# Submission to the Australian Federal Government consultative process on reform to the WET rebate eligibility criteria.

7/10/2016

Dylan McMahon & Matt Burton - Burton McMahon wines

As a wine producer concerned with the future of our industry, I feel it important to participate in the consultation process regarding proposed changes to the Wine Equalisation Tax rebate, and in particular the definitions of ‘eligible producer’ under the act. My response to the Government’s discussion questions are as follows:

1. **For rebatable wine, is the proposed definition of packaged and branded wine appropriate?**

Yes, the definition of packaged and branded wine is appropriate.

**If a trademark approach is used, what types of trademarks should be permitted (e.g. exclusively licensed trademarks) and what would be the impact?**

Common law and registered trademarks should be permitted, licenced trademarks permitted unless they entitle one business or associated businesses access to multiple rebates.

1. **For eligible producers, how should a winery ownership and leasing test be applied? What should be the nature and extent of investment in the wine industry required to access the rebate, and how can this be implemented?**

No asset tests, ‘significant interest’ or ‘skin in the game’ tests should be required. See below for further explaination. Any eligibility criteria based on asset levels introduces unnecessary complexity and regulation, will be difficult to implement and administer, will be easily circumvented, and will exclude some legitimate producers.

1. **What is the impact from a 1 July 2019 start date of the tightened eligibility criteria? How might this change from an earlier transition period?**

If eligibility criteria must be tightened, the transition period should allow time for businesses to effectively restructure their operations to minimise disruption and to reflect the long lead times from production decision to commercial sale.

While questions 1 and 3 are important issues, for my business and livelihood question 2 in particular is critical. I offer the following supporting information:

As the government’s discussion paper has noted, there are many successful non-traditional business models operating in the Australian wine Industry today. The government’s discussion paper goes some way to acknowledging this, but under any of these proposed alternative definitions my particular business model would still be ineligible.

Burton McMahon is a collaboration between two friends that started in 2012. The brand was created because of our passion for winemaking and exploring unique vineyard sites to make interesting wines from. We have been winemakers in the industry for more than 15 years and believe we represent exactly what the WET rebate was originally designed for. Burton McMahon sources its own fruit from independent growers and leases space to in winery to make the wines. We own every process from the gapes to the bottle. We have great relationship with our growers that we have built over the years, this helps support the growers because we work together to ensure they can be financially sustainable.

The loss of the WET rebate would have a significant financial impact on our business to the point where it would not be viable. This would affect all our growers and staff that we imply in this business. Growers have benefited financially from moving away from suppling large corporate wine companies that pay very little and pay late for fruit. Dealing with small producers has meant they can reinvest that money into their vineyard, make the business more profitable, produce better grapes and get better recognition for the vineyard.

We feel we fit the original intent for the WET rebate as we are heavily invested in what we do and care about what we do. While the business is young we don’t have the capital to buy a winery and removing the rebate from producers like us will ensure we never do.

The Government is ignoring state regional and national industry bodies, all of whom agree that there is no need for asset based eligibility criteria for the WET rebate.

Independent financial modelling undertaken by PWC for the Winemakers Federation of Australia has clearly demonstrated that almost all of the so called ‘rorting’ of the rebate and recuperation of lost taxation revenue can be remedied by simply eliminating the rebate for bulk and unbranded wine, and by tightening the rules regarding ‘associated entities’ claiming multiple rebates.[[1]](#endnote-1) I, my regional association, state association and national industry body are all supportive of these measures.

I do not, however, support the recommendation of the Government’s Consultative group (Oct 2015) that

*“The business owns or leases one out of three of a vineyard, winery (production facilities or fermentation facilities) or cellar door outlet*” [[2]](#endnote-2)

Any imposition of ‘skin in the game’ or asset based eligibility criteria unfairly penalises younger and new entrants to the industry, who do not have the financial capacity to secure major leases and asset purchases.

The WET rebate has enabled many quality brands to emerge and contribute positively to the Australian wine landscape. These are the innovators, the ones who have been able to take risks with new styles, new varieties and new packaging. They have helped create a fertile and vibrant wine market that is necessary to capture the imagination of the next generation of educated wine consumers. Many of these producers could never have survived beyond the first few vintages given the ‘perfect storm’ of adverse market conditions seen in the wine industry over the past five years. Several of these young producers are now among Australia’s brightest stars, championed by domestic and international wine journalists and the world’s hottest restaurants and bars. They are the future of our wine industry, and if nurtured they will invest back in the industry, in vineyards, wineries, and other links in the supply chain.

Innovation in the wine industry should be encouraged and supported, particularly at a time when the industry desperately needs to shed its ‘commodity’ image and instead be known for quality, uniqueness, and driving new wine trends. Other agricultural industries are being actively encouraged to develop low-asset business models, and to utilise existing infrastructure. This is fundamentally efficient. The government however appears to be encouraging the wine industry to do the opposite.

As a long-term, committed wine producer, I implore you to remove the ‘lease or own a winery’ provisions and any associated physical asset-based criteria for eligibility for the WET rebate. Such changes will likely cause significant collateral damage to my business and to the future of our industry.

Sincerely,

Dylan McMahon – Winemaker

Burton McMahon

101 McDonalds Rd

Pokolbin, NSW 2320
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