and vectors, in equitably contributing to biosecurity management.

#### GPA Biosecurity Committee

In recognising the increasing focus on biosecurity matters and need to take action and advocate better outcomes for growers, GPA has established a dedicated [Biosecurity Committee](#). The Committee plays an active role supporting GPA's representative responsibilities on biosecurity, for all levy-paying growers, which complements these same responsibilities for RD&E and chemical use/market access. The Committee's work includes providing opportunities to share knowledge, expert advice and relevant information, to inform national policy development and activities, while engaging with our State Member representatives and their professional staff and grower representatives. For example, former Inspector General of Biosecurity Rob Delane has presented at meetings, along with the PHA Grain Farm Biosecurity Program Officers.

GPA's Biosecurity Committee also provides inclusive opportunities for other grains industry groups and stakeholders to engage with our members and professional staff proactively, to pursue shared projects and joint initiatives. This enables genuine collaboration, communication and advocacy opportunities, to help strengthen biosecurity protections and outcomes for growers. This approach includes access to the extensive corporate knowledge of managing biosecurity response processes that's provided by GPA's experienced Grower Board Members Barry Large and Andrew Weidemann. Engaging in these processes also provides a conduit to identify and manage issues collaboratively and subsequently communicate grower views to other stakeholders and groups as needed, such as PHA and State and Federal Governments. This coherence and clear communication of the grower voice is especially critical during an emergency response incident, to maintain trust and confidence in decision-making.

A meeting in June this year was attended by other grains representatives and included the following examples of GPA providing these engagement and information sharing opportunities.

- *Presentation on potential impact of FMD on the grains industry – Alastair James CEO Red Meat Advisory Council.*
- *Andreas Glanznig Centre for Invasive Species Solutions – presentation on strategic direction and investment for biosecurity R&D in ISS2030Initiative.*
- *Presentation on PHA Grains Industry Biosecurity Plan – PHA National Manager, Preparedness and RD&E Stuart Kearns.*
- *Update on changes to the PHA Act – Michael Milne PHA Company Secretary/CFO.*

GPA's Biosecurity Committee provides a coherent structure and processes to engage on issues which impact Australian grain producers to prevent duplication and the potential for mixed messaging and confusion. Including other groups in these representative processes provides them with an opportunity to engage on grower specific issues in good faith, should they choose to, to collaborate and work together to help determine appropriate actions and factual responses. This inclusive approach also helps to build trust and grow positive relationships, with decision-makers.

#### Biosecurity Feedback in GPA's Grower Survey

GPA's 2022 Federal Election priorities survey was conducted at the start of this year. One of its questions asked grain producers what five policy issues they believed needed to be prioritised by the Federal Government, to support the productivity and profitability of their grain farming business. 37.8pc of respondents indicated biosecurity as a priority. This was compared to – trade and market access (60pc), transportation infrastructure/freight costs (44.4pc), market competition and transparency (42.2pc) and input and production costs – i.e. chemical and fertilisers (46.7pc). If this survey was held during the recent incidents of FMD, LSD and Varroa, we could expect the response on biosecurity to be higher, given the significant public, media, political and industry interest and commentary it has created, highlighted by the potential \$80 billion impact of FMD.

When asked “Where should Federal Government invest public funds to help support the performance and productivity of your business?” 4.5pc of growers said biosecurity. This is compared to trade and market access (9.1pc), transportation infrastructure/freight costs (25pc), sustainability/climate change/carbon trading (6.8pc), input and production costs – i.e. chemical and fertilisers (6.8pc) and digital connectivity (11.4pc).

Biosecurity was subsequently a key pillar in GPA's 2022 Federal Election Policy [Priorities](#), calling for an increased focus on preventative biosecurity measures to protect Australian grains; recognising GPA's work on biosecurity also complements our legislative responsibilities in other areas – such as oversight and accountability of the GRDC – for about 22,500 Australian growers who contribute 1.02 per cent of their crop sale value towards funding.

The current government responded to GPA's policy priorities saying they recognised the grains industry is a “substantial part of the agriculture sector. Furthermore, maintaining a thriving grains sector, coming off a record harvest last year, will be a key element in achieving the agriculture industry's farm gate income target of \$100 billion by 2030. With over 20,000 businesses employing tens of thousands of workers, activity in the grains industry is a major contributor to the future prosperity of regional economies. And of course, it's a key contributor to Australia's food security and export income.”

#### GRDC Biosecurity Investment

GPA policy supports the compulsory farm-gate levy on growers to fund activities (as stated previously), with the continued government-industry partnership created through the RDC system being vital to the Australian grains industry's future. In addition to these investments, GRDC also contributes significant capacity and resources to engage and collaborate with PHA and GPA on activities which also benefit and support growers and industry on biosecurity.

Page 118 of GRDC's 2020-21 Annual Report (below) shows \$30.9 million, representing 18 percent of its RD&E portfolio, was spent on biosecurity.

*Table 12: Australian Government Rural Research, Development and Extension Priorities, dollars and percentage values.*

<b>STAKEHOLDER PRIORITIES</b>	<b>ESTIMATED 2020–21 EXPENDITURE*</b>	
	<b>\$M</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE OF GRDC RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND EXTENSION PORTFOLIO</b>
<b>Rural RD&amp;E priorities</b>		
Advanced technology	\$22.0	13%
<b>Biosecurity</b>	<b>\$30.9</b>	<b>18%</b>
Soil, water and managing natural resources	\$23.1	13%
Adoption of R&D	\$49.1	29%
Other	\$35.5	22%
Not yet assessed	\$8.3	5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$168.9</b>	<b>100%</b>

The Annual Report also says GRDC's involvement with Agricultural Innovation Australia will deliver for growers, particularly those running livestock or involved in other commodities and contributing to multiple R&D levy schemes. “This collaboration will drive improved interaction across agriculture,

decrease duplication, and increase delivery on hard to solve, whole of sector challenges. This will include initiatives such as challenges with climate, biosecurity, soils and water, that will help agriculture reach the ambitious \$100 billion farmgate value national target by 2030

Last harvest the Australian grains industry returned a forecast value of \$26 billion, from an estimated 62 million tonne record crop. This means grain producers will contribute about \$260 million in levies from last harvest, representing 1.02 per cent of their grain sales (0.99pc of which goes to the GRDC).

Data provided by the Australian Grain Export Innovation Centre (as attached) shows there's been a significant increase in the size and value of the Australian crop, which coincides with the start of this levy-collection system more than 30-years ago. In the late 1980s the gross value of crop production was only around \$4 billion, but growth in value means it now reaches \$20 billion, AGEIC says. "Additional grain production since the early 2000s has not come from increased plantings of crops. Rather the increase in production is attributable to the persistent increase in crop yields."

This data shows the national grains industry has grown significantly in size and value and the level of investment in critical areas, such as biosecurity management and preventions, needs to keep pace with this growth and adapt to modern challenges, with flexible systems and appropriate funding streams. This includes activities in GPA's remit for growers, such those identified in the Craik Report (page 23).

"In particular, industry should take greater ownership for biosecurity issues which it can drive with limited, or no, government involvement. The Livestock Biosecurity Network (LBN) and Grains Farm Biosecurity Program (GFBP) are examples of strong industry-led initiatives (Box 2)."

The Craik Report (Page 129) also highlights the grains industry's leadership example, as represented by GPA, for taking a more progressive and proactive approach to biosecurity.

"It has set its PHA levy at a rate which collects approximately \$700,000 more per annum than the cost of its annual subscriptions and its EPPR levy rate at 0.005 per cent of the sale price rather than at zero. These funds are used to: (a) support the GFBP, which is aimed at improving awareness and farm management practices relating to grains industry biosecurity risks; and, (b) to build a reserve fund to cover the grains industry's share of an approved emergency response plan.

"The GFBP is managed by PHA in conjunction with GPA, and part of the partnership program includes funding for state government agencies to employ staff to work on the GFBP. The funds collected through the EPPR levy built, over several years, to just over \$5.1 million by the end of 2016. This reserve provides a ready source of funds to pay the grain industry's share of approved emergency response plans and is currently being drawn on to cover costs associated with the Khapra beetle and Varroa incursions. Funds collected under the EPPR levy can also be used for purposes relating to emergency plant pests, within the meaning of the EPPRD, such as surveillance.

"The panel considers the decisions by the grains industry to set the two levies above the minimum required as a positive example for other industries to follow (noting a few others do likewise already). It shows industry leadership in strengthening biosecurity activities for the industry and also building a fund ready to use when an incursion happens."

We note also GRDC's submission to this inquiry, which GPA also supports, has provided details on these specific investments and programs. GRDC's investment in establishing Grains Australia to consolidate 'industry good' functions and efficiencies, is also providing greater capacity to manage biosecurity across industry, in regards to maintaining, promoting and developing grain market access.

In December 2021, Hort Innovation and PHA announced a new three-year National Bee Pest Surveillance Program. Funded by Hort Innovation, the Australian Honey Bee Industry Council and GPA, in collaboration with State and Territory Governments, the program will continue to monitor for honey bee pests that threaten the Australian honey bee [industry](#).

## Summary

GPA's long-standing collaboration and engagement on biosecurity has delivered important strategic initiatives to benefit all growers, such as the award-winning Grains Farm Biosecurity [program](#). As mentioned previously, this collaboration between industry and governments helps bolster the management of, and preparedness for, biosecurity risks in the grains industry at the farm and local

industry level. With officers in five states, New South Wales, Queensland, South Australia, Victoria and Western Australia, this program provides access to practical resources and accurate information, to help growers manage biosecurity risks in their own businesses. For example, growers can access training opportunities, on-farm signage, fact sheets, biosecurity planning tools, risk assessment guides etc. As part of these long-standing roles with PHA, GPA has also engaged in regular activities to communicate and promote these important resources to growers – including through cross-promotion in media releases, social media, newsletters and events such as field days – recognising the importance of growers being able to directly access single points of truth, to support their business activities.

GPA welcomes continued engagement and genuine collaboration with all stakeholders, to support a biosecurity system that promotes continuous improvement and deliver stronger protections for growers and our industry. GPA also has a clear track record of engaging and working with PHA and other stakeholders on emergency response efforts for growers, since assuming these legitimate representative responsibilities for growers in 2010. This is also supported by our inclusive democratic, governance and policy development processes, which engages the grass roots members of the Grains Councils of State Farming Groups throughout Australia. As part of these legitimate representative functions, GPA's processes, as the peak industry body, supports and empowers the views of those growers who pay to be members of these organisations. Rather than duplicating the voice and policy views of these growers, GPA's processes and structures remain inclusive of all groups who choose to support these fundamental democratic principles.

If you would like to discuss this submission further, please don't hesitate contact me on  
and .

Yours sincerely

Colin Bettles

Chief Executive – Grain Producers Australia

## **GPA's Representative Roles and Responsibilities**

Grain Producers Australia represents the interests of an estimated 22,500 grain producers who grow broadacre, grain, pulse and oilseed crops throughout Australia, contributing to the economic strength of their communities, and an industry valued at an estimated \$13 billion.

GPA advocates national policy outcomes with benefits for grain producers and to deliver a more profitable, sustainable and globally competitive Australian grains industry.

As a not-for-profit company limited by guarantee, GPA is governed by a board that's elected by producer members, representing the major grain producing regions. GPA's membership comprises direct producer members and producer members of the Grains Councils of State Farming Organisations. The elected leaders of these groups – backed by professional staff – also represent their members' interests, via the GPA Policy Council.

GPA's State Members include:

- Agforce Grains
- Grain Producers SA
- NSW Farmers Association
- Victorian Farmers' Federation Grains Group
- Tasmanian Farmers and Graziers Association
- WAFarmers Grains Council
- WA Grains Group

This robust representative process also engages and enables producers to advocate their views and deliver policy outcomes via various GPA Sub-Committees and Taskforces; such as the GPA Biosecurity Committee and GPA Pesticides and Technology Sub-Committee.

GPA's objectives are to:

- Provide a strong, independent, national advocate for grain producers based on a rigorous and transparent policy development process.
- Engage all sectors of the Australian grains industry to ensure operation of the most efficient and profitable grain supply chain.
- Facilitate a strategic approach to research, development and extension intended to deliver sound commercial outcomes from industry research.

GPA's responsibilities representing the interests of Australia's 22,500 levy-paying grain producers are legitimised under federal legislation.

This includes; managing biosecurity for the Australian grains industry through Plant Health Australia as a signatory to the Emergency Pest Plant Response Deed (EPPRD); as a joint Representative Organisation responsible for overseeing the Grains Research and Development Corporation's performance and strategic investment, with matching Federal Government funding, in RD&E activities, under the PIRD Act; and managing the risk of chemical residues and environmental contaminants in grain products, to help facilitate access to domestic and export markets and protect product integrity and export reputation, via the National Residue Survey.

Grain growers contribute 1.02 per cent of their net crop sales toward levies comprising the GRDC the EPPRD responsibilities, Plant Health Australia membership, National Residue Survey testing. Of that, the vast majority (0.99pc) goes to the GRDC, with PHA receiving 0.01pc, the NRS 0.015pc and emergency plant protection response the remaining 0.005pc.

According to the latest report (Report to levies stakeholders 2018–19, Appendix B) grower levies to GRDC (97% of levies paid by grain growers) were at least \$110 million for each of the 5 years reported. The average between 2014-15 and 2018-19 of grower levies to GRDC was about \$120m, ranging from \$100m to \$139m. The corresponding average paid to all bodies is about \$124m.

Further information: <https://www.grainproducers.com.au/>