



THE SENATE
SENATE FINANCE AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
REFERENCES COMMITTEE

**The operation, effectiveness, and consequences of the Public Governance,
Performance and Accountability (Location of Corporate Commonwealth
Entities) Order 2016**

Public Hearing – Tuesday 11 April 2017

Questions Taken on Notice – Gaven and Associates

1. HANSARD, Page 19

Senator McKENZIE: And how have they gone, Mr Lee? Mr Gaven, do you have anything to add about the ability of the three former CEOs of APVMA to get it efficient so that what it is actually tasked to do—to ensure that we have a globally competitive chemical regime for our farmers—is achieved?

Mr Gaven: I have only been able to measure the results of my applications over the two years since the online system started, and the first year, from 1 July 2014, I did 19 applications, of which 15 were completed on time—about 80 per cent—and then, from 1 July 2015, when news of the move came, I did 38, of which 24 were finalised on time, that is, 60 per cent.

Senator McKENZIE: Mr Gaven, can you break those approvals down to the types of chemicals? Some are quite pro forma approval processes and others require quite detailed approval processes.

Mr Gaven: I cannot break it down now, but they would be a mixture of applications other than just variations.

Senator McKENZIE: Could you provide that on notice –the tick and flick versus the detailed?

I have re-examined my record of applications for the two years mentioned in my evidence and note that I did not include any “tick and flick” applications in those numbers. All applications referred to were various application items that required assessment of information by the APVMA.

I omitted the “tick and flick” applications because the point of my evidence was to show that when news of the move to Armidale became commonly known, about mid-2015, on time finalisation of applications that required staff assessments fell.