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

7/10/2016

Paul & Gilli Lipscombe, Sailor Seeks Horse

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 explanation. 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.

We are a small, nascent wine business that owns our own 6.5ha vineyard and related equipment, as well as some of the infrastructure required for fermentation and elevage. We are the winemakers for Home Hill winery in the Huon Valley who won the last Jimmy Watson trophy and as part of the arrangement are allowed to make wine from our own vineyard at the Home Hill winery. We own our tanks and barrels but utilise their press, destemmer and pumps as well as the building to conduct our operations. Our wine is then bottled and stored up at the Pooley winery in Hobart.

We studied and worked in the industry from 2006-2010 before moving to Tasmania and buying our vineyard. With limited capital we have grown our business incrementally from 0 tonnes in 2011, 0.5T in 2012 through to 21T in 2016 and expectations of full capacity at 30T by 2018. During this time we have spent on average $60k p.a. on labour through backpackers and have recently taken on a new local employee in the vineyard permanently. We buy our chemicals/fertilisers/fuel/equipment locally and our wines sell out within a couple of months of release and have contributed to the rise in perceived quality and excitement within the Tasmanian Pinot Noir scene at a national and international level as our wines are just starting to be exported to Singapore, the UK and the US. Moreover, the Huon Valley has suffered significant hardships over the previous decades and the development of the wine industry in the local area contributes a financial benefit for the community through employment, purchases and ‘sustainable local beverage tourism’. Our wines in the Huon Valley have won some of Australia’s most important wine awards and it is becoming recognised as having the potential to become Australia’s best Pinot Noir wine region.

The Huon Valley has a long growing season and is marginal in terms of ripening the fruit. There is no large company exposure to the region. It requires small growers of skill and determination to grow good fruit and requires a fair degree of financial risk to attain the heights that the region can deliver. The WET rebate currently allows these small producers, such as us, to remain viable in their early years before they become well established.

Our intention is to build a winery and cellar door in the future but to get the funding to commit to this plan we have needed a viable business in the first place to get the ball rolling. The WET rebate has assisted with us being able to establish that business and we are now looking at investing significant capital in the local area and being part of an exciting tourism development in the Huon Valley. We are also planting more vineyard land to satisfy the demand that we have for our wines.

The loss of the rebate at this critical juncture in our own personal journey would curtail our ability to expand and develop our business to the detriment of the local community. This would also be the case with other wine businesses in the area and severely impact the expansion of the industry within the Huon Valley at a time when it needs more investment.

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,

Paul & Gilli Lipscombe, Owners, Sailor Seeks Horse

102 Armstrongs Rd, Cradoc, Tasmania 7109

pinecones@sailorseekshorse.com.au
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