Doc 7

## Wall, Amanda

**From:** s9(2)(a) @tcil.co.nz>
**Sent:** Friday, 18 December 2015 1:24 PM
**To:** Daniels, Nick
**Cc:** s9(2)(a)
**Subject:** FW: Security Policy
**Attachments:** Capture2.JPG; s9(2)(b)(ii)

Hi Nick thanks for the call on Wednesday and as mentioned please see attached our updated proposal which was published in January of this year. It covers the current core service we have provided since 2006 and the ability to add more value at no cost. The security risk management framework that is suggested is the same one we are rolling out for s9(2)(ba)(i) and it's our intention to have this common standard across s9(2)(ba)(i)

As mentioned on the phone I believe it would add great value if we met up to discuss the proposal and next steps. I am a great believer in pre-incident relationships and over the years we have developed some great relationships with various members of AgResearch whilst working through Brian, we have been involved in nearly every controversial project undertaken by the Institute in the past 9 years and have built up detailed knowledge of your locations and operations. I believe with the re-structuring of AgResearch over the past couple of years we have lost some direction around what concerns the company currently faces, be it vivisection, genetic research or another area which is likely to spark issue motivated groups attention and risk to your staff, assets, operations and reputation.

I have spoken to s9(2)(a) and with the Bobby Calf story as there was no mention of AgResearch his direction was to analyse the situation and report on it to our wider animal / GE clients who weren't immediately effected. The reason why AgResearch wasn't alerted immediately is due to the rule of thumb that it didn't mention you so we wouldn't normally notified you. We do however work for s9(2)(ba)(i) o were very much focused on supporting them. What is and what isn't of interest to AgReseach can certainly be reviewed when we meet up.

Also just to confirm information is being sent to your PA s9(2)(a) and that this is the correct process for it to be disseminated out to the wider AgReseach community?

Please review the proposal which is in line with New Zealand and Australia Security Risk Management framework as outlined in AS/NZS ISO 31000:2009 Risk Management Principles and Guidelines and I look forward to hopefully catching up and perhaps undertaking the proposed workshop in the new year.

Have a good break over the holidays.

Kind Regards

s9(2)(a)

**From:** s9(2)(a)
**Sent:** Tuesday, 27 January 2015 5:05 PM
**To:** 'Thom, Brian' <brian.thom@agresearch.co.nz>
**Subject:** RE: Security Policy

Hi Brian please see attached our proposal which outlines what we provide currently for AgResearch and how we would like to add value at no extra cost. The added value is the develop a security risk management framework and is outlined in the proposal.

We have reviewed your policy document and apart from some layout changes believe it forms a good starting block for the framework. We would however like to see a document structure like we have done for s9(2)(ba)(i) which is attached with the Security Policy being shorter and more detail flowing into a AgResearch security standard.

I'll give you a call towards the end of the week to discuss and seek your feedback. Once again sorry for the delay and hopefully we can get a workshop underway in February.

Regards

s9(2)(a)

/ FAX +64 9 361 3260
/ POSTAL PO Box 301775, Albany, NSMC 0752, New Zealand
/ WEBSITE www.tcil.co.nz

THOMPSON+CLARK
INVESTIGATIONS / DETECTION / PROTECTION / SECURITY