

November 21, 2012 File: 44200-50/12-04, 12-05A-B

## **DELIVERED BY E-MAIL**

John Walsh President V.I.P. Produce Ltd. c/o 555 Baylis Rd Qualicum BC V9K 2G2 Tom Demma General Manager BC Vegetable Marketing Commission 207 – 15252 – 32 Ave Surrey BC V3S 0R7

Lloyd Hiebert, President Vancouver Island Farm Products Inc. 2550 Quennell Road Nanaimo BC V9X 1K4

## APPEALS FROM AN APRIL 27, 2012 DECISION OF THE BC VEGETABLE MARKETING COMMISSION CONCERNING AGENCY STATUS

V.I.P. Produce Ltd. (VIP) and Vancouver Island Farm Products Inc. (VIFP) each separately appealed the subject decision concerning the respective agency status of each of them.

On November 16, 2012, I wrote to the parties in my capacity as the presiding and sole member of the panel appointed to hear the appeals to advise that I was giving consideration to referring the subject matter of these appeals to the British Columbia Farm Industry Review Board (BCFIRB) in its supervisory capacity and deferring further consideration of the appeals in accordance with s. 8(8) of the *Natural Products Marketing (BC) Act* (NPMA). I gave the parties the opportunity to provide their positions on this question and subsequently extended the time for them to respond to 2 p.m. November 21, 2012.

## Section 8(8) of the NPMA states:

If, after an appeal is filed, an appeal panel considers that all or part of the subject matter under appeal is more appropriately dealt with in a supervisory process under its supervisory power, the appeal panel, after giving the appellant and the commodity board or commission an opportunity to be heard, may defer further consideration of the appeal until after the supervisory process is completed.

The BC Vegetable Marketing Commission (VMC) considers all of the subject matter of the appeals is more appropriately dealt with in a supervisory process under BCFIRB's supervisory power and requests that further consideration of the appeals be deferred until after the

British Columbia
Farm Industry Review Board

Mailing Address:

PO Box 9129 Stn Prov Govt Victoria BC V8W 9B5

Telephone: 250 356-8945 Facsimile: 250 356-5131 Location:

780 Blanshard St Victoria BC V8W 2H1

Email: firb@gov.bc.ca Website: www.firb.gov.bc.ca VIP v BCVMC (12-05A-B) VIPF v BCVMC (12-04) November 21, 2012 Page 2

supervisory process is completed. The VMC has provided the following reasons in support of its position:

- Vancouver Island greenhouse vegetable growers are at a stage in their annual business and production
  cycles where they need certainty on a number of considerations; including crop planning, input
  purchasing and assurance of marketing. Consequently, time is of the essence for reaching a FIRB
  decision and one is expected to be available sooner with FIRB proceeding by way of its supervisory
  power as opposed to proceeding by way of appeal hearing;
- for reaching a decision on the appeal matters before it, proceeding by way of its supervisory powers is expected to allow FIRB to receive and consider a broader spectrum of BC vegetable sector information that goes beyond what might otherwise form an appeal hearing record; and
- in the normal course if agency designation is recommended to FIRB by a marketing board or
  commission, it proceeds by way of its supervisory powers for reaching such a decision, and given the
  appeal matters now before it, proceeding in the same manner appears to be more economic on a number
  of fronts because all can be addressed simultaneously.

VIP also supports BCFIRB proceeding with a supervisory process.

VIFP takes the position that the appeals should proceed. VIFP provided no reasons in support of its position.

I have considered the position of all of the parties.

The respective appeals all relate to a single decision of the VMC concerning the designation of agencies. The appeals raise issues with respect to designation of agencies and conditions attached to such designations. As I noted in my letter of November 16, 2012:

The designation of agencies and the consequent delegation of authority by a commodity board or commission to those agencies is a significant decision that under s. 8 of the NPMA Regulations requires the prior approval of BCFIRB.

The regulatory and agency structure of the British Columbia vegetable industry has been the subject of several reviews over the past number of years. The VMC also commissioned a January 30, 2012 'Opportunities Assessment of British Columbia's Vegetable Sector' that reports on marketing, regulatory, governance and other challenges and opportunities for going forward. I am not convinced that the status of these two agencies should be decided without taking this broader context into account as part of the decision-making process.

With respect to all of the appeals of the April 27, 2012 decision of the VMC, I am of the view that the subject matter under appeal is more appropriately dealt with in a supervisory process under BCFIRB's supervisory power for the reasons stated by the VMC and as set forth in my November 16, 2012 letter.

Since the supervisory process will deal with all of the subject matter under appeal, it is likely that most, if not all, issues raised by the appeals will be determined by that process. Accordingly, it would be a duplication of effort to continue at the same time with any of the appeals.

VIP v BCVMC (12-05A-B) VIPF v BCVMC (12-04) November 21, 2012 Page 3

I therefore order that further consideration of all of the appeals be deferred until after the supervisory process has been completed.

## BRITISH COLUMBIA FARM INDUSTRY REVIEW BOARD

Per

Suzanne K. Wiltshire

Presiding Member