



Appendix Two: Submission Analysis Quantitative Findings

Introduction

This report provides a **quantitative**¹ analysis of submissions received in the Round Two consultation on the AFB Pest Management Plan (AFB PMP).

The quantitative analysis reports on the findings of the close-ended consultation questions. A separate qualitative analysis reports on the findings of the open-ended consultation questions and written submissions (see Submission Analysis Qualitative Findings, Appendix 1).

The Round Two consultation is the second part of a three-part consultation being undertaken by the Management Agency Board on what, if any, new plan rules or powers are needed in the National American Foulbrood Pest Management Plan (AFB PMP).

The Round One consultation took place during June-July 2021 and the second Round Two took place during November-December 2021. Based on Round One findings, four priority areas for change were identified, and these formed the basis of the Round Two consultation questions.

It is intended that findings from the Round Two consultation will input into the drafting of a new AFB PMP. The proposed draft for the new AFB PMP will be subject to the third and final round of consultation later in 2022.

It should be noted that while submission findings are a key input into the review of the AFB PMP Plan, the preferences expressed should not be interpreted as decisions taken.

This report contains the following sections:

- A. Submission process and consultation questions
- B. Number of submissions and responses by question
- C. Method
- D. Findings.

A. SUBMISSION PROCESS AND CONSULTATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Submission Process

Registered beekeepers were invited to make a submission by:

- completing the consultation questionnaire online using SurveyMonkey, or
- mailing a submission to the Management Agency by email or post.

SurveyMonkey, an online survey tool, was used as the main way of making a submission. It was seen as a relatively easy and time-effective way for many beekeepers to express their preferences and views. Submissions were also welcomed in different formats (e.g., emails and letters).

SurveyMonkey is also a cost-effective tool for conducting the consultation and analysing submissions, and it includes software for analysing close-ended questions.

¹ Qualitative data is nonnumerical (e.g., the text provided in comments and letters), and quantitative data is numerical (e.g. the count of preference options selected for each recommended change). (Refer Neuman, Social Research Methods, 2006, p.8)



Review of AFB Pest Management Plan, Round Two Consultation Findings

Submission Quantitative Analysis, Appendix 2

Consultation Questions

The consultation questions were based on the findings of the Round One consultation which canvassed the views of beekeepers about what, if any, changes should be made to the current AFB PMP. These findings guided the development of a suite of recommended changes for the new AFB PMP by the Management Agency and formed the basis for the Round Two consultation questions. The three key areas identified for further consultation were: education and training; surveillance and prevention; and enforcement and penalties.

For each of the three key areas, consultation questions were developed and set out in a questionnaire format. There were 18 questions: 14 close-ended questions and four open-ended questions² (shown in Table 1). The analysis of responses to the four open-ended questions is provided in a separate report (see qualitative analysis in Appendix 1).

B. NUMBER OF SUBMISSIONS AND RESPONSES BY QUESTION

Number of submissions

There were 342 submissions in the Round Two consultation.

- a. 315 were made using the on-line consultation questionnaire posted on SurveyMonkey (referred to as 'questionnaire submissions'). Two of these submitters also sent a written submission.
- b. 20 were posted or emailed with a completed questionnaire, and these submissions were manually entered into SurveyMonkey by the researcher (referred to as 'questionnaire submissions').
- c. Nine were provided as an email or letter (referred to as 'letter submissions'), and two of these submitters also used the consultation questionnaire and posted on SurveyMonkey.

The overall response rate was three percent of all registered beekeepers (that is 342 out of 9855 registered beekeepers).

Seventy percent of submitters completing questionnaire submissions owned less than 11 hives. This broadly reflects the national picture where 77% of all beekeepers own less than 11 hives. By contrast, over half of all hives are owned by beekeepers with 1001 hives or more, and this group comprised approximately four percent of questionnaire submissions (see Table 1).

² An open-ended question asks people to answer in any way they want, and a closed-ended question asks people to choose from a fixed set of answers (Neuman, 2006, 286-287).

Review of AFB Pest Management Plan, Round Two Consultation Findings

Submission Quantitative Analysis, Appendix 2

Table 1: Number and percentage of submitters (completing questionnaire submissions), and number and percentage of beekeepers nationally, by number of hives owned (provisional figures only)

Number of hives	Number submitters ³	% Submitters	Number beekeepers nationally**	Number colonies	% Beekeepers nationally
0-5	181	54%	6731	13,186	68%
6-10	53	16%	860	6,672	9%
11-50	40	12%	1083	26,262	11%
51-250	25	7%	653	76,639	7%
251 -500	13	4%	215	76,591	2%
501-1000	8	2%	156	108,145	2%
1001 or more	12	4%	159	497,263	2%
not applicable	3	1%	-	-	-
not stated	7				
TOTAL	342	100%*	9855	804,756	100%*

*Percentages rounded up

** figures taken from regional council statistics dated 25 August 2021

Number of submissions compared with other consultations

The number of submitters in this round two consultation (342) was less than the number submitting in round one (434) held in 2021. Submitter numbers are not dissimilar to other consultations conducted the Management Agency. The number of submissions received is also markedly higher than the number of submissions recorded as received for the 2008 Ten Year Review of the PMP, as shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Number of responses to national surveys

Year	Topic	number of submitters
2021	Ten Year Review of Pest Management Plan, Round Two Consultation	342
2021	Ten Year Review of Pest Management Plan, Round One Consultation	434
2020	Proposal to set the AFB Levy for 2021/22	104
2019	Proposal to Replace the AFB Apiary and Beekeeper Levy with a Hive and Beekeeper Levy	466
2018	Proposal to increase the AFB Apiary and Beekeeper Levy	828
2018	Budget Consultation	11
2017	AFB PMP – 5 Year Plan	39
2016	AFB PMP – 5 Year Plan	404
2016	Consultation Survey to Beekeepers	597

³ Questionnaire submissions only as letter submitters did not necessarily provide hive ownership details

Review of AFB Pest Management Plan, Round Two Consultation Findings

Submission Quantitative Analysis, Appendix 2

Number of responses to questions in the consultation questionnaire

There was a very high response rate to all the close-ended questions by the submitters who used the consultation questionnaire. Comparatively, the number of responders to the open-ended questions was lower (consultation questions 6, 11, 17, 18), as shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Number of responses to each consultation question, for submitters who used the consultation questionnaire <small>Note: open-ended questions shaded for easy reference</small>	number on-line responses
1. How many hives do you own?	335
2. Do you support requiring beekeepers to complete <u>AFB Refresher Training</u> as a condition of retaining a DECA?	333
3. Do you support requiring DECA holders to ensure their employee beekeepers complete and pass an <u>AFB Recognition Course</u> , as a condition of retaining their DECA?	330
4. Do you support requiring DECA holders to ensure their employee beekeepers complete <u>AFB Refresher Training</u> , as a condition of retaining their DECA?	333
5. How often do you think AFB Refresher training should be required to retain a DECA?	330
6. Do you have any comments about the proposals to strengthen education training and support requirements for DECA holders and their beekeeper employees? (open-ended question)	196
7. Do you support requiring diagnostic laboratories to provide all AFB test results to the Management Agency?	332
8. Do you support requiring beekeepers to notify any transfers of beehive ownership within 7 days?	333
9. Do you support requiring Beekeeper Registration Numbers to be provided when declaring beehive transfers, as part of an Annual Disease Return?	331
10. Do you support AP2s having the authority to use detector dogs (if in the future, detector dogs are recognised as effective by the scientific community)?	331
11. Do you have any comments about the proposals to enhance surveillance and prevention? (open-ended question)	184
12. Do you support the Management Agency having the power to destroy AFB infected hives and take actions to prevent the spread of AFB?	332
13. Do you support the Management Agency having the authority to issue infringement fines for failure to keep honeybees in moveable frame hives?	333
14. Do you support the Management Agency having the authority to issue infringement fines for failure to register an apiary?	334
15. Do you support the Management Agency having the authority to issue infringement fines for failure to submit an Annual Disease Return (ADR)?	333
16. Do you support the Management Agency having the authority to issue infringement fines for failure to complete a Certificate of Inspection (COI)?	334
17. Do you have any comments about the proposals to enhance enforcement powers and penalties? (open-ended question)	192
18. Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns? (open-ended question)	166

Review of AFB Pest Management Plan, Round Two Consultation Findings
Submission Quantitative Analysis, Appendix 2

C. METHOD

The close-ended questions asked submitters to express their level of support or opposition to each of the proposed changes by choosing one of five options. These options were set on a scale, known as a Likert scale⁴. The options were: strongly support; support; neither support or oppose; oppose; strongly oppose.

D. FINDINGS

This section outlines the findings under the following headings:

- a) Overview of preferences for each of the proposed changes
- b) Preferences for proposed changes to strengthen education and training
- c) Preferences for proposed changes to enhance surveillance and prevention
- d) Preferences for proposed changes to enhance enforcement powers and penalties.

a) Overview of preferences for each of the proposed changes

For the 335 submissions entered on Survey Monkey all the proposed changes were supported by at least 69% of submitters. The proposed changes are listed in table 3 below and ranked in order from the proposed changes that received the most support, to those that received less support.

Table 3: Percentage of questionnaire submissions that supported and opposed the proposed changes, listed in rank order from highest to lowest support

Questions	Supported	Opposed
Do you support the Management Agency having the power to destroy AFB infected hives and take actions to prevent the spread of AFB? (Q12)	89%	8%
Do you support requiring Beekeeper Registration Numbers to be provided when declaring beehive transfers, as part of an Annual Disease Return? (Q9)	83%	6%
Do you support requiring DECA holders to ensure their employee beekeepers complete and pass an AFB Recognition Course, as a condition of retaining their DECA? (Q3)	79%	9%
Do you support AP2s having the authority to use detector dogs (if in the future, detector dogs are recognised as effective by the scientific community)? (Q10).	78%	9%
Do you support the Management Agency having the authority to issue infringement fines for failure to register an apiary? (Q14)	74%	14%
Do you support requiring DECA holders to ensure their employee beekeepers complete AFB Refresher Training, as a condition of retaining their DECA? (Q4)	73%	12%
Do you support requiring beekeepers to notify any transfers of beehive ownership within 7 days? (Q8)	72%	13%
Do you support requiring beekeepers to complete AFB Refresher Training as a condition of retaining a DECA? (Q2)	72%	17%

⁴ Likert scales are often used in survey research in which people express attitudes or other responses in terms of ordinal-level categories (e.g., agree, disagree, etc) that are ranked along a continuum (Neuman, W.L., 2006, 'Social Research Methods, Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches', p.207).

Review of AFB Pest Management Plan, Round Two Consultation Findings

Submission Quantitative Analysis, Appendix 2

Do you support the Management Agency having the authority to issue infringement fines for failure to complete a Certificate of Inspection (COI)? (Q16).	70%	15%
Do you support requiring diagnostic laboratories to provide all AFB test results to the Management Agency? (Q7)	69%	13%
Do you support the Management Agency having the authority to issue infringement fines for failure to submit an Annual Disease Return (ADR)? (Q15).	69%	14%
Do you support the Management Agency having the authority to issue infringement fines for failure to keep honeybees in moveable frame hives? (Q13).	69%	17%

Review of AFB Pest Management Plan, Round Two Consultation Findings

Submission Quantitative Analysis, Appendix 2

b) Preferences for each of the proposed changes to strengthen education and training

There were four questions (questions 2-6) relating to AFB Refresher Training as a condition of retaining a DECA. The findings for the three closed questions (questions 2-5) are shown in Tables 4-11 below.

Most submitters supported (36%) or strongly supported (36%) requiring beekeepers to complete AFB Refresher Training as a condition of retaining a DECA (Table 4).

Table 4. Responses to Question 2 ‘Do you support requiring beekeepers to complete AFB Refresher Training as a condition of retaining a DECA?’

Answer choices	Number of answers	% Answers
Strongly support	120	36
Support	121	36
Neither support or oppose	37	11
Oppose	29	9
Strongly oppose	26	8
Total	333	

Submitters owning more than 251 hives were more likely to oppose (14) rather than support the proposed changes (12), although the numbers of submitters in this cohort was small (33) (Table 5).

Table 5. Responses to Question 2 ‘Do you support requiring beekeepers to complete AFB Refresher Training as a condition of retaining a DECA?’ by number of hives owned?

Number of hives	Answer choices										Total
	Strongly support		Support		Neither support or oppose		Oppose		Strongly oppose		
	number	% ⁵	number	%	number	%	number	%	number	%	
1-5 hives	62	34%	76	42%	20	11%	14	8%	8	4%	180
6-10 hives	27	52%	17	33%	4	8%	2	4%	2	4%	52
11-50 hives	20	50%	12	30%	3	7%	2	5%	3	8%	40
51-250 hives	2	8%	10	40%	3	12%	4	16%	6	24%	25
251-500 hives	3	23%	2	15%	2	15%	2	15%	4	31%	13
501-1000 hives	2	25%	1	12%	3	37%	2	25%	0	0%	8
1001 hives or more	2	17%	2	7%	2	17%	3	25%	3	25%	12

⁵ All percentages in table rounded up.

Review of AFB Pest Management Plan, Round Two Consultation Findings

Submission Quantitative Analysis, Appendix 2

Most submitters supported (38%) or strongly supported (41%) requiring DECA holders to ensure their employee beekeepers complete and pass an AFB Recognition Course, as a condition of retaining their DECA (Table 6).

Table 6. Responses to Question 3 ‘Do you support requiring DECA holders to ensure their employee beekeepers complete and pass an AFB Recognition Course, as a condition of retaining their DECA?’

Answer choices	Number of answers	% Answers
Strongly support	135	41
Support	126	38
Neither support or oppose	41	12
Oppose	12	4
Strongly oppose	16	5
Total	330	

Submitters were more likely to support rather than oppose the proposed changes, irrespective of the number of hives owned (Table 7).

Table 7. Responses to Question 3 ‘Do you support requiring DECA holders to ensure their employee beekeepers complete and pass an AFB Recognition Course, as a condition of retaining their DECA?’ by number of hives owned?

Number of hives	Answer choices										Total
	Strongly support		Support		Neither support or oppose		Oppose		Strongly oppose		
	number	% ⁶	number	%	number	%	number	%	number	%	
1-5 hives	67	38%	79	44%	26	15%	3	2%	3	2%	178
6-10 hives	23	44%	23	44%	2	4%	2	4%	2	4%	52
11-50 hives	23	57%	7	17%	7	17%	1	2%	2	5%	40
51-250 hives	7	29%	11	46%	1	4%	2	8%	3	12%	24
251-500 hives	6	46%	0	0%	3	23%	1	8%	3	23%	13
501-1000 hives	2	25%	3	37%	2	25%	1	12%	0	0%	8
1001 hives or more	5	42%	3	25%	0	0%	1	8%	3	25%	12

⁶ All percentages in table rounded up.

Review of AFB Pest Management Plan, Round Two Consultation Findings

Submission Quantitative Analysis, Appendix 2

Most submitters supported (37%) or strongly supported (36%) requiring DECA holders to ensure their employee beekeepers complete and pass an AFB Recognition Course, as a condition of retaining their DECA (Table 8).

Table 8. Responses to Question 4 ‘Do you support requiring DECA holders to ensure their employee beekeepers complete AFB Refresher Training, as a condition of retaining their DECA?’

Answer choices	Number of answers	% Answers
Strongly support	119	36
Support	123	37
Neither support or oppose	51	15
Oppose	17	5
Strongly oppose	23	7
Total	333	

Submitters were more likely to support rather than oppose the proposed changes irrespective of the number of hives owned, except those who owned 251-500 hives. Those who owned 251-500 hives were equally divided between supporting and opposing the proposed change (Table 9).

Table 9. Responses to Question 4. ‘Do you support requiring DECA holders to ensure their employee beekeepers complete AFB Refresher Training, as a condition of retaining their DECA?’ by number of hives owned?⁷

Number of hives	Answer choices										Total
	Strongly support		Support		Neither support or oppose		Oppose		Strongly oppose		
	number	% ⁸	number	%	number	%	number	%	number	%	
1-5 hives	65	36%	74	41%	27	15%	9	5%	5	3%	180
6-10 hives	20	38%	26	50%	3	6%	1	2%	2	4%	52
11-50 hives	19	47%	9	22%	7	17%	1	2%	4	10%	40
51-250 hives	4	16%	9	36%	4	16%	2	8%	6	24%	25
251-500 hives	5	38%	0	0%	3	23%	2	15%	3	23%	13
501-1000 hives	2	25%	2	25%	3	37%	1	12%	0	0%	8
1001 hives or more	2	17%	3	25%	3	25%	1	8%	3	25%	12

The most popular preference for the frequency of AFB Refresher training to retain a DECA was once every five years (38%) followed by once every three years (15%) and once every two years (14%).

⁷ Figures generated by SurveyMonkey.

⁸ All percentages in table rounded up.

Review of AFB Pest Management Plan, Round Two Consultation Findings

Submission Quantitative Analysis, Appendix 2

Ten percent of submitters considered AFB Refresher training should never be required to retain a DECA (Table 10).

Table 10. Responses to Question 5 ‘How often do you think AFB Refresher training should be required to retain a DECA?’

Answer choices Rank ordered from most supported to least supported	Number of answers	% Answers
Once every five years	126	38%
Once every three years	50	15%
Once every two years	47	14%
Never	33	10%
Once every ten years	29	9%
Once every four years	18	5%
None of these	11	3%
Once every year	9	3%
Don't know	3	1%
Once every eight years	2	>1%
Once every six years	1	>1%
Once every seven years	1	>1%
Once every nine years	0	0
Total	330	

The top preference for most cohorts by number of hives owned, was ‘once every 5 years’. For those owning 51-250 hives the top choice was ‘never’ closely followed by ‘once every 5 years’ (Table 11).

Table 11. Responses to Question 5. ‘How often do you think AFB Refresher training should be required to retain a DECA?’

Number of hives owned	First choice	Second choice	Third choice
1-50 hives	Once every 5 years (n=107)	Once every 3 years (n=49)	Once every 2 years (n=41)
51-250 hives	Never (n=6)	Once every 5 years (n=5)	Once every 10 years (n=4)
251-500 hives	Once every 5 years (n=5)	Never (n=3)	None of these (n=2)
501-1000 hives	Once every 5 years (n=3)	Once every 2 years (n=2)	Once every 4 years (n=1) Once every 10 years (n=1) None of these (n=1)
1001 hives or more	Once every 5 years (n=4) Never (n=4)	Once every year (n=1) Once every 2 years (n=1) Once every 10 years (n=1) None of these (n=1)	

Review of AFB Pest Management Plan, Round Two Consultation Findings
Submission Quantitative Analysis, Appendix 2

c) Preferences for each of the proposed changes to enhance surveillance and prevention

There were five questions (questions 7-11) relating to surveillance and prevention. The findings for the four closed questions (questions 7-10) are shown in the tables below.

Most submitters supported (36%) or strongly supported (33%) requiring diagnostic laboratories to provide all AFB test results to the Management Agency?

Table 12. Responses to Question 7 ‘Do you support requiring diagnostic laboratories to provide all AFB test results to the Management Agency?’

Answer choices	Number of answers	% Answers
Strongly support	111	33
Support	119	36
Neither support or oppose	59	18
Oppose	15	5
Strongly oppose	28	8
Total	332	

Most submitters owning less than 51 hives were in support of the proposed change. In contrast, for those owning more than 51 hives there was a wider span of views, with 27 of submitters in this cohort supporting the proposed change and 20 submitters opposing.

Notably, there was equally split support and opposition to the proposed change by submitters who owned between 251-500 hives (four supported and four opposed), and those who owned 1001 hives or more (six supported and six opposed) (Table 13).

Table 13. Responses to Question 7 ‘Do you support requiring diagnostic laboratories to provide all AFB test results to the Management Agency?’ by number of hives owned?

Number of hives	Answer choices										Total
	Strongly support		Support		Neither support or oppose		Oppose		Strongly oppose		
	number	% ⁹	number	%	number	%	number	%	number	%	
1-5 hives	61	34%	74	41%	31	17%	8	4%	7	4%	181
6-10 hives	14	37%	23	44%	12	23%	1	2%	2	4%	52
11-50 hives	20	50%	9	22%	7	17%	1	2%	3	7%	40
51-250 hives	6	24%	6	24%	5	20%	5	20%	3	12%	25
251-500 hives	2	18%	2	18%	3	27%	0	0%	4	36%	11
501-1000 hives	3	37%	2	25%	1	12%	0	0%	2	25%	8
1001 hives or more	3	25%	3	25%	0	0%	0	0%	6	50%	12

⁹ All percentages in table rounded up.

Review of AFB Pest Management Plan, Round Two Consultation Findings

Submission Quantitative Analysis, Appendix 2

Most submitters supported (43%) or strongly supported (29%) requiring beekeepers to notify any transfers of beehive ownership within 7 days (Table 14).

Table 14. Responses to Question 8 'Do you support requiring beekeepers to notify any transfers of beehive ownership within 7 days?'

Answer choices	Number of answers	% Answers
Strongly support	98	29
Support	144	43
Neither support or oppose	47	14
Oppose	23	7
Strongly oppose	21	6
Total	333	

Submitters were more likely to support rather than oppose the proposed changes, irrespective of the number of hives owned (Table 15).

Table 15. Responses to Question 8 'Do you support requiring beekeepers to notify any transfers of beehive ownership within 7 days?' by number of hives owned?¹⁰

Number of hives	Answer choices										Total
	Strongly support		Support		Neither support or oppose		Oppose		Strongly oppose		
	number	% ¹¹	number	%	number	%	number	%	number	%	
1-5 hives	55	30%	83	46%	25	14%	10	6%	8	4%	181
6-10 hives	14	27%	26	50%	7	13%	3	6%	2	4%	52
11-50 hives	18	45%	12	30%	4	10%	3	7%	3	7%	40
51-250 hives	3	12%	9	36%	7	28%	3	12%	3	12%	25
251-500 hives	2	17%	5	42%	2	17%	1	8%	2	17%	12
501-1000 hives	2	25%	3	37%	1	12%	1	12%	1	12%	8
1001 hives or more	2	17%	6	50%	1	8%	1	8%	2	17%	12

Most submitters supported (46%) or strongly supported (37%) requiring beekeeper Registration Numbers to be provided when declaring beehive transfers, as part of an Annual Disease Return (Table 16).

¹⁰ Figures generated by SurveyMonkey.

¹¹ All percentages in table rounded up.

Review of AFB Pest Management Plan, Round Two Consultation Findings

Submission Quantitative Analysis, Appendix 2

Table 16. Responses to Question 9 ‘Do you support requiring Beekeeper Registration Numbers to be provided when declaring beehive transfers, as part of an Annual Disease Return?’

Answer choices	Number of answers	% Answers
Strongly support	124	37
Support	151	46
Neither support or oppose	36	11
Oppose	6	2
Strongly oppose	14	4
Total	331	

Most submitters supported this proposed change, irrespective of the number of hives owned (Table 17).

Table 17. Responses to Question 9 ‘Do you support requiring Beekeeper Registration Numbers to be provided when declaring beehive transfers, as part of an Annual Disease Return?’ by number of hives owned?

Number of hives	Answer choices										Total
	Strongly support		Support		Neither support or oppose		Oppose		Strongly oppose		
	number	% ¹²	number	%	number	%	number	%	number	%	
1-5 hives	73	41%	84	47%	16	9%	1	1%	5	3%	180
6-10 hives	16	31%	28	54%	5	10%	2	4%	1	2%	52
11-50 hives	19	47%	16	40%	1	2%	0	0%	4	10%	40
51-250 hives	4	16%	9	36%	7	28%	2	8%	3	12%	25
251-500 hives	5	42%	3	25%	4	33%	0	0%	0	0%	13
501-1000 hives	3	37%	3	37%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	8
1001 hives or more	2	17%	8	67%	0	0%	1	8%	1	8%	12

Most submitters supported (42%) or strongly supported (36%) AP2s having the authority to use detector dogs (if in the future, detector dogs are recognised as effective by the scientific community) (Table 18).

¹² All percentages in table rounded up.

Review of AFB Pest Management Plan, Round Two Consultation Findings

Submission Quantitative Analysis, Appendix 2

Table 18. Responses to Question 10 ‘Do you support AP2s having the authority to use detector dogs (if in the future, detector dogs are recognised as effective by the scientific community)?’

Answer choices	Number of answers	% Answers
Strongly support	120	36
Support	139	42
Neither support or oppose	43	13
Oppose	15	5
Strongly oppose	14	4
Total	331	

Most submitters supported this proposed change, irrespective of the number of hives owned (Table 19).

Table 19. Responses to Question 10 ‘Do you support AP2s having the authority to use detector dogs (if in the future, detector dogs are recognised as effective by the scientific community)?’ by number of hives owned?¹³

Number of hives	Answer choices										Total
	Strongly support		Support		Neither support or oppose		Oppose		Strongly oppose		
	number	% ¹⁴	number	%	number	%	number	%	number	%	
1-5 hives	62	35%	83	46%	22	12%	5	3%	7	4%	179
6-10 hives	21	40%	23	44%	4	8%	3	6%	1	2%	52
11-50 hives	15	37%	16	40%	6	15%	0	0%	3	7%	40
51-250 hives	5	20%	10	40%	4	16%	5	20%	1	4%	25
251-500 hives	6	50%	1	8%	3	25%	2	17%	0	0%	12
501-1000 hives	4	50%	2	25%	1	12%	0	0%	1	12%	8
1001 hives or more	5	42%	4	33%	2	17%	0	0%	1	8%	12

¹³ Figures generated by SurveyMonkey.

¹⁴ All percentages in table rounded up.

Review of AFB Pest Management Plan, Round Two Consultation Findings

Submission Quantitative Analysis, Appendix 2

d) Preferences for each of the proposed changes to enhance enforcement powers and penalties

There were six questions (questions 12-17) relating to enforcement powers and penalties. The findings for the five closed questions (questions 12-16) are shown in the tables below.

Nearly 90% of submitters either supported (36%) or strongly supported (53%) the Management Agency having the power to destroy AFB infected hives and take actions to prevent the spread of AFB (Table 20).

Table 20. Responses to Question 12 'Do you support the Management Agency having the power to destroy AFB infected hives and take actions to prevent the spread of AFB?'

Answer choices	Number of answers	% Answers
Strongly support	177	53
Support	119	36
Neither support or oppose	9	3
Oppose	7	2
Strongly oppose	20	6
Total	332	

Most submitters supported this proposed change, irrespective of the number of hives owned (Table 21).

Table 21. Responses to Question 12 'Do you support the Management Agency having the power to destroy AFB infected hives and take actions to prevent the spread of AFB?' by number of hives owned?

Number of hives	Answer choices										Total
	Strongly support		Support		Neither support or oppose		Oppose		Strongly oppose		
	number	% ¹⁵	number	%	number	%	number	%	number	%	
1-5 hives	97	54%	65	36%	7	4%	3	2%	8	4%	180
6-10 hives	30	57%	21	40%	0	0%	1	2%	1	2%	52
11-50 hives	22	55%	13	32%	0	0%	1	2%	4	10%	40
51-250 hives	13	54%	8	33%	1	4%	1	4%	1	4%	25
251-500 hives	5	42%	3	25%	1	8%	0	0%	3	25%	13
501-1000 hives	3	37%	4	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	12%	8
1001 hives or more	6	50%	3	25%	0	0%	1	8%	2	17%	12

¹⁵ All percentages in table rounded up.

Review of AFB Pest Management Plan, Round Two Consultation Findings

Submission Quantitative Analysis, Appendix 2

Most submitters supported (36%) or strongly supported (33%) the Management Agency having the authority to issue infringement fines for failure to keep honeybees in moveable frame hives (Table 22).

Table 22. Responses to Question 13 ‘Do you support the Management Agency having the authority to issue infringement fines for failure to keep honeybees in moveable frame hives?’

Answer choices	Number of answers	% Answers
Strongly support	109	33
Support	119	36
Neither support or oppose	49	15
Oppose	30	9
Strongly oppose	26	8
Total	333	

Most submitters supported this proposed change, irrespective of the number of hives owned. (Table 23).

Table 23. Responses to Question 13 ‘Do you support the Management Agency having the authority to issue infringement fines for failure to keep honeybees in moveable frame hives?’ by number of hives owned?¹⁶

Number of hives	Answer choices										Total
	Strongly support		Support		Neither support or oppose		Oppose		Strongly oppose		
	number	% ¹⁷	number	%	number	%	number	%	number	%	
1-5 hives	54	30%	69	38%	28	15%	19	10%	11	6%	180
6-10 hives	20	38%	14	27%	12	23%	5	10%	1	2%	52
11-50 hives	14	35%	15	37%	4	10%	3	7%	4	10%	40
51-250 hives	8	32%	10	40%	2	8%	2	8%	3	12%	25
251-500 hives	3	25%	3	25%	2	17%	0	0%	4	33%	13
501-1000 hives	3	37%	4	50%	0	0%	1	12%	0	0%	8
1001 hives or more	7	58%	3	25%	0	0%	0	0%	2	17%	12

¹⁶ Figures generated by SurveyMonkey.

¹⁷ All percentages in table rounded up.

Review of AFB Pest Management Plan, Round Two Consultation Findings

Submission Quantitative Analysis, Appendix 2

Most submitters supported (34%) or strongly supported (40%) the Management Agency having the authority to issue infringement fines for failure to register an apiary (Table 24).

Table 24. Responses to Question 14 'Do you support the Management Agency having the authority to issue infringement fines for failure to register an apiary?'

Answer choices	Number of answers	% Answers
Strongly support	133	40
Support	114	34
Neither support or oppose	38	11
Oppose	28	8
Strongly oppose	21	6
Total	334	

Most submitters supported this proposed change, irrespective of the number of hives owned (Table 25).

Table 25. Responses to Question 14 'Do you support the Management Agency having the authority to issue infringement fines for failure to register an apiary?' by number of hives owned?

Number of hives	Answer choices										Total
	Strongly support		Support		Neither support or oppose		Oppose		Strongly oppose		
	number	% ¹⁸	number	%	number	%	number	%	number	%	
1-5 hives	75	41%	70	39%	17	9%	10	6%	9	5%	181
6-10 hives	21	40%	17	32%	9	17%	6	11%	0	0%	53
11-50 hives	20	50%	10	25%	6	15%	1	2%	3	7%	40
51-250 hives	5	20%	11	44%	2	8%	4	16%	3	12%	25
251-500 hives	4	33%	2	17%	2	17%	1	8%	3	25%	12
501-1000 hives	2	25%	2	25%	1	12%	3	37%	0	0%	8
1001 hives or more	5	42%	2	17%	0	0%	2	17%	3	25%	12

Most submitters supported (40%) or strongly supported (29%) the Management Agency having the authority to issue infringement fines for failure to submit an Annual Disease Return (ADR) (Table 26).

¹⁸ All percentages in table rounded up.

Review of AFB Pest Management Plan, Round Two Consultation Findings

Submission Quantitative Analysis, Appendix 2

Table 26. Responses to Question 15 ‘Do you support the Management Agency having the authority to issue infringement fines for failure to submit an Annual Disease Return (ADR)?’

Answer choices	number of answers	% answers
Strongly support	97	29
Support	134	40
Neither support or oppose	56	17
Oppose	23	7
Strongly oppose	23	7
Total	333	

Most submitters supported this proposed change, irrespective of the number of hives owned (Table 27).

Table 27. Responses to Question 15 ‘Do you support the Management Agency having the authority to issue infringement fines for failure to submit an Annual Disease Return (ADR)?’ by number of hives owned?

Number of hives	Answer choices										Total
	Strongly support		Support		Neither support or oppose		Oppose		Strongly oppose		
	number	% ¹⁹	number	%	number	%	number	%	number	%	
1-5 hives	54	30%	76	42%	30	17%	10	6%	10	6%	180
6-10 hives	17	32%	19	36%	12	23%	4	7%	1	2%	53
11-50 hives	13	32%	16	40%	7	17%	2	5%	2	5%	40
51-250 hives	2	8%	12	48%	3	12%	3	12%	5	20%	25
251-500 hives	3	25%	4	33%	1	8%	1	8%	3	25%	12
501-1000 hives	2	25%	4	50%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	8
1001 hives or more	4	33%	3	25%	1	8%	2	17%	2	17%	12

¹⁹ All percentages in table rounded up.

Review of AFB Pest Management Plan, Round Two Consultation Findings

Submission Quantitative Analysis, Appendix 2

Most submitters supported (40%) or strongly supported (30%) the Management Agency having the authority to issue infringement fines for failure to complete a Certificate of Inspection (COI) (Table 28).

Table 28. Responses to Question 16 ‘Do you support the Management Agency having the authority to issue infringement fines for failure to complete a Certificate of Inspection (COI)?’

Answer choices	number of answers	% answers
Strongly support	101	30
Support	133	40
Neither support or oppose	50	15
Oppose	27	8
Strongly oppose	23	7
Total	334	

Most submitters supported this proposed change, irrespective of the number of hives owned (Table 29).

Table 29. Responses to Question 16 ‘Do you support the Management Agency having the authority to issue infringement fines for failure to complete a Certificate of Inspection (COI)?’ by number of hives owned?²⁰

Number of hives	Answer choices										Total
	Strongly support		Support		Neither support or oppose		Oppose		Strongly oppose		
	number	% ²¹	number	%	number	%	number	%	number	%	
1-5 hives	56	31%	76	42%	26	14%	13	7%	10	6%	180
6-10 hives	17	32%	21	40%	10	19%	3	6%	2	4%	52
11-50 hives	15	37%	15	37%	6	15%	2	5%	2	5%	40
51-250 hives	2	8%	11	44%	2	8%	6	24%	4	16%	25
251-500 hives	3	25%	4	33%	1	8%	1	8%	3	25%	13
501-1000 hives	2	25%	4	50%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	8
1001 hives or more	4	33%	2	17%	2	17%	2	17%	2	17%	12

.....

²⁰ Figures generated by SurveyMonkey.

²¹ All percentages in table rounded up.