

General Meeting

**Wednesday, 14 November 2012
9.30am – 4.20pm**

**The Terrace Conference Centre
114 The Terrace, Wellington**

MINUTES

Present: Kathryn Bicknell, Sue Brown, Ingrid Collins, Penny Fisher, Barbara Nicholas, Don Nicolson, Karen Phillips (Acting Chair), David Scobie, Alan Sharr, Virginia Williams

In attendance: § 9(2)(a)

[Redacted]

§ 9(2)(a)

will be in attendance for agenda item O 6.

§ 9(2)(a)

(Manager, Animal Welfare Sector Support) will join the meeting for agenda item O 7 to give an update on the *Safeguarding our Animals, Safeguarding our Reputation* compliance and enforcement programme.

§ 9(2)(a)

(Manager, Regulatory Reform and Animal Welfare Policy) will join the meeting for agenda item C 7.

Apologies: John Hellström.

Welcome: K Phillips welcomed incoming members Ingrid Collins and Alan Sharr, whose appointments officially started on 1 November 2011.

Any Other Business Part One (Public Excluded Agenda)

There were no additional items of business for discussion under Part One of the Agenda.

Any Other Business Part Two (Open to the Public)

Discussion of guideline eight.

**PART ONE
(PUBLIC EXCLUDED AGENDA)**

RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

(K Phillips/ K Bicknell):

I move that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

- | | | |
|------|---|------------------------|
| C 1. | Confirmation of previous minutes | K Phillips |
| C 2. | Status of actions arising from previous meetings | K Phillips |
| C 3. | Codes of welfare update | § 9(2)(a) |
| C 4. | Agree on code of welfare work plan for 2013 | § 9(2)(a) / All |
| C 5. | Discussion on draft equine code of welfare | K Phillips / § 9(2)(a) |
| C 6. | Discussion on future reviews process for codes of welfare | § 9(2)(a) / All |
| C 7. | Update on Animal Welfare Strategy and Act Review | § 9(2)(a) |
| C 8. | Work planning for animals in the wild | P Fisher / § 9(2)(a) |

THE GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED WHILE THE PUBLIC IS EXCLUDED, THE REASON FOR PASSING THIS RESOLUTION IN RELATION TO EACH MATTER, AND THE SPECIFIC GROUNDS UNDER SECTION 48(1) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL INFORMATION AND MEETINGS ACT 1987 FOR THE PASSING OF THIS RESOLUTION ARE AS FOLLOWS:

<i>General subject of each matter to be considered</i>		<i>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</i>	<i>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</i>
C 1.	<i>Confirmation of previous minutes</i>	<i>To protect the privacy of natural persons.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(a) of the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA).</i>
C 2.	<i>Status of actions arising from previous meetings</i>	<i>As above.</i>	<i>As above.</i>
C 3.	<i>Codes of welfare update</i>	<i>To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(g)(ii) of the OIA.</i>
C 4.	<i>Agree on code of welfare work plan for 2013</i>	<i>As above.</i>	<i>As above.</i>

<i>General subject of each matter to be considered</i>		<i>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</i>	<i>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</i>
<i>C 5.</i>	<i>Discussion on draft equine code of welfare</i>	<i>As above.</i>	<i>As above.</i>
<i>C 6.</i>	<i>Discussion on future reviews process for codes of welfare</i>	<i>As above.</i>	<i>As above.</i>
<i>C 7.</i>	<i>Update on Animal Welfare Strategy and Act Review</i>	<i>To maintain the constitutional conventions for the time being which protect the confidentiality of advice tendered by Ministers of the Crown and officials.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(f)(iv) of the OIA.</i>
<i>C 8.</i>	<i>Work planning for animals in the wild</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>As above</i>

I also move that:

s 9(2)(a)



be permitted to remain at this meeting after the public has been excluded, because of their knowledge of meeting procedure and the subject matter under discussion. This knowledge is relevant background information to assist the committee in its deliberations.

The motion was put: carried

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

[Secretariat Note: the below agenda items were not covered in the order presented in these minutes.]

C 1. Confirmation of previous minutes

The draft minutes of the NAWAC general meeting held on 15 August 2012 (NAWAC 37/12) were reviewed. There were no amendments.

Moved (V Williams/ S Brown):

That the draft minutes of the NAWAC quarterly general meeting held on 15 August 2012 be adopted as a true and accurate record of that meeting.

The motion was put: carried.

C 2. Status of actions arising from previous meetings

Actions from previous meetings (NAWAC 38/12) were reviewed and it was agreed to complete pending actions when possible.

B Nicholas noted that the papers on fish welfare provided by s 9(2)(a) confirm that fish feel pain, and internationally there is policy and legislation being developed to address the welfare of fish. Further action on the welfare of fish is something to consider when the Committee review their strategic plan and priorities in 2013.

It was raised that NAWAC and MPI's progress to amend the dairy cattle code of welfare to address long-term housing of cows is taking a long time. There was concern that farmers are investing in off-pasture systems without being aware of the animal welfare considerations. The current code of welfare adequately covers cows housed for short periods of time and the issue is one of awareness, rather than imperfect minimum standards. Separate to what NAWAC is doing, MPI is working with industry to develop a short guidelines document encompassing the welfare, environmental and food safety outcomes that farmers need to take into account when designing off-pasture systems.

Action - P Timmer-Arends to modify action list accordingly

C 3. Codes of welfare update

Meat chickens – The Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand have distributed posters to all their members containing the minimum standards and example indicators from the revised code.

Layer hens – the revised code has been signed off by the Minister and will be issued on 6 December 2012.

Llamas and Alpacas – this has been recommended to the Minister and it is anticipated he will issue it in the first half of 2013.

Dairy cattle housing – s 9(2)(a) informed the Committee that draft standards will be sent to the Dairy Industry Technical Advisory Group at the end of November for targeted consultation. Further to the discussion held earlier in the meeting D Scobie and D Nicolson agreed to assist the dairy subcommittee to develop some key messages for farmers when they are designing off-pasture systems.

Actions –

- *D Scobie and D Nicolson to assist the dairy subcommittee to develop messaging.*
- *NAWAC to advise the Minister of the proposed communications plan by 14 December 2012.*

Zoos and Circuses – to be discussed under agenda item C 6.

C 4. Agree on code of welfare work plan for 2013

s 9(2)(a) explained the draft code of welfare work plan for 2013 to the committee. The committee agreed on priorities and confirmed which subcommittees they will sit on.

Subcommittees include:

- Housing of Dairy Cattle - J Hellström, K Phillips and D Nicolson
- Rodeos - V Williams, P Fisher, S Brown
- Equine - K Phillips, D Nicolson, K Bicknell,
- Temporary housing of companion animals – K Bicknell, V Williams, A Sharr
- Circuses and Zoos – J Hellström, D Scobie, B Nicholas and S Brown
- Saleyards – K Phillips, D Nicolson, I Collins, V Williams
- Painful Husbandry Procedures - D Scobie, B Nicholas, V Williams, S Brown

Action – s 9(2)(a) *to update the work plan for final agreement at the February 2013 meeting*

C 5. Discussion on the draft equines code of welfare

The draft code (47/12) and an overview of the issues which the subcommittee felt would attract interest during consultation (46/12) was circulated to the Committee prior to the meeting.

The Committee discussed:

- Pregnancy testing equipment, examples of which should be included in the general information;
- Leaving halters on horses which are grazing;
- Ensure consistency with the rodeos code regarding ropes;
- Use of the whip in the racing industry;
- Exercise requirements for horses which are confined or tethered;
- Pain relief for hot branding;
- Dentistry performed by non-veterinarians; simple procedures such as tooth-rasping should be permitted but there needs to be a clear distinction between dentistry and orthodontics.

Moved (K Phillips/ V Williams):

That, subject to agreed amendments and final review by the subcommittee, the draft equines code of welfare be released for public consultation.

The motion was put: carried.

Actions:

- *Committee members to send further comments to s 9(2)(a) by 30 November.*

- s 9(2)(a) *to update the document and agree changes with the chair of the subcommittee prior to consultation.*
- s 9(2)(a) *to include a call for comments to seek the public's view of whether hot branding should be prohibited.*
- *MPI to undertake public consultation on behalf of NAWAC.*

C 6. Discussion on future reviews process for codes of welfare

The committee had received the document written by J Hellström (44/12) prior to the meeting. This document is the outcome of discussion at the previous meeting of how the Committee could approach the review of the zoos and circuses codes of welfare, particularly in light of the proposal that codes be replaced with regulations and guidelines.

B Nicholas explained that as codes of welfare are now likely to be kept when the Act is amended, the proposed committee process could be reconsidered. However it was agreed that the subcommittee should continue to review the circuses and zoos code within the framework of an ethical discussion. It was felt that using this approach would be helpful for future code reviews i.e. high level thinking to define the issues, prior to reviewing the code according to the process set out in the Act.

The definition of animals kept for entertainment is broad and is currently scoped as 'an animal kept for a non-production purpose'. While exotic animals could be kept separate due to their specific needs, some broad welfare issues affect both exotic and domestic animals. How this should be addressed requires further thinking.

Actions:

- *Subcommittee to further develop process and begin by defining the scope and agreeing initial identification of issues by February 2013.*

C 8. Update on Animal Welfare Strategy and Act Review

K Phillips welcomed s 9(2)(a) to the meeting at 10.15am. s 9(2)(a) gave an overview of the issues that were raised during public consultation, and how this has shaped the final proposal that will be presented to Cabinet. This information was provided in confidence as the Minister and Cabinet are yet to agree to the recommendations.

Strategy

Most submitters were supportive of the strategy and only minor amendments will be made. This will include recognising animal sentience.

Legislation

Following consultation, MPI has put two options to the Minister regarding the core proposal to replace codes of welfare with enforceable regulations and guidelines with no legal effect.

Option One: Retain the codes of welfare and the NAWAC led development process and create a limited set of regulations from those minimum standards which need a firm regulatory backing.

Option Two: Replace codes of welfare with a comprehensive set of regulations developed by MPI, which will be packaged with best practice guidelines in a single publication.

It was clear from the feedback received during consultation that industry valued codes of welfare and the collaborative approach taken by NAWAC during development. One member commented it was an improvement over the original proposal and MPI had done well to listen to stakeholders. [REDACTED] noted that option one will leave the role of NAWAC largely unchanged, and will likely increase their workload as it will now have to consider regulations when developing the codes.

Proposed changes to the code development process will take some pressure off NAWAC by removing the obligation to review codes every 10 years and allowing NAWAC to consider whether a code is the appropriate way to manage animal welfare risks.

The creation of new compliance tools e.g. infringement offences and compliance orders which can be more easily enforced will help to improve the overall enforceability of the system without making significant changes to the current system.

Live animal exports – unchanged from the proposal that was consulted on.

Wild animals – unchanged from the proposal that was consulted on.

Exemptions to replace exceptional circumstances – only a minor change to the proposal that was consulted on.

Surgical procedures – the classification system is confusing and proposal is to replace this with a single set of regulations which will also include the minimum standards in the painful husbandry procedures code of welfare.

RTT – the proposal to record the number of animals killed for research will go ahead. MPI is undertaking additional targeted consultation about AEC oversight for breeding animals with adverse phenotypes.

The Committee thanked [REDACTED] for his presentation and he departed the meeting at 11.20am

C.8 Work planning for animals in the wild

P Fisher and [REDACTED] led a discussion regarding issues in wild animal management. A document (41/12) had been circulated to NAWAC prior to the meeting

MPI commissioned research 'A review of best practice management for humane and effective vertebrate pest control' which has made a number of recommendations. There is an opportunity for NAWAC to act upon recommendations in the report. Australia is ahead of NZ and has developed codes of practice for humane pest control for various species.

Glueboards are due to be phased out by 2015. As part of the phase out discussion is needed with stakeholders to ensure they are going to meet this deadline. NAWAC fully support the phase out of glueboards and nominated P Fisher to represent the committee at a workshop to be organised by MPI.

The committee agreed that [REDACTED] and P Fisher should progress the glueboards workshop and review of the NAWAC traps guideline. A subcommittee to address animals in the wild as a strategic issue will also incorporate the other issues in the document 41/12 as discrete pieces of work within the overall project.

Actions –

- **P Fisher and s 9(2)(a) to progress the glueboards workshop and review the guideline for testing traps**
- **s 9(2)(a) to include ‘animals in a wild state’ on the NAWAC work plan.**
- **s 9(2)(a) to circulate link to research about humane best practice**

**PART TWO
(OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)**

STRATEGY AND PLANNING

O.1 Contribution for Welfare Pulse

Dairy housing – D Scobie and the dairy cattle subcommittee will write an article for the March 2013 issue.

Glueboards article – P Fisher and s 9(2)(a) will write an article to raise awareness of the phase out.

Actions –

- **D Scobie and the dairy cattle subcommittee will prepare an article for the March 2013 issue.**
- **P Fisher and s 9(2)(a) will write an article on the phase out of glueboard traps.**

O2. Agree meeting dates for 2013:

The Committee had no objections to the dates which had been proposed prior to the meeting. The following dates were agreed:

- 13 – 14 February – a two day meeting to discuss NAWAC’s strategy. Potentially to be held in Christchurch
- 15 May
- 14 August
- 13 November

O 3. Review Strategic Plan 2011-2015 (2013 update)

Deferred until the February 2013 meeting.

O. 4 Guideline 8

K Bicknell and J Hellström amended guideline eight to include information on the multi-criteria decision analysis tool. This was circulated to the committee prior to the meeting and subject to minor wording changes, the committee agreed to formally accept this as its new guideline.

Moved (S Brown/ D Nicolson):

That, subject to minor amendments, guideline eight 'balancing animal welfare needs' be accepted as a NAWAC guideline.

The motion was put: carried.

Action – MPI to have the new guideline placed on the web for the public to view.

OTHER REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

O 5 Discussion of information circulated by MPI

The MPI update was circulated prior to the meeting (12) and was taken as read.

V Williams commented in relation to point 5 that the NZVA is writing guidance for vets who suspect non-accidental injury of animals, which has a strong link to domestic violence.

Correspondence

§ 9(2)(a) advised the committee that Tegel had invited members to attend a day in Wellington to discuss a new hatchery system which they are considering installing. The SPCA and MPI have also been invited to discuss the welfare implications of this system. Attendees from NAWAC and preferred dates to be decided by email after the meeting.

There is an opportunity for NAWAC to invite § 9(2)(a) to the February or May general meeting as he will be in New Zealand on sabbatical in the first half of 2013. The Committee agreed this would be an excellent opportunity, and agreed that MPI should extend the invite on its behalf.

Action – § 9(2)(a) to invite § 9(2)(a) to attend the NAWAC general meeting.

O 6. Committee members' reports on recent presentations and attendance at conferences

§ 9(2)(a) and D Scobie attended the NZ Dairy Goat Breeders Association field day and spoke to the attendees about the goats code of welfare.

§ 9(2)(a) and D Scobie presented to a class of Lincoln University students to inform them of the requirements in the sheep and beef cattle code, and the painful husbandry procedures code.

§ 9(2)(a) attended a seminar held by Carne Technology who, in conjunction with a UK training provider, has set up Animal Welfare Training NZ to provide animal welfare training courses at slaughter processors.

§ 9(2)(a) attended the Road Transport Forum Livestock Transport and Safety Subcommittee meeting. There was considerable discussion at the meeting around promotion of the transport code of welfare and crate design.

§ 9(2)(a) met with MPI's Australian counterpart, the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (DAFF). The DAFF Animal Welfare group are currently reviewing their live animal export for slaughter processes following recent high-profile incidents.

O 7. Mini-tutorial – Bull Riding Association

K Phillips welcomed s 9(2)(a) to the meeting at 11.20am. s 9(2)(a) gave a brief overview of the history of Bull Riding NZ, and answered questions the committee members had about rodeos.

Feeding prior to the event needs to be carefully managed as animals can develop colic if they are fed too close prior to performing. Large animals such as bulls will be kept off feed; however young stock will be fed. Water is always available for the animals, particularly as they are performing in summer.

All of the bulls used in the bull riding events are individually owned and contracted by the event organiser.

The reason for having a bell on the riders' rope is to provide weight to pull the rope off once the rider has left the bull. The reason for having a bell is traditional; it is the weight of the bell that is of importance, not the ability for it to produce sound. However a hollow structure is preferred should the bull stand on it.

The use of the flank strap is required to make the bulls buck, however they should be applied lightly to 'tickle' the animal. If it is applied too tightly they will not buck so it is not in the event organiser's interest to have tightly strapped animals.

The animals are trained to work in the yards and understand the layout of the arena so they can easily find the exit race.

K Phillips thanked s 9(2)(a) and he departed the meeting at 12.00pm

O 8. Update on the *Safeguarding our Animals, Safeguarding our Reputation* programme

K Phillips welcomed s 9(2)(a) to the meeting at 12.30pm to update the committee on the *Safeguarding our Animals, Safeguarding our Reputation* programme.

s 9(2)(a) gave an overview of the work that has been undertaken so far this year

- Completion of the research '*What drives primary sector compliance with animal welfare legislation?*'
- The Farmer Representatives Toolkit developed in collaboration with Federated Farmers and industry was launched by the Minister in June 2012 at the Federated Farmers Conference.
- Publication of the VetPak, a document designed for veterinarians MPI engage to assist with large scale animal welfare issues was completed in November.

s 9(2)(a) briefly presented the results from the operational research project '*What drives primary sector compliance with animal welfare legislation?*' undertaken by Prime Consulting Limited. The results of the research suggest that animal welfare awareness in the New Zealand farming industries is relatively high, and that farmers consider animal welfare compliance to be very important.

External factors such as weather, availability and quality of labour, and market prices seem to have an important bearing on farm management and therefore a farmer's ability to meet their animal welfare obligations.

B Nicholas outlined the committee's concerns around dairy farmers installing housing for cows without fully considering the animal welfare outcomes and asked that s 9(2)(a) act with urgency in the

development of off-pasture guidance for farmers. This is a project which is being done in collaboration with industry under the *Safeguarding our Animals, Safeguarding our Reputation* programme and will inform farmers of the food safety, environmental and animal welfare outcomes they need to consider during the design phase.

K Phillips thanked ^{s 9(2)(a)} and she departed the meeting at 1.05pm

[Secretariat Note: the above agenda items were not covered in the order presented in these minutes.]

There being no further items of business to discuss, the Chair thanked the committee members for their attendance and declared the meeting closed at 4:20pm.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

General Meeting

13 February 2013
10.00 am – 4.30 pm

The Lawrence Room
Lincoln Research Centre
Corner Springs Road and Gerald Street, Christchurch

MINUTES

Committee members: John Hellström (Chairperson), Kathryn Bicknell, Sue Brown, Ingrid Collins, Penny Fisher, Barbara Nicholas, David Scobie, Alan Sharr, Virginia Williams, Don Nicolson.

In attendance: s 9(2)(a)

Apologies

Apologies from A Sharr and K Phillips.

K Phillips was able to attend items C3 and O1 via online videoconferencing between 10am and 12pm.

Welcome

J Hellstrom welcomed the new secretary, s 9(2)(a), and D Scobie welcomed members to AgResearch. The meeting was opened at 10am, s 9(2)(a) (University of British Columbia) was welcomed to the meeting at 12.30pm for items C 6 to C 9 and O2 to O8.

Any Other Business Part One (Public Excluded Agenda)

No other items of business were identified for discussion under Part One of the agenda.

Any Other Business Part Two (Open to the Public)

O 9. NAWAC Correspondence

**PART ONE
(PUBLIC EXCLUDED AGENDA)**

DRAFT RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC
Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

There being no other introductory items of business, it was moved (J Hellström/V Williams):

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

- | | | |
|------|--|---------------|
| C 1. | Confirmation of previous minutes | (J Hellström) |
| C 2. | Status of actions arising from previous meetings | (J Hellström) |
| C 3. | Layer hens code of welfare update | (J Hellström) |
| C 4. | Code of welfare work plan for 2013 | s 9(2)(a) |
| C 5. | Codes of welfare update | s 9(2)(a) |
| C 6. | Update on Tegel Foods meeting | (V Williams) |
| C 7. | Calf feeding requirements | (J Hellström) |
| C 8. | Update on Animal Welfare Strategy and Act Review | s 9(2)(a) |
| C 9. | MPI Update | s 9(2)(a) |

THE GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED WHILE THE PUBLIC IS EXCLUDED, THE REASON FOR PASSING THIS RESOLUTION IN RELATION TO EACH MATTER, AND THE SPECIFIC GROUNDS UNDER SECTION 48(1) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL INFORMATION AND MEETINGS ACT 1987 FOR THE PASSING OF THIS RESOLUTION ARE AS FOLLOWS:

<i>General subject of each matter to be considered</i>		<i>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</i>	<i>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</i>
C 1.	<i>Confirmation of previous minutes</i>	<i>To protect the privacy of natural persons.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(a) of the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA).</i>
C 2.	<i>Status of actions arising from previous meetings</i>	<i>As above.</i>	<i>As above.</i>
C 3.	<i>Layer hens code of welfare update</i>	<i>To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2) (g)(ii) of the OIA.</i>
C 4.	<i>Codes of welfare update</i>	<i>As above.</i>	<i>As above.</i>

General subject of each matter to be considered		Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
C 5.	Code of welfare work plan for 2013	As above.	As above.
C 6.	Update on Tegal Foods meeting	To protect the privacy of natural persons and, or: To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(a) and 9(2)(g)(ii) of the OIA.
C 7.	Calf feeding requirements	As above.	As above.
C 8.	Update on Animal Welfare Strategy and Act Review	To maintain the constitutional conventions for the time being which protect the confidentiality of advice tendered by Ministers of the Crown and officials.	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(f)(iv) of the OIA.
C 9.	MPI Update	As above.	As above.

I also move that:

s 9(2)(a)

be permitted to remain at this meeting after the public has been excluded, because of their knowledge of meeting procedure and the subject matter under discussion. This knowledge is relevant background information to assist the committee in its deliberations.

The motion was put: carried.

O 1. Election of Deputy Chair

K Phillips joined the meeting via videoconference at 10am.

The Animal Welfare Act 1999 (section 67 and Schedule 1, clause 3(1)) requires the committee to elect one of its members as its deputy chairperson at its first meeting each year.

Moved (J Hellstrom/V Williams):

That K Phillips be elected deputy chairperson of the committee for 2013, pursuant to the Animal Welfare Act 1999 (section 67 and Schedule 1, clause 3)).

The motion was put: carried.

C 1. Confirmation of previous minutes

The draft minutes of the NAWAC general meeting on 14 November 2012 were reviewed and accepted with two minor amendments:

- Adding D Nicolson as an attendee
- Noting the correct order of proceedings, which will not necessarily follow the agenda. Future minutes should be recorded this way.

Moved (B Nicholas/D Nicolson)

That, subject to the amendments agreed, the draft minutes of the NAWAC general meeting held on 14 November 2012 be adopted as a true and accurate record of that meeting.

The motion was put: carried.

C 2. Status of actions arising from previous meetings

Actions from previous meetings were reviewed and it was agreed to complete pending actions where possible with the following exceptions:

- Update item 3, noting it is complete

It was noted that most other actions are already on meeting agendas, to be discussed.

Action: ^{s9(2)(a)} to update item 3 as complete

C 3. Layer hens code of welfare update

A document circulated prior to the meeting detailed correspondence between the Egg Producers Federation and the Minister on transition periods for cages [NAWAC 13/13].

J Hellström outlined the background to this item, noting that NAWAC had recommended the Minister release the draft code to the Egg Producers Federation (EPF) in July last year, to ensure a smooth transition away from current systems. He told the committee that the EPF received the code two days before the Minister issued the code and it was not what the industry was expecting. EPF do not disagree with the 10 year deadline but do think it's impractical to meet some of the transition times within it.

J Hellström reported on a meeting the EPF had on 23 January 2013 with the then Minister, Hon David Carter, and then Associate Minister Nathan Guy on the issue. [See NAWAC13/13 for industry briefing for that meeting]. J Hellström suggested to the Ministers that he seek the Committee's advice on how to respond to the concerns the industry raised.

He reminded members of the analyses behind the transition times written into the code of welfare, was based on data provided by the EPF. It appeared that it differed from current information that the EPF had provided to the Minister to support its concerns.

J Hellström suggested three options to take the issue forward:

1. Retain existing decision on transition and deadline, based on evidence used at the time, noting risk of judicial review or other measures;
2. Retain existing decision as above, but note that regulations could be developed to revise the situation after the amendment to the Animal Welfare Act;

3. Reopen discussion on minimum standard 12b, c and d to address the transition times. This would include developing a recommended approach, taking it through public consultation, and then the further code process. The prescribed final deadline would not be revisited.

The Committee discussed the above options, noting that current and accurate data would be needed from the industry if it went with option 3. New data would need to be provided quickly in order for a quick review so that it did not impinge on producers' ability to transition under current requirements. Members were reminded of the time taken to produce the code already, including the time taken to source data, both of which should have already allowed relevant analysis to be undertaken. K Bicknell noted the committee was aware of the large margins of error around the figures derived from the data, arising for both mathematical and economic reasons, and the resulting unpredictability was recognised when NAWAC made its original decision.

Members discussed industry's concern that it was not feasible for producers to change from cages installed prior to December 1999 by 2016, as prescribed in minimum standard 12 (b). The Committee considered that this timeframe *would* support transition, on the basis of time required to secure resource consent and financing. However, they noted that actual timeframes for resource consent may vary around the country.

The Committee also considered whether this constituted undue pressure and whether other lobby groups' views should be considered. J Hellström reminded members that this was about the Committee's statutory responsibility to consider feasibility, under section 73(4) of the Animal Welfare Act 1999.

Members discussed options other than changing the code of welfare, such as allowing leeway for producers to meet the minimum standards, if they could prove that they had tried everything to build in time. J Hellström reported that this was not considered favourably by the Ministry, which is responsible for ensuring compliance with the minimum standard as it is written. However, it was an option for industry and could be agreeable to the Committee. For instance, the Committee could re-frame the minimum standard to allow some flexibility in meeting the transition dates.

The Committee also discussed the logistics of revisiting the minimum standards. It was reminded that it could review new data and did not then have to propose an amendment, with the ensuing statutory requirements for major amendments to codes of welfare.

D. Scobie recommended that NAWAC should also respond to the point raised in the Minister's briefing by EPF [attached to NAWAC 13/13] that their transition plan based on stocking density received no feedback from NAWAC.

The nature of the data the Committee would need was also discussed, compared to the nature of the data that had already been considered. It was proposed that an economic analysis was not needed, but instead the committee required information on the feasibility of the change – resource consent times, financials, farm management, public opposition to new buildings, etc.

The Committee agreed to respond to the Minister suggesting that it gather information on particular points, which it would specify in the correspondence, and analyse the information over the two months to determine whether the code should be reviewed or not. The Committee would make a decision at its General Meeting in May as to whether the code should be amended or not. The Committee noted that it did not want to amend its previous decision if there was no new data supporting EPF's concerns raised in its letter.

Resolution: NAWAC advise the Minister that in light of EPF concerns, we review new information on feasibility and practicality to determine whether concerns by EPF are valid. Then NAWAC can advise the Minister on whether sections 12b, c and d need to be revisited or not.

The motion was passed unanimously.

Action: J Hellström to progress letter to Minister.

Members then discussed possible consultants to collect and analyse the data.

Action: All to provide suggestions to s 9(2)(a) by Monday 18 February 2013.

C 4. Code of welfare work plan for 2013

s 9(2)(a) introduced the work plan [NAWAC 05/13]. She noted the previously agreed priorities, layer hens and dairy cattle housing, owing to importance, followed by rodeos to meet the statutory deadline for review, then zoos and circuses to meet ten-year review deadlines. Others were listed in decreasing priority order in the document.

Members agreed to retain the top priorities, s 9(2)(h). They agreed that the priorities for this year were layer hens, dairy cattle housing, and rodeos and noted that deadlines on remaining codes and issues would need to be flexible to meet committee and support staff availability.

Action: s 9(2)(h)

Action: s 9(2)(a) to re-send 05/13 due to misprint

C 5. Codes of welfare update

s 9(2)(a) addressed codes of welfare update as in NAWAC 07/13.

Layer Hens – discussed under Agenda Item C3.

Llamas and Alpacas - Briefing for Minister has been drafted and expected to him in March.

Dairy cattle housing - s 9(2)(a) reported on the amendment, including the best way to work with industry moving forward. A proposal for amending the code had been circulated to representatives of those likely to be affected, as required by the Act. One submission had been received and one was expected by 21 February. The Committee agreed to call a writing group by inviting submitters to provide a representative and also input from engineering firms in the industry.

Action: s 9(2)(a) to invite submitters to nominate contributors to a writing group.

Rodeos - s 9(2)(a) updated the Committee that following public consultation there were 30 unique submissions, 270 SAFE form letters, and 8 rodeo supporter form letters. The rodeo subcommittee will meet in March to go over submissions.

Equine - The equine code is out for consultation and so far there has been one submission.

Zoos and Circuses - A literature scan has been completed and the subcommittee will meet in March.

Temporary housing for companion animals - s 9(2)(a) noted that it tends to attract a “why bother” response from many people. It has been on the table for a long time and the writing group has been looking at it periodically, but have been sympathetic to the time that NAWAC has while dairy housing,

layer hens and pigs have been on the table. It is suggested that we ask ourselves whether it should be a code at all, and to consider another option such as a sign of quality assurance (like the "blue tick" for eggs, run by the SPCA) that NAWAC is not directly involved in. It was noted that there is an AsureQuality scheme for the boarding establishments, but as lot of businesses are not involved, perhaps the public is not being discriminatory based upon it.

s 9(2)(a) noted the animal welfare risks driving the development of this code were the number of boarding kennels and catteries in New Zealand which were not required to subscribe to the current commercially available auditing scheme, but that private assessment is not compulsory. Also, this standard also applies to SPCA, who is asking when it will be available to support consistency within and between SPCA and local authority animal shelters. The Committee agreed it could revisit whether a code of welfare is the best way of assisting regulation in this sector, or not.

Saleyards - Members noted the work on saleyards being undertaken under the *Safeguarding our Animals, Safeguarding our Reputations* programme to support consistent and relevant guidance on animal welfare requirements and rules at saleyards.

Painful Husbandry procedures – Active work will begin again if/when Regulations are to be developed.

Wild Animals - The workshop on replacing glueboards is still to be organised. s 9(2)(a) and P. Fisher are reviewing the guideline on trap testing.

C 6. Update on Tegel Foods meeting

V Williams reported on a workshop to discuss a new "Hatch-brood system". Instead of handling and moving day-old chicks straight onto farm, they are put into an incubation system, where the environment is very strictly controlled, and moved to rearer/production units at four days of age.

C 7. Calf feeding requirements

J Hellström received and circulated an email prior to the meeting [NAWAC 11/13] on a possible exception to the rule that bobby calves must be fed in the time up to two hours prior to transportation. A processor in the South Island had requested exception for some suppliers because they were very close to the premises, and processing so shortly after feeding was resulting in regurgitation with consequential carcass contamination and welfare implications. A trial under a specific QA Programme resulted in much fewer deaths among those calves involved in the trial and better overall animal welfare outcomes.

The Committee noted that the Act's requirements to meet physical, health and behavioural needs supersede requirements in the code of welfare and that it was not an offence to breach minimum standards. It agreed to respond to the email recommending that for suppliers where welfare was improved by not feeding calves within two hours of transport, a QA programme could provide special conditions that did not require this feeding, with a number of specific requirements put in place and close ongoing monitoring to ensure calves' welfare needs are met.

Action: J Hellström to reply to AWOC as outlined above.

C 8. Update on Animal Welfare Strategy and Act Review


s 9(2)(a) updated the committee on the Animal Welfare Strategy and Act Review [NAWAC17/13], noting that a Bill was being drafted to allow regulations for live animal export and surgical and painful procedures, regulations to complement codes of welfare, amendments to make the codes process more efficient and to make it possible to amend only part of a code, and clarification to the provisions relating

to cruelty towards animals in a wild state. She noted that the position of the new Minister, Nathan Guy, on the Act amendment had not yet been canvassed by the Ministry.

Action: J Hellström to write to Minister regarding NAWAC'S priorities (in particular dairy housing) and supporting amendment of the Act to create efficiencies.

C 9. MPI Update

This was gratefully received by the Committee. The Chair also reminded members of the passing of family members of past NAWAC members. Committee members expressed their sympathy and agreed to pass on condolences.

Action: J Hellström to write to ^{s 9(2)(a)}  .

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

PART TWO (OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)

STRATEGY AND PLANNING

O 2. Results of 2012 review of committee performance

s 9(2)(a) had compiled the 2012 surveys on performance into a summary document for NAWAC to discuss. Key points raised were that the Committee could spend less time on developing codes and more on strategic priority issues.

O 3. Contribution for *Welfare Pulse*

Members suggested items as follows, due 15 April for publication in the 1 June issue:

- NAWAC strategic planning (J Hellström/s 9(2)(a))
- Hatch-brood systems for chick rearing (V Williams/S Brown)
- Canadian Animal Welfare Strategy (s 9(2)(a) /J Hellström)

Action: MPI to follow up with identified authors for the above suggestions by 11 March 2013

O 4. Identification of mini-tutorial topics for 2013

Members suggested the following, to be considered for 2013:

- A zoo visit (Wellington zoo)
- Horse racing (including stable visit?)
- Aquaculture facility
- Greyhound racing

Action: s 9(2)(a) to coordinate a selected topic for at least one meeting in 2013

O 5. Discussion on 'over treatment of companion animals' and draft letter to the Minister

The Committee discussed K Phillips' article on the over treatment of companion animals in *Welfare Pulse* in March 2012 and whether it could be adapted into a letter to the New Zealand Veterinary Association and the Veterinarians Council of New Zealand. s 9(2)(a) reported on a Canadian study that found that there were three groups of veterinarians – those who act according to clients' wishes without exception, those who outlined all the options to owners and those who advocate for the animals. He also noted that veterinarians were expected to act in isolation from each other, rather than with human medics who could act in a collegial environment.

The Committee agreed this issue could be raised with the VCNZ and NZVA, and also to highlight it as an emerging animal welfare issue to Minister Guy.

Action: J Hellström to draft letter to NZVA and VCNZ as described, for Committee comment prior to sending

Action: J Hellström to send a letter highlighting the overtreatment of companion animals as an emerging issue to Minister Guy

OTHER REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

O 6. Discussion of information circulated by MPI

The Committee noted that it appreciated the information that had been circulated.

O 7. Committee members' reports on recent presentations and attendance at conferences

D Nicolson reported on a visit to a free stall dairy unit constructed by Rakaia Engineering Limited in Southland.

V Williams reported on the previous day's meeting of the National Animal Ethics Advisory Committee, with the key item being regulatory animal testing of recreational synthetic drugs.

§ 9(2)(a) reported on the Farm to Processor Forum workshop which was held to progress work, including projects on disease, defective and injured animals and bobby calves, under the *Safeguarding our Animals, Safeguarding our Reputations* programme.

O 9. NAWAC Correspondence

J Hellström added a late agenda item on the topic of racing greyhounds. § 9(2)(a) of the Greyhound Protection League had sought information on whether NAWAC would be advising Ministers of the animal welfare concerns in the greyhound industry. He noted that § 9(2)(a) contacted NAWAC in November last year seeking advice as to whether NAWAC had ever investigated, or carried out research into the greyhound racing industry.

Members discussed some key welfare issues in greyhound racing, and J Hellström reported that he had replied to § 9(2)(a) on behalf of the Committee saying that it may consider the issues when developing advice on animals in entertainment. The Committee agreed that some general principles relating to greyhound racing may be developed at that time, however, specific greyhound racing issues and some wider ethical issues such as euthanasia of surplus and/or underperforming animals would be unlikely to be investigated this year given other priorities in NAWAC's work plan.

Action: J Hellström to reply to § 9(2)(a) as described above

§ 9(2)(a) also reported on further correspondence on colony cages and meat chicken cleanliness as an animal welfare indicator, which will be circulated to the Committee.

J Hellstrom noted that NAWAC should be aware of what he was saying on their behalf, and the Committee moved to accept correspondence being sent to all NAWAC members [S Brown/D Scobie].

Action: § 9(2)(a) to ensure that correspondence sent on behalf of NAWAC is copied to the Committee for information as ongoing mailouts.

There being no further items of business to discuss, the Chair thanked the committee members for their attendance and declared the meeting closed at 3.15.

O 8. Mini-tutorial – Site visit to LandCare Research animal facility

§ 9(2)(a) guided the Committee through the Landcare Research animal facility and outlined its key research programmes. The Committee's tour of the live animal facility at Landcare Research ended at 4:30.

Strategy Meeting

Thursday, 14 February 2013
9.30am – 3.00pm

The Lawrence Room
Lincoln Research Centre
Corner Springs Road and Gerald Street, Christchurch

Committee members: John Hellström (Chairperson), Kathryn Bicknell, Sue Brown, Ingrid Collins, Penny Fisher, Barbara Nicholas, David Scobie, Alan Sharr, Virginia Williams, Don Nicolson.

In attendance: ^{s 9(2)(a)}

OBJECTIVE

To determine NAWAC priorities for the next decade and what actions should be planned to achieve them.

MINUTES

Welcome

^{s 9(2)(a)}

Apologies

K Phillips would be attending intermittently, via online videoconferencing.

Any Other Business Part One (Public Excluded Agenda)

No other items of business were identified for discussion under Part One of the agenda.

Any Other Business Part Two (Open to the Public)

No other items of business were identified for discussion under Part Two of the agenda.

**PART ONE
(PUBLIC EXCLUDED AGENDA)**

DRAFT RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC
Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

It was moved (J Hellström/K Bicknell) that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

- | | | |
|------|--|---------------------|
| C 1. | International Animal Welfare Issues and Update | (s 9(2)(a)) |
| C 2. | New Zealand Animal Welfare Strategy | (J Hellström / All) |
| C 3. | Identify the key issues for animal welfare in New Zealand now and over the next decade in terms of husbandry and ownership practices | (All) |
| C 4. | Discuss what the best processes are for NAWAC to clarify and address those issues | (All) |
| C 5. | Summary and close | (All) |

THE GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED WHILE THE PUBLIC IS EXCLUDED, THE REASON FOR PASSING THIS RESOLUTION IN RELATION TO EACH MATTER, AND THE SPECIFIC GROUNDS UNDER SECTION 48(1) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL INFORMATION AND MEETINGS ACT 1987 FOR THE PASSING OF THIS RESOLUTION ARE AS FOLLOWS:

<i>General subject of each matter to be considered</i>		<i>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</i>	<i>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</i>
C 1.	International Animal Welfare	To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2) (g)(ii) of the Official Information Act 1982.
C 2.	NZ Animal Welfare Strategy	As Above.	As Above.
C 3.	Key issues	As Above.	As Above.
C 4.	NAWAC processes	As Above.	As Above.
C 5.	Summary	As Above.	As Above.

I also move that:

§ 9(2)(a) [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

be permitted to remain at this meeting after the public has been excluded, because of their knowledge of meeting procedure and the subject matter under discussion. This knowledge is relevant background information to assist the committee in its deliberations.

The motion was put: carried.

C 1. International Animal Welfare Issues and Update

§ 9(2)(a) [REDACTED] was invited to the NAWAC meeting to address the committee on international animal welfare issues. He thanked the Committee and MPI for their hospitality.

§ 9(2)(a) [REDACTED] noted that NAWAC is an internationally well-known group, and that New Zealand is well-known for its progressive policies in animal welfare. He believed that Canadians are generally less concerned about animal welfare than New Zealanders, and their equivalent of NAWAC is still trying to get many different industries to pull together in the same direction.

The main points of the presentation were:

- The relation between conservation and animal welfare
- Addressing public concern about intensive animal production

He discussed the idea that "conservation" issues (such as dead zones, birds being hit by cars, and birds flying into office towers) are equally animal welfare issues. A survey by § 9(2)(a) [REDACTED] his PhD student, found that welfare-orientated and conservation-orientated people rank the same activities as being harmful to animals, and so ideas that were traditionally considered as 'conservation issues' may be the next big thing for animal welfare.

The second part of the presentation discussed the concern in the modern day about intensive farming. § 9(2)(a) [REDACTED] considered three models of animal production: agrarian, industrial and professional. He noted that there is some opinion that replacing farms with cities and factories causes something close to spiritual impoverishment in people. It was then suggested that to be a farmer is becoming a profession rather than a job: it has standards; it has a high hurdle of competence; and the farmers provide an important service. As the role of the farmer changes, this will have implications on the standards that they hold themselves to.

Note: Copy of § 9(2)(a) [REDACTED] presentation sent as NAWAC 25/13.

The Committee discussed the trust and professionalism of the modern intensive farmer.

C 2. New Zealand Animal Welfare Strategy

The draft Animal Welfare Strategy was circulated by § 9(2)(a) [REDACTED] prior to the meeting.

C 3. Identify the key issues for animal welfare in New Zealand now and over the next decade in terms of husbandry and ownership practices

General discussion by all members included:

- There will be an increase in the awareness of animals well-being and sentience;
- There will be an increased desire to extend the lifetime of animals by whatever means available and this may not always be in the best interests of the animals;
- Sentience - definition, recognition of sentience, coverage of sentience in legislation;
- Changes in veterinary clients attitudes (animals have a value themselves, rather than a purely instrumental value);
- Assessing positive welfare (and difficulties in assessing positive welfare);
- How to express features of positive welfare.

Specific issues of current or future priority raised were:

- Inherited defects;
- Breeding standards that demand harmful traits, both in companion animals, and for production that results in welfare issues;
- Shelter for farm animals;
- Housing for production/recreational animals;
- Welfare issues in free range farming;
- Live export of animals;
- Cats in our society and regulations that may be imposed on cat households e.g. curfews and confinement;
- Overweight companion animals, including livestock;
- Issues in keeping horses (e.g. kept alone, small paddocks, minimal exercise);
- Issues around intensification, e.g. stockmanship and staffing (such as professionalisation leading to increased staff costs and less staff to do routine and repetitive tasks);
- Zoos, including what animals are appropriate animals to keep in zoos;
- Social needs of animals, both social and solo-living animals (e.g. single dogs in working families, camelids, horses, elephants);
- Despatch of animals – both unwanted, bred animals (e.g. bobby calves, racing animals, male chicks) and animals at the end of their productive lives, including many issues around it such as:
 - Needing involvement of all relevant players to make change
 - Impact of despatching animals in front of other animals
 - Technologies to avoid the unwanted animals in the first place e.g. sexing germplasm
- Self-regulation in compliance (applying the VADE compliance model);
- Introducing farmed animals into natural environments where they have not been kept previously, with consequent impacts on the animals and the environment;
- Fish farming including meeting behavioural needs on fish farms;
- Dog tail docking and surgical procedures on animals;
- Drivers for animal cruelty and abuse;
- Having better conversations or working more closely with the judiciary;
- Climate change impacts (e.g. in the nature and spread of disease); and

- Selecting animals for positive welfare features or features that have positive implications e.g. polled cattle, sexing germplasm.

Discussion of these points included:

- Driving change beyond relying upon codes of welfare;
- Models for interaction/getting all necessary people 'around the table' e.g. workshops;
- The reasons for people keeping single companion animals, and a suggested workshop on the keeping of single companion animals (e.g. dogs);
- The implications for NAWAC's workload of increasing the number of regulatory tools available (i.e. regulations in addition to codes, plus potentially other forms of intervention).

The following actions were agreed:

Action: ^{s 9(2)(a)} /P Fisher to add cats to the list of issues in the paper being developed by P Fisher on potential NAWAC work on animals in the wild.

^{s 9(2)(a)} listed some summary points, comparing the situation with the Canadian equivalent of NAWAC. He noted:

- The relative advantage of time spent providing high level advice on codes, rather than developing codes;
- Working within a remit to advise Ministers; this can be taken more broadly or narrowly. A broader interpretation can have positive results.

He also noted that housing and invasive procedures are well-researched and often identified animal welfare issues; and handling is becoming better developed. Underdeveloped areas include:

- Breeding. This is the "forgotten" area. These include breeding for broader production indices, breeding out undesirable traits, or breeding for desirable traits;
- Feeding to match genetic potential ('feeding to match breeding'); and
- Providing good lives for animals – animals do things for two reasons: they are driven to by an unpleasant sensation e.g. hunger, thirst, pain to meet an urgent need, or they are enticed to by a pleasurable sensation e.g. play, which may be non-essential in the immediate term but that has long-term benefits and animals are strongly driven to achieve.

He closed by noting there is a role for codes and a role for initiatives through better-developed relationships with constituents such as the kennel club.

Members then broke into two working groups to identify areas where the greatest animal welfare gain can be made in the next ten years:

Working group one (J Hellström (facilitator), ^{s 9(2)(a)}, K Phillips, A Sharr, B Nicholas, V Williams, K Bicknell, P Fisher, ^{s 9(2)(a)} (rapporteur)) identified:

- Euthanasia – including avoiding production of unwanted animals, as well as denial of euthanasia to prevent suffering;
- Breeding - to avoid unwanted animals, to select for welfare gains, and the possibility to use new technology available (e.g. polled cattle gene);
- Wildlife issues – welfare for pests and natives.

Working group two (S Brown (facilitator), D Nicolson, ^{s 9(2)(a)}, S Brown, I Collins, D Scobie, ^{s 9(2)(a)} identified:

- The changes that the Act amendment will bring about, including providing additional compliance tools and allowing regulations, both in general terms (e.g. in raising prominence of animal welfare via public communications) and specific terms (e.g. mulesing)
- Working in the V & A areas of the compliance (extension activities such as communications, workshops etc)

Specific issues where gains could be made:

- Layer hens
- Fish farming/commercial slaughter of fish
- Genetic improvements
- Avoiding welfare issues in dairy housing
- Housing for pigs
- Meeting social needs of animals, and
- Use of animals for recreational purposes

C 4. Discuss what the best processes are for NAWAC to clarify and address those issues

Although this agenda item was not discussed specifically, relevant points raised throughout the day included:

- Deciding when codes are necessary versus other forms of intervention. The Committee agreed it would need to consider how to make this decision in the future;
- Developing positive tools for handling immediate issues as opposed to negative 'knee jerk' responses;
- Framing or considering animal welfare issues as part of holistic assessments or considerations, not in isolation (e.g. as animal welfare versus economics);
- How to convey advice to the Minister, including in the letter discussed at the previous day's meeting as an action [item C 5];
- How to identify, keep abreast of, and prepare for in advance, emerging issues such as new technologies;
- What having a new Minister means for NAWAC;
- Resourcing/staffing to support NAWAC;
- How the focus for the Ministry for Primary Industries aligns with the breadth of NAWAC's scope (e.g. companion animals); and
- Whether the attention paid to particular sectors fairly reflects the animal welfare issues in that sector.

Suggestions on how to approach the issues included:

- Workshops with all relevant participants
- Updating NAWAC's Communications Strategy
- Formalising a process for identifying and preparing for emerging issues;
- Proactive release of educational or informative material, e.g. dehorning pamphlets, as opposed to reactive release only by request, and
- Having a running agenda item on progress on strategic issues

Action: J Hellstrom, ^{s 9(2)(a)} to add an hour in the agenda for each NAWAC meeting to discuss what the best processes are for NAWAC to clarify and address the strategic priorities developed today

C 5. Summary and close

There being no further items of business to discuss, the Chair thanked the committee members and the visiting speaker for their contributions, thanked D Scobie for organising the venue and declared the meeting closed at 3.00pm.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

General Meeting

15 May 2013
9:30 am – 4:00 pm

Room 3.2
Pastoral House
The Terrace, Wellington

MINUTES

Committee members: John Hellström (Chairperson), Karen Phillips, Kathryn Bicknell, Sue Brown, Ingrid Collins, Penny Fisher, Barbara Nicholas, Don Nicolson, David Scobie, Alan Sharr, Virginia Williams.

In attendance: s 9(2)(a)

Hon Nathan Guy (Minister for Primary Industries) attended item C8.
s 9(2)(a) (Manager, Animal Welfare Policy) attended items C4, C7 and C8.
Matthew Stone (Director, Animal and Animal Products) attended items C4 to C8.

Apologies

Ingrid Collins had to leave at 1:45pm to attend to other business matters.

A Sharr arrived at 12:45pm due to a cancelled flight.

Absent

Deborah Roche (DDG Policy), who was to attend item C8.

Any Other Business Part One (Public Excluded Agenda)

No other items of business were identified for discussion under Part One of the agenda.

Any Other Business Part Two (Open to the Public)

O7: Ideas for mini-tutorials in 2013

**PART ONE
(PUBLIC EXCLUDED AGENDA)**

DRAFT RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC
Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

There being no other introductory items of business, it was moved (J Hellström / V Williams):

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

- | | | |
|------|---|--------------------------|
| C 1. | Confirmation of previous minutes | (J Hellström) |
| C 2. | Status of actions arising from previous meetings | (J Hellström) |
| C 3. | Codes of Welfare update | § 9(2)(a) |
| C 4. | Layer hens code of welfare | (J Hellström) |
| C 5. | Animals in entertainment | (J Hellström) |
| C 6. | Rodeos Code of Welfare | (V Williams/ § 9(2)(a) |
| C 7. | Update on animal welfare strategy and Act review | § 9(2)(a) |
| C 8. | Discussion with Hon Nathan Guy, Minister for Primary Industries | (Hon N Guy/ J Hellström) |
| C 9. | MPI update | § 9(2)(a) |

THE GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED WHILE THE PUBLIC IS EXCLUDED, THE REASON FOR PASSING THIS RESOLUTION IN RELATION TO EACH MATTER, AND THE SPECIFIC GROUNDS UNDER SECTION 48(1) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL INFORMATION AND MEETINGS ACT 1987 FOR THE PASSING OF THIS RESOLUTION ARE AS FOLLOWS:

<i>General subject of each matter to be considered</i>		<i>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</i>	<i>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</i>
C 1.	<i>Confirmation of previous minutes</i>	<i>To protect the privacy of natural persons.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(a) of the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA).</i>
C 2.	<i>Status of actions arising from previous meetings</i>	<i>As above.</i>	<i>As above.</i>
C 3.	<i>Codes of Welfare update</i>	<i>To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2) (g)(ii) of the OIA.</i>
C 4.	<i>Layer hens code of welfare update</i>	<i>As above.</i>	<i>As above.</i>

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
C 5.	<i>Animals in Entertainment subcommittee update</i>	As above.
C 6.	<i>Rodeos code of welfare</i>	As above.
C 7.	<i>Update on Animal Welfare Strategy and Act Review</i>	<i>To maintain the constitutional conventions for the time being which protect the confidentiality of advice tendered by Ministers of the Crown and officials.</i>
C 8.	<i>Discussion with Hon Nathan Guy, Minister for Primary Industries</i>	<i>To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.</i>
C 9.	<i>MPI Update</i>	<i>To maintain the constitutional conventions for the time being which protect the confidentiality of advice tendered by Ministers of the Crown and officials.</i>

I also move that:

s 9(2)(a)

9. Matt Stone (Director, Animal and Animal Products)

be permitted to remain at this meeting after the public has been excluded, because of their knowledge of meeting procedure and the subject matter under discussion. This knowledge is relevant background information to assist the committee in its deliberations.

The motion was put: carried.

C 1. Confirmation of previous minutes

The draft minutes of the NAWAC general and strategy meetings on 13 and 14 February 2013 were reviewed and accepted, with the following amendments:

- Change the year in which K Phillips was elected as deputy chair from 2012 to 2013 (refer to item O1, 13 February);
- Clarify the sentence that named birds striking office buildings as a conservation issue (refer to item C1, 14 February);
- Delete the mention of methane release (refer to item C1, 14 February).

Moved (V Williams / P Fisher)

That, subject to the amendments agreed, the draft minutes of the NAWAC general meeting held on 14 November 2012 be adopted as a true and accurate record of that meeting.

The motion was put: carried.

C 2. Status of actions arising from previous meetings

Actions from previous meetings were reviewed and it was agreed to complete pending actions where possible, with the following exceptions:

- Update item 11, noting it is complete;
- Change item 17 from 'pending' to 'ongoing'.

s 9(2)(a) then updated the Committee on progress made on item 11, s 9(2)(b). It was explained that under the Animal Welfare Act 1999, NAWAC is required to have recommended a review to the Minister within 10 years of the last release.

Due to a lack of precedent, it is not known what would occur if this requirement was not met. It was noted however that the main risk would likely come in retrospect, for example if a Judicial Review was ever called, or if there was a complaint lodged based on NAWAC's process. It was pointed out that if required, NAWAC can advise the Minister to recommend an Order in Council to get an extension.

It was agreed that NAWAC and the Minister clearly don't want to not meet the Act requirements, whether the Amendment Bill is passed by the end of the year or not, and NAWAC will continue to keep the Minister informed of progress and provide advice on process needs.

C 3. Codes of Welfare update

s 9(2)(a) addressed the codes of welfare update as in NAWAC 36/13.

Animal Welfare Strategy and Act Review – Discussed in item C7.

Layer Hens – Discussed in item C4

Llamas and Alpacas – The code was released on 26 April.

Dairy Cattle Housing Amendment – A pre-consultation has been conducted with Fonterra, the Dairy Technical Advisory Group (DTAG), and DairyNZ. Some good feedback was received, although some of it is very detailed and prescriptive so it will be difficult to use, especially as the Dairy Cattle Code has no example indicators. It was noted that there has been some discussion over a very principle-based Code for pastoral species, which would be a long-term solution for these issues.

For now, it was explained that the subcommittee will be discussing whether they would like to put together a more immediate fix, for example to produce a separate document that is more technical than the Codes. DairyNZ are already producing a document like this (Minimising Muck, Maximising Money).

Action: ^{s 9(2)(a)} to make a recommendation to the Committee on how to progress the development of some general pastoral farming indicators.

Rodeos – Discussed in item C6

Equine – The subcommittee held their meeting to consider the public submissions on 8 May. The code report still needs to be written. It was noted that the Racing Board is keeping an eye on the progress of this Code, as it will cover the welfare of all horses including those used in racing.

Animals in Entertainment – Discussed in item C5

Temporary Housing of Companion Animals – The current timeline is that the draft could be out for public consultation in September, however it was suggested that the draft copy requires some more editing, perhaps to be carried out in June. It was also noted that temporary housing has some crossover with the upcoming animals in entertainment code, and so more discussion is required on whether this specific code is still needed or whether these animals are already covered by other codes.

Saleyards – ^{s 9(2)(a)} and other members of the animal welfare team met with the Stock and Station Agent Association to discuss the proposed code of welfare for saleyards. While the code continues to progress slowly, it is definitely on the radar. It was further noted that the stakeholders involved in this code are very keen to develop standards, as not having them is a risk to their reputation (although currently they do follow the old guideline, which is out of date).

It was suggested that a saleyard visit by NAWAC would be a good idea. ^{s 9(2)(a)} noted that the next meetings held by the Stock and Station Agent Association will be held in Franklin and Fielding. Some Committee members expressed interest in coming to the next meeting themselves even if the timing isn't right for the full committee, although it was cautioned that Animal Welfare is generally a small part of these meetings.

Action: ^{s 9(2)(a)} to inform the Committee of Stock and Station Agent Association meeting dates.

Painful Husbandry Procedures – This code is very suited to having regulations, and so is generally considered by the Committee and MPI to be on hold until the Amendment Bill is passed. It was however noted that the code is up for its 10 year deadline in 2015 so also can't be delayed indefinitely.

One committee member then brought up the fact that the vet council has been consulting on the surgical conduct of vets in training and overseas vets, and whether they may be able to obtain a temporary license. Otherwise they must be dealt with under the Act, i.e. must be under supervision at all times. This idea arose after the council wanted to make changes to the Animal Welfare Act as part of the Amendment, but they have not been included. This idea may affect the code or the regulations down the track.

Wild Animals – MPI is organising a workshop on glueboard traps. P Fisher noted that she is going to a pest control / biosecurity conference in July, and will do a presentation on glueboard traps.

C4. Layer hens code of welfare

J Hellström summarised the most recent correspondence from the Egg Producer's Federation (EPF) [NAWAC 45/13] and outlined some of the main findings of the review on feasibility of transition times by consultant ^{s 9(2)(a)} [NAWAC 40/13].

It was agreed that while possibly feasible, it will be very challenging for many operators to make the transition away from cages on time. Some members of the Committee agreed that the review brought up some good points, and there are some clear grounds for accepting that the industry are not just being obstructive and have some genuine concerns about price and supply of eggs, especially if NAWAC does not allow the transition to work within the laying cycle to avoid the worst bottlenecks. It was noted that predictions about volatility are well supported in cases overseas - a UK example was quoted where the transition from cage eggs was not smooth, and prices quadrupled in some areas.

The review questionnaire in the report went out to 75 cage producers, of which 12 control 80% of the industry, and interestingly none indicated that they were going to shift to barn production. The two responses to the transition from cages were to invest in colony cages or exit the market.

It was then noted that the total revenue impact could possibly still be quite positive for some producers – as the supply drops and demand and price goes up. This benefit may particularly be felt by barn and free-range producers. It was further noted that there will be some small producers who may simply be casualties of the transition, and NAWAC has acknowledged and accepts this scenario.

[Secretariat note: M Stone and ^{s 9(2)(a)} arrived at this point (10:40am). J Hellström welcomed them to the discussion.]

The Committee considered the EPF's concerns that the first transition steps are too soon. Some Committee members acknowledged that the main problem is the 2016 date, especially due to resource consent process, and that this date is the only compelling one to change.

It was generally agreed that the ideal transition steps would be smooth, and penalise operators who lag behind, although concerns were raised that this carrot-stick approach may be hard to regulate. The Committee then discussed their concerns surrounding current and future compliance of welfare in the egg industry, especially how late adopters will be dealt with. It is agreed that there must be public confidence that NAWAC will put in place a system to deal with latecomers, especially since NAWAC has already been seen to have deferred.

It was noted that the Amendment Bill will potentially bring in regulations, directly enforceable with fines and penalties, which will work well with this transition, although concern is still expressed that late compliance may still be an attractive option and there are welfare issues with simply shutting down a non-complying egg farm mid cycle. It is likely that an increasing series of deterrents and punishments will be needed. Further concerns were raised that the regulations are 'not a done deal', and in the worst case, MPI will only be able to deal with non-compliance in the way it always has (Minimum Standards), which may not be ideal.

It is then noted that, as stated in the 2 letters by the EPF, there are some farms that are already not complying. ^{s 9(2)(a)} noted that MPI compliance has already visited some of these farms and followed up to try and change on-farm practice, they have not brought any prosecutions. Therefore it is noted that there is already an issue where some egg farmers think that they could 'get away with' late compliance, and further regulations would be a good tool.

It was agreed that NAWAC must make a decision now on which option should go out for public consultation, although it was noted that the submission process may turn up more options to consider.

The layer hen subcommittee teleconference, with reviewer ^{s 9(2)(a)}, was held on 8 May. The subcommittee settled on 2 practical options: pushing the 2016 date two years back (it was noted that this option is still not ideal and could result in up to three million extra hen cage years), or introducing managed incentives to change. Such a scheme could involve setting up a governing body that manages

individual changeover plans; however the industry may be too competitive to carry out such a plan amongst themselves.

It was confirmed that the communications message that NAWAC will release is that NAWAC is not moving that final phase-out date, but is trying to get a smoother transition to keep the price and supply of eggs as stable as possible for consumers in NZ. It was suggested that a message be added that NAWAC wants to encourage farmers to make the move early. The discussion document should also include an appropriate summary of the report by ^{s 9(2)(a)} in order to explain exactly why NAWAC is proposing to push these dates back.

Moved (J Hellström / K Phillips):

That, having considered the ^{s 9(2)(a)} report and the discussion of previous meetings, NAWAC will revisit the transition times in a public discussion document.

The motion was put: Carried unanimously.

Moved (J Hellstrom / S Brown):

That the basis of the public consultation document will be a change to the transition timeline that shifts the 2016, 2018 and 2020 transitions each back by two years.

The motion was put: Carried unanimously.

In recognition of the urgency, it was agreed that there will be an out-of-session agreement on the wording of the public discussion document.

It was confirmed that NAWAC would be recommending that layer hens regulation to be the highest priority once the Amendment Bill is passed.

It was further confirmed that the carryover requirement to reduce the stocking density (so that each bird has 550cm² for all cages by 2014 (Minimum Standard 6 (b) (iii)) would not be removed or changed.

Further discussion on matters other than cage transition times:

Claw shortening devices – Minimum Standard 4 (i) (iii) is essentially asking the industry to retroactively install claw shortening devices in all cages, although this requirement wasn't in the draft of the 2012 Code or the 2005 Code. However, it was noted that the use of claw-shortening devices was discussed extensively in the development of the 2005 Code.

Stocking density in barns with outdoor access – The 2005 Code allowed a Minimum Standard of 10 birds per square metre (and it is noted that a producer can get an SPCA 'blue tick' at this density). The consultation code proposed 10 birds per square metre. It was noted that all of the barn operators are currently operating at 7 birds per square metre or less, and that the EU requirement is 9 birds, regardless of access to outdoors or not. It was noted that there is very little science on the welfare effects of stocking rates in barns. NAWAC decided to go with EU standard, as it is the only widely accepted international standard. There were few submissions on density; however, it was noted there may have been more if NAWAC had consulted on 9 in the first place.

It was stated that most of the industry is already complying with a 9-bird limit, but there are a number who are unhappy with the change. J Hellström stated that he has asked the EPF for data – on how many operators are actually at the 10 bird stocking density now?

Action: Layer hens subcommittee to discuss matters raised by the EPF in their letter of 3 May 2103 (other than transition times) and whether they should be included in the public discussion document. Report back to NAWAC.

C 5. Animals in entertainment

The NAWAC discussion document, NAWAC 41/13, was distributed before the meeting. It was agreed that the main purpose of an eventual public discussion document is to get an opinion from stakeholders and the public on how they regard animals in entertainment, as there are quite profound issues around over breeding, containment methods, and using animals for amusement.

It was noted that ^{s 9(2)(a)} and J Hellström will be attending the Zoo and Aquarium Association New Zealand Conference from 29 to 30 May in Dunedin. This will serve to take the discussion to a broader group of stakeholders. It was noted that strong initial feedback so far was that zoos consider themselves to be educators, not entertainers.

The discussion moved to considering when an animal should be considered to be used for entertainment and therefore in scope for this review. For example, many zoos in NZ are actually aviaries carrying native birds. These operators don't necessarily regard themselves as zoos at all. The Fieldays event may be, in some cases, classified as education (and therefore RTT) but regulating these events would be more efficiently served by a Code than an ethics committee. Horse jumping was identified as a seemingly minor entertainment activity that is coming under the animal welfare spotlight in some countries.

Further grey areas identified by the Committee were mobile petting zoos, therapy animals, school 'pet days', and dogs and cats in shows (and therefore, some animals in temporary housing). It was further suggested that if dogs and cats used in shows are considered as 'entertainment' then potential values and principles and how pain and distress are addressed need to be applied in a consistent way in the temporary housing code. It was agreed that mobile petting zoos should be covered by the Code.

It was also suggested that to see a return of exotic animals to circuses would be a disappointment, and this could be addressed by way of regulation.

It was confirmed that recreational hunting and fishing for food is out of scope, but that there is potential for trophy hunting to be in scope.

Action: Animals in entertainment subcommittee to convene before the next general meeting to consider 41/13 and any points raised here or in upcoming stakeholder meetings.

It was then noted that this issue would lend itself to a public workshop very well, and this could be carried out later in the year.

Action: Subcommittee to assess the possibility for NAWAC to run a public workshop on animals in entertainment.

C 6. Rodeos Code of Welfare

V Williams summarised some of the main points from the recent meeting between the rodeos subcommittee and 2 representatives from the Rodeo Cowboys Association in Christchurch on 22 April. The rodeos issues paper (NAWAC 42/13) had been circulated prior to the meeting and was taken as read.

The main issue was that some activities in the rodeo were considered better, in terms of animal welfare, than others. The subcommittee considered that certain activities should be banned.

There was consensus that the Rodeos Code could not be delayed to be included in the animals in entertainment code (because the 10 year review deadline is December this year), although perhaps the potential of it being included in the future could be mentioned in the code report.

The subcommittee suggested that the calf roping event should be banned. The problem is that there is very little science on stress and calf roping, apart from the absence of high cortisol levels, which is not a very useful indicator. However, the injury rate is also very low (although it was pointed out that the event is very short, so if compared to other longer activities, the rate may seem artificially low). The weight of calves is also a problem. Simply raising it is not easy, as bigger calves may in fact be more prone to injury from the sudden jerking motion. It was suggested that the jerking motion alone could be banned (and in some rodeos overseas it already is).

There were many public submissions calling for a calf roping ban; however, there were not many submissions overall (30 unique, 270 form letters) and so concerns were raised that this is not necessarily a good indicator of societal values, especially given the rising admission numbers to rodeos in New Zealand.

Concern was raised that in some areas on New Zealand, calf roping is in fact a husbandry technique. On farm, it could be considered 'necessary'. This raised the question as to whether the practice itself is wrong, or the use of the practice in entertainment.

A committee member asked: how far do we let absence of evidence be evidence of absence? It was suggested that when animals in entertainment are in question, we may have to use our common sense and be more cautious than in other situations, as using animals for entertainment could be seen as less necessary than using animals in other cases. It was noted that there are precedents for NAWAC issuing minimum standards that are not solely science-based (as scientific knowledge is not the only matter NAWAC must consider).

It was then suggested that permitting the use of only trained contract animals could take care of the problem: but how can a calf be trained? This method could work in the South Island, where such measures are already largely in place, but not in the North Island. Breed could also be regulated: beef breeds are stockier than dairy breeds and may cope better.

[Secretariat Note: Hon Nathan Guy arrived at this point, so item C8 interrupted here]

The Rodeo Cowboys Association is very aware of the research that shows that the calf roping is not stressful and is very defensive of the weight (100kg) issue.

It was suggested a note be included in the Code or the report that society does not view the rope and tie event favourably, and that other countries have banned it. This could serve as a kind of warning that regulations may come in the future. Some Committee members agreed that this would be a pragmatic approach. It was suggested that there may be more research in the future that supports regulations against calf roping.

Some Committee members indicated they would prefer a stronger approach while NAWAC has the opportunity.

Moved (V Williams / S Brown) that NAWAC recommends the ban of the rope and tie event at rodeos in New Zealand.

The motion was put: 4 in favour. Not carried.

The issue of sheep riding was then brought to the Committee. It was explained by the subcommittee that many submissions were against the practice, and many of those submitters justified a ban by arguing that it taught children the wrong way to handle and respect animals. There was some discussion over whether sheep riding may be physically bad for the animal. It was agreed that sheep riding should be removed from the Code.

It was then agreed that the use of fireworks at a rodeo should be banned.

The subcommittee then brought forward the issue of spurs and flank straps. It was noted that fully locked spurs are already banned by the industry from rodeo and partially locked are only allowed to be used on bulls. It was also noted that the riders in the events are also judged on use of spurs. The only concern with flank straps was the thicker straps on horses vs. bulls, which did not seem to be well justified. However the subcommittee tended to agree with the Rodeo Cowboys Association on the use of flank straps in general (especially as a training device).

The committee agreed that it should be recommended that all animals should be contract animals, but not a minimum standard.

It was then suggested that there should be a veterinarian on site whether another emergency is called or not (currently a vet must attend but can be called away for an emergency). Concerns were raised on the feasibility of this requirement.

Moved (V Williams / S Brown) that requiring rodeos to have a vet on site at all times should become a minimum standard.

The motion was put: carried.

The issue of calf riding was then raised. It was argued in submissions that the event is good for children to learn about animals – but some others argued that it taught children the wrong things about animal handling. There was discussion that if NAWAC deems sheep riding to be bad for animal welfare, then calf riding should also be banned (especially given that its bone structure may not be developed). However there are differences when comparing adult sheep to calves.

It was suggested the calf weight should go up to 200kg (from 150kg) however that would also essentially stop calf riding, and the Rodeo Cowboys Association considered it would be too dangerous for the kids.

C 8. Discussion with Hon Nathan Guy, Minister for Primary Industries

The Minister thanked the Committee for the opportunity to attend the meeting and for the work that they do. He mentioned the Strategy, how wide ranging and important animal welfare is (68% households have a pet and there are currently \$20 billion in animal based exports) and that it is generally well supported by stakeholders. He noted that he anticipates that animal welfare issues will only heighten over time, and that he considers the Committee very important to him and MPI in maintaining New Zealand's reputation.

The Animal Welfare Amendment Bill may be read after Budget and recess. The Minister noted the overwhelming support the Codes received in the submissions, and the Committee, and added that the regulations will be a good tool and it will be very important to get them right. The key message will be around having the tools available for all sections of the compliance triangle (VADE model).

J Hellström summarised the layer hens' discussion and actions for Hon N Guy. The Minister agreed that the option taken is pragmatic. He acknowledged that New Zealand society welcomes a change in terms of battery hens, but it is important not to cause economic difficulties and volatility (especially in low-socioeconomic groups).

J Hellström then summarised the animals in entertainment discussion, as an emerging issue that may draw the Minister's attention later in the year. Hon N Guy mentioned that he receives 1 or 2 letters a week on the jumping of horses (as the Minister of Racing). It was also noted that greyhound racing is

also an issue in Australia at the moment, and it will be good to see what they do there - the current review in New Zealand will be very interesting too. The two countries can learn from each other.

Hon N Guy then asked the Committee about their current priorities (apart from the Amendment Bill and layer hens). J Hellström summarised the status of the Dairy Housing Amendment and expressed the wish to get this resolved for the Minister. The 10 year cycle was also mentioned – for example, the Rodeos Code must be finished by the end of the year. It was then noted that the next code likely to be recommended to the Minister is the Equines Code.

It was noted that the Amendment Bill will hopefully address the 10 year deadline and means that NAWAC can concentrate their time on animal welfare issues that affect larger numbers of animals, not just those that are near a deadline – for example, the rodeos code was being debated alongside the layer hens code while there are far fewer rodeo animals than hens.

Hon N Guy then mentioned that fact that NAWAC is now boasting a portfolio of nearly 20 codes, and suggested that this could be reduced in the future. J Hellstrom acknowledged that the Committee will soon sit down and discuss the ideal number of codes that could be more generic (for example, a Pastoral Species Code).

Hon N Guy stated that the big debate to do with the Amendment Bill is the level of regulations – too many and we suffocate our industry – too little and we risk our reputation.

New Zealand therefore must protect all of these areas in order to protect its reputation:

- Biosecurity
- Food safety
- Animal welfare
- Environmental sustainability

If any of these suffer, the international media could damage New Zealand's reputation.

The problem of intensification in order to meet economic goals was then raised. This may have impacts on animal welfare and water quality. It was suggested that the key may be added value - which may even allow de-intensifying. The importance of innovation, which may result in more added value products and could allow less livestock, was acknowledged.

[Note: A Sharr arrived at this point (12:45pm) and was welcomed]

J Hellström thanked Hon Nathan Guy for coming and Hon Nathan Guy thanked the Committee for their time.

C 7. Update on animal welfare strategy and Act review

s 9(2)(a) updated the Committee on the New Zealand Animal Welfare Strategy and the Animal Welfare Amendment Bill. He handed a document to the Committee (NAWAC 46/13) and explained that the Minister is aiming to achieve all 3 readings of the Bill by the end of the year, which is very ambitious.

It was noted that the first reading debate will be very interesting, as it will give an opportunity to see the response of the other parties. Then it will hopefully be voted in and submissions, oral and written, will be accepted by the Select committee.

s 9(2)(a) outlined the current strengths of the Act: it is progressive, it enshrines the five freedoms, it is comprehensive, and it provides for public participation. The main problems currently are enforcement, clarity, and transparency.

The current enforcement toolkit was then discussed. While it may look comprehensive, it has problems: particularly that the minimum standards in the codes are not directly enforceable. Anyone on the front line finds it very hard to prosecute anything other than major 'car crash' events. More tools are needed to deal with medium to low level offending. Regulation can help – new offences may be at a lower level than the ones in the Act and MPI can implement an infringement regime (instant fines). It was stressed that an infringement regime must be created for specific offences, and they will only be created when there is extensive low-level offending that may be best dealt with in this way.

There was some concern around when a moderate issue is considered a minor or severe one; ^{s 9(2)(a)} assured the Committee that the animal welfare compliance system will not be about writing tickets. Many infringement notices should not be expected, and it is acknowledged that compliance needs to retain the hearts and minds of people - and turning people into criminals at the drop of a hat is not the way to do it.

It was then noted that the current plan for MPI compliance is to retain a core group of experienced animal welfare inspectors but perhaps to cross-train some fisheries officers to assist them with screening callouts in the future. The work load on animal welfare inspectors has increased enormously lately.

^{s 9(2)(a)} then addressed the areas of the Amendment Bill that will be clarified. These are: live animal exports (where guidelines will be replaced with regulations, and the Customs Export Prohibition Order (CEPO) will be brought from Customs to animal welfare); surgical procedures (where the classification system will be removed entirely); and ill-treatment of wild animals (it will be made clear that wilful or reckless ill-treatment is an offence).

It was explained that transparency was also an issue with the Act. To address this, in the future the criteria for delivering minimum standards will be more open, in that practicability and economic impact will be listed as considerations, and the justification for transitions and exceptions will have to be clearer. Animals used in RTT will require ethical approval to be killed (and these animals will be in usage statistics) and bred (if they have known or potentially compromised welfare).

Some of the more minor technical amendments were then covered. Of particular interest to the Committee was the removal of the 10-year review requirement and the provision that allows NAWAC not to progress a Code that another group has drafted.

^{s 9(2)(a)} explained to the Committee that the chairs of NAWAC and NAEAC should have their submissions ready by the end of June. He also described the reaction by the Ombudsman to the proposed amendment that stated that NAWAC and NAEAC meetings would no longer be subject to the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act (LGOIMA); he did not agree and the amendment did not pass, however the deputy Ombudsman did understand the issue and has provided further advice. NAWAC and NAEAC should expect to continue to have to comply with LGOIMA and state when the meetings are opened or closed.

Action: ^{s 9(2)(a)} to remind the Chairs when their submissions are due and to ensure they both have seen relevant correspondence relating to LGOIMA.

C 9. MPI update

The Committee gratefully received the MPI update (NAWAC 43/13).

Action: ^{s 9(2)(a)} to send the new OIE ISO standard to V Williams.

PART TWO (OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)

STRATEGY AND PLANNING

O 2. Standards Integration Project

s 9(2)(a) introduced MPI's Standards Integration Project (SIP) to the Committee, as outlined in NAWAC 35/13.

It was explained that as the Codes are considered a NAWAC document, not an MPI document, the Committee is being asked if they agree to have the Codes in the same style, to look part of the "standards family".

The Minister's preface may be removed from future codes, and the front sections and Introduction would be changed. For example the introduction will include these sections: background; to what and to whom this code applies to; the outcome it's trying to achieve; other relevant documents; consequences; and definitions and abbreviations. These may be pared down even further. It is also possible that the official names of the Codes may change.

There was consensus from the Committee that the most important thing is to get the information out there, and so the formatting changes suggested by MPI so far are to be accepted.

O 3. Welfare Pulse

Members suggested items as follows, due 19 July for publication in the 15 September issue:

- V Williams - an upcoming visit to the Australian Veterinary College;
- K Phillips - obesity in animals;
- A new repeating article, summarising NAWAC's latest meetings or business.

O 7. Mini tutorial

It was noted that the Wellington Zoo has an open invitation to NAWAC to hold their general meetings in their conference facilities. They could possibly lead a tutorial at such a meeting. There was general consensus that a meeting held there in August or November would be informative.

Temporary housing was another issue that members felt they could learn more about, for example through visiting a boarding kennel, vet clinic, pet shop and/or the SPCA.

Action: s 9(2)(a) to look into hosting the next NAWAC meeting at the Wellington Zoo or organising some visits to temporary housing facilities.

OTHER REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

O 4. Discussion of information circulated by MPI

The Committee noted that it appreciated the information that had been circulated, and enjoyed receiving electronic mailouts each Friday.

Some Committee members expressed concern that they were receiving their hard copy meeting papers too late.

Action: s 9(2)(a) to email future meeting papers to NAWAC at the same time as mailing them.

O 5. NAWAC Correspondence

The Chair expressed concern that he is writing correspondence on behalf of NAWAC without the members always seeing it first, and requested that members read any correspondence and advise any concerns or disagreements as soon as possible.

The Committee agreed to this and noted that there had been no problems so far, and that the correspondence being circulated is much appreciated.

O 6. Committee members' reports on recent presentations and attendance at conferences

- J Hellström and ^{s 9(2)(a)} recently talked with Wellington Zoo staff about the upcoming animals in entertainment discussion (and were reminded that Wellington Zoo do not consider themselves to be an entertainment business). Both were invited to the upcoming annual Zoo and Aquarium Association conference in Dunedin.
- J Hellström met with a company representative from First Light foods, which exports venison to the UK. A customer, Waitrose supermarket, is opposed to velvetting and wanted to meet with someone from NAWAC. J Hellström gave a talk including NAWAC's opinion on velvetting, and showed them the Deer Industry NZ video which includes a statement from NAWAC.
- K Phillips and V Williams recently attended the World Small Animal Veterinary Association (WSAVA) conference, which had a dedicated animal welfare stream that was quite well attended. Topics such as inherited defects and obesity were covered. There was also a session on pain the day before the main conference started.
- V Williams summarised the NAEAC meeting in Auckland, which included visiting Living Cell Technologies, Auckland University, Auckland Zoo, and Unitec. NAEAC also received a presentation from ^{s 9(2)(a)} on the Animal Welfare Amendment Bill. It was also noted that there are 9 Codes of Ethical Conduct up for review, so NAEAC has a meeting especially to deal with these coming up soon.
- D Nicolson attended the Invercargill District Court sentencing of two companies involved in 2010 animal welfare incidents in the south that centred on lame or poor conditioned dairy cows. He was interested to observe that the companies were fined significantly more than would have been the case if the company directors had been fined as individuals. But it also meant that no individuals have any criminal record as a consequence. D Nicolson was heartened to learn of the new compliance regime mooted at today's meeting by MPI. He believes this new style of standardised assessment will lead to significant improvement in compliance implementation and MPI relationships with animal owners.

O 1. Actions to address NAWAC strategic priorities

The Committee looked over document NAWAC 30/13, section C4, and identified the first two bullet points as items to discuss (namely: deciding when Codes are necessary to address animal welfare rather than other forms of intervention; and developing positive tools to handle urgent issues or media fallout).

The question was then asked: should NAWAC detail what is taken into account when deciding whether to utilise a code or a regulation to achieve their goals – for example, by developing an implementation framework for the Amendment Bill? This type of document could also lay out when and how NAWAC considers economics and feasibility, and how NAWAC determines priorities.

A new subcommittee was suggested to address these questions.

Action: J Hellström to go through the Amendment Bill and identify points around which new NAWAC processes will have to be developed.

Action: NAWAC to establish an 'implementation subcommittee' at the next general meeting (14 August).

Action: s 9(2)(a) to send out web-links on the Amendment Bill and its progress.

The next issue discussed was the need for NAWAC to identify future 'train-wrecks' and prepare position statements, or an approach to handle it, ahead of time if possible.

Action: At the end of each meeting, insert a new agenda item on identifying any 'public issues' raised in that meeting that could cause a challenge for NAWAC.

Questions were then raised over whether this would have to be 'closed session' item, but the suggestion was met with some disagreement. It was then suggested that there is potential to further this kind of privacy and transparency conversation in NAWAC. For example, the minutes to each meeting could go up on the website soon after each general meeting. It was noted that some parts may have to be amended to allow the Committee to continue to provide free and frank advice, especially on ongoing issues, to the Minister.

Action: Committee members to raise any concerns about the privacy or transparency of the February minutes with J Hellström as soon as possible.

Action: J Hellström, s 9(2)(a) to create an amended version of the February general meeting minutes for public release (if feasible and there are no objections).

There being no further items of business to discuss, the Chair thanked the committee members for their attendance and declared the meeting closed at 4:00pm.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

General Meeting

**14 August 2013
9:30 am – 4:00 pm**

**Archibald Centre
Wellington Zoo
200 Daniell Street, Newtown, Wellington**

MINUTES

Committee members: John Hellström (Chairperson), Kathryn Bicknell, Sue Brown, Ingrid Collins, Barbara Nicholas, Karen Phillips, David Scobie, Alan Sharr, Virginia Williams, Don Nicolson.

In attendance: s 9(2)(a)

Apologies: Apologies were received from Penny Fisher and s 9(2)(a).

Welcome: J Hellström (Chair) opened the meeting at 9:30am and welcomed attendees. s 9(2)(a) were introduced to the Committee.

Any Other Business Part One (Public Excluded Agenda):

There were no additional items of business for discussion under Part One of the Agenda.

Any Other Business Part Two (Open to the Public):

There were no additional items of business for discussion under Part Two of the Agenda.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

**PART ONE
(PUBLIC EXCLUDED AGENDA)**

DRAFT RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC
Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

There being no other introductory items of business, it was moved (J Hellström / V Williams):

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

- | | | |
|-------|--|--------------------------|
| C 1. | Confirmation of previous minutes | (J Hellström) |
| C 2. | Status of actions arising from previous meetings | (J Hellström) |
| C 3. | Codes of Welfare update | s 9(2)(a) |
| C 4. | Layer hens code of welfare | s 9(2)(a) / J Hellström) |
| C 5. | Rodeos code of welfare | (V Williams/ s 9(2)(a) |
| C 6. | Dairy housing | s 9(2)(a) |
| C 7. | Greyhounds | s 9(2)(a) / J Hellström) |
| C 8. | Update on animal welfare strategy and Act review | s 9(2)(a)) |
| C 9. | MPI update | s 9(2)(a) |
| C 10. | Summary of minutes for public release | (J Hellström / All) |

THE GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED WHILE THE PUBLIC IS EXCLUDED, THE REASON FOR PASSING THIS RESOLUTION IN RELATION TO EACH MATTER, AND THE SPECIFIC GROUNDS UNDER SECTION 48(1) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL INFORMATION AND MEETINGS ACT 1987 FOR THE PASSING OF THIS RESOLUTION ARE AS FOLLOWS:

<i>General subject of each matter to be considered</i>		<i>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</i>	<i>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</i>
C 1.	<i>Confirmation of previous minutes</i>	<i>To protect the privacy of natural persons.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(a) of the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA).</i>
C 2.	<i>Status of actions arising from previous meetings</i>	<i>As above.</i>	<i>As above.</i>
C 3.	<i>Codes of Welfare update</i>	<i>To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for</i>

General subject of each matter to be considered		Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
		employees from improper pressure or harassment.	withholding would exist under section 9(2)(g)(ii) of the OIA.
C 4.	Layer hens code of welfare	As above.	As above.
C 5.	Rodeos code of welfare	As above.	As above.
C 6.	Dairy housing	As above.	As above.
C 7.	Greyhounds	As above.	As above.
C 8.	Update on Animal Welfare Strategy and Act Review	To maintain the constitutional conventions for the time being which protect the confidentiality of advice tendered by Ministers of the Crown and officials.	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(f)(iv) of the OIA.
C 9.	MPI Update	As above.	As above.
C 10.	Summary of minutes for public release	To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(g)(ii) of the OIA.

I also move that:

s 9(2)(a)

be permitted to remain at this meeting after the public has been excluded, because of their knowledge of meeting procedure and the subject matter under discussion. This knowledge is relevant background information to assist the committee in its deliberations.

The motion was put: carried.

C 1. Confirmation of previous minutes

The draft minutes of the NAWAC general meeting on 15 May 2013 were reviewed and accepted, with the following amendment:

- Clarify the paragraph that describes D Nicolson's attendance at the sentencing of an animal welfare case (refer to bullet 5, item O6).

Moved (A Sharr / S Brown):

That, subject to the amendments agreed, the draft minutes of the NAWAC general meeting held on 15 May 2013 be adopted as a true and accurate record of that meeting.

The motion was put: carried.

C 2. Status of actions arising from previous meetings

Actions from previous meetings were reviewed and it was agreed to complete pending actions where possible, with the following exceptions:

- Remove item 1, noting that it is out of date. The implementation subcommittee will address new strategic actions when it comes to the New Zealand Animal Welfare Strategy;
- Remove item 3, noting that it is complete;
- Remove item 11, noting that it is complete;
- Items 13 and 14 will be dealt with in this meeting and can then be removed.

s 9(2)(a) then updated the Committee on progress made on item 6, which was to recommend to the Committee a way forward on developing some general pastoral farming indicators. Funding has been approved for a desktop review of some indicators. A contract is being pulled together for tender (or maybe to go to preferred provider), within 2 weeks. Proposals could be expected in 4-6 weeks. NAWAC representation for the project was requested and D Scobie expressed interest.

J Hellström addressed item 8, explaining that there has been no subcommittee meeting yet, but progress has been made nonetheless that can be discussed later in this meeting.

C 8. Update on animal welfare strategy and Act review

s 9(2)(a) updated the Committee on the New Zealand Animal Welfare Strategy and the Animal Welfare Amendment Bill.

There is an increasingly small chance that the Bill will be read before the end of the year (s 9(2)(a) offered to supply details for interested Committee members). It was noted that if the Bill is delayed that will have a major effect on NAWAC's planned work programme as the 10 year review time will still stand.

s 9(2)(a) then mentioned that s 9(2)(a) had stated, during the Psychoactive Substances Bill protests, that that he aims to push his amendment to ban animal testing into the Animal Welfare Amendment Bill.

C 10. Summary of minutes for public release

At the May 2013 meeting the Committee had decided that there was more that NAWAC could do to increase their transparency to the public (refer to item O1), for example by releasing the minutes after each meeting on the MPI website or in *Welfare Pulse*. However, as the current style of minute taking is

very detailed, an amended version would have to be created in order to protect the privacy of individuals and retain the ability for NAWAC to provide 'free and frank' advice to the Minister.

Secretary ^{s 9(2)(a)} circulated a shortened version of the May meeting minutes (61/13) prior to the meeting for NAWAC to discuss.

The Committee were happy with a one-page summary. The document cannot be called 'minutes', as they have to be confirmed by the entire committee at the next meeting.

The summary should also have the date of the next meeting on it. It should be released as soon as possible after each meeting (1-2 weeks at the latest).

Action: ^{s 9(2)(a)} to liaise with J Hellström to create summary of the August meeting for public release

C 3. Codes of Welfare update

^{s 9(2)(a)} addressed the codes of welfare update as in NAWAC 62/13:

Amendment Bill – Discussed in item C8

AW Strategy – At the Ministry for Primary Industries, the Strategy implementation is still progressing, but the steering committee is aware that if the Bill doesn't progress that will create implications to the work program. The Strategy itself will continue, but priorities may change.

The Animal Welfare Strategy and Legislation Review Project stage two (July 2013 – September 2014) plan was approved by the Steering Committee in mid-July. The work is divided into work streams: Legislation, Implementation (including the Strategy) and Communications (internal and external). The legislation workstream includes both the Bill and the regulations that will follow the Bill, and is led by ^{s 9(2)(a)}. The Implementation work stream is led by ^{s 9(2)(a)} and has been divided into 3 work packages:

- Frontline operations – led by ^{s 9(2)(a)}
- Systems and processes – led by ^{s 9(2)(a)}
- Animal Welfare Strategy - led by ^{s 9(2)(a)}

The Systems and processes work package relates to engaging with NAWAC on new systems and processes for regulations, codes of welfare and decisions on when and how to intervene on animal welfare priorities (which also requires deciding how to prioritise animal welfare issues).

^{s 9(2)(a)} requested the formation of an implementation subcommittee within NAWAC (as discussed at the last meeting, refer to item O1).

It was clarified that this subcommittee will look at planning for how to set priorities and make strategic decisions and work in a more balanced way on NAWAC's work programme, in order to better provide strategic advice to the Minister - as opposed to mostly working on Codes of Welfare. In the longer term, which is more dependent on the process of the Bill, it will look at how codes and regulations will work together and what the process will be once the Bill is passed (for example, which codes and what will they look like?) and be able to provide advice to the Minister on the Bill as it progresses and changes.

A Sharr (Chair), I Collins, K Phillips and S. Brown volunteered for the subcommittee.

Action: J Hellström and ^{s 9(2)(a)} to write a ToR for the implementation subcommittee

It was noted that it would be best if the subcommittee came back with solid recommendations at each meeting that are very action and outcome orientated. Since the main Committee meets only every 3 months, vague strategic plans are not ideal.

Layer Hens – Discussed in item C4

Dairy Cattle Housing – Discussed in item C6

Rodeos – Discussed in item C5

Equine – While it was noted that the subcommittee has been working very hard (the code is finalised and report is being drafted), the Equine item had to be bumped due to how packed the agenda has become with rodeos, dairy housing and greyhounds. Consideration of this Horses and donkeys code will be added to the November meeting for recommendation to the Minister.

Circuses and Zoos Review – An addendum to 65/13 was passed around by s.9(2)(a). It details updates to the animals in entertainment work programme.

J Hellström summarised 65/13 for the Committee. He emphasised the issue that some facilities that display animals are not members of the Zoos and Aquarium Association (ZAA), for example the hundreds of DOC approved aviaries, and may therefore be at the low end of the welfare spectrum. Especially vulnerable are domestic animals, reptiles and fish.

The other major issue raised was that the big zoos are pushing for bigger exhibits, for example, gorillas at Orana Park, or another elephant for Auckland Zoo. It was suggested that the subcommittee go to Auckland zoo and see what they are doing in terms of animal welfare. The Minister should also get some advice on elephants/gorillas in zoos in New Zealand from NAWAC before the issue takes off on its own.

It was further suggested that it would be a good idea for NAWAC members to go and look at zoos or members of ZAA in their own towns. If members make it clear that they are part of NAWAC, bring along a copy of the code, and raise that the Code is under review and submissions will be welcome, it will help get more awareness out there that all of these establishments are covered by the Zoos code already. This would work especially well at aviaries and aquariums.

It was noted that DOC is currently working on a list of aviaries licensed to display animals, including the small council-owned facilities. The ZAA has a list, and it can be circulated to NAWAC members.

Action: s.9(2)(a) to circulate a current list of ZAA members to NAWAC

Action: subcommittee to recommend to NAWAC whether to send advice to the Minister on the welfare of elephants and gorillas in captivity

Action: NAWAC members to visit their local zoos to raise awareness of the Code review

Temporary housing of companion animals – The discussion has started on what the focus of this code should be. temporary housing, or just housing? It was also noted that a housing code will cover species that are already covered by other codes - e.g. a dog in a kennel should already be covered by the Dog Code. However, the industry is heavily supporting (demanding) this code, so there is agreement that one is needed.

s 9(2)(a) and K Bicknell suggested that the Code will cover high-density housing for commercial services but should also cover pounds and shelters. Some situations are definitely temporary but some others could be considered permanent (e.g. breeders). Suggested scope includes: pet shops, breeders, vet clinics (maybe), pounds and shelters, doggy day care, boarding, catteries, and groomers.

It was noted that, of course, different facilities have different potential problems and needs. In Australia for example, there are codes of practice for each different facility - but also no general Dogs Code - and on top of that, many states in Australia have professional codes of practices run by societies and organisations.

A draft will be ready to be considered at the November meeting.

Saleyards – It was explained that this workstream hasn't moved further, mainly because there hasn't been the follow-up with the North Island industry. The MPI team is working on it.

Painful Husbandry Procedures – This programme is dependent on progress of the Bill. An Order in Council (to extend the 10-year timeframe) may be required. However, NAWAC will have to decide whether to review, rollover, or ban mulesing, among other procedures, at some point, even if the Bill doesn't go through.

Wild Animals – This will be covered at the November meeting when P Fisher is present.

C 4. Layer hens code of welfare

Paper 63/13, the summary of public submissions, was taken as read.

It was raised again that some members of NAWAC believe the Committee is setting a dangerous precedent by listening to the EPF concerns. The theme of the submissions demonstrates this belief among the public.

It was suggested that to avoid this situation again, NAWAC should be insistent that the affected party be aware of what is in the code before its release. Concern was raised how the Committee ensures that the data it relies on are correct (which was acknowledged as being difficult), and this could be better achieved by being very explicit about what NAWAC wants from the data. More precise questions could be asked. There was some disagreement, as others think that NAWAC already asked the right questions, and this kind of misunderstanding must be expected to happen sometimes. It is not until you publish the minimum standards that the industry fully understands the impact.

It was then suggested that NAWAC take a harder line with the EPF. J Hellström however noted that EPF are not the lobbyists in this situation, but the affected group, as there has not been undue pressure on the Minister from EPF. The Minister simply asked for advice, not for an amendment to the code.

It was agreed that the submissions did not have any substantive information against the proposals in the discussion document.

The SPCA, among others, believe that any rise in the price of eggs will be accepted (or at least tolerated) by consumers. In general, people agree on what will happen - in terms of price rises and farms having to close - but disagree on how bad the impacts will be.

It was clarified that the EPF did not get everything they wanted and the timeline will not be extended again, as some submissions feared. 2022 is still the final date. It was agreed that the message must be given to the industry that they need to plan their laying cycles now: it will not be changed again.

The point raised by some submitters that NAWAC should have pushed harder for the abolition of battery cages in 2005 may well be valid, but the claim that industry have had from 2005 to prepare for this change is not valid as the industry had no certainty of whether or when battery cages would be banned.

The Committee reached agreement that the 2-year option as described in the discussion document should be carried out.

It was noted that the code would have an amendment notice added to it (i.e. this is not a re-issue).

The issue of claw shortening was then brought up. J Hellström explained that from next year, birds in cages must have 550cm² per bird, up from 500cm² (refer to the 2005 code). When the farmers go from 500 to 550cm², it effectively means that a bird is taken out and moved to superior housing. However, farmers have alerted J Hellström to the fact that some farmers have the option of modifying their cages by shifting or changing the cage door to increase the floor area in the cage so that they won't have to take a bird out. This action complies with the letter of the law but not the intent. Those producers who have 'Big Dutchman' brand cages can even buy a commercial modification to their cages. Others may remove a partition to make essentially a colony cage with no enrichment but slightly more space. Some farmers are concerned about the reputation of the industry if this information gets out.

J Hellström will contact EPF to establish whether this is actually happening, and if so, warn them that NAWAC does not support this option and will not support them in the media if it comes to that.

It was also agreed that NAWAC could propose, after this current consultation, that modified cages must also have claw shortening devices added. It will potentially stop farmers from modifying their cages in this way, and NAWAC has consulted on claw-shortening devices. It was clarified that during a consultation NAWAC is able to get information from anywhere, not just formal submissions.

Moved (J Hellström / K Phillips) that:

The proposed changes to the layer hens code be made as put forward in the discussion document, with the exception that claw-shortening devices must be added to any cage that is modified.

The motion was put: carried.

The response to the submissions will be completed by the layer hens subcommittee. A report will also be drafted, but it will be based heavily on the discussion document.

Action: J Hellström to contact the EPF to update them on NAWAC's decision and to advise them that NAWAC would disavow farmers modifying their cages to circumvent the cage space requirements due in 2014.

C 5. Rodeos code of welfare

The draft rodeo code of welfare and the report (NAWAC 59/13 and 60/13) had been circulated prior to the meeting and were taken as read.

Amendments to the Code were then suggested:

- Minimum standard 8: "bull fighters" is not defined, and the term should be changed as it is misleading at the moment. It also conjures images of fighting animals, which is illegal. Another word should be found and it should be defined in the glossary.
- Minimum standard 9: "Event must not exceed 30 seconds from the release of the calf" (also see minimum standards 10 and 11). This needs to say *initial* release, i.e. from the chute.

- Section 2: statements are repeated (e.g. responsibilities under the act, first paragraph). Editing suggested.
- The recommended best practice in section 2 comes too close to telling a vet how to do their job. While it was noted that the intent of this point is to illustrate that a companion animal vet should not be working a rodeo, K Phillips pointed out that not treating species of animals you are not familiar with is already covered in the Code of Professional Conduct for Veterinarians. The point is already covered in Minimum standard 1 (c) as well. This recommended best practice should be deleted.
- In section 2.1 under responsibilities, the last sentence repeats the previous sentence. One of them isn't needed.
- The example indicator on page 12 states that horned cattle likely to be aggressive have the tips of their horns removed. Should the suggested length of the tip be longer than 2.5cm? Further, the meaning of "outer" should be clarified. It was decided to remove the indicator.
- The recommended best practice on page 12 and 13 state that horned cattle should not be used. Members of the committee considered this suggestion unrealistic, and that maybe it should state that aggressive cattle should not be used. It was decided to remove the sentence.
- On page 9, some of the recommended best practices are repeats of the example indicators and can be removed.
- Minimum standard 3 contains some repetition: (b), (c), (d), (e), should be contained under (a).
- Minimum standard 3 (k) should read "Animals must not be used if they are likely to injure themselves when placed into a chute".
- Minimum standards 4 (h) (i) (j) and (k) are repetitive and could be tidied up.
- Further, minimum standard 4(i) is not needed already covered by the Animal Welfare Act.
- Minimum standard 4 (d) should be moved under stockmanship and selection.
- Minimum standard 6 (b) and (d) could be combined as they say almost the same thing.
- Minimum standard 6 (e) could be under Handling.
- Minimum standards 9 (a) and (b) could be moved to section 4, Handling.
- Minimum standard 9 (g) has already been stated in minimum standard 3 (h).
- It was suggested that the recommended best practice about removing ropes on page 20 is already enforced under rodeo rules. ^{s 9(2)(a)} confirmed that it is not. However it should be checked whether the point has been repeated within the code.
- Minimum standard 13 (b) talks about gear, which should be covered in minimum standard 6.
- Minimum standard 14 (b), (c) and (d) could be pooled together. K Phillips suggested that if the animal cannot move, it should instantly be placed under the care of the vet and should not be moved at all. In this case, (c) and (d) could be removed.
- Minimum standard 14 (i) should be moved under the Arena section.
- Minimum standard 14 (h) could be moved under the Handling section.
- Minimum standard 15 (f) talks about how the animal could be bled out. This may not apply in practice; in the interests of the crowd, a vet would probably inject. The second to last sentence in first paragraph of the introduction on page could be removed.
- The question was then raised over whether anyone would use a firearm at a rodeo. It was confirmed that yes, sometimes one is used. However it was suggested that the acceptable methods for euthanasia be rearranged so that intravenous injection is first on the list, followed by captive bolt.

- The last paragraph of the general information should be removed (out of date).
- Move Appendix I to be included under the section Emergency Humane Destruction.
- In section 9, the term 'welfare assurance system' should be used throughout, as opposed to 'quality management schemes'.
- Any other small errors in spelling or grammar should be sent straight to § 9(2)(a).

It was noted that there is a lot of repetitiveness in the whole document. This will require editing, but it was also pointed out that sometimes statements have to be repeated because people don't read the whole document at once; therefore, if it is related to two sections, it gets put in two sections.

Moved: (V Williams / S Brown)

That, subject to the amendments agreed at this meeting, the Rodeos Code of Welfare be recommended to the Minister.

The motion was put: carried.

Code report

The first point raised in relation to the code report was that, since contract calves are used multiple times and only for a short while, the statistics on the number of injuries in rodeos (section 18) becomes quite misleading. If calves on farms had the same chance of being injured, it wouldn't be acceptable. The last sentence of this section should be changed to acknowledge that NAWAC has made changes to the code in order to reduce these injury statistics even further.

Concern was raised that the recommendation that only contract animals are used is not policed and is therefore ineffective. However, it was noted that this recommendation may become a requirement in the future. With this recommendation, hopefully the number of contract animals will increase to where it is practical to require them to be used at all times.

There was some concern that the report or Code does not specifically ban sheep, but simply doesn't mention them. There was some disagreement with this, as it was pointed out that minimum standard 3 (i) states that only horses and cattle may be used in rodeo events. It was suggested that (i) be moved up to (a) to make it more prominent. It was also noted that the minimum standard and report has to phrase the minimum standard this way, rather than by exclusion, such as "no sheep may be used" - because then the standard would also have to say "no sheep, bison, ostriches, monkeys...."

In general, NAWAC considers that sheep should never be ridden, and so this will have to be considered under animals in entertainment. At the moment they still may be ridden at certain events (e.g. school days, A&P shows).

C 6. Dairy housing

Paper 64/13, the draft discussion document, had been circulated to NAWAC the week prior. The Committee was required to give its views on this document, as the dairy subcommittee was scheduled to meet with industry following this meeting.

§ 9(2)(a) summarised the situation so far for the Committee. A pre-consultation document (i.e. the main principles) was released out to target groups (NZVA, SPCA, Fed Farmers, dairy sector). DairyNZ is worried that NAWAC is not supportive of permanent housing.

[Secretariat note: Submissions from the pre-consultation are available to NAWAC. Please ask § 9(2)(a).]

They now have a draft copy of the proposed minimum standards and they know that NAWAC will be discussing 64/13 and coming back to them next week ('they' includes DairyNZ, Fed Farmers, and the NZVA). It was noted that some stakeholders did not have a view on permanent housing before this and are gathering their own information at the moment.

The key issue to consider here is whether cows should be able to be managed off-pasture permanently, or whether NAWAC considers that they should be allowed access to the outdoors, or a 'break' from the system. Of course, there are welfare pros and cons for each option. It should be considered whether access to the outdoors is an ethical concern.

It was noted that those who setup these housing units are often brought here by international stakeholders and there is a cultural clash. New Zealanders expect to see cows outside.

Waste management was raised, and it was explained that ammonia levels are covered under the proposed minimum standards. Further, the original standards proposed were very prescriptive and have since been pared down to more outcome-based, so it is not desirable to move back to more prescriptive standards.

Clarification was then sought over what these systems do better than pastoral systems – is it solely an economic gain? It was explained that there are also some welfare advantages: protection from cold, close supervision, precision feeding. Environmental factors are also a factor (effluent management, feed efficiency). Stockmanship and management is key to achieving good animal welfare outcomes, regardless of system. There are problems with housing and there are strengths with housing; but it is possible to get very good outcome with an indoor system.

In any case, it was accepted that dairy housing is happening already. NAWAC must form a view on these systems; the Committee needs to ensure the welfare of these cows too.

D Scobie talked of his trip to a well-known free stall barn operation in South Canterbury. When he visited, the cows were outside for calving and they were 'knee-deep in mud'. Therefore, saying that 'they are outside 3 months a year' is not inherently good. What is the condition of the paddocks? How much space do they have?

It was explained by ^{s9(2)(a)} that the idea to insert a new standard that cows outside the housing system must be in a clean dry space to calve has already been discussed; but this is not already a requirement for pastorally kept cows, which poses a problem. It must be acknowledged, however, that to let cows out to bad paddocks may be worse to their welfare than keeping them inside.

V Williams raised a concern that NAWAC is running to catch up. This was a problem with pigs and poultry, in that they intensified before it was a problem, and now de-intensifying is a huge effort. Grazing animals should be able to graze: it is one of the five freedoms. Even if their needs can be met indoors, it should be considered whether a cow need access to the outdoors, the grass, the blue sky - is it an ethical issue, or maybe even a marketing one?

It was noted that only a few years ago, there was huge push-back for the Mackenzie Basin proposal: back then, even Fonterra and Prime Minister John Key spoke out against it. There was fear for 'Brand New Zealand'. Now, this outcry has subsided. The country no longer has small farms. Dairy is an established industrial practice in NZ with a major market.

Further, pastorally kept cows are burning out, some farmers can't feed them properly, the pastures are pugged, and the herds have to walk too far. It was questioned whether our current method of dairy farming is even sustainable in the long term. Is it right that we keep cows on such a metabolic knife-

edge that we cannot feed them unless they're housed? It was agreed that these ethical issues are important but part of a larger discussion about dairy cows in general, not just housing.

s 9(2)(a) stated that there is no definitive research to say that cows cannot have good welfare if you keep them indoors for their whole life. However it was pointed out by K Phillips that the EFSA has come to the conclusion that if dairy cows are not kept on pasture for part of the year, there is increased risk of lameness, dystocia, and mastitis.

However, even in the absence of evidence, NAWAC is required to hold a position. It was suggested that the public's position would probably be, if you don't know either way, to keep them in paddocks.

It was explained that in general the view from the farmer groups – Federated Farmers and DairyNZ – is that 'we should be able to house cows all the time if we want to (as long as we meet the Code of Welfare)'. s 9(2)(a) has started a conversation within NZVA on intensification and how the country will present itself in the face of housing and intensification.

It was noted that these conversations will lead to standardisation of the housing of dairy cows which will be welcomed. On the other hand, this conversation could finally blow out into putting a spotlight on the current poor welfare of some dairy practices in New Zealand.

There is also the problem that, if stockmanship is key in these systems, can it even be ensured that the New Zealand workforce will be able to manage indoor dairy farms? This would require a more skilled workforce than the current dairy milkers. There was some disagreement over whether this is an industry problem or a government one.

The stocking density of these barns in another issue: it was suggested that the standard should be very clear and prescriptive. However, there are problems with putting a grass herd into a house with fixed-size stalls. The cows vary in size and some cows rub against the bars and cannot lie down. One standard may not fit all.

The Committee was reminded that they must reach an agreement, and it comes down to: will NAWAC oppose permanent housing, or will the Committee find a way to release minimum standards that increase the welfare of housed cows? It was agreed that NAWAC will go with the ideas in the discussion document. No member is uncomfortable if NAWAC's view is not totally opposed to permanent housing.

The discussion document will be useful to engage with the community as well. A public meeting was suggested. J Hellström will raise the idea at the meeting with industry - if they are running their own seminars and so on, maybe it would be easier for NAWAC to attend theirs.

The issue of bedding was raised. In light of recent research of river stones as a substrate for keeping calves, D Scobie stated that cows should not be expected to sit on concrete or stones. J Hellström agreed that cows are heavier, lie down for longer, and so stones are not suitable (though no one has done a study). In any case, the studies on the use of river stones for calves are already causing unease in the animal welfare community without bringing cows into it.

Moved (J Hellström / I Collins)

That, subject to small changes from the scheduled meeting with industry, NAWAC goes out to consultation based on this discussion document (64/13). Significant changes will require re-approval outside of session.

The motion was put: carried.

[Secretariat note: during this item, at 2:00pm, § 9(2)(a) arrived and was introduced to the Committee. Please refer to item O3 for the discussion. At 3:45pm the Committee thanked § 9(2)(a) for his time and continued from C7.]

C 7. Greyhounds

In March 2013 the Greyhound Protection League presented a petition, signed by 1,590 people, on the welfare of greyhounds to the Government Administration Select Committee. The presentation to the Select Committee raised concerns that greyhounds surplus to or injured through racing are euthanised en masse, and that racing conditions put greyhounds at unnecessary risk of injury or death.

In January 2013 Greyhound Racing New Zealand (GRNZ) commissioned an independent review into the industry. It was released on 19 July and the Minister sent NAWAC a letter (53/13) on the same day, requesting advice on the recommendations in the report (54/13), which include addressing over breeding and euthanasia in the industry, creating minimum standards for greyhound racing, and a formal liaison between NAWAC and the New Zealand Greyhound Racing Association (NZGRA) in order to improve the industry's animal welfare governance.

NAWAC has a full schedule, and greyhounds are not currently at the top of the priority list, although it was noted that our current primary industries Minister is also Minister of Racing.

The biggest issue raised in the letter is that of over breeding and euthanasia. That's a big ethical issue that also applies to horses, layer hens and many other animals in New Zealand.

A new subcommittee was suggested, but it was decided that NAWAC's expert on greyhound welfare, P Fisher, would be added to the animals in entertainment subcommittee so that the group can address greyhound issues specifically.

C 9. MPI update

The Committee gratefully received the MPI update (NAWAC 56/13).

One question was raised over the new appointment process for NAWAC members. New appointments will be open to public application from next year. D Nicholson asked whether the balance of skill sets will still be required across NAWAC (e.g. veterinary expertise, commercial use of animals, ethical standards or animal welfare advocacy). J Hellström clarified that yes, the range of skills required by the Animal Welfare Act for NAWAC will still stand. Advertisements will have to be very specific in order to replace each member.

**PART TWO
(OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)**

STRATEGY AND PLANNING

O 1. Actions to address NAWAC strategic priorities

Transparency - Addressed in item C10

Implementation subcommittee - Addressed in item C3

O 2. Welfare Pulse

Members suggested items as follows, due mid-late October for publication in the December issue:

- § 9(2)(a) - Animal welfare accreditation scheme for ZAA;
- § 9(2)(a) and J Hellström – Dairy housing;
- § 9(2)(a) and J Hellström – Summary of NAWAC meeting;
- P Fisher and § 9(2)(a) – Wild animals.

OTHER REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

O 3. Mini-tutorial: Wellington Zoo

§ 9(2)(a)

showed NAWAC a new welfare monitoring system that is currently being trialled.

§ 9(2)(a) described the aims of the zoo and the ZAA accreditation committee in terms of creating positive welfare states in their animals. The focus is being placed on the carrot rather than the stick, and the program aims to go beyond minimum standards – so their 'bottom level' will be equivalent to NAWAC's recommended best practices.

At the moment there is only a general checklist in order to give a zoo their animal welfare accreditation. In the future, there will be specifications for specific species, especially for the elephants, the cetaceans, the pinnipeds, the apes, and so on. Hopefully one day every species held will have at least one positive welfare standard specific to them.

The accreditation is simple: it should only take half an hour per exhibit. A zoo the size of Wellington Zoo therefore could be assessed in a day and a half. The idea is that all species with their own specifications (initially 12, but that will increase with each cycle of checks) are always checked and the others are randomly selected. A pilot of this process is being launched at the moment, beginning with 5 institutions.

Copies of the checklist and a summary of the aims of the ZAA Accreditation and Animal Welfare Committee were passed around for NAWAC [69/13], and feedback was sought.

It was pointed out that the mental domain of the five freedoms is not part of the checklist. § 9(2)(a) explained that this is because, based on § 9(2)(a) work, it is thought that if you meet the first four physical domains the mental will also be met. It is also very difficult to measure the mental domain. However, future species specific assessments may include mental aspects (e.g. chimpanzees).

Whether or not the checklist document went out for consultation was then raised. It was confirmed that it didn't, but it is hoped that the pilot program will generate feedback from the member institutions.

It was then explained that a single fail on any species means that the zoo will fail their accreditation. What happens next depends of the severity of the failure. Failing to meet legislative requirements, for example, would go straight to the board and the government would be informed. The member may be expelled from the ZAA. All failures will receive technical advice to improve their rating.

The number of member zoos in New Zealand was then clarified, as not all zoos are members. In New Zealand, the ZAA has about 20 members. To be a member of ZAA has many benefits: the key one being easier access to animals. Every single ZAA member will be required to be part of this welfare program.

Desktop reviews of the policies and procedures involved have been completed for every member (e.g. what they would do if they had to close down for a few days). Each assessment cycle will be 3 years, in which every member is assessed (hopefully including new members as they join). The assessment tool will not change in this time and will only be up for review between cycles.

The key point from ^{s 9(2)(a)} is that welfare is the most important thing that Wellington Zoo does. Without it, everything else will fail: the visitors will stop, therefore no conservation or education is possible. Animal welfare should be the basis of every zoo operation.

The Committee was then shown some of the zoo invertebrates in "HeroHQ", along with Smiley the tortoise. These animals are used for contact with visitors. How their welfare is managed - including the fact that the keepers will judge their personalities - was explained by ^{s 9(2)(a)} and the keepers.

At 3:45 the Committee returned to the Archibald Room, thanked ^{s 9(2)(a)} for his time, and finished their discussion of closed items C7 and C9 before moving on to the other open items.

O 4. Discussion of information circulated by MPI

The Committee agreed that they appreciated the information that had been circulated.

O 5. NAWAC Correspondence

There were no comments on recent correspondence received by or sent on behalf of NAWAC.

O 6. Committee members' reports on recent presentations and attendance at conferences

As part of the animals in entertainment work programme, J Hellström and ^{s 9(2)(a)} attended the ZAA conference, a meeting with DOC, and a meeting at Melbourne Zoo. These meetings are detailed in document 65/13.

V Williams attended the NZVA conference. It had a focus on Food safety, animal welfare and biosecurity, so there was lots of MPI presence. It was an excellent conference. There was a broad 'One Health' concept – including antibiotic resistance, welfare, disease and so on. The conference doubled as a celebration of 50 years of vet education. V Williams also attended the ANZCVS science week in Australia.

The NAEAC meeting was held over two days, 13 and 14 August, which included a strategic planning day. The second day was held at the Royal Society and included a liaison meeting with ANZCCART.

D Scobie reported on the AgResearch shift, the key point for NAWAC being that the animal welfare and behaviour group will move from Ruakura to Massey. The work produced from the group may slow during this time.

§ 9(2)(a) recently attended a seminar on the Primary Industries Capability Alliance (PICA), an organisation promoting integrated career development pathways among New Zealand's youth.

§ 9(2)(a) attended the Road Transport Forum on 12 July. There was considerable discussion on the New Zealand Livestock Transport Assurance (NZLTA) programme, which came into effect on 5 July.

§ 9(2)(a) also attended the annual pork industry conference and producers appreciated having an MPI animal welfare presence there.

§ 9(2)(a), a veterinary adviser for DEFRA in the UK, visited MPI and gave a seminar titled "*Developing fit for purpose risk-based selection of on farm welfare inspections with limited resources – lessons learned!*" [Secretariat note: Please ask § 9(2)(a) if you are interested in seeing the PowerPoint].

Matthew Stone chaired the 2013 EU/NZ Animal Welfare Cooperation Forum, also attended by § 9(2)(a). The agreement on NZ equivalence to EC 1099/2009 (animal welfare at slaughter) was finalised and minuted.

0 7. Identifying potential public issues

There were no potential public issues to discuss.

Closing:

Departing member D Nicolson was thanked for his significant contribution and wished well for the future.

There being no further items of business to discuss, the Chair thanked the committee members for their attendance and declared the meeting closed at 4:00pm.

Next meeting: 13 November 2013

General Meeting

13 November 2013
9:40 am – 4:00 pm

Rooms 8.2 and 8.3
Pastoral House, 25 The Terrace
Wellington

MINUTES

Committee members: Karen Phillips (Deputy Chair), Kathryn Bicknell, Sue Brown, Katie Milne, Barbara Nicholas, David Scobie, Alan Sharr, Virginia Williams.

In attendance: s 9(2)(a) (Manager, Animal Welfare Standards), s 9(2)(a) (Technical Adviser, Animal Welfare Standards), s 9(2)(a) (Policy Analyst, Animal Welfare Policy), s 9(2)(a) (Manager, Animal Welfare Policy), s 9(2)(a) (Manager, Animal Welfare Standards) and s 9(2)(a) (Secretary).

Apologies: Ingrid Collins, John Hellström, Penny Fisher. B Nicolas had to leave early at 2pm.

Welcome: K Phillips (Deputy Chair) opened the meeting at 9:40am and welcomed attendees.

Katie Milne was introduced and welcomed to the committee.

Any Other Business Part One (Public Excluded Agenda)

There were no additional items of business for discussion under Part One of the Agenda.

Any Other Business Part Two (Open to the Public)

There were no additional items of business for discussion under Part Two of the Agenda.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

**PART ONE
(PUBLIC EXCLUDED AGENDA)**

DRAFT RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC
Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

There being no other introductory items of business, it was moved (K Phillips / V Williams):

I move that the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

- C 1. Confirmation of previous minutes (K Phillips)
- C 2. Status of actions arising from previous meetings (K Phillips)
- C 3. Codes of Welfare update (s 9(2)(a))
- C 4. Horses and donkeys code of welfare (K Phillips/ s 9(2)(a))
- C 5. Animal Welfare Amendment Bill update (s 9(2)(a))
- C 6. Systems review subcommittee update (A Sharr)
- C 7. MPI update (s 9(2)(a))

THE GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED WHILE THE PUBLIC IS EXCLUDED, THE REASON FOR PASSING THIS RESOLUTION IN RELATION TO EACH MATTER, AND THE SPECIFIC GROUNDS UNDER SECTION 48(1) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL INFORMATION AND MEETINGS ACT 1987 FOR THE PASSING OF THIS RESOLUTION ARE AS FOLLOWS:

<i>General subject of each matter to be considered</i>		<i>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</i>	<i>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</i>
C 1.	<i>Confirmation of previous minutes</i>	<i>To protect the privacy of natural persons.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(a) of the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA).</i>
C 2.	<i>Status of actions arising from previous meetings</i>	<i>As above.</i>	<i>As above.</i>
C 3.	<i>Codes of Welfare update</i>	<i>To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(g)(ii) of the OIA.</i>
C 4.	<i>Horses and donkeys code of welfare</i>	<i>As above.</i>	<i>As above.</i>
C 5.	<i>Animal Welfare Amendment Bill update</i>	<i>To maintain the constitutional conventions for the time being which protect the confidentiality of</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for</i>

General subject of each matter to be considered		Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
		advice tendered by Ministers of the Crown and officials.	withholding would exist under section 9(2)(f)(iv) of the OIA.
C 6.	Systems review subcommittee update	To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment..	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(g)(ii) of the OIA.
C 7.	MPI Update	To maintain the constitutional conventions for the time being which protect the confidentiality of advice tendered by Ministers of the Crown and officials.	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(f)(iv) of the OIA.

I also move that:

s 9(2)(a)



be permitted to remain at this meeting after the public has been excluded, because of their knowledge of meeting procedure and the subject matter under discussion. This knowledge is relevant background information to assist the committee in its deliberations.

The motion was put: carried.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

C 1. Confirmation of previous minutes

The draft minutes of the NAWAC general meeting on 14 August 2013 were reviewed and accepted, with the following amendments:

- Change the date in the confirmation of previous minutes to May (refer to page 4, item C1);
- Add 'species of' before 'animals you're not familiar with' (refer to page 9, item C5);
- V William's trip to Australia was for ANZCVS Science week (refer to page 16, item O6);
- Clarify some details of the NAEAC meeting. There was a liaison meeting with ANZCCART when NAEAC was at the Royal Society on the second day (refer to page 16, item O6).

Moved (A Sharr / S Brown):

That, subject to the amendments agreed, the draft minutes of the NAWAC general meeting held on 14 August 2013 be adopted as a true and accurate record of that meeting.

The motion was put: carried.

C 2. Status of actions arising from previous meetings

Actions from previous meetings were reviewed and it was agreed to complete pending actions where possible, with the following exceptions:

- Item 1, guidelines for testing traps, will be postponed to next meeting. However it was noted that the glueboards workshop is progressing. Glueboards are to be phased out by 2015 by Order in Council, with some exceptions for food factories. A workshop will be held for those groups who are struggling with the shift so MPI can discuss some alternatives;
- Remove item 2, noting that it is complete;
- Item 3 will be dealt with later in this meeting and can then be removed;
- Remove item 7, noting that it is complete;
- Alter item 10, noting that it is partially complete. The committee was also informed that TV3's 3rd degree programme will soon do a story on greyhounds. The main welfare issues are doping and injuries on the track, otherwise it will cover ethical issues e.g. wastage.

C 3. Codes of Welfare update

^{s 9(2)(a)} addressed the codes of welfare update as in NAWAC 83/13:

Amendment Bill – Discussed in item C5.

Systems Review – Discussed in item C6.

Layer Hens – The amendment notice is with the Minister and ^{s 9(2)(a)} has been busy doing briefings for his office. ^{s 9(2)(a)} noted that the Minister was at Mainland that day, looking at a colony system.

It was explained that the Minister would like to have a discussion with the industry on reporting back on progress out of cages. This is because there is a lot of concern about pushing back the date and how it will look to members of the public. The farmers will be required to report progress against annual milestones in order to get the Minister's approval for the amendment. So far the Egg Producers Federation has been positive.

Committee members asked about the farm and § 9(2)(a) clarified that Mainland is a good one to visit as they have over 30% of the egg market and already have a colony cage house up and running. They also have cages and a free range farm nearby. They have been able to put forward the money to switch over quickly – Farmer Brown already sells 'colony laid' eggs. Members could work through MPI or go directly to § 9(2)(a) of the EPF and ask for a visit to a local farm.

The amendment, therefore, is looking positive to be issued this year. It was explained that the Minister is taking it to Cabinet. Although he doesn't have to, he wants the support.

Questions were raised about who the farmers will report to and how the pressure will be kept on. The commitment to report, though, is ultimately to the Minister for Primary Industries. It was confirmed that NAWAC will look at the suggested milestones before they're given out. It was suggested that it could be in the agenda once a year to assess those milestones. It was also noted that if the process is quite public, the transparency will increase the pressure, as well as trust in the industry if done right.

Dairy Cattle Housing – The housing amendment is out for consultation. There have been approximately 1400 submissions so far (most from a Greens e-card).

It was noted by some members that the media has been mixed up about the issue e.g. K Phillips has been asked if all cows are going to have to be housed. People are also immediately thinking 'factory farming'. J Hellström's message, trying to clarify the issue, has been appreciated by the MPI Communications team and has helped somewhat. It was also noted that some are confused about cattle housing vs. HerdHomes (the brand) vs. covered feed pads... and so on. The term HerdHomes has become synonymous with dairy housing, although NAWAC has been avoiding using the brand name.

Another dairy housing meeting will be held next year after submissions are collected.

K Milne volunteered to fill D Nicolson's place on the subcommittee.

Rodeos – The updated code is with the Minister, but with the Amendment Bill going on nothing has happened yet. It looks like the code won't be issued before the end of the rodeo season. It was noted that this is not a major welfare concern since the subcommittee had been working with the industry groups and most rodeos are already being run to the proposed rules.

Equine – Discussed in item C4.

Circuses and Zoos Review – The subcommittee couldn't meet before December. § 9(2)(a) and J Hellström, however, were able to visit Auckland Zoo (it was noted that there would be a write-up soon). The main focus of that visit was their elephant, Burma. At the time of their visit J Hellström had already made a statement about how some animals shouldn't be in zoos, with elephants in mind. The subcommittee may recommend sending a letter to the Minister about the issue as well (refer to action list).

However, the Zoo is already very far through the process of importing another elephant. The way they work with Burma (an Indian elephant) is by making sure there are a lot of people there all the time; people are her herd. During their visit, § 9(2)(a) and J Hellström spent a lot of time with Burma but also looked at some other areas, especially the aviary and native birds and animal encounters.

The next subcommittee meeting (apart from S Brown who sends her apologies) will be at Orana Park on 5th December. V Williams had expressed interest in coming to visit as well and the invitation to attend was extended to other committee members who live nearby.

Temporary housing of companion animals – K Bicknell and § 9(2)(a) have been doing a lot of work on revising this code. The subcommittee will also meet during the lunch break to agree how to progress next. However much of this will depend on the 2014 work plan. It was explained that this has been a tough code because the minimum standards and information overlap so many other codes.

Saleyards – § 9(2)(a) has done some work on preparing an initial draft but it hasn't gone any further. The North Island meeting with the saleyards industry still has not progressed (because MPI staff member § 9(2)(a) has been on sick leave) but § 9(2)(a) is planning to meet with one industry representative anyway.

Painful Husbandry Procedures – Linked in closely with the Amendment Bill and future regulations. Awaiting 2014 work plan.

Wild Animals – This will be covered at the February meeting when P Fisher is present. Glueboards had been discussed earlier.

C 5. Animal Welfare Amendment Bill update

§ 9(2)(a) was welcomed to the meeting. He updated the Committee on the progress of the Animal Welfare Amendment Bill, including some of the issues raised so far in the submissions and what kind of functions NAWAC may have to take on if it passes.

There were 1700 submissions. The MPI Policy team, along with § 9(2)(a) from Standards, are putting together an issues report for the Primary Production Select Committee. In the New Year, probably early February, there will be a final departmental report. From there, the Select Committee makes its decisions on any changes to the Bill and passes this back to parliament. The Bill will then be debated for a second time, before going through a committee of the whole House who will debate the bill part by part. Opposition members may wish to promote specific changes at this point and the house will vote on them case-by-case. Then the Bill gets read a third time to be made into law.

While it was hoped that will all be done before the election next year, it was noted that this timeline is going to be a bit tight. If it doesn't get through, all legislation that is before Parliament remains there through the election and then the incoming government can make a decision on how to proceed.

§ 9(2)(a) reported that the idea at the moment is that NAWAC will lead on all regulations. This is because of concern that if regulations are led by the Minister of the day, it would politicise the regulations too much. There have been a few concerns about the relationship that NAWAC has with MPI; therefore it must be ensured that NAWAC keeps its independence.

Some of the main issues raised by submitters were then discussed. § 9(2)(a) explained that virtually all the submitters support the *intent* of the Bill (enforceability, transparency and clarity). As well as that, right across the board, people think NAWAC is important and essential.

- Enforcement - some stakeholders are concerned about the new compliance order powers. It could be perceived as effectively making the codes of welfare enforceable through a back door route.
- Live animal exports - there is a lot of support for regulations on live animal export. However, many submitters want to go further and for trade for slaughter to be absolutely banned in the Act.
- Significant surgical procedures - the Veterinary Council and the New Zealand Veterinary Association want significant surgical procedures explicitly defined. At the moment, each

procedure is significant or not depending on evolving practices. There are problems with making a definition – for example, you may capture too many and then have a massive list of exemptions. You may also miss some. At the moment the thought is to suggest to the Select Committee that a set of ‘checks’ be written so that a procedure can be easily categorised as they come up.

- Transitions and exemptions – there is a lot of concern here. It is not so much about the concept of a transition, but around the fact that they can be made indefinite. The only examples of this in action at the moment are primarily the religious slaughter and maybe farrowing crates (since there is no commercial alternative). It was also noted that the exemptions would still have to be reviewed each 10 years - but not necessarily changed. There is some thinking going on about changing this clause.
- Collecting evidence - when inspectors go onto a property they would be able to take video and pictures. There is concern about SPCA inspectors going onto farms and perhaps stepping across a boundary that the industry sees as belonging to MPI. Also, if the evidence is collected, it could be released under the Official Information Act and damage reputations (however, it was noted that the Official Information Act already has provisions around this scenario). The other issue is the sharing of information around investigations. The industry would like a heads up when the inspector is going to launch an investigation so that they can support the farmer and manage the industry’s reputation. In MPI’s view, the farmer’s information is private; there may be commercial repercussions in sharing any information. Also, until the investigator checks everything out, what is being reported may not even be a breach of the Act.

§ 9(2)(a) then outlined NAWAC’s new responsibilities if the Bill passes.

- Regulations: In the future, NAWAC will have the ability to consider whether minimum standards should be made into mandatory and enforceable regulations. So for example, when NAWAC consults on a Code, it will also consult on the proposed regulations. Then the Minister will receive recommendations and take the regulations through cabinet as per the normal process for regulations.

Therefore, NAWAC will need more support from MPI; regulations have more internal process than Codes since they set out penalties. § 9(2)(a) will have to work with NAWAC to increase the secretarial support for NAWAC.

- Animals in the Wild: The Bill clarifies that ill-treatment of animals in the wild is definitely an offence – but hunting and fishing is not. The wording is that ‘generally accepted’ practices are OK. And of course, stakeholders are asking “what is generally accepted?”

NAWAC will be in charge of developing guidelines around acceptable practice in hunting and fishing.

§ 9(2)(a) also updated the Committee on the layer hens amendment.

The Minister is leaning toward accepting NAWAC’s recommendations but he wants to place more pressure on the industry to move forward quickly. He wants industry to make specific yearly milestones and reports on those, and to make the reports public. The Committee was pleased that the milestones will be public as that will increase pressure. It was also acknowledged that MPI and NAWAC will have to keep applying pressure themselves to ensure the industry meets these milestones.

The industry has committed to come back by the 15th November with suggested milestones. § 9(2)(a) has also been working on what MPI will recommend additionally to those. Some examples

given were: how many new sheds have you built? How many resource consent applications have you made? How many cage conversions?

s 9(2)(a) asked the Committee how they would like to be involved with the process. It was decided that, via s 9(2)(a), MPI will liaise with the existing layer hens subcommittee.

Action: s 9(2)(a) to update the layer hens subcommittee with progress on industry milestones

C 6. Systems review subcommittee update

The minutes from the systems review subcommittee meeting (82/13) were taken as read. A Sharr summarised the meeting and the 'prioritisation matrix' for the Committee.

s 9(2)(a) agreed that it would be a good idea to attend their next meeting in order to discuss codes of welfare vs. regulations in the future.

There was some discussion about the suggested process for writing regulations. s 9(2)(a) clarified that the actual regulation writing is done by specialised staff at the Parliamentary Council Office. NAWAC/MPI will only be making proposals for regulation. However, MPI can provide some guidelines on proposals. It was also clarified that NAWAC can give their view on the level of penalty for breaching a regulation; however the staff at the Parliamentary Council Office will also be comparing the level of punishment to offences to make sure it makes sense, is legal etc.

The four groups of regulations will be:

Care and conduct (to support codes of welfare);
Surgical procedures and painful husbandry;
Live animal exports; and
Research, testing and teaching.

Live export will probably be first as this area is seen to have the most supporting documentation already. The last will be research, testing and teaching as the Animal Ethics Committees will need more time to incorporate new practices – research proposals are submitted years in advance. For the two others, the order hasn't been decided.

It was agreed that major decisions on NAWAC's priorities will have to be made by February and therefore the February meeting will be key in developing a work plan for 2014. It was suggested that there should be some initial thinking before the meeting (with the systems review subcommittee) and a briefing paper could be developed. At the February meeting, a workshop space would be allocated.

Action: Systems review subcommittee to develop a briefing paper or draft work plan

Action: s 9(2)(a) to add a 'workshop' for 2014 work plan to the February meeting agenda

It was also suggested that NAWAC should invite the Minister to more meetings – and rather than the Minister presenting to us, NAWAC presents to him in a proactive way.

The prioritisation matrix idea was then raised for discussion:

1. It was noted that in analysing the degree of suffering, the time of suffering is lost (e.g. painful husbandry procedures are acute but high pain; dairy housing chronic and low) and this is a key component in degree of suffering. V Williams noted that NAEAC deals with this issue in that their impact measure includes the time of suffering. V Williams has access to a lot of literature on the subject (for example, refer to the A-E grading in "Animal Use Statistics" on the MPI website), but ultimately, it's still subjective. The subcommittee explained that it did include time of suffering in their thinking, but not quite as formally as NAEAC might have.

2. It was noted that politics and news also affects prioritisation. For example, the issue of animal shelter may be low until there's a snow storm.

The basic idea of the prioritisation matrix was accepted, but it was agreed that it should be refined; since NAWAC is working on transparency it will at some point be available to the public.

Action: Systems review subcommittee to refine the prioritisation process

It was then suggested that NAWAC should begin work on their work plan today. K Phillips asked the Committee: How do you feel about the proposed list of priorities?

There was some discussion on the circled priorities: breeding, fish farming, shade and shelter, social needs of animals, and wildlife.

It was noted that because the concept of codes may be under review, any work is not a "code" program – it's an issues program. For example the saleyards subcommittee may come up with a code, or they may tackle the issue in another way.

Action: s 9(2)(a) to send saleyard code draft to saleyards subcommittee

Education was also raised by K Milne. For example, how do new lifestyle farmers know about their obligations under the Animal Welfare Act? It was acknowledged that this can be a problem. After all, how many cat and dog owners have a copy of the relevant code? There are some groups that distribute this info – veterinary offices, the SPCA, species associations and clubs, etc. However it is a gap that may need some work.

Animals in entertainment were then discussed. While not considered a top priority in terms of numbers of animals affected and degree of suffering, this is a political issue, and the Minister may request the work from NAWAC anyway.

The 5 priorities were listed and voted on, as there were too many to work on in 2014. Each member had two votes. Breeding, wildlife and shelter came out with the most votes (6, 5 and 5 respectively).

The two regulations that need to be prioritised (surgical procedures and care and conduct) were then voted on separately to decide which one to do first. Surgical procedures were seen as affecting fewer animals but a shorter work program and therefore perhaps easier starting point.

Surgical procedure regulations was voted for 5-3.

Education and awareness was then raised as a key issue – these new priority issues aren't necessarily for codes – instead, the subcommittees must ask themselves: what do we recommend to the Minister? What can we do proactively? Can we change attitudes?

For example, shade and shelter may not be dealt with best under a minimum standard turned into a regulation. Raising awareness could be a better approach. If this is the case, NAWAC needs to put in the work and recommend that to the Minister proactively.

It was agreed that the three new groups would develop new work programs as a test. While it was noted that they wouldn't get very far by February, it was thought that they could each come back and report on their progress to the Committee at the next meeting.

New subcommittees were then assigned.

- Breeding – V Williams (Chair), K Milne, and K Phillips. s 9(2)(a) as MPI contact.

- Wildlife – D Scobie (Chair) P Fisher, A Sharr, and S Brown. s 9(2)(a) as MPI contact.
- Shelter – B Nicholas (Chair), K Bicknell, I Collins. s 9(2)(a) as MPI contact.

See Appendix One for a list of all subcommittees as at November 2013.

Action – s 9(2)(a) to send out subcommittee memberships (including already established subcommittees)

Action: 3 new subcommittees to report back in February with ideas to progress their work program

C 7. MPI update

The Committee gratefully received the MPI update (NAWAC 81/13).

There was some discussion about how large the MPI bobby calf project is, as it is perceived as an issue that could 'blow up'. It was clarified that there has been real improvement and change in the industry. However, death percentage is still being used as the exclusive indicator of welfare and that should be changed. It was also noted that hopefully, the accepted age for transport will be increased from 4 days over time. MPI already doesn't specifically state '4 days' on purpose - instead it offers indicators for a fit and healthy calf.

C 4. Horses and donkeys code of welfare

The draft horses and donkeys' code of welfare and the report (NAWAC 84/13 and 85/13) had been circulated prior to the meeting and were taken as read.

Amendments to the Code were then suggested:

- The term equid vs. equine was discussed. It was agreed that perhaps the term 'horses' could be substituted throughout the code instead.
- On page 5, the term cross-bred should be hybrid. Hybrid should be defined in the glossary.
- General information, page 11: 'thin skinned' is not an appropriate term. Something like 'more susceptible to cold' should be used instead.
- Minimum standard 2(d) is standard wording but water quality is not mentioned. Water that is not harmful to health is perhaps not enough to encourage a horse to drink enough. 'Palatable' was suggested instead;
- The first example indicator on page 8 should have an addition that the diet is balanced nutritionally and the horse is not showing signs of bad nutrition.
- The 5th example indicator on page 8 should have 'when' changed to 'if'.
- On page 10 remove the phrase 'sweating may stop'.
- Under general information on page 9, when mentioning covers, a sentence should be added to say something like 'there are no skin lesions due to rubbing of the cover'.
- On page 12, recommended best practice (a) should be an example indicator of minimum standard (b).
- On page 13, the paragraph at the top should be in the temporary housing section.
- Minimum standard 5(c) was suggested to be 8 hours (to allow for race days). There was some discussion about the tethering issue.
- In minimum standard 5, there's an example indicator on having a contingency plan but no corresponding minimum standard. One should be added.

- It was suggested that restraint and containment under section 6.1 should be under the housing chapter but it was agreed to leave it where it is for now.
- Minimum standard 8(g) states 'objects or other equids' but should say 'objects and other animals'.
- On page 20, the section on how equids are social animals etc. is repeated from page 16.
- Recommended best practice (g) on page 22 is a repetition.
- On page 23, the reference to veterinary surgeon should just say veterinarian.
- Minimum standard 10(e) says that laparoscopic artificial insemination must be carried out under veterinary supervision and with appropriate pain relief. However, the veterinarian will make that call so the section on appropriate pain relief should be removed.
- Under minimum standard 12, add an example indicator that horses should show minimal reaction to hot branding (because of the pain relief).
- Minimum standard 14(d): take out 'and function'.
- Example indicators for minimum standard 14: Remove example indicator two, as sometimes horses will have a wound that's being healed.
- Example indicator 3: personnel working with equids should demonstrate, not just have, a good knowledge of equine first aid etc.
- The first line under section 9 should be amended or removed. Sometimes the owner makes the call on emergency euthanasia and that can be better for welfare than waiting for a veterinarian.
- Minimum standard 15 (e): take out 'until after death'.
- Minimum standard 15 (c) should not have a comma
- Remove the recommended best practice that emergency destruction should be performed by a veterinarian. Sometimes the vet is too far away and waiting for them would be bad for welfare.
- Glossary: a few terms are defined but are not in the code.
- Remove the term 'roughs' from glossary; this word is not in common use in New Zealand. Also remove it from page 9.
- Any other small errors in spelling or grammar should be sent straight to ^{s 9(2)(a)}

Action: ^{s 9(2)(a)} to investigate any knowledge or practice to support tethering in horses set at 6 hours and confirm with the Committee

Code report

In the housing section, the phrase should be 'under veterinary recommendation' rather than supervision.

Moved: (K Bicknell/D Scobie)

That, subject to the amendments agreed at this meeting, the Horses and Donkeys Code of Welfare be peer reviewed by ^{s 9(2)(a)} then recommended to the Minister.

The motion was put: carried.

**PART TWO
(OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)**

Action: summary, letter and offer of a meeting with the Chair to be extended to the Dominion Post reporter who came to Pastoral House but was not able to wait for the Open part of the meeting

STRATEGY AND PLANNING

O 1. 2014 meeting dates and mini-tutorial ideas

The dates suggested prior to the meeting were:

- Wednesday February 12th
- Wednesday May 14th
- Wednesday August 13th
- Thursday November 13th

K Milne found that February and August meeting dates may conflict with her work. She decided to check with her colleagues about moving those meetings (as there are fewer of them than of NAWAC).

Thursday 13th was changed to Wednesday 5th November to suit several members.

Action: s 9(2)(a) to send electronic invitations for 2014

Mini tutorial suggestions:

- Shelter: The *Safeguarding* programme is doing some work on shelter so there is a possibility of a shelter mini-tutorial from them. Also, some farmers doing alternative things like riparian planting or putting stock in vineyards. Would it be possible for someone from Beef+Lamb or DairyNZ to do a presentation on shelter?
- K Phillips suggested a tutorial on hunting – common practice, welfare issues, etc. Both K Phillips and D Scobie suggested contacts that they know who are very knowledgeable on the subject.
- Compliance: Changes they have made to the way they work recently, and how the Bill will affect them.

Action: s 9(2)(a) to follow up with the Safeguarding programme about a shelter mini-tutorial in 2014.

Action: K Phillips and/or D Scobie to follow up with their contacts about a hunting mini-tutorial in 2014.

Action: s 9(2)(a) to invite MPI compliance to a NAWAC meeting in 2014.

O 2. Welfare Pulse

Members suggested items as follows, due late January for publication in the March 2014 issue:

- There will be the normal Codes update and K Milne will have an introduction piece;
- It was suggested that P Fisher could write an article on the issue of greyhounds; and
- A Sharr and K Bicknell volunteered to write an article (topic undecided).

O 3. Identifying animal welfare issues

The Committee was asked to each name an animal welfare issue that was of importance to them, or that they considered an emerging issue, or that they thought the media/public may pick up on soon.

K Milne: Considered that it takes too long for compliance to go out and check on an issue when they are reported. Also thought that if someone rings up to report it would be a good idea to require them to state their occupation (as a farmer will probably have better insight into stockmanship than a bus driver). It was noted that the staff answering the 0800 number at MPI will tend to do this already. However, having compliance come along to a NAWAC meeting was suggested as an idea and it was added to the list of possible workshops for 2014.

K Phillips: Bulls with broken legs are an issue. Farmers will leave them in the back paddock and claim that the fracture will just heal eventually. It was questioned whether these animals are being picked up at the works, and § 9(2)(a) confirmed that if they are transported with healing fractures then yes, verification vets will record it and treat as a welfare case.

V Williams noted that NZVA's advice is that leaving bulls out to heal a broken leg is unacceptable.

S Brown: Euthanasia. Drowning kittens etc is banned, yes, but people still are doing it. V Williams suggested education as an answer. Homekill on a commercial basis was also discussed. § 9(2)(a) explained that legally, anyone carrying out homekill in this manner needs to be registered under the Animal Products Act. However some committee members suggest that maybe a few aren't, and there have been a few horror stories. It was also noted that generalising is a risk here, as many homekill operators are fine.

K Bicknell: Sterilisation of animals (including wild animals) and early spay and neuter of dogs and cats. Could there be an upswell of concern from consumers and animal rights groups?

V Williams: Meat chickens. Especially the welfare of meat chickens as they get towards the end of their life: from lameness and transport to slaughter.

Scobie: Mulesing. This procedure may be dealt with under new regulations in the coming years.

OTHER REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

O 4. Discussion of information circulated by MPI

The Committee appreciated the information that had been circulated.

O 5. NAWAC correspondence

There were no comments on recent correspondence received by or sent on behalf of NAWAC.

O 6. Committee members' reports on recent presentations and attendance at conferences

V Williams attended the Commonwealth Veterinary Association Conference in Fiji. There was quite an emphasis on animal welfare, which is not an area of focus there at the moment.

V Williams represented MPI at a WSPA meeting, where they looked at opportunities to do more work in the Pacific (especially to do with disaster management).

V Williams was also invited to Auckland to talk to the international union of hunting with hounds. She talked about NAWAC, NAEAC, and how MPI does consultation and liaise with stakeholders. The group is worried about the future of their sport.

§ 9(2)(a) attended the New Zealand Companion Animal Conference in Auckland, which had a big emphasis on the sentience of animals and the changes that the Animal Welfare Amendment Bill will bring.

§ 9(2)(a) attended the Road Transport Forum and the farm to processor animal welfare forum.

§ 9(2)(a) also went with § 9(2)(a) to attend some training that the Compliance officers were receiving and talk about the role of MPI's standards branch and NAWAC. § 9(2)(a) also attended the Verification branch's animal welfare coordinators 6-monthly meeting.

The International Society for Applied Ethology has a one day regional meeting coming up.

Action: § 9(2)(a) to send abstracts to NAWAC.

Closing

There being no further items of business to discuss, the Deputy Chair thanked the committee members for their attendance and declared the meeting closed at 4:10pm.

Next meeting: 12 February 2014

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

Appendix One

NAWAC Subcommittees

As at 13.11.2013

<i>Name</i>	<i>Members</i>	<i>MPI</i>
Systems review	Alan (Chair), Ingrid, Karen, Sue	s 9(2)(a)
Amendment Bill	John (Chair), Virginia, Barbara	
Layer hens	John (Chair), Karen, Katie B	
Dairy cattle housing	John (Chair), Karen, Katie M	
Equine	Karen (Chair), Katie B	
Rodeos	Virginia (Chair), Sue, Penny	
Painful husbandry procedures	Scobie (Chair), Barbara, Virginia, Sue	
Circuses and Zoos review	John (Chair), Scobie, Barbara, Sue, Penny	
Temporary housing	Katie B (Chair), Virginia, Alan	
Saleyards	Karen (Chair), Ingrid, Virginia	
New - report back in February		
Breeding	Virginia (Chair), Katie M, Karen, Katie B	
Wildlife	Scobie (Chair), Penny, Alan, Sue	
Shelter	Barbara (Chair), Katie B, Ingrid	

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

General Meeting

12 February 2014
9:30 am – 4:00 pm

Rooms 7.3 and 7.4
Pastoral House, 25 The Terrace
Wellington

MINUTES

Committee members: John Hellström (Chair) Karen Phillips, Kathryn Bicknell, Sue Brown, Ingrid Collins, Penny Fisher, Katie Milne, Barbara Nicholas, David Scobie, Alan Sharr, Virginia Williams.

In attendance: s 9(2)(a) (Manager, Animal Welfare Standards), s 9(2)(a) (Technical Adviser, Animal Welfare Standards), s 9(2)(a) (Senior Adviser, Animal Welfare Standards), s 9(2)(a) (Manager, Animal Welfare Policy), s 9(2)(a) (Policy Analyst, Animal Welfare Policy), s 9(2)(a), and s 9(2)(a) (Secretary).

Apologies:

Katie Milne had a Federated Farmers meeting on the same day so arrived at 11:05am.

Welcome:

Professor s 9(2)(a) was welcomed to the meeting in order to observe and comment on NAWAC processes.

Any Other Business Part One (Public Excluded Agenda)

Any Other Business Part Two (Open to the Public)

**PART ONE
(PUBLIC EXCLUDED AGENDA)**

DRAFT RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC
Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

There being no other introductory items of business, it was moved (J Hellström / I Collins):

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

- | | | |
|-------|---|----------------------------|
| C 1. | Confirmation of previous minutes | (J Hellström) |
| C 2. | Status of actions arising from previous meetings | (J Hellström) |
| C 3. | Codes of Welfare update | (s 9(2)(a)) |
| C 4. | Systems review subcommittee update | (A Sharr) |
| C 5. | Subcommittee update | |
| | - Wildlife | (P Fisher) |
| | - Shelter | (B Nicholas) |
| | - Breeding | (V Williams) |
| C 6. | Companion animals in temporary housing update | (K Bicknell) |
| C 7. | Animals in public display, exhibition and entertainment discussion document | (J Hellström) |
| C 8. | Work plan for 2014 | (J Hellström / s 9(2)(a)) |
| C 9. | Animal Welfare Amendment Bill and Strategy update | (s 9(2)(a)) |
| C 10. | MPI update | (s 9(2)(a)) |

THE GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED WHILE THE PUBLIC IS EXCLUDED, THE REASON FOR PASSING THIS RESOLUTION IN RELATION TO EACH MATTER, AND THE SPECIFIC GROUNDS UNDER SECTION 48(1) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL INFORMATION AND MEETINGS ACT 1987 FOR THE PASSING OF THIS RESOLUTION ARE AS FOLLOWS:

<i>General subject of each matter to be considered</i>		<i>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</i>	<i>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</i>
C 1.	<i>Confirmation of previous minutes</i>	<i>To protect the privacy of natural persons.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(a) of the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA).</i>
C 2.	<i>Status of actions arising from previous meetings</i>	<i>As above.</i>	<i>As above.</i>

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
C 3. Codes of Welfare update	To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(g)(ii) of the OIA.
C 4. Systems review subcommittee update	As above.	As above.
C 5. Subcommittees update	As above.	As above.
C 6. Companion animals in temporary housing update	As above.	As above.
C 7. Animals in public display, exhibition and entertainment discussion document	As above.	As above.
C 8. Work plan for 2014	As above.	As above.
C 8. Animal Welfare Amendment Bill and Strategy update	To maintain the constitutional conventions for the time being which protect the confidentiality of advice tendered by Ministers of the Crown and officials.	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(f)(iv) of the OIA.
C 9. MPI Update	As above.	As above.

I also move that:

s 9(2)(a)



be permitted to remain at this meeting after the public has been excluded, because of their knowledge of meeting procedure and the subject matter under discussion. This knowledge is relevant background information to assist the committee in its deliberations.

The motion was put: carried.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT

C 1. Confirmation of previous minutes

The draft minutes of the NAWAC general meeting on 11 November 2013 were reviewed and accepted with no amendments.

Moved (A Sharr / I Collins)

That the draft minutes of the NAWAC general meeting held on 11 November 2013 be adopted as a true and accurate record of that meeting.

The motion was put: carried.

C 2. Status of actions arising from previous meetings

Actions from previous meetings were reviewed (refer to paper 02/14) and it was agreed to complete pending actions where possible, with the following exceptions:

- Remove items 2, 3a, 4, 6, 7b, 8, 9, 10 and 12, noting that they are complete;
- Remove item 4b, as advice on these captive animals is probably not needed for now;
- Item 7c is to be dealt with later in the meeting and then removed;
- Remove item 11b. K Phillips has spoken to her contact and they want a more detailed brief. This may come later in 2014 as the wildlife subcommittee begins work on the best practice guidelines, and he could be invited then.

It was noted that the need for the workshop mentioned in item 3b, and the formal liaison with GRNZ in item 5, will be clarified once the 'entertainment' subcommittee releases their discussion document. J Hellström has also been invited to a meeting by NZ Racing Board on 19 March 2014.

It was agreed that staff from MPI compliance should be invited to the next meeting in May.

C 3. Work Programme update

§ 9(2)(a) addressed the work programme update as in NAWAC 06/14.

The title change, from 'codes of welfare update' to 'work programme update' was explained. Since NAWAC has expanded its work beyond codes, it makes more sense to refer to a work programme rather than a code of welfare programme.

Systems Review – The subcommittee were keen to have a meeting but the work program needed further discussion at this meeting and then the subcommittee will meet to progress it.

Dairy Cattle Housing – § 9(2)(a) explained the progress on the summary of submissions. There were 444 individual submissions on the amendment to the Dairy Cattle Code of Welfare, along with 2,453 standard letters from the Green Party website and 100 signatures on a petition circulated by § 9(2)(a) from the Manawatu. The vast majority of individual submissions were against indoor dairy housing as a form of 'factory farming'. Many called for a time limit on how long cows can be housed due to concerns over poor welfare. Fears around maintaining food safety and 'brand New Zealand' were also raised. Industry stakeholders were mostly positive towards the amendment with no major alterations suggested.

§ 9(2)(a) summarised her work with the off-paddock steering group and explained that she will act on NAWAC's behalf and feed information back to the subcommittee. The group tends to focus on environment and building structure rather than welfare, which is unfortunate. There have been some welfare issues raised e.g. tail docking.

Action: J Hellström to write to DairyNZ expressing NAWAC's concern around the continued prevalence of tail docking

Action: Secretariat to gather data on what this prevalence actually is – it should be less than 1% but may be as high as 30% of cattle with docked tails in some areas

Action: Secretariat to obtain an invitation for J Hellström to one or more of the off-paddock steering group meetings where they are discussing the issue

Action: Systems review subcommittee to consider changing the process around receiving submissions and gathering information. Public submissions are gradually getting more inflammatory and less substantive

Horses and Donkeys – The peer review of the final draft has been received. There are some really good suggestions and the reviewer was complimentary. s 9(2)(a) is on track to get the code to the Minister later this month.

Animals in Public Display, Exhibition and Entertainment – Discussed in item C7.

Temporary Housing of Companion Animals – Discussed in item C6.

Saleyards – Discussed in item C5.

K Phillips suggested a meeting with the industry and asked for a list of people to talk to, as it could be done locally to the members of the subcommittee rather than in Wellington (however it was noted that these meetings must be documented, even if that it's only a few paragraphs and email). The MPI *Safeguarding* programme could be contacted to provide a list as they have been working on a signage project for saleyards.

Surgical and Painful Procedures – It was noted that the Minister recently took an interest in mulesing. This workstream will be discussed in terms of regulation (see item C9).

Wild Animals – The glueboard traps review is just about finished at Landcare Research and that will inform the subcommittee about the alternatives to glueboards. Some stakeholders are pushing back at losing them. s 9(2)(a) explained that there will be a workshop in late March between representatives from Fonterra, DOC, Air New Zealand, s 9(2)(a), Penny Fisher, MPI, Pest Management Association and others that will discuss the issue.

Ministerial exemptions may be a possibility and some industry groups are happy to pursue this option and still see the traps taken off shelves for household use. It does look like in some situations there will be no other option than granting an exemption. s 9(2)(a) noted that she will need to test that the exemption process will work under the regulations and will discuss this further with MPI and NAWAC. Other options apart from providing exemptions are to not go ahead with the regulation or to amend the regulation, but it is not anticipated that these will be recommended by MPI.

P Fisher suggested that she could draft a document (even a bulleted framework) describing what kind of situations would need to be covered under best practice guidelines for hunting. Definitions of different practices would be particularly helpful. This could then be discussed at May meeting.

Shelter for Farm Animals – Discussed in item C5.

Breeding – Discussed in item C5.

Action: s 9(2)(a) / Safeguarding to provide the saleyards subcommittee with a contact list

C 4. Systems review subcommittee update

A Sharr provided a brief update according to the work programme update above. The subcommittee hasn't met but is keen to progress the work that will be raised in item C8.

C 5. Subcommittee update

Wildlife

There was already a wildlife update in item C3. The subcommittee haven't met yet. P Fisher and ^{s 9(2)(a)} will update the work programme according to the issues discussed earlier.

Action: P Fisher ^{s 9(2)(a)} to circulate the wildlife work programme with milestones

Shelter

The proposed work programme, in paper NAWAC 12/14, was developed by email correspondence and by phone conversations. It was noted that the paper did take into account the work already being done by MPI's *Safeguarding or Animals, Safeguarding our Reputation* programme. Having reviewed this other work, the subcommittee will decide to either join the existing workstream and work to accelerate it or start new work that aligns with those goals and report on it directly to the Minister.

There has also been a review of the information that the codes already have on shade and shelter – but this still doesn't provide an integrated picture of what's happening on farm.

It was explained that *Safeguarding* is about to commission a review of the literature, and the subcommittee has decided to request that they help with and have access to this document, as it will meet both MPI's and NAWAC's needs. It is expected to be finished in October/November. The working group will then get together to review it along with what they know independently, identify any gaps, and give advice to the Minister. *Safeguarding* is open to working with NAWAC.

It was noted that there is also work going on at local government level including tree planting and resource management rules. This is another group to engage with. Some universities, e.g. Lincoln, are doing work on alternative species to use on farm for shelter that works around irrigation.

Action: Assign a representative from the NAWAC subcommittee to join the Safeguarding group

Breeding

The record of the groups' first teleconference in 13/14 was taken as read.

The main issues around animal breeding were divided into 3 areas:

- Hereditary diseases and inherited defects – mostly companion animals
- Breeding for production over health and welfare – mostly farm animals
- Overbreeding – unintentional (accidental pregnancies) and intentional (e.g. racing industry)

The subcommittee also had a look through the codes for any existing information related to breeding. The only minimum standard was in the dog code, Minimum Standard No. 7: "Breeders must make all reasonable efforts to ensure that the genetic make-up of both sire and dam will not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of known inherited disorders". The sheep and beef code has a nice paragraph about breeding as well.

Therefore, there is the potential for breeding to be covered in the codes, but it is an issue that is very hard to police. The subcommittee is leaning towards not putting breeding into a series of minimum standards. Instead, education will be important.

J Hellström stated that there is a real opportunity to provide NAWAC's first expert opinion technical paper to the Minister. It would explain that these are 'sleeper' issues that affect our reputation and they must be considered. It would be based on good science and could be split into two parts (one for companion animals, one for farm animals).

It was agreed that a good place to start would be in talking to people like the Kennel Club or dairy cattle breeders and ask them questions about the sorts of things they consider when breeding.

s 9(2)(a) talked about how the problem with dog breeding was approached in Sweden. They targeted the judges of shows, and that's where the change began. The subcommittee agreed with this approach and had discussed it in their teleconference. It was also noted that the NZVA is doing some work in this area (e.g. establishing a register of inherited diseases) and the subcommittee could approach them in order to work with the judges most effectively. It was suggested that the ideal situation would be that impaired dogs are stripped of their ribbons, and in fact some shows have started doing this sort of thing.

The process along the way to releasing a technical paper will engage stakeholders and hopefully kick-start some thinking about how they can change before the paper is even finalised.

It was suggested that animals being imported could be raised in the paper. Biosecurity doesn't ask questions about ancestry/breeding as new animals come into the country.

It was also suggested that s 9(2)(a) could talk to the subcommittee about poultry breeding, as his earlier talk to NAWAC was enlightening for then members.

Action: Breeding subcommittee to develop a timeline with milestones for the next meeting

C 6. Companion animals in temporary housing update

The draft code, document NAWAC 09/14, was taken as read.

The subcommittee had made good progress, with a meeting at Orana Park in December followed up with a lot of work by email and phone. The content has been cut down from the code that the New Zealand Companion Animal Council submitted and it now looks very different. Therefore the idea is to send this latest version of NZCAC to them for their information.

It was noted that with MPI's Standards Integration Project, this code will have a change in format and 'look' from previous codes.

Some problems that MPI compliance has been having with Hastings Pound were briefly mentioned. The inspector was not happy with their facilities and is working with them to improve (in fact, he was not impressed by any council pounds in the bay area). This pound has used the fact that they are waiting for the code as an excuse not to change anything. He has let them know that that is not a defence under the Animal Welfare Act.

Communal catteries were questioned. The subcommittee reported that they can work for some cats, but not for others – they must be managed properly.

Amendments to the Code were then suggested:

- Under Minimum Standard 5(b), is there a legal problem here in that the person in charge must seek veterinary attention (i.e. the person who drops an injured animal off is 'in charge', not the facility)? It was explained that it is correct that the owner must seek veterinary attention for an injured animal themselves, however, once the animal is in the care of the facility then they are in charge and whether or not the owner met their obligations beforehand shouldn't factor in to it.
- Minimum Standard 6(b) should say pain or distress, not pain and distress.
- Minimum Standard 15(b) was suggested to be too light. The 'knowingly' could be removed from the standard ("Animals with potential hereditary problems must not knowingly be sold or rehomed without full disclosure to and acceptance by the new owner."). The word 'potential' could also be changed to 'known' or 'at risk of'. It was agreed that the ideal outcome here is that, for example, when someone picks up a fox terrier puppy the adopter/seller also hands out information on known health issues in all fox terriers, rather than only giving information on a few specific test results for that animal.
- Minimum Standard 15(g) was questioned. Requiring all animals leaving a pound or animal welfare centre to be desexed is an SPCA internal rule, but can it be legislated? It was suggested that this could be a recommended best practice instead. Whether or not this is workable and necessary should be examined. The other problem is that this is not technically an animal welfare standard – it could be considered a population control measure, but that only indirectly applies to the individuals' welfare.
- The statement that dogs, cats and rabbits are only rehomed at 8 weeks should be recommended best practice rather than a minimum standard (as in species specific codes).
- Any further grammatical or spelling errors should be sent to § 9(2)(a) or K Bicknell by 21 February.

Moved: (J Hellstrom / K Bicknell)

That, subject to the amendments agreed at this meeting, the Companion Animals in Temporary Housing code of welfare be finalised for public consultation.

The motion was put: carried.

§ 9(2)(a) was welcomed to the meeting here, at 11:25am, and the Committee moved to item C9.

C 9. Animal Welfare Amendment Bill and Strategy update

§ 9(2)(a) gave NAWAC an update on the Animal Welfare Amendment Bill. It is currently at select committee as they work through the 1700 submissions. On 10 February, MPI provided them with the departmental report, which summarises the issues that submitters raised, provides analysis and recommends appropriate changes to the Bill.

There will be a session with the select committee tomorrow. Following that, they must report back to parliament by the end of March (i.e. quite a short timeframe).

§ 9(2)(a) ran through the key issues and what was recommended by MPI. This is confidential to NAWAC.

§ 9(2)(a) then read out some examples of the criteria to determine whether a surgical procedure is significant (i.e. can only be performed by a veterinarian). The criteria captures a wide scope – it may even cover practices like bloat-sticking, but the intention is that the Minister can release regulation

specifying what is or isn't a significant surgical procedure. The regulation may also be as specific as "You must make sure to do x when you are doing procedure y". Routine on-farm practices are unlikely to be picked up in prosecutions. It was noted that the Veterinarian Act does not have rules on what is or isn't a veterinarian-only procedure. Therefore the profession relies heavily on the Animal Welfare Act to establish these guidelines.

Tail docking in sheep and deVelvetting stags was then raised. This will be dealt with in regulation. NAWAC/MPI will have to go through each procedure and determine what the rules will be. It is anticipated that deer velvetting will get some regulatory backing.

Members asked whether the Bill will pass before the 2014 elections and how quickly MPI will engage with NAWAC on regulation afterwards. ^{s 9(2)(a)} explained that it depends on whether an early election is called and how much cross-party support the Bill maintains in the house. In terms of MPI engaging with NAWAC, work will begin before the Bill is in place. There's a lot of lead-in work to do.

There was some discussion on whether the regulations for significant surgical procedures would be written all at once or released in groups. Since it's such a process, it would be better to start with comprehensive regulations (while always acknowledging that they may need to change). In the long run it's more efficient to do it all at once.

The wildlife subcommittee questioned how the generally accepted practice guidelines for hunting would work. It was explained that NAWAC would most likely issue a guidelines document which is not directly related to obligations in the Act. Before they are in place, guidance can be provided by support groups (e.g. Fish and Game).

Transitions and exemptions were then discussed. What about things that don't suit a timeframe or have no clear end point, e.g. glueboards and farrowing crates? NAWAC and MPI will have to determine is the time that is reasonably necessary for the industry to develop their own alternative. For example, the regulations could set a requirement for farrowing crates to be phased out and give the industry time to figure something out. At the end of the period, if the industry failed, the Government would have the ability to create a new set of regulations. This starts to put some strong incentives on the industry – they can't rely on the second set of regulations to be approved.

The New Zealand Animal Welfare Strategy was touched on: there hasn't been a lot of work at the start of the year but it is continuing. The main aim at the moment is for the Ministry itself to be better connected across the Branches and develop an operating model.

At this point J Hellström thanked ^{s 9(2)(a)} for his time and the Committee moved to item C7.

C 7. Animals in public display, exhibition and entertainment discussion document

J Hellström summarised the subcommittee's approach (detailed in NAWAC 16/14) and comments on the draft discussion document 10/14 were invited.

It was questioned whether the specific example regulation of banning African elephants or polar bears, listed as number 2 on page 3, would detract from the rest of the document by being too controversial. Could the examples be more general?

It was then suggested that the concept of regulations be de-emphasised throughout the document as stakeholder groups may not be familiar with the passage of the Bill in the first place. However, some members thought that the industry needs to be aware that very specific regulations could be released. The idea of the document is to make groups aware that "this could happen to you". Example regulations

should be listed, as it would be unfair to state that there will be regulation and then fail to give an idea of what it could look like.

It was agreed that sections specific to the entertainment industry (e.g. visitor interaction) be moved to the front of the document, while more general sections that are also covered in other codes (e.g. feeding) be moved to the back.

The document should still be structured to promote the 5 physical, health and behavioural needs, but it must be noted that this code is very much focused on the mental domain and opportunity to express normal behaviour.

Visitor ^{s 9(2)(a)} [redacted] raised the issue of whale/seal/penguin watching as part of New Zealand's tourist attractions. Technically this involves an entry fee, but are the animals being used? It was noted that it could be said that the visitors are paying a fee to use the boat or car, as seeing the animals is not guaranteed. The animals are not in a nature park. Also, the Department of Conservation is in charge of monitoring these types of activities, but of course they are administering the Conservation Act not the Animal Welfare Act. The Marine Mammals Act deals with whale watching in a way that improves their welfare but not penguins or other animals.

At the moment, the draft does not cover free-ranging species in nature parks, conservation areas and mainland islands. Therefore, could this issue be covered by the wild animals' code or guidelines? ^{s 9} [redacted] explained that in Sweden, it was generally accepted that these animals have fallen through the cracks and were not covered in full by any legislation.

It was agreed to amend question 2, "Do you consider the scope appropriate?" by adding the question "Should there be other animal uses considered?"

The committee agreed that changes will be made as discussed and the document will then be used as a resource to consult with stakeholder groups. It was expected that the process would take at least 6 months.

Action: J Hellström to amend the discussion document according to the above discussion

C 8. Work plan for 2014

^{s 9(2)(a)} [redacted] introduced the Committee to document 07/14, the suggested work programme process that will apply to both codes of welfare and strategic issues.

NAWAC agreed that it was very useful to see everything set out in clear steps.

It was noted that it should be clear that the milestones are flexible and open. For example, a subcommittee does not need to meet every step (but ideally would document why they decided not to).

In terms of time limits, it was agreed that every subcommittee should try and report back on each milestone in either the times as outlined in the work programme, or an agreed timetable put forward by each new subcommittee at the start of their work. While the time may be variable depending on the outcome (e.g. an advice paper could take less than one year, while a code with consultation would take longer), the main thing is that each subcommittee is held to time-bound milestones of some kind so that the work doesn't blow out to take years and years.

It was agreed that 07/14 will be the basis of every workstream's approach, subject to small changes as discussed above.

NAWAC also had the opportunity to state whether they would like to be on different subcommittees, and it was agreed that members should work with each other... Members are also welcomed to ask for information from other groups if they are interested in their work.

It was noted that the concept of subcommittees as a whole may change – there didn't used to be any, rather NAWAC had two-day meetings each quarter. The systems review subcommittee will discuss options around subcommittees.

It was explained that the painful husbandry procedures group are a kind of placeholder for the regulatory workstream, as surgical procedures may be the first group of regulations to be developed. J Hellström asked to join this subcommittee when it begins.

The Committee then discussed the priorities for 2014. The crux of the issue was that the 3 new workstreams (breeding, shelter and wildlife) are additional to the already existing work programme. This is on top of an already extensive workload that in reality will not all fit in one year. Priorities will have to be set so that the secretariat can know what resources to provide through the year.

Some major groups were identified:

Top priorities

- Systems review
- Painful husbandry procedures / Surgical regulations
- Dairy housing

Ongoing strategic issues

- Breeding
- Wildlife
- Shade and shelter

Nearly completed

- Rodeos
- Horses and donkeys

Companion animals in temporary housing and animals in public display, exhibition and entertainment were therefore not identified as top priorities, but it was agreed that it would be a shame to drop them now. 'Animals in entertainment' is also an issue raised by the Minister, so it was noted that it can't be dropped until NAWAC has provided the advice he has requested on greyhounds. Saleyards was also a priority before and is ongoing – it represents a gap in the livestock chain of supply that has not been adequately covered. So there are 3 extra workstreams that need fit in somehow.

It was suggested that temporary housing could be put out for consultation early in the year so that it can be seen to be progressing. Whether there will be the resource to summarise the submissions is another matter that can be dealt with later. If needed, that stage can be pushed back. While there was some discussion on whether to just drop it for now (the work is a sunk cost, and the code is not a priority in terms of number of animals affected or severity of violations) it was eventually agreed that this would be the approach.

There was no further agreement on what issues could be dropped.

Noting that:

- MPI can contract in extra staff if needed;
- The saleyards and breeding work would be led by the subcommittees for now;

- The shelter workstream will largely be driven by *Safeguarding*;
- The regulation workstream will not begin until June;
- Wildlife must deal with glueboard traps as that is on a deadline, but otherwise it's not the end of the world if their work is delayed until 2015; and
- MPI and NAWAC must leave some breathing room to deal with Minister issues and concerns

It was agreed that no workstream would drop off the work plan totally, but ^{§ 9(2)(a)} would write up the year's workplan with the top priorities in mind and keep it flexible.

C 10. MPI update

The Committee gratefully received the MPI update (NAWAC 08/14).

^{§ 9(2)(a)} added one item: MPI recently met with MFAT about the seal ruling from WTO. A WTO dispute settlement panel in November upheld the European Union's ban on imported seal products, and its decision in part cited "public moral concerns" for animal welfare. This has effectively set a precedent for ending trade based on animal welfare concerns. The decision is being appealed by Canada and Norway. New Zealand is watching the situation very closely.

The MPI staff realignment was also discussed. The Committee was reassured that it is not a downsizing or a major restructure, but the details of how the secretariat would be affected were not available yet.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

PART TWO (OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)

STRATEGY AND PLANNING

O 2. Mini-tutorial – s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a) gave a presentation to NAWAC on the intersection of animal welfare policy and science and the different stages countries tend to go through as they develop policies to promote higher farm animal welfare. The full PowerPoint is available on request from s 9(2)(a).

O 3 Results of 2013 review of committee performance

The results of the review of the committee's performance in 2013 were summarised. There were many responses that stated that NAWAC should be more strategic, and it was agreed that the systems review subcommittee will help with considering this further.

O 1 Election of Deputy Chair

The Animal Welfare Act 1999 (section 67 and Schedule 1, clause 3(1)) requires the committee to elect one of its members as its deputy chairperson at its first meeting each year.

Moved (J Hellstrom / V Williams):

That K Phillips be elected deputy chairperson of the committee for 2014, pursuant to the Animal Welfare Act 1999 (section 67 and Schedule 1, clause 3)).

The motion was put: carried.

O 4. Contribution for *Welfare Pulse*

Members suggested items as follows, due 15 April for publication in the 1 June issue:

- Documents that are being written up for shelter, wildlife and breeding may be potential sources for a story. For example, 2 paragraphs from each chair could be combined into one piece.
- s 9(2)(a) has also asked s 9(2)(a) to contribute.
- A photo of the committee could be taken at the next meeting and included.

The distribution of the magazine was discussed. It was also noted that the 'fate' of *Welfare Pulse* is tied to the progress with the implementation of the New Zealand Animal Welfare Strategy.

Action: s 9(2)(a) to circulate Welfare Pulse distribution numbers

O 5. Identifying animal welfare issues

The killing of bobby calves with blunt force was raised. Is it widespread in New Zealand? s 9(2)(a) explained that MPI does not know exactly. The only figure MPI has is that 1.7m were killed at slaughter plants in 2013. The rest were raised for meat, killed on farm, or kept as replacements, but there is no way to separate the categories.

In light of the euthanasia of Marius the giraffe in Copenhagen, it was asked whether the practice of culling animals that don't fit a zoo's breeding programme is normal in New Zealand. The entertainment subcommittee stated that it is practiced among ZAA members in Australasia.

Action – s 9(2)(a) to circulate minutes from the latest 'animals in entertainment' subcommittee meeting

OTHER REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

O 6. Discussion of information circulated by MPI

The Committee noted that it appreciated the information that had been circulated.

In terms of 2014 meeting dates, K Milne stated that she has a clash in August.

Action – ^{s 9(2)(a)} to check whether the August meeting can be moved forward one week.

O 7. NAWAC correspondence

The Government Administration Committee gave NAWAC 3 recommendation on greyhounds:

- consider developing standards for the use of animals, particularly greyhounds, in racing
- consider developing guidelines on the breeding of greyhounds
- consider reviewing the Animal Welfare (Dogs) Code of Welfare 2010, with a view to specifying the circumstances in which dogs can be euthanased

The Government has responded and NAWAC's work on greyhound welfare is ongoing from the Minister's previous request.

The NZVA response on over-treatment of companion animals was questioned. It was thought that NAWAC should explore whether NZVA is still taking animal welfare seriously.

O 8. Committee members' reports on recent presentations and attendance at conferences

There being no further items of business to discuss, the Chair thanked the committee members for their attendance and declared the meeting closed at 3:50pm.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

General Meeting

14 May 2014
9:30 am – 4:30 pm

General Meeting Room
Wellington SPCA
140 Alexandria Road
Newtown, Wellington

MINUTES

Committee members: John Hellström (Chair) Karen Phillips, Kathryn Bicknell, Sue Brown, Ingrid Collins, Penny Fisher, Katie Milne, David Scobie, Alan Sharr, Virginia Williams.

In attendance: s 9(2)(a) (Manager, Animal Welfare Standards), s 9(2)(a) (Technical Adviser, Animal Welfare Standards), s 9(2)(a) (Senior Adviser, Animal Welfare Standards), s 9(2)(a) (Policy Analyst, Animal Welfare Policy), s 9(2)(a) (Secretary), s 9(2)(a) (DG SANCO, EU Commission).

s 9(2)(a) (Manager, Planning & Intelligence, Compliance Branch), and s 9(2)(a) (Chief Inspector, Wellington SPCA), were in attendance for item O2.

Apologies: Barbara Nicholas was unable to attend due to other work commitments.

Katie Milne put in apologies as she had to leave early (2:45pm).

Welcome: s 9(2)(a) welcomed the Committee to Wellington SPCA's new home.

John Hellström welcomed s 9(2)(a) from the EU Commission, who was there to observe NAWAC's process as part of her secondment to the Ministry for Primary Industries.

Any Other Business Part One (Public Excluded Agenda)

Any Other Business Part Two (Open to the Public): s 9(2)(a) informed the Committee that she would be leaving MPI at the end of July.

**PART ONE
(PUBLIC EXCLUDED AGENDA)**

DRAFT RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

There being no other introductory items of business, it was moved (J Hellström / V Williams):

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

- C 1. Confirmation of previous minutes (J Hellström)
- C 2. Status of actions arising from previous meetings (J Hellström)
- C 3. Work programme update (s 9(2)(a))
- C 4. Systems review subcommittee update (A Sharr)
 - Website
 - Annual report
- C 5. Dairy subcommittee update (J Hellström)
- C 6. Animal Welfare Amendment Bill and Strategy update (s 9(2)(a))
- C 7. MPI update (s 9(2)(a))

THE GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED WHILE THE PUBLIC IS EXCLUDED, THE REASON FOR PASSING THIS RESOLUTION IN RELATION TO EACH MATTER, AND THE SPECIFIC GROUNDS UNDER SECTION 48(1) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL INFORMATION AND MEETINGS ACT 1987 FOR THE PASSING OF THIS RESOLUTION ARE AS FOLLOWS:

<i>General subject of each matter to be considered</i>		<i>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</i>	<i>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</i>
C 1.	<i>Confirmation of previous minutes</i>	<i>To protect the privacy of natural persons.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(a) of the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA).</i>
C 2.	<i>Status of actions arising from previous meetings</i>	<i>As above.</i>	<i>As above.</i>
C 3.	<i>Codes of Welfare update</i>	<i>To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for</i>

General subject of each matter to be considered		Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
		employees from improper pressure or harassment.	withholding would exist under section 9(2)(g)(ii) of the OIA.
C 4.	Systems review subcommittee update	As above.	As above.
C 5.	Dairy subcommittee update	As above.	As above.
C 6.	Animal Welfare Amendment Bill and Strategy update	To maintain the constitutional conventions for the time being which protect the confidentiality of advice tendered by Ministers of the Crown and officials.	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(f)(iv) of the OIA.
C 7.	MPI Update	As above.	As above.

I also move that:

s 9(2)(a)

be permitted to remain at this meeting after the public has been excluded, because of their knowledge of meeting procedure and the subject matter under discussion. This knowledge is relevant background information to assist the committee in its deliberations.

The motion was put: carried.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

C 1. Confirmation of previous minutes

The draft minutes of the NAWAC general and strategy meeting on 12 February 2014 were reviewed and accepted with the following amendments:

- One typographical error was corrected

Moved (I Collins / S Brown)

That the draft minutes of the NAWAC general and strategy meeting held on 12 February 2014 be adopted as a true and accurate record of that meeting.

The motion was put: carried.

C 2. Status of actions arising from previous meetings

Actions from previous meetings were reviewed (refer to paper 23/14) and it was agreed to complete pending actions where possible, with the following exceptions:

- Action 1: the glueboards workshop has been held, this will be discussed in item C3.
- Action 2: the animals in entertainment subcommittee have begun contacting stakeholders. This will be discussed in item C3.
- Action 3: J Hellström held a meeting with NZGRA in March and will discuss this in item C3.
- Action 4: Systems review subcommittee has completed the prioritisation framework and will report in item C4.
- Action 5b: Complete
- Action 13: Complete
- Action 6: J Hellström wanted more information on dairy tail docking before drafting the letter to industry on NAWAC's concern over the continued presence of tail docking.

§ 9(2)(a) confirmed that a working group has been formed between MPI and the dairy sector to address continued short tail docking in breach of the code of welfare for painful husbandry procedures. She outlined work by MPI's Verification Services to collect statistics on dairy tail docking, and the Verification Services programme to escalate cases to MPI Compliance if they could not be dealt with by educating the farmer involved. There had also been recent MPI prosecutions for dairy tail breaking and docking.

The dairy sector has agreed that it needs to better support compliance by farmers. It is collecting data on tail docking, educating farmers about requirements and encouraging trimming of the switch rather than tail docking.

It was agreed that a letter should still be sent to DairyNZ and Fonterra.

Action: J Hellström to send a letter to DairyNZ and Fonterra stating that NAWAC acknowledges that there has been work in the area and they support this approach - but is still concerned that tail-docking should have stopped by now.

C 3. Work programme update

§ 9(2)(a) addressed the work programme update as in NAWAC 24/14.

Systems Review – Addressed in item C4.

Dairy Cattle Amendment – Addressed in item C5.

Rodeos – The subcommittee is finalising the code in response to the last comments from MPI Policy and Legal. Following this it will be sent back to the Minister with an accompanying briefing.

Horses and Donkeys – The subcommittee was congratulated as this code has been recommended to the Minister.

Animals in Public Display, Exhibition and Entertainment – The Amendment Bill, which removes the 10-year review period for the zoos and circuses codes, may not be through in time for this code to be released. MPI has drafted an Order in Council to extend the life of the current codes until either the Bill is passed or the review is complete. NAWAC agreed that the Order in Council should be progressed. It is not anticipated that the stakeholders will have a problem with the extension.

J Hellström stated that he will meet with the New Zealand Kennel Club (NZKC) in about a month as it is concerned about the code.

V Williams mentioned she had been interviewed about the NZKC. NZKC has hired someone independent to help them improve their public image. The central body is aware of problems in this area, and there seems to be some division within the club on welfare/breed/agility standards.

Greyhound Racing New Zealand is also aware that NAWAC is working on this code. The Committee noted the huge effort that the industry has been making. § 9(2)(a), their animal welfare officer, has done a lot of work on developing a code for the industry. This may include things like surplus breeding, microchipping and tracking all dogs as well as improving tracks. Enforcement will lie with GRNZ – fines will be up to \$10,000 or expulsion from the racing body, meaning the dogs can no longer race. A new facility in Levin will take over the responsibility to re-home retired dogs (up to 400 per year). § 9(2)(a) has also written an article for *Welfare Pulse*.

The ability of any data that is collected by GRNZ to be audited was questioned. It was thought that V Williams or J Hellström may find out about this possibility at the next AWBCC meeting.

Action: The animals in public display, exhibition and entertainment subcommittee to check up on how the greyhound animal welfare programme is progressing in August 2015.

Temporary Housing of Companion Animals – The Committee had resolved at its last meeting to release this draft code for consultation. It is now to be released in June.

Action: J Hellström to inform the Minister

Saleyards – K Phillips explained that the subcommittee was beginning to think that a full code may not be necessary for saleyards. Ultimately, the problems come back to who holds responsibility at different parts of the chain and who is policing it. The Act itself already states that stock must be fit for sale.

It was noted that any document, including a guideline, would require collaboration with the industry.

Action: Saleyards subcommittee to draft an issues paper to get all the problems on paper and help figure out the best way to tackle them

Surgical and Painful Procedures – The subcommittee is waiting for the Amendment Bill to pass to begin work on possible regulations.

Wild Animals – The glueboards workshop was held on 28 March and s 9(2)(a) will circulate a summary of the meeting. P Fisher noted she has some NAWAC recommendations that MPI supports and that will go in a MPI briefing to the Minister.

Action: s 9(2)(a) to circulate paper on the glueboards workshop

The workshop was slightly adversarial at first but eventually solutions were found. The stakeholders being faced with the imminent ban on glueboard traps (from 2015) included service providers (e.g. Rentokil), manufacturers, importers, the pest management industry and some businesses (e.g. Fonterra and Air New Zealand). MPI, NAWAC, the Department of Conservation and the SPCA were represented too. The purpose of the meeting was to air and share, to come together towards Ministerial approval for exemptions, and to discuss alternatives for replacing glueboard traps.

P Fisher explained that this issue with phasing out glueboard traps (and industry believing there are no alternatives) has been going on for decades, and although the industry can name some situations where glueboards are the only solution, they are still not taking responsibility for moving on and finding solutions. They don't appear to want to hear about how successful bans have been in other countries. Ultimately it might be up to NAWAC to continue pushing for alternatives.

NAWAC agreed that they are supportive of the exemptions but only if gaining one is not easy and they are time-limited. Some strict conditions could be applied – e.g. reporting on how many are used, how the animals are euthanised, and how often they are checked.

It was pointed out that a business would need to consider their own reputational risk in continuing to use glueboard traps under a Ministerial Approval when it is clear that glueboard traps are inhumane.

It was also thought that a transitional period recommended by NAWAC but then not carried out completely because of widely available exemptions would not look good for all the other transitions that the Committee works on.

It was pointed out that even with exemptions, the prohibition would get the traps out of \$2 shops, fewer animals will be trapped, and stringent checking policies can be applied via exemptions. It would still, overall, be positive.

NAWAC agreed that their advice to the Minister would be to acknowledge that MPI is working with the industry, but the Committee's advice remains the same as previously: glueboard traps are inhumane and should be discontinued, and to note that the credibility of NAWAC's transition processes may be at stake.

Action: J Hellström to write a letter to the Minister on glueboard traps and exemptions

The subcommittee has contacted the National Pest Control Agencies, which writes guidelines for pest management including humane best practice, to see whether it is interested in working together on the review of NAWAC's trap-testing guideline and on developing humane best practice principles in hunting and killing.

Shelter for Farm Animals – The internal MPI working group will hold a meeting on scope on 20 May.

It was explained that some groups are looking at bamboo-type plants for shelter. They grow so fast that irrigators can just drive straight over the shelter belt – they recover quickly in order to provide continual shelter.

It was noted that although the industry may come up with guidelines (and NAWAC is aware that ECAN is working on something, while other groups are active) they should be backed by a strong NAWAC position. This position should also point out that there are strong economic benefits to good shelter for production animals.

Breeding – A timeline and workplan is in place and potential stakeholders have been identified. One literature review has been completed (NAWAC 31/14) which could be the basis for a discussion document. The subcommittee will organise another meeting before the August NAWAC meeting to figure out the next steps.

At the moment, companion animals are front and centre in the document, but it was noted that the principles of the literature review apply to all selectively bred animals.

C 4 Systems review subcommittee update

A Sharr summarised the subcommittee's work since the last quarterly meeting. There have been two subcommittee meetings with one more scheduled for the 18 June. Minutes were circulated to the wider committee after both meetings.

The committee discussed the proposed new NAWAC Guideline 12 and prioritisation in general.

Website

It was suggested that the NAWAC website could have more information (in the interest of the Committee's transparency) and could stand to look more modern.

V Williams explained that the NAEAC website is a standing agenda item for that committee – e.g. making sure links are up to date, or informing MPI of any changes needed.

It was agreed that while some more exciting content (like pictures) would be welcomed, the most important thing is that it is up to date and correct. J Hellström asked again for a 'biography' paragraph from each member, emphasising that it is very important to keep everyone's information accurate and up to date as NAWAC is under constant scrutiny.

Action: All committee members to send a short paragraph to NAWAC secretary on their expertise and qualifications that enable them to serve on the Committee.

New additions to the website were discussed.

The publically available work programme [NAWAC 30/14] was approved for publishing on the web.

One update was requested: that the saleyards section be updated to say that the subcommittee will consider issues around saleyards, not draft a code of welfare.

Action: NAWAC work programme [NAWAC 30/14] to be published online as soon as possible.

Guideline 12

Two amendments were suggested: that a sentence be added on sudden media priorities or substantial animal welfare compromise; and that a diagram be added as an example.

It was suggested that the subcommittee review all the NAWAC guidelines as they may need to be re-ordered. The information is quite up to date but the guideline topics are a bit jumbled up.

Action: Systems review subcommittee to consider re-ordering or numbering the NAWAC guidelines
Moved (V Williams / K Phillips)

That, subject to the above changes, NAWAC adopts Guideline 12 (Prioritisation Framework) as a NAWAC guideline and it is published online.

The motion was put: carried.

The Web Integration Project that MPI is currently undertaking was mentioned. Since NAWAC's pages are hosted on MPI's website, the NAWAC sites 'look' will change when the new site is launched (MPI is aiming for the end of 2014).

Annual report

It was agreed that the subcommittee should spend time on the style of the annual report for the future. More photos could be added, as well as the member biographies.

The subcommittee should decide whether hard copies are needed at all.

s 9(2)(a) reminded the Committee that according to the Act, the annual report is only supposed to serve as a report to the Minister and the Act does not prescribe much about what should be in it.

Action: Systems review subcommittee to discuss the future and format of the Annual Report and report back in August.

C 5. Dairy subcommittee update

J Hellström summarised the recent work from the dairy subcommittee, specifically on the calf amendment. It was stated that many submissions have not been too helpful, in that they don't contain reasons for their opinions.

It was noted that no matter what, any amendments released will be controversial. The calf amendment however should be released before calving season. Dairy cattle housing is more difficult and not ready for release yet, so the amendments will probably be released separately. It was agreed that NAWAC's advice to the Minister will be to release the dairy amendments in two parts.

Further discussion with industry groups on housing will also be needed. NAWAC's position must be robust. It was noted that DairyNZ is currently working on housing guidelines and are a bit unsure how to proceed as long as NAWAC hasn't set the minimum standards.

On-farm humane destruction

s 9(2)(a) summarised the issues laid out in 27/14, noting the concern from some submitters that NAWAC was being reactive and not considering the best animal welfare outcomes and the technical issues around euthanasia.

It was noted that NAWAC has considered the on-farm destruction of dairy calves as the result of a request from the Minister. The Committee recognises that there are welfare risks in using blunt force trauma in the destruction of calves. NAWAC has therefore prepared advice to the Minister that this should be minimised and reserved for emergencies. If this amendment passed, welfare should be

increased as long as operators are correctly trained and guidelines are followed for following up to ensure death.

It was emphasised that farmers should be trained in whatever method they use. Currently it is proposed that blunt force can be used only in an emergency situation, but during routine destruction a different, more consistent way that staff have been trained in must be utilised.

The discussion moved to the code structure, which currently separates emergency humane destruction vs. humane destruction in any situation. This might not be the most efficient way to get the information across. Some codes, e.g. Animal Welfare (Sheep and Beef) Code of Welfare, have a humane destruction section (i.e. not for use in emergencies) because there is a reasonable amount of homekill on these farms.

It was noted that the Meat Industry Association (MIA) submitted that all dairy cattle should be euthanised in the same way as they are at slaughter plants. The advantage of this approach is that it is consistent. There is however an argument that it is unnecessary to go that far and the disadvantage is that a blow to the head for calves in an emergency would be singled out from every other emergency situation in other animals.

Advice was given that the simplest approach would be to look at calf euthanasia only, as widening the scope would raise issues of consistency of method with lambs and other animals. It was suggested that there could be an entire code or guideline about routine euthanasia on farm. However it was proposed that if this idea was put through the prioritisation matrix (as in Guideline 12) it would probably come out as a low priority; the reason that calf euthanasia was being considered now is because it is a direct request from the Minister. It was agreed that the discussion of euthanasia would remain focused on dairy calves. MIA's submission can be considered in later deliberations on the euthanasia issue.

It was noted that the word used to refer to euthanasia/destruction/humane slaughter should be consistent through the code. It was agreed that destruction should be the word used. 'Humane destruction' will be used throughout the code, as written in the current draft amendment.

Specific changes:

Minimum Standard 17:

- It was pointed out that the name 'calf management' may not look appropriate when 4/5 of the minimum standards related to killing of calves. Therefore the title 'calf destruction' or 'management of calf destruction' or 'routine destruction of calves' could be better. It was then suggested that minimum standard (b) can move up to (a) and the other four are grouped as their own section. It was agreed to organise the section in this way. "Calf Management" will remain as the title.
- Minimum standard (c) should read differently. It starts off with 'calves that are killed' then switches tense to 'must be rendered' – the first section should be 'calves to be killed'
- Minimum standard (f) states that calves must be treated in the same way by the contractors. This is already a requirement of the Act so it was questioned whether it needed to be spelled out in the minimum standard. It was pointed out that some farmers do leave killing up to contractors, so this may need to be spelled out. It was suggested that (f) could be moved into the introduction so that the obligations of farmers and contractors under the Act were clear.
- The Minimum standards should qualify what NAWAC means by 'rapidly'. Otherwise, a defence could be used that "it was rapid compared to drowning" but it wasn't objectively rapid at all.

'Immediately' was suggested. It was argued that 'immediately' is not in line with the other codes, and may not be technically possible. However the term 'immediately insensible' is used in the commercial slaughter code. It was agreed that the wording should be in line with the commercial slaughter code.

Minimum Standard 20:

- The reference to the blink reflex should specify that you should touch the eyeball not just the eye.
- The introduction sentence, "If the animal is stunned they must remain..." is also a minimum standard, so can be removed. Add "until death is confirmed" to the minimum standard.
- Is the neck cut description in the 2nd to last paragraph descriptive enough? A calf has difficult arteries to reach. It was agreed that a more generic "follow up procedure to ensure death" could be used.
- Remove "no jugular pulse visible in the neck" as the submitter DairyNZ thinks it is not clear to the average operator. However it was considered that this may be fine since it is just one option put forward among many. It was agreed to remove it.
- Move absence of corneal reflex to be a sign of death rather than insensibility.
- Change the term 'rapid' to 'immediate'.
- Typos to be sent to s 9(2)(a)

Moved (V Williams / A Sharr)

That, subject to the above changes, NAWAC recommends the proposed amendment to the dairy cattle code of welfare to the Minister for Primary Industries.

The motion was put: carried.

Dairy cattle housing

s 9(2)(a) introduced the dairy housing amendment. The main issue was stated to be: should cows be able to spend their whole lives indoors? It was explained that the general submissions on the amendment were overwhelmingly against this. Submissions from farmers and industry groups were generally supportive of dairy housing.

A key point raised in submissions was that grazing is considered to be a behavioural need. Is that correct? If so, when cows eat silage indoors, could that be considered grazing or foraging?

It was explained that there is no definitive proof that lack of grazing of pasture is a stressor for cattle. However it has been shown that cows will still spend time on pasture even when their feeding needs have been met. They will choose to access pasture when they can - it has to be very cold for them not to choose to spend time outdoors.

Further, it has been shown that cows will work to be outside whether the ground is pasture or something else. There is plenty of evidence that cows will 'celebrate' bring outdoors by kicking their heels up and having a run around, but they will not graze necessarily; they may still choose to eat indoors. It was

noted that the UK's Farm Animal Welfare Committee has stated that 'foraging behaviour' is a need, not necessarily 'grazing'.

It was noted that there is also an argument that if there is a deficit with the cows' indoor housing, providing access to the outdoors provides some relief. But insisting on outdoor grazing could reduce welfare, by giving metabolic issues to cows that are used to their indoor feed. Also, cows have been shown to choose to go indoors to rest.

It was agreed that there is no evidence that grazing at pasture is a behavioural need but access to the outdoors (and open space) might be. In fact there is pretty strong evidence that going outside is a behavioural need, given that cows will work for it.

If they must have access to the outdoors, but not necessarily pasture, it should be stated that the cows have access to a soft standing area; standing on concrete is a big contributor to lameness. This is different from a lying area.

It was suggested that a minimum standard could state that cows must have access to a soft standing surface with a corresponding recommended best practice saying that it should be outside.

It was noted that a few farmers in New Zealand are keeping their cows indoors 365 days per year already, and this is common in other parts of the world; but ^{s 9(2)(a)} noted that many of these countries are moving to require animals have access to the outdoors. In NZ the state of indoor-only barns is experimental; we can't know whether access to outdoors will be the norm.

Another suggestion was made for a minimum standard: cows must be given enough space with suitable footing so that they can express their normal social behaviour. This behaviour should be classed separately from just walking, sitting and eating. That does leave the option for it to be indoors (though that would be expensive). Having this area outdoors could be recommended best practice.

It was agreed that the Act has five needs and they should be treated equally. Access to the outdoors can be provided without considerable trade-off to the other needs.

It was explained that the argument against it from industry is that it is technically difficult to move them around all the time (e.g. it compromises feeding), and they need the knowledge and organisation to pull it off. It was argued by some NAWAC members that it's a trivial expense to provide access to an outdoor area.

It was agreed that the subcommittee needs to meet to discuss this behavioural need further.

In general it was noted that submitters are comfortable with a period of indoor living for 2-3 months in winter, but not permanent indoor production.

The Committee's preference is for cows to have some time outdoors. Based on a precautionary approach access to the outdoors should be provided until it is shown to be unnecessary.

It was further noted that there is an enormous variation in stand-off pads and bad welfare in stand-off areas and sacrifice paddocks should be addressed. An appropriate time period for time outdoors should also be discussed.

It was agreed that there doesn't need to be another public consultation, but affected parties may need to be briefed.

A final issue was then raised: riverstones are being promoted as a suitable substrate to raise calves, but they are not considered by NAWAC to be a suitable surface for adult dairy cattle or calves, based on available science. It was noted that there may be strong pushback on this stance.

It was also pointed out that some science portrays riverstones as providing for good welfare. Why choose the science that is are against? It was explained that the paper being referred to [secretariat note: Sutherland, M.A et al 2014: Rearing substrate and space allowance influences locomotor play behaviour of dairy calves in an arena test] was a well-designed paper that presented overwhelming data against the use of riverstones for bedding. It was agreed that NAWAC would engage with the industry rather than allow it to continue.

Action: Dairy subcommittee to continue discussion on the dairy housing amendment and bring back a proposal on ensuring some time outdoors.

C 6. Animal Welfare Amendment Bill and Strategy update

s 9(2)(a) updated NAWAC on the progress of the Animal Welfare Amendment Bill.

It is still with the Primary Production Select Committee. They were due to report in March, but have now extended that deadline to mid-June.

The Select Committee seems to be in a place where the members are happy with the Bill, and remaining points will probably be debated in the house. s 9(2)(a) also noted the recent ban on testing psychoactive substances on animals. The Supplementary Order Paper related to cosmetic testing will probably also go through to the full house for debate.

Currently, it is thought that the Bill will be referred to the house before the election but not necessarily passed.

C 7. MPI update

The Committee gratefully received the MPI update (NAWAC 28/14).

The recent re-alignment of MPI staff was noted. A diagram of the new organisational structure was passed around for information.

PART TWO (OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)

STRATEGY AND PLANNING

O 1. Mini-tutorial – animal welfare inspectors

§ 9(2)(a), Chief Inspector at the Wellington SPCA, gave a presentation to NAWAC.

- Complaints – thousands of complaints of animal ill-treatment are received per year. Routine inspections and pick-up of volunteered goods are also common.

The most common problems relate to Section 10 of the AWA (the obligation to meet physical, health and behavioural needs), followed by Section 11 (the obligation to alleviate pain and distress). Examples are skinny dogs, tied up with no access to shelter and medical treatment. Stray cats are another common call. Reckless and wilful ill-treatment is rare, as are illegal surgical procedures and traps.

Complaints can come in by phone, email, walk-ins and during other call-outs.

- Response time – There are five priority levels at the SPCA: Priority 1 is an emergency and should be answered in an hour; priority 2 requires a same-day response; priority 3 within 24 hours; priority 4 within 48 hours; and priority 5 within one week. Priority 5 includes scheduled property checks.
- Prosecution – whether or not to prosecute is a multi-level decision. Firstly the investigation team will discuss the possibility, and check the background of the people involved and pull together their investigation notes. The case will be put to the prosecution subcommittee of the Board, which includes a lawyer, the CEO, and the Chief Inspector.
- Codes of Welfare – are used extensively by investigators. On the job, they have the minimum standards available as a checklist, reducing the information to a few pages. Codes of Welfare are also used as an education tool.
- Amendment Bill – there is worry that the instant fines will actually water down the severity of the offenses that they see. At what point do you hand an instant fine to the owner of a starving dog, rather than prosecute them? Bad cases should still go through the courts. Training and implementation will be key to rolling out the new compliance tools.

§ 9(2)(a), Manager Planning & Intelligence at MPI, then talked to NAWAC about MPI's compliance model.

- Structure – the structure of the compliance directorate was explained. The district managers, located throughout the country, are key to coordinating all of the compliance officers. The coordinators, first point of contact for the public calling in, are based in Auckland.
- Complaints – MPI has about 700 complaints per year. They come in from the public, from intelligence gathered in proactive work, MPI veterinarians, referrals from the SPCA, industry and NAIT checks.

- VADE model – MPI operates their compliance based on the VADE model – Voluntary, Assist, Direct and Enforce. The idea is that the vast majority of people will voluntarily comply because they want to and will make sure they know the right information. Some will require assistance – they want to comply but don't know how. A few will require direction to comply. A small minority will require enforcement for failure to comply (i.e. a prosecution). So, education becomes an important tool that is used much more often than strong enforcement. Animal welfare is a good news story: most people do it well.
- Myths
 - “The merger to create MPI degraded compliance service delivery”. In fact, prosecutions have gone up since the merger.
 - “Fishery officers are now suddenly animal welfare officers and don't know what they're doing”. In fact, new animal welfare officers volunteered and are passionate. They are trained and know the legislation.
 - “MPI works independently from industry”. In fact MPI must work with industry to affect change – see cow tail breaking as an example.
 - “Staff aren't trained at UNITEC (like the SPCA officers are)” – this is true, MPI staff go through their own programme.
 - “Compliance and verification work independently”. They work closely together.
 - “It's all about farmers”. Actually, MPI is currently involved with a rodeo, a stock agent, transporters and saleyards.

O 2. Contribution for *Welfare Pulse*

Members suggested items as follows, due late July for publication in the September issue:

- Breeding (K Phillips)
- Work programme other than codes – e.g. systems review priorities (A Sharr)

O 3. Identifying animal welfare issues

Members were invited to discuss current areas of interest to Committee members and any new or emerging issues for the public. None were raised.

OTHER REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

O 4. Discussion of information circulated by MPI

The Committee appreciated the information that had been circulated.

O 5. NAWAC correspondence

There were no comments on recent correspondence to and from NAWAC.

O 6. Committee members' reports on recent presentations and attendance at conferences

V Williams mentioned the recent Animal Welfare and Behaviour Consultative Committee meeting, noting that Greyhound Racing New Zealand reported making good progress against their animal welfare goals.

V Williams also reported on the latest NAEAC meeting. The most prominent issues for the Committee were cosmetic testing and testing of psychoactive substances.

Any Other Business

^{s 9(2)(a)} [REDACTED] announced to the Committee that she will be leaving MPI in July in order to take up an opportunity at AgResearch. She thanked NAWAC for their work and dedication over her time at MPI.

O 7. Tour of Wellington SPCA's facilities

Closing

There being no further items of business to discuss, the Chair thanked the committee members for their attendance and declared the meeting closed.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

General Meeting

6 August 2014
9:30 am – 4:30 pm

Meeting Rooms 8.2 and 8.3
Pastoral House
25 The Terrace
Wellington

MINUTES

Present: John Hellström (Chair), Karen Phillips, Sue Brown, Penny Fisher, Katie Milne, Barbara Nicholas, David Scobie, Alan Sharr, Virginia Williams, Ingrid Collins.

In attendance: § 9(2)(a) (Manager Standards Programme), § 9(2)(a) (Technical Adviser, Animal Welfare), § 9(2)(a) (Policy Analyst, Regulatory Reform and Animal Welfare Policy), § 9(2)(a) (Acting Secretary) and § 9(2)(a) (Senior Policy Analyst, Regulatory Reform and Animal Welfare Policy) for agenda items C4 and C7.

Apologies: An apology for absence was received from Kathryn Bicknell.

J Hellström opened the meeting at 9.45 am and welcomed attendees. Agenda items assigned to § 9(2)(a) who was no longer employed by the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI), would be addressed by § 9(2)(a). It was noted that K Bicknell had provided email comments to the acting secretary on the morning of the meeting, on a number of agenda items.

Any Other Business Part One (Public Excluded Agenda)

No other items of business were identified for discussion under Part One of the agenda.

Any Other Business Part Two (Open to the Public)

V Williams wished to discuss the topic of hunting with hounds under Part Two of the agenda.

PART ONE (PUBLIC EXCLUDED AGENDA)

DRAFT RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

There being no other introductory items of business, it was moved (J Hellström/K Milne):

A: *That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:*

- C 1. Confirmation of previous minutes
- C 2. Status of actions arising from previous meetings
- C 3. Work programme update
- C 4. Systems review subcommittee update
- C 5. Pigs: Farrowing crate review
- C 6. Wildlife: RNZSPCA proposal to prohibit snare traps
- C 7. Animal Welfare Amendment Bill and Strategy update
- C 8. MPI update

The general subject of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48 (1) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered		Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
C 1.	<i>Confirmation of previous minutes.</i>	<i>To protect the privacy of natural persons.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(a) of the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA).</i>
C 2.	<i>Status of actions arising from previous meetings.</i>	<i>As above.</i>	<i>As above.</i>
C 3.	<i>Codes of Welfare update.</i>	<i>To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(g)(ii) of the OIA.</i>
C 4.	<i>Systems review subcommittee update.</i>	<i>As above.</i>	<i>As above.</i>
C 5.	<i>Pigs: Farrowing crate review.</i>	<i>As above.</i>	<i>As above.</i>
C 6.	<i>Wildlife: RNZSPCA proposal to prohibit snare traps.</i>	<i>As above.</i>	<i>As above.</i>
C 7.	<i>Animal Welfare Amendment Bill and Strategy update.</i>	<i>To maintain the constitutional conventions for the time being which protect the confidentiality of advice tendered by Ministers of the Crown and officials.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(g)(ii) of the OIA.</i>

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
		withholding would exist under section 9(2)(f)(iv) of the OIA.
C 8.	MPI Update	As above.

B: That ^{s 9(2)(a)} [REDACTED]) be permitted to remain at this meeting after the public has been excluded, because of their knowledge of meeting procedure and the subject matter under discussion. This knowledge is relevant background information to assist the committee in its deliberations.

The motion was put: carried.

C 1. Confirmation of previous minutes

The draft minutes of the general meeting held on 14 May 2014 were reviewed. It was noted that the subcommittee referred to on page 6, under the heading 'shelter for farm animals', was not the NAWAC shelter subcommittee but rather an internal working group from MPI.

Moved (V Williams/A Sharr):

That the draft minutes of the general meeting held on 14 May 2014 be adopted as a true and accurate record of that meeting, subject to the above clarification being made.

The motion was put: carried.

Action - ^{s 9(2)(a)} [REDACTED] to make amendment to 14 May 2014 meeting minutes.

C 2. Status of actions arising from previous meetings

The committee reviewed progress with the various items on the list of actions agreed at previous meetings. The following updates were provided:

Action 2: ^{s 9(2)(a)} [REDACTED] had not yet identified an individual who would present the mini-tutorial on shelter. The committee was adamant that the person not be an industry representative. ^{s 9(2)(a)} [REDACTED] suggested ^{s 9(2)(a)} [REDACTED], Manager Animal Welfare as a possible candidate which the committee supported. Committee members discussed a site visit to I Collins' sheep and beef farm which was located in Gisborne. It was agreed that the farm visit take place in February next year in conjunction with the general meeting and mini-tutorial on shelter.

Action 3: J Hellström had still not received an invitation to attend a dairy off-paddock steering group meeting.

Action 7: The NAWAC member assigned to join the *Safeguarding* group was B Nicholas.

Action 8: J Hellström reported that this action had not yet been completed and noted that as written, was not entirely accurate. The letter that would be sent to DairyNZ and Fonterra would also raise concerns about what the dairy industry had not yet achieved such as ending the practice of tail docking.

§ 9(2)(a) took the opportunity to report back on the DairyNZ workshop she had attended the previous day which had outlined the industry's 2013-2020 strategy for sustainable dairy farming. Target 12 of the strategy, relating to animal health, welfare and well-being had been led by DairyNZ and the Dairy Companies Association of New Zealand (DCANZ). Target 12 sought to have 100 percent of dairy farmers being compliant with good practice animal welfare guidelines and industry standards for dairy farming. Attendees considered that compliance with animal welfare standards sat at 60 or 70 percent. Animal welfare concerns relating to painful husbandry procedures, bobby calves, body condition score, lameness and mastitis were acknowledged. Industry was to focus on some of these issues and develop action plans to support farmers and their staff to achieve good welfare outcomes for their animals. Education was noted as being an important part of this process. § 9(2)(a) reported she would forward the action plans to NAWAC's dairy cattle subcommittee when available.

B Nicholas was surprised that shelter had not been identified as an area which required action plan development. J Hellström agreed to add the issue of shelter to his letter which would also address tail docking in dairy cattle.

Action 9: J Hellström reported that the dairy cattle subcommittee had held a teleconference since the last general meeting, raising two areas of concern. The subcommittee was of the opinion that cows in indoor housing systems needed access to the outdoors and should not be held for long periods on river shingle. J Hellström asked § 9(2)(a) and § 9(2)(a) to review the literature on these two issues. The dairy cattle subcommittee would respond to DairyNZ after this information had been received.

Action 12: J Hellström reported that he had met with New Zealand Kennel Club (NZKC) representatives in June. Under the leadership of the current chief executive officer and president, NZKC had initiated a survey of their membership and also of the general public. The NZKC membership identified concerns they had about the tail docking of dogs. As a result, NZKC modified its policy on tail docking to enable traditionally docked breeds to now be shown or entered into competitions with tails. J Hellström thanked § 9(2)(a) for drafting the letter to NZKC and reported that NZKC now had a new president. The committee agreed that the letter be amended and sent to NZKC.

J Hellström reported that he had recently attended a full day's greyhound racing at the Wanganui track and would write a detailed report for the committee to comment on before writing back to the Minister. Since § 9(2)(a) first raised his concerns about greyhound racing with NAWAC a year ago, the industry had been proactive about making improvements, especially in regards to quality control. Some of the improvements included: trialling a new safety barrier to prevent injury to dogs; having a requirement for new dogs to be registered and micro-chipped by three months of age and their details entered into a database; independent reporting of racing injuries; and an active re-homing programme. V Williams volunteered to send committee members a copy of the greyhound racing report that had been tabled at the last Animal Behaviour and Welfare Consultative Committee (ABWCC) meeting, which she had chaired.

J Hellström advised that there were 4,500 racing greyhounds and that most races were run at distances between 300 and 500 metres. The Wanganui race track held approximately 100 meetings per year. The other race venues around the country were noted.

J Hellström had also attended an Equine Health Association meeting. The horse racing industry was of the opinion that because they had their own codes relating to horse welfare, they did not have any problems or issues to deal with.

§ 9(2)(a) asked J Hellström if the issue of drug use in the greyhound industry was discussed at all. § 9(2)(a) had been made aware of concerns from the Agricultural Compounds and Veterinary Medicines (ACVM)

group at MPI about drug use for masking pain. While this issue was not specifically discussed, J Hellström advised that 40 dogs were drug tested at each race meeting.

P Fisher reported that she had heard about a professional bull riding and pyrotechnics event on the radio recently with a disclaimer that the event was not a rodeo. s 9(2)(a) reported that she and s 9(2)(a) had been working with MPI Legal on the definition of 'rodeo'. J Hellström asked MPI if they could find out more about this event and if necessary refer it to the MPI Compliance Branch.

Action 16: It was noted that the Minister had replied to J Hellström's letter relating to glueboard traps. The letter had been circulated to committee members for information prior to the meeting.

Action 17: It was noted that not all committee members had yet submitted their short biographies to the secretary.

Actions:

s 9(2)(a) *to forward DairyNZ action plans to the NAWAC dairy cattle subcommittee when available.*

J Hellström to add the issue of shelter to his letter to DairyNZ and Fonterra which will also address tail docking.

s 9(2)(a) *to finalise and send out letter to NZKC.*

J Hellström to write a report on his attendance at a greyhound racing meeting.

V Williams to send the NZKC report, which was presented at the last ABWCC meeting, to committee members.

s 9(2)(a) *to find out about advertised bull riding and pyrotechnic event and refer to MPI compliance if necessary.*

C 3. Work programme update

The work programme update was circulated prior to the meeting. For work programme items not already on the agenda, the following updates were provided:

Dairy cattle amendment: s 9(2)(a) reported that the humane destruction amendment to the dairy cattle code of welfare had been issued on 4 June 2014. There appeared to be some confusion in the public domain about the use of blunt force to kill calves which was putting animal welfare inspectors in a difficult position. While routine killing of calves cannot now be carried out by a blow to the head, the practice can be performed in unforeseeable or unexpected conditions by operators who are trained and competent in doing so.

s 9(2)(a), Manager Animal Welfare Sector Support, was working with DairyNZ to prepare some educational material that inspectors could distribute to people when attending animal welfare complaints involving calf destruction. In the mean time, continued reporting of suspected cases of animal ill-treatment and cruelty involving calves was encouraged.

Work on the dairy cattle housing amendment continues.

Rodeos: As mentioned previously, the rodeos code was currently with MPI Legal. s 9(2)(a) advised committee members that due to the new format for codes of welfare, introductory information which was once held at the front of the code would now be incorporated into the body of the code, meaning it would be part of the standard. It was noted that consultation with MPI Legal was built into code development and NAWAC would be part of the conversation in future codes of welfare.

Horses and donkeys: s 9(2)(a) reported that the code was still with the Minister. It was noted that s 9(2)(a), Senior Policy Analyst, Regulatory Reform and Animal Welfare Policy would be providing the policy advice.

Animals in public display, exhibition and entertainment: According to the work programme update, it was anticipated that this code would be ready for recommendation to the Minister in February next year. J Hellström advised that a discussion document would need to be developed prior to that. A realistic timeline for delivery was mid-2015. It was noted that the zoos and circuses code of welfare review date would be extended by two years via an Order in Council and the Animal Welfare Amendment Bill, when passed, would abolish the need for codes to be reviewed every 10 years.

Temporary housing of companion animals: s 9(2)(a) reported that public consultation on the temporary housing code was due to close the next day, with at least 13 submissions received to date. Some of the issues raised in the submissions included de-sexing of dogs, de-sexing animals upon release from shelters and cat micro-chipping.

Saleyards: A draft code of welfare on saleyards drafted by MPI had been updated by s 9(2)(a). Before taking the next step in the code's development, s 9(2)(a) had been asked by the NAWAC saleyards subcommittee to draft an issues and options paper which would be considered by the entire committee.

s 9(2)(a) reported that she and K Phillips had attended the recent fitness for transport pilot road show, which included discussion on issues at saleyards, and encouraged other committee members to attend when it was in their area. Further road shows were scheduled for the North Island later this year with road shows commencing in the South Island sometime next year.

K Phillips shared her concerns about unfit animals arriving at saleyards. It was noted that owners of condemned animals which arrived at slaughter plants were charged financially. It was suggested the same deterrent could be applied to owners of condemned animals which arrived at saleyards. K Phillips questioned whether there was a role for animal welfare inspectors to play here.

Surgical and painful procedures: s 9(2)(a) reported that following the most recent systems review subcommittee meeting, work on the surgical and painful procedures regulations would continue in parallel.

Shelter for farm animals: s 9(2)(a) reported that a proposal relating to shelter research had been submitted to MPI's Animal Welfare Operations Committee (AWOC) and that approval had been received from the committee to seek funding for the project. s 9(2)(a) (Manager of the *Safeguarding our Animals, Safeguarding our Reputation* Programme) was of the opinion that industry stakeholders should be consulted prior to the funding bid going ahead. s 9(2)(a) asked committee members whether they wanted to lead a workshop with industry stakeholders on this research. B Nicholas, chair of the NAWAC shelter subcommittee was supportive of the idea and it was agreed that the workshop could be run before the end of the year. s 9(2)(a) agreed to convey this information to s 9(2)(a).

Breeding: s 9(2)(a) sought clarification from the committee about whether they wanted to send a letter to relevant stakeholders about selective breeding and animal welfare and if so, was the issue a priority in the short term. s 9(2)(a) was concerned that the letter would not be expected and may cross over with other areas of work being undertaken by NAWAC. V Williams reported she had not considered how the letter would impact on other matters and certainly did not want to create unnecessary difficulties.

It was agreed that the NAWAC breeding subcommittee review the stakeholder list and amend it to have a conversation in the first instance with key individuals only. Included in the scope of the letter should be an acknowledgement that NAWAC is looking to develop advice to the Minister on how big an issue breeding really is. This would inform the subcommittee about how to proceed next.

s 9(2)(a) reported that dairy cattle breeding had also been discussed at the workshop she attended the previous day.

Actions:

s 9(2)(a) to work with s 9(2)(a) on a NAWAC/Safeguarding programme shelter workshop before the end of the year.

NAWAC breeding subcommittee to review stakeholder list and discuss with key individuals prior to sending the letter.

C 4 Systems review subcommittee update

s 9(2)(a) joined the meeting to discuss this agenda item.

J Hellström invited s 9(2)(a) to speak to her paper titled *Animal Welfare Bill - Regulatory Work Programme*, copies of which were circulated at the meeting. The work programme detailed was due to commence mid-September. Membership of the core project team was discussed including NAWAC representation. It was agreed that alongside J Hellström, V Williams and D Scobie would represent NAWAC on the project team. Representatives of the Veterinary Council of New Zealand would join the project team for the development of regulations relating to surgical and painful procedures.

A Sharr reported that the systems review subcommittee had held two meetings since the last general meeting. The minutes of the systems review subcommittee meeting held on 30 July 2014, were circulated electronically to committee members the previous day. The development of regulations had been the focus of both meetings and it was agreed that the care and conduct regulations and the surgical and painful procedures regulations be developed in parallel. s 9(2)(a) paper sought to set realistic time frames for achieving the work. s 9(2)(a) invited NAWAC sign off on the work programme once they had had an opportunity to read it in full.

The guiding principles of the work programme were discussed. It was envisaged that the regulations would be animal centric; they would prevent harm; and allow for prosecution. There was no intention to create regulations that would put New Zealand's animal welfare system in disrepute.

The regulations that were developed would be tested on the reference group which was made up of operational representatives from MPI Compliance and Verification Services and the Royal New Zealand SPCA. It was noted that training of animal welfare inspectors would be required once the regulations were developed.

s 9(2)(a) had to leave the meeting to attend to other business but agreed to rejoin the meeting later in the afternoon to continue discussion of this agenda item.

A Sharr continued his report for the benefit of the rest of the committee. It was noted that the systems review issue paper, prepared by s 9(2)(a) addressing what should or should not be included in regulations, had been developed following the meeting which had taken place on 18 June 2014. The extensive lists of 'input focussed' and 'output focussed' animal welfare issues were noted.

s 9(2)(a) reported she was the NAWAC secretariat contact for both work streams for the current time but envisaged that eventually she would focus on one and s 9(2)(a) on the other.

s 9(2)(a) took the opportunity to update committee members on animal welfare resourcing in light of s 9(2)(a) resignation. Recruitment for a fourth member of the codes team would be underway shortly.

A Sharr touched on the other matters that had been on the agenda for the systems review subcommittee including the NAWAC annual report, NAWAC guidelines and matters relating NAWAC meetings. J Hellström considered the future look and structure of codes of welfare also required some consideration and asked that the subcommittee consider this and report back at the November general meeting. J Hellström thanked the systems review committee for their work to date. [REDACTED] agreed to circulate an update of the systems review subcommittee's work plan to the subcommittee, and organise another subcommittee meeting.

Actions:

Systems review subcommittee to review its work plan and consider how NAWAC structures codes of welfare as a priority.

[REDACTED] ***to circulate systems review subcommittee work plan to subcommittee members and organise another meeting of the subcommittee.***

C 5. Pigs: Farrowing crate review

J Hellström reported that after the airing of the first *Sunday* programme which depicted apparently poor conditions in a piggery, including a rodent infestation, the Minister had called J Hellström to discuss options for industry moving away from the use of farrowing crates and adopting alternative systems. The Minister announced that he had requested NAWAC to investigate options for moving away from farrowing crates at a recent pork industry conference. The Minister's speech, detailing the above information, was circulated prior to the meeting.

It was noted that the Bill as introduced allowed the making of regulations that could permit practices that do not fully meet the obligations of the Act during a transition to a new practice. Following public consultation, the Bill was amended to provide for a specific timeframe for transitional regulations. Transitional regulations can now only be made for a maximum of 10 years, with the ability to extend this, once only, for an additional 5 years in limited circumstances. This means that the pork industry would only have a maximum of 15 years to transition away from farrowing crates to alternative systems.

J Hellström indicated K Bicknell's interest in being part of the NAWAC subcommittee looking at this issue and suggested she chair the group. S Brown and K Milne also agreed to join the subcommittee. [REDACTED] reported that [REDACTED] would be the MPI lead on this piece of work.

J Hellström reminded committee members that 40 percent of farmers did not use farrowing crates. While no country in the world had yet banned the use of farrowing crates, there was a lot of work being done on this issue. Piglets were most at risk of being crushed by their mothers when they were between 10 and 14 days old. Piglets older than two weeks were able to get out of the way of danger so the use of farrowing crates for a maximum period of six weeks was not really necessary. The need for new farrowing systems to provide nesting material was noted, so too, the costs associated with different housing systems.

It was agreed that MPI draft a letter to the Minister, on J Hellström's behalf, advising him that a subcommittee had been established to look at the issue of farrowing crates. The letter would also ask the Minister for clarification as to what exactly he wanted from NAWAC, unless it could be confirmed that the Minister would make a written request for advice. [REDACTED] agreed to follow up the formal request for advice from the Minister's office.

Actions:

[REDACTED] ***to seek formal request from the Minister's office about NAWAC providing advice on farrowing crates.***

to draft letter to the Minister advising him that a NAWAC subcommittee has been established to look at the issue of farrowing crates.

C 6. Wildlife: RNZSPCA proposal to prohibit snare traps

The proposal by the Royal New Zealand Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RNZSPCA) to prohibit the sale and use of all snares in New Zealand was circulated to committee members prior to the meeting. The original proposal had been sent to J Hellström as chair of NAWAC and referred to P Fisher and the NAWAC wild animal subcommittee for comment. It was noted that document number 51/14, referred to in the background reading list had not yet been drafted and as such, was not available for consideration under this agenda item.

P Fisher provided an update on current snare use in New Zealand based on the information she could find. This information, along with comments from the wild animal subcommittee, had been circulated as a memo prior to the meeting to be considered alongside the RNZSPCA proposal. The following items were noted:

- Neck snares were being sold on Trademe;
- Snares were not used for operational pest management;
- More information was required on the cultural use of snares by Maori;
- Snares are subject to the same requirements as leg hold traps under the Animal Welfare Act;
- Snare use can be 'attended' (where the setter waits near the snare) or 'unattended';
- Snare use appears to be very limited in terms of numbers used.

NAWAC agreed to two recommendations from the wild animal subcommittee that committee members raise initial thoughts at the meeting and that the snare report be considered by the wild animal subcommittee. The subcommittee would consider whether a restriction or prohibition on snares was required, using the RNZSPCA report as a starting point to inform their work.

Action – Wild animal subcommittee to add issue of snare use to their work programme.

The meeting adjourned for lunch at 12.40 pm and resumed again at 1.15 pm. s 9(2)(a) departed the meeting at 1.15 pm to attend to another work matter. In light of s 9(2)(a) departure, J Hellström recommended the committee move to the open part of the meeting.

PART TWO (OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)

STRATEGY AND PLANNING

O 1. Contribution for *Welfare Pulse*

The topic/author(s) of articles for future issues of *Welfare Pulse* were discussed. A Sharr volunteered to write an article on NAWAC's involvement with developing animal welfare regulations. J Hellström reported he would be talking to Rotary on animal welfare policy and offered to adapt his presentation for a future article.

Action – A Shar and J Hellström to draft articles for 'Welfare Pulse'.

O 2. Identifying animal welfare issues

J Hellström invited committee members to identify current areas of interest to them and new or emerging issues for the public. The following items were identified:

- B Nicholas noted the interesting conference on the ethics of in-vitro flesh and enhanced animals, details of which were circulated to committee members prior to the meeting. [REDACTED] reported there was a centre in Auckland doing similar work.
- J Hellström noted that he had met with MPI's Director-General, Martyn Dunne to discuss animal welfare issues after the broadcasting of the *Sunday* programme on pigs. It was noted that politicians were engaging in animal welfare 'aesthetics' – i.e. if a particular practice looked unpleasant it was automatically assumed that it must equate to bad animal welfare.
- K Milne reported that cow sheds in the Buller region, damaged by recent storms had not yet been repaired and could pose a risk during calving season.
- J Hellström reported an increasing awareness of post operative pain following specific procedures such as disbudding of calves.
- [REDACTED] rejoined the meeting. The recent revelation that an egg producer had deliberately misled consumers by labelling his cage eggs as free range was noted. NAWAC, when reviewing the layer hen code of welfare, had deliberately not defined the term 'free-range'.

PART ONE CONTINUED (PUBLIC EXCLUDED AGENDA)

C 8. MPI update

The MPI update, circulated prior to the meeting was noted. [REDACTED] reported that the draft report on welfare indicators for pastoral species, prepared by [REDACTED], had now been received.

PART TWO CONTINUED (OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)

OTHER REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

O 3. Discussion of information circulated by MPI

J Hellström reported that he had been invited to participate in a brain storming session on regulatory partnerships which was run by MPI's Animal & Animal Products Directorate senior leadership team. The outcome of that session had been summarised by Matthew Stone (Director, Animal & Animal Products) and circulated to committee members prior to the meeting. MPI employees were being asked to focus on regulatory councils to make sure the relationships were being maximised.

O 4. NAWAC correspondence

It was noted that all key items of correspondence had been circulated to committee members.

[REDACTED] rejoined the meeting at 1.45 pm.

O 5. Committee members' reports on recent presentations and attendance at conferences

[REDACTED] reported she had attended and presented at the National Education and Training Seminar (NETS) run by National Pest Control Agencies (NPCA) and the New Zealand Biosecurity Institute (NZBI). As one

of the roles of NPCA is to develop industry best practice s 9(2)(a) was asked to talk about the Animal Welfare Amendment Bill and how it would affect both industry and NAWAC.

s 9(2)(a) presentation had focused on generally accepted practice and had shown video footage of individuals killing possums in different ways to demonstrate this principle. As NETS is made up of such a large and diverse group of stakeholders the meeting provided a good opportunity to convey the message of making animal welfare part of normal business.

P Fisher noted that the consideration of animal welfare was well advanced in the use of traps, but not so accepted in the use of poisons.

V Williams reported she had attended the Australian and New Zealand Council for the Care of Animals in Research and Teaching (ANZCCART) conference in Queenstown the previous week. Of note were the presentations from Associate Professor Joseph Garner, from Stanford University relating to behavioural management and enrichment and attrition rates in drug discovery. Other presentations relating to the statistical merit of studies including blinding and randomisation were noted.

K Phillips reported that she had attended a genetic testing presentation hosted by an animal health laboratory. A test is now available (at a cost of \$150) to screen for inherited canine and feline diseases.

J Hellström reported he had been contracted to advise the Department of Conservation (DOC) and MPI on the economic impact of wasp control.

PART ONE CONTINUED (PUBLIC EXCLUDED AGENDA)

C 4 Systems review subcommittee update continued

s 9(2)(a) continued her summary of the regulatory work programme. In respect to the care and conduct regulations there was a need to identify those minimum standards that were applicable to all species as well as those that were species specific. There was an intention to involve industry at the outset with the process being led by NAWAC. s 9(2)(a) reported that MPI policy had held a meeting with primary industry representatives on Monday to discuss the Animal Welfare Amendment Bill and that they had indicated a willingness to engage with NAWAC on the work programme. It was noted that during the pre-consultation workshops, some issues may be identified which cannot be resolved. It was possible that additional NAWAC meetings and teleconferences may be required to approve the formal consultation document. On behalf of the committee, J Hellström thanked s 9(2)(a) for her update.

s 9(2)(a) asked NAWAC whether they could approve the work programme so she could circulate it to the reference group. Given that the work programme had only been circulated at the start of the meeting it was agreed to give committee members until Friday to submit any additional comments on the programme.

Moved (A Sharr/K Phillips):

That the Regulatory Work Programme, drafted by s 9(2)(a) be approved by NAWAC and circulated to the reference group by NAWAC, subject to any additional comments on the programme being received by Friday 9 August 2014.

The motion was put: carried.

It was agreed that NAWAC would invite stakeholders to the pre-consultation workshops, when necessary, and invite RNZSPCA to join the reference group as this invitation had not yet been extended.

Action – Committee members to provide additional comment on the work programme by Friday 9 August 2014.

C 7. Animal Welfare Amendment Bill and Strategy update

Two papers relating to the Animal Welfare Amendment Bill were circulated to committee members prior to the meeting. § 9(2)(a) asked committee members to contact § 9(2)(a) if they had any questions relating to the document titled *Overview of the Animal Welfare Amendment Bill*.

§ 9(2)(a) reported that the Primary Production Select Committee reported the Bill back to the House on Thursday 26 June 2014 with a recommendation that it should proceed with some amendments. § 9(2)(a) summarised the key amendments as follows:

- The sentience of animals has been recognised in the Bill.
- The consultation process during the development of regulations has been clarified.
- The term 'compliance order' has been changed to 'compliance notice'.
- The Bill specifies each offence in the Act as either a criminal offence or an infringement offence.
- To enable a knowledge base to be established, exporters of live animals have to report on the welfare of animals not only during the journey but also 30 days after they have arrived at their destination.
- Indefinite exemptions are only available for religious and cultural practices.
- Scientists will have to report on the number of animals killed for research, testing and teaching purposes as the definition of 'manipulation' has been changed to include killing as a manipulation.
- Animal ethics committees will be required to assess whether applicants have sufficiently considered non-sentient or non-living alternatives to the use of live animals in research, testing or teaching projects.
- Criteria have been included in the Bill to determine whether a procedure is, or is not, significant.
- The Bill allows approved organisations to dispose of animals abandoned in their care; seize an animal if it is at clear risk of imminent harm; and dispose of an animal immediately if it is wild or unsocialised and severely distressed as a result of being contained.

Some parts of the Bill remain unchanged, including:

- Not allowing MPI to share information with industry on farmers being investigated for animal welfare breaches.
- Inspectors retaining the ability to collect evidence without a warrant as all public law enforcement agencies are subject to the Official Information Act 1982.
- Allowing NAWAC to take 'practicality' and 'economic impact' into account when setting minimum standards in codes of welfare.
- Not allowing an outright ban on live animals for slaughter.
- Permitting the hunting and killing of animals in a wild state provided that the animals are hunted and/or killed in accordance with "generally accepted practice". It was noted that NAWAC will be providing guidelines on this.
- Not banning specific activities or procedures.

J Hellström thanked § 9(2)(a) for the overview noting the amendments as outlined were consistent with NAWAC's submission on the Bill.

PART TWO CONTINUED (OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)

Any Other Business Part Two

O 6. Hunting with hounds

V Williams reported that she had been approached by the New Zealand Hunts' Association Inc about speaking at a seminar in February next year. Even though the invitation was a personal one, V Williams was happy for another NAWAC member to talk to the group if it were considered more appropriate. It was agreed that V Williams would represent NAWAC at the seminar. Given that hunting with hounds was a form of entertainment it was suggested that V Williams' presentation include reference to the work being undertaken by the greyhound racing industry and its move towards self regulation. ^{s 9(2)(a)} reported that the NAWAC wildlife animal subcommittee had previously discussed hounds being used to hunt hares. Coursing was noted as being illegal in New Zealand.

J Hellström reported that the weakest link in the greyhound racing industry was its breeders but industry representatives would be visiting each of them in due course.

It was agreed that ^{s 9(2)(a)} (from MPI Verification Services) be invited to the May 2015 general meeting to provide an update on bobby calves. J Hellström suggested the NAWAC trip to Gisborne take place in early February.

Before closing the meeting J Hellström on behalf of the committee paid tribute to K Phillips and her contribution to the work of the committee over the last six years. K Phillips' term of appointment was due to expire on 31 October 2014 but it was noted that due to the upcoming election there may be delay in appointing her replacement. Therefore K Phillips would continue on the committee until such time as her replacement had been appointed.

There being no other items of business, the Chair thanked committee members for their attendance and declared the meeting closed at 3.10 pm.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

General Meeting

05 November 2014
9:30 am – 5:00 pm

Te Aro Meeting Room 3
The Terrace Conference Centre
114 The Terrace
Wellington

MINUTES

Committee members: Karen Phillips (Acting Chair), Kathryn Bicknell, Sue Brown, Ingrid Collins, Penny Fisher, Katie Milne, Barbara Nicholas, David Scobie, Alan Sharr, Virginia Williams.

In attendance: s 9(2)(a) (Manager Standards Programme), s 9(2)(a) (Senior Adviser, Regulation & Assurance), s 9(2)(a) (Principal Adviser, Policy & Trade), s 9(2)(a) (Senior Policy Analyst, Policy & Trade), s 9(2)(a) (NAWAC secretary).

Apologies: John Hellström.

Welcome: s 9(2)(a) were welcomed to the meeting.

Any Other Business Part One (Public Excluded Agenda)

Any Other Business Part Two (Open to the Public)

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

**PART ONE
(PUBLIC EXCLUDED AGENDA)**

DRAFT RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC
Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

There being no other introductory items of business, it was moved (K Phillips / A Sharr):

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

- C 1. Confirmation of previous minutes (K Phillips)
- C 2. Status of actions arising from previous meetings (K Phillips)
- C 3. Work programme update (s 9(2)(a) / All)
- C 4. Draft work plan for 2015 (s 9(2)(a) / All)
- C 5. Animal Welfare Amendment Bill and Strategy update (s 9(2)(a))
- C 6. MPI update (s 9(2)(a))
 - Committee appointments
 - New look for Codes of Welfare

THE GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED WHILE THE PUBLIC IS EXCLUDED, THE REASON FOR PASSING THIS RESOLUTION IN RELATION TO EACH MATTER, AND THE SPECIFIC GROUNDS UNDER SECTION 48(1) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL INFORMATION AND MEETINGS ACT 1987 FOR THE PASSING OF THIS RESOLUTION ARE AS FOLLOWS:

<i>General subject of each matter to be considered</i>		<i>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</i>	<i>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</i>
C 1.	<i>Confirmation of previous minutes</i>	<i>To protect the privacy of natural persons.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(a) of the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA).</i>
C 2.	<i>Status of actions arising from previous meetings</i>	<i>As above.</i>	<i>As above.</i>
C 3.	<i>Work programme update</i>	<i>To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(g)(ii) of the OIA.</i>
C 4.	<i>Draft work plan 2015</i>	<i>To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the free and frank expression of opinions by or between Ministers and officials.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for</i>

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
		withholding would exist under section 9(2)(g)(i) of the OIA.
C 5. <i>Animal Welfare Amendment Bill and Strategy update</i>	<i>To maintain the constitutional conventions for the time being which protect the confidentiality of advice tendered by Ministers of the Crown and officials.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(f)(iv) of the OIA.</i>
C 6. <i>MPI Update</i>	<i>As above.</i>	<i>As above.</i>

I also move that:

s 9(2)(a)

be permitted to remain at this meeting after the public has been excluded, because of their knowledge of meeting procedure and the subject matter under discussion. This knowledge is relevant background information to assist the committee in its deliberations.

The motion was put: carried.

C 1. Confirmation of previous minutes

The draft minutes of the general meeting held on 06 August 2014 were reviewed with no comments.

Moved (V Williams / I Collins):

That the draft minutes of the general meeting held on 06 August 2014 be adopted as a true and accurate record of that meeting.

The motion was put: carried.

C 2. Status of actions arising from previous meetings

The committee reviewed progress on the list of actions (NAWAC 61/14) agreed at previous meetings. The following updates were provided:

- Action 1: This action on the animals in public display, exhibition and entertainment workstream should be removed in order to reflect the most recent work plan.
- Action 2: Complete.
- Action 3: Complete. NAWAC now has permanent representation on the off-paddock steering group. It was noted that DairyNZ is dependent on the code of welfare release in order to write effective guidelines, so it was suggested that NAWAC should develop guidelines rapidly for farmers who are making big investment decisions; s 9(2)(a) explained that DairyNZ is still out there talking to farmers and giving guidance about the big issues even before the final

documents are ready. It was noted however that problems do lie with the engineering firms, who may be the first in line to give advice to farmers building a barn.

- Action 8: Remove. Saleyards is on hold pending the passing of the Bill.
- Action 11: Complete.
- Action 13: Complete.
- Action 16: Remove. The Safeguarding programme and MPI has been raising the issue of shelter at the Farm to Processor forums; many stakeholders are not even at the stage of accepting it as a problem.
- Action 22: Complete.
- Action 23: Complete.

In regards to the wildlife subcommittee action, there was some discussion on 1080 in the media; it was noted that NAWAC has commissioned work on the humaneness of 1080 in the past and uses that to shape the NAWAC opinion. Best practice use is always encouraged so that non-target exposure is limited and that harm is minimised to target animals; NAWAC supports efforts to find alternatives to 1080. It was noted that P Fisher and colleagues are doing work on improvements to the humaneness of pest control methods.

Action: ^{s 9(2)(a)} to circulate pest control humaneness report to NAWAC

There was also some discussion around travelling speakers who are coming to NZ to talk about dairy housing; ^{s 9(2)(a)} confirmed she will attend at least one. World Animal Protection has been talking to Fonterra about dairy housing and the seemingly worldwide movement towards ensuring time for cows outdoors.

The selective breeding subcommittee gave an update on the meeting various stakeholders they held day before (with NZVA, NZKC, NGRA, NZTR and NZPork). NZKC was highlighted as a stakeholder that had made real progress - e.g. they have an accredited breeder's scheme - but still has some problems in thinking about conformation and welfare. NZGRA were particularly impressive with their approach to overbreeding and selection. Pigs were an unanticipated problem: There are only two main breeding companies in New Zealand, supplying genetic material from overseas, and the subcommittee learned that pig farms often have a 40% replacement rate of breeding sows each year. The Committee highlighted some issues including brachycephaly, caesareans required in bulldogs, the polled gene in cattle not being selected for, media attention on certain dog and cat breeds that are not healthy, and a new 'arms race' in sheep breeding. Selective breeding affecting the welfare of ornamental fish was highlighted as a previously unconsidered area.

Action: ^{s 9(2)(a)} to circulate ornamental fish paper to NAWAC

C 3. Work programme update

The work programme update (NAWAC 69/14) was circulated prior to the meeting. For work programme items not already on the agenda, the following updates were provided:

Animals in Public Display, Exhibition and Entertainment – This work is on hold until 3rd quarter 2015. There was some discussion about whether too many issues had been incorporated into this code. The vision of more generic codes of welfare that encompass many species was explained.

Wild Animals – The work plan will be circulated soon. The subcommittee also agreed on a meeting date (Wednesday December 10 2014).

The current plan for the wildlife subcommittee is to discuss a guidelines document on generally accepted practice in New Zealand order to get it ready to circulate to whole Committee.

s 9(2)(a) outlined the work that various pest management, hunting and fishing associations are doing – including work around helicopter hunting, 'ethical hunt' guidelines, and even bow hunting. These hunting associations/councils have been quite open about identifying their own animal welfare concerns, which is very promising. Examples of concerns include pig hunting, sport fishing and live baiting.

It was noted that the SPCA has had concerns recently around recreational cruelty to wild animals, especially since some offenses are being filmed and uploaded to places like Facebook and Youtube, perhaps showing an increase in offending due to people's attitudes towards pests and wild animals.

Fishing was discussed by the committee. It was noted that at least one country has banned catch and release, although it is very difficult to imagine this in a New Zealand context. One study has shown that 70% of released fish die. It is complicated because New Zealand rules state that small fish must be released.

NAWAC members were invited to a glueboards workshop in Wellington on glueboard alternatives – P Fisher is not able to attend, and it was thought that there should be NAWAC representation. NAWAC would be pushing that alternatives must be discussed, i.e. the discussion around whether or not to ban glueboards is long gone (it has been many years since that point passed). The workshop is on 1 December after lunch (a Monday). K Milne stated that she would be in Wellington on that day on other business, and will need to check her flight times but may be able attend.

Selective Breeding – this was already discussed under item C2.

Dairy Cattle – s 9(2)(a) was contracted to write a paper summarising the evidence around access to the outdoors and the issue of cows needing to separate from the herd at calving. Bedding on stones was raised; however the evidence for not allowing stones is unclear for adult cattle, and the definition of what 'stones' means (gravel, chips etc) will need to be explored.

Bedding for animals being exported live was discussed as well: one member had heard that bedding was not refreshed until just before landing which could be weeks. However, s 9(2)(a) noted that there is on-board monitoring, Animal Welfare Exports Certificates must be issued for each shipment, and reports are passed back to MPI on landing so it is unlikely that the bedding is never changed. It was noted that lately livestock transport to the Chatham Islands has picked up; historically there have been issues there.

s 9(2)(a) explained her work on export regulations. At the moment MPI is working on guidelines, but later on regulations under the Act will tighten things up further.

Pigs and Farrowing Crates – An issues paper has been completed covering research done since the latest release of the code of welfare. It outlines alternatives to crates, but also some ideas like breeding for maternal ability (behaviourally and physiologically). Time in the crate can also be reviewed e.g. should it be limited to 3 days? The size of the crates is also an issue: bigger pigs are being bred that are kept in crates built a long time ago that are now too small. Changes like adding straw may make a difference, allowing the sow to carry out nesting behaviour.

A memo (NAWAC 70/14) on a recent meeting with pork industry representatives was taken as read and opened for discussion. It was suggested that although breeding is discussed a lot, could mis-mothering among pigs be a solely behavioural issue? That is, since piglets are kept separate from the sow and not allowed to learn from her, are farmers propagating bad mothers that require stalls and so the cycle

continues? It was noted that the heritability of pig mothering had been discussed by the breeding subcommittee and is very low (0.05% heritability).

One member was concerned about the amount of contact with the pork industry at this early stage. It was explained that the shared writing group concept has been used many times before over other codes. NAWAC will always meet on its own at some point in the process, and this has worked well in the past. It was also suggested that it is good to involve industry because NAWAC wants their buy in. K Bicknell also pointed out that the industry has to participate in the economic impact analysis which is important to this work. Doing that work separately and ending up with two analyses (MPI vs. industry) has occurred before and it is really difficult to work together past that point.

A teleconference or meeting was suggested for the subcommittee fairly soon since the timeline for this advice on farrowing crates is short; the economic analysis needs to be underway very soon.

C 5. Animal Welfare Amendment Bill and Strategy update

§ 9(2)(a) introduced themselves to the Committee. It was explained that the most up to date information on the progress of the Bill is available in the MPI update (NAWAC 72/14). It was confirmed that it is unlikely the Bill will be read again before the end of the year.

C 3. Work programme update continued

Regulations – Two meetings have been held on regulations: one on care and conduct and one on painful husbandry and surgical procedures. Care and conduct was the subject of the first meeting, and the working group went through a long list of Minimum Standards to think about how to pull them together. One MPI-only meeting was also held with compliance and systems; this was in order to look at developing criteria or a framework that is shorter or more manageable.

The surgical procedures work has had one meeting which was smaller and very valuable; surgical procedures were listed and a regulatory intent was identified for each one around who should do these procedures (i.e. vet only or not) and how they should do it (e.g. must use pain relief). Some were suggested to be prohibited, including dog tail docking.

It is envisaged that draft regulations will go out for full public consultation late next year. NAWAC's annual workplan has been aligned it with the regulation work so that stakeholders are managed well.

D Scobie compared the two meetings, explaining that the first care and conduct meeting was more complex and frustrating. In contrast the surgical procedures meeting was straightforward and satisfying.

Horses and Donkeys – The Committee asked why this code has not been progressed, as NAWAC had recommended it in April. § 9(2)(a) explained that MPI had been providing advice on other codes of welfare, the regulations and the Amendment Bill and that February or March 2015 was the suggested date for release. § 9(2)(a) also explained Policy's role in the release of a code in checking that it met the requirements of the Act. It was noted that J Hellström had talked to the Policy director around his concerns about the length of time for release, especially considering that racing horses is an issue and greyhounds were clearly pulling ahead in terms of welfare.

Horse racing was discussed and it was noted that horse racing breeding numbers are falling worldwide according to § 9(2)(a) who met with the selective breeding subcommittee that week. § 9(2)(a) had also recently appeared on a breakfast show really pushing rehoming of racing horses. The difference with the greyhound industry here is that they have committed to following the life of every greyhound bred from birth to death while horses are branded/identified but when retired or sold the industry does not keep track of them.

The Minister may get questions about racing given the recent events at the Melbourne Cup events; it is good that he will be able to say he is considering a horse code (that does cover racing horses).

Rodeos – The subcommittee was congratulated as this code was released on 31 October. The recent media stories on Glassons advertising and the shutdown of Huntly rodeo was discussed.

§ 9(2)(a) updated the Committee – she met with the Rodeo Cowboys Association just before release of the code. An MPI inspector was also there to talk about compliance so it was a really productive meeting. § 9(2)(a) will also meet with Bull Riders Association spokesperson next week.

The code has been sent to A&P shows, which also have sheep riding events, though they are not technically rodeos; it was suggested that MPI/NAWAC could send a follow-up letter clarifying the situation.

An international rodeo (branded as a 'bull riding contest') is happening on 13 November. The New Zealand Rodeo Cowboys Association has sent MPI a letter to clarify they are definitely not associated in any way. They also asked to follow up and make sure the show had an animal welfare inspector present.

The show organiser also called § 9(2)(a) and asked about pyrotechnics, stating that they'd paid \$14,000 and were all ready to go – he did not want to drop that part of the show. The issue has been forwarded to legal and compliance. He has been told what may happen if they go ahead with the display knowingly breaking a Minimum Standard.

Saleyards – Recently, § 9(2)(a) met with stock agents, Federated Farmers and *Safeguarding* to discuss the supply chain and the transfer of responsibility for the animals, also getting the opportunity to see § 9(2)(a) fitness for transport roadshow. She spent the next day at Feilding saleyards and saw how it all worked.

An issues paper for saleyards has been drafted. The key issues are the change in responsibilities across the supply chain, unloading of animals (timing, space, left on trucks without water), and penning of animals (especially mixing unfamiliar animals). These issues are similar to transport, however at the saleyard there is no verification vet or animal welfare officer. It was suggested this could be addressed via regulation.

V Williams was also shown around a saleyard recently, and realised towards the end that she hadn't seen any water. However when asked they stated that any stock that is kept overnight or has travelled a distance would be kept in a 'water pen'.

Temporary Housing of Companion Animals – The subcommittee has scheduled a meeting in December to go over the summary of submissions.

C 4. Draft work plan for 2015

The draft 2015 work plan had been circulated prior to the meeting (NAWAC 71/14).

§ 9(2)(a) went over the plan outline. The top three priorities – drafting regulations, farrowing crates, and dairy housing – are the major focus for 2015. The workstream on saleyards has been shifted into the regulations workstream, so that the knowledge from that work can be used in the drafting.

It was noted that the delivery milestone for dairy housing may be pushed out because J Hellström does not have good availability to meet with stakeholders and the subcommittee until 2015.

The systems review subcommittee will be put on hold until August 2015; this will be discussed further later in the meeting.

With no further comments, s 9(2)(a) will finalise the work programme and bring it to the next NAWAC meeting. A simplified version will be published online, as it was in 2014.

Action: s 9(2)(a) to finalise and publish NAWAC's 2015 work plan

C 6. MPI update

The Committee gratefully received the MPI update (NAWAC 81/13). s 9(2)(a) was congratulated on her promotion to Senior Adviser.

The publication of the report on 'barriers to compliance' was highlighted. V Williams has been working on the report in her role as a consultant to MPI. The basis for the report was a survey asking farmers what they already know about animal welfare rules and the five basic needs. Those within the pig and poultry industries had higher knowledge as a result of being small industries under more scrutiny. The publication has been delayed due to the absence of human ethics approval but it is hoped it will be published soon.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

**PART TWO
(OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)**

STRATEGY AND PLANNING

O 1. 2015 meeting dates and mini-tutorial ideas

The dates suggested prior to the meeting were:

- Tuesday and Wednesday March 10th and 11th, to be held in Gisborne
- Wednesday May 20th
- Wednesday August 19th
- Wednesday November 11th *or* Thursday 19th

It was agreed that the August meeting would be held on **5 August** (to take into account calving later on in August) and that the November meeting would be on the **19 November** because J Hellström is not available until then.

Action: s 9(2)(a) to send electronic invitations for 2015

A NAWAC/NAEAC joint meeting was suggested for 2015 since it has been several years since the last one. The Committee welcomed the idea and V Williams agreed to bring it to NAEAC's meeting the following week; a date would be circulated afterwards. [Secretariat note: this date is 4 August].

Mini tutorial ideas were then suggested:

- Shelter already organised for March
- Bobby calves already organised for May
- Farrowing crates and pig farming, although this programme is moving very quickly so the subject may be 'too late' by August
- Game animal council or Fish and Game - any wildlife topic

Action: P Fisher / s 9(2)(a) to advise the secretary of an appropriate wildlife speaker for August meeting

O 2. Welfare Pulse

s 9(2)(a) gave an update on the new structure and ownership of *Welfare Pulse*. s 9(2)(a) is the new editor, and the layout will be different after the current issue is published – only one or two articles per issue plus the usual repeated sections ("across our desks", NAWAC update, etc). At the moment there is a backlog of articles so no new articles were requested.

O 3. Systems review subcommittee update

The systems review subcommittee held a meeting on 8 October 2014 that consolidated all of their actions to date and established that the subcommittee had met the requirements laid out in their terms of reference.

The minutes to the meeting (NAWAC 73/14) and a report (NAWAC 74/14) had been circulated. A Sharr asked for the committee to agree or not agree to each motion in the report.

The first point around the new strategic plan was agreed.

Moved (A Sharr / V Williams)

That the NAWAC strategic plan be updated at the first meeting in 2016, with the current plan extended to cover 2015.

The motion was put: carried.

The second point on abusive submissions was discussed. It was suggested that if the sole purpose of a submission is to throw abuse then NAWAC should not count it. However, then it depends on what people think is abusive. A statement could be abusive but it's also a true representation of how that person feels. Another suggestion was to send back letters to abusive people to let them know it wasn't accepted – but is that too much effort? It was agreed that NAWAC needs to take on the issues and consider the submissions even if they are critical of the Committee.

MPI's Policy & Trade thought that hardly any letters ever come into MPI that are solely abusive, and unless it was threatening it would be considered and summarised alongside the others.

Moved (A Sharr / S Brown)

To stick with the status quo in regards to summarising submissions.

The motion was put: carried.

The third point on NAWAC guidelines was agreed.

Moved (I Collins / D Scobie)

That the NAWAC Guidelines will not be renumbered or reordered.

The motion was put: carried.

The point on meeting regularity was noted; everyone agreed that the current setup was working well.

Moved (V Williams / S Brown)

That NAWAC meetings would be continued to be held quarterly with occasional two-day strategic meetings as required.

The motion was put: carried.

A question was raised in regards to meeting papers. It was thought that they could be dated or organised better. It was noted that MPI keeps an 'index' of papers that could be circulated (it has been previously).

Action: ^{s 9(2)(a)} [redacted] *to circulate index of papers quarterly alongside meeting papers*

The point on NAWAC's annual report was then discussed; a mock-up report was contained in Appendix One. It was noted that even if not printed, the secretariat will continue to file hard copies and the report would be published online.

Moved (A Sharr / B Nicholas)

That the NAWAC Annual Report will be the minimum allowable by the Act and will be published online only.

The motion was put: carried.

The final point was on the format of the annual work programme.

Moved (A Sharr / V Williams)

That the quarterly work programme update remain the same, while the annual large excel spreadsheet will remain within MPI and not be circulated to NAWAC.

The motion was put: carried.

O 5. MPI compliance update

s 9(2)(a) introduced himself to the Committee. It was noted that compliance had been invited by J Hellström to each meeting from now on to give an update on activities.

Action: s 9(2)(a) to send NAWAC meeting dates for 2015 to s 9(2)(a)

There was a comparison of complaints in 2014 to other years; there has been an increase in the total number of complaints plus it must be noted that November and December are traditionally high. Prosecutions have jumped since the MPI merger which can be put down to MPI being a bigger organisation with more resourcing.

Education work has been ongoing; this year there have been 2 reports on tail breaking vs. 9 prosecutions last year. s 9(2)(a) *Safeguarding* programme is a good news story in this area. It is too early to tell the effect that infringement notices will have. It was noted that verification vets will be able to issue them as well.

There are 11 full time animal welfare inspectors, but 29 cross-warranted officers have completed 13,246 hours of animal welfare work in the year to date.

It was noted that new, inexperienced farmers have been an issue especially in the dairy industry lately. Another issue has been the tension with the Privacy Act: getting the industry involved to help support cases has been problematic when information sharing is constrained.

Recovering a farm after an investigation has been a huge drain on resources and the compliance side has been thinking of ways to reduce this. The line between an animal welfare intervention and teaching routine farm management has to be drawn so that inspectors are not staying on for long periods while new cases pop up elsewhere. Some ideas are: hiring more inspectors, especially vets; hiring farm management consultants; using volunteers; learning from the fisheries model; and working with the SCPA on livestock as well as pets.

O 4. Safeguarding our Animals, Safeguarding our Reputation update

s 9(2)(a) introduced herself and noted that the bulk of the *Safeguarding* update is contained in the MPI update (NAWAC 81/14) document circulated earlier.

She shared some information on the recent roadshows, which targeted transport operators. There was some tension there in that transport operators considered animal welfare issues to be the farmer's problem and felt that they could not turn down business; meanwhile the saleyard operators are blaming

the transporters and the farmers are blaming the saleyards. In short there are many issues around transporting and logistics, especially relating to bobby calves, that need to be sorted out and it is hoped that the recent work on education via posters, brochures and roadshows will make a difference.

Roadshows will continue into 2015 in the South Island and NAWAC members were invited.

Action: ^{s 9(2)(a)} to circulate invitations to the South Island roadshows when dates are available (RSVP to ^{s 9(2)(a)}).

O 6. Identifying animal welfare issues

K Phillips invited the Committee to discuss an animal welfare issue that was of importance to them, or that they considered an emerging issue, or that they thought the media/public may pick up on soon.

K Phillips noted the new setup for this agenda item from March next year which was decided at the latest Systems Review subcommittee meeting. From now on MPI would bring a list of topics that they had seen over the last few months in order to get the conversation started. ^{s 9(2)(a)} raised some that MPI had seen lately as an indication of the type of topics that may come up:

- Cows calving on trucks – the incidence has risen alongside an increased demand for foetal blood serum
- Bobby calves
- Live export of wild-caught fish may soon be possible
- Dehorning/disbudding problems spotted in Franklin saleyards
- Broiler grower companies in New Zealand lock farmers into contracts and supply feed, fresh litter, pickup times etc – if farmers are unsatisfied with the resulting welfare conditions they feel they cannot speak out since technically they're the person in charge, but on the other hand they can't change the contract
- Pet shops/temporary housing issues have been in the news
- Drones used to monitor livestock. Can they stress animals or separate mother/young pairs? Will there be rules in the future, like not being allowed to use them around pregnant stock?

OTHER REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

O 7. Discussion of information circulated by MPI

The Committee appreciated the information that had been circulated.

O 8. Glueboard traps communications plan

From 1 January 2015 the sale or use of rodent glueboard traps is prohibited unless approved by the Minister for Primary Industries (delegated to MPI). A memo (NAWAC 75/14) containing the 'backpocket' responses to potential media enquiries had been circulated prior to the meeting. This will support the plan to help deal with the compliance side of the transition plan.

At the moment the situation is tricky because people can still import traps and can still use them for insects – so messaging will be key. The upcoming alternatives workshop will be aimed at supporting users to meet their food safety obligations by showing them what others are already doing.

The SPCA has been approaching two-dollar shops and other places selling traps in order to tell them about the upcoming prohibition. There will be a press release at the time, and perhaps a letter will go out to these shops.

Another use for these traps – pest management – was noted; while they cannot be used on rodents without approval, DOC has been using them to catch rainbow skinks and this use will be able to continue.

O 9. NAWAC correspondence

There were no comments on recent correspondence received by or sent on behalf of NAWAC. The greyhound report was noted.

O 10. Committee members' reports on recent presentations and attendance at conferences

V Williams chaired the latest Animal Behaviour and Welfare Consultative Committee (ABWCC) meeting. This is a forum for the exchange of information of animal welfare between many parties. It was a really good exchange of information with great presentations. One issue that came up was that of dairy goats and what to do with goat kids; a representative of the industry came along for the first time. They are doing some work on using penetrative captive bolts.

Action – s 9(2)(a) to circulate ABWCC minutes/reports for information

s 9(2)(a) attended the Asia Pacific Poultry Congress and talked about the codes for meat chickens and layer hens. One highlight was learning about some exotic crossbreeds being developed in Asia to raise production (e.g. pheasant x chicken or duck x chicken). Some producers are coming up with new alternatives to antimicrobials, like turmeric added to the feed.

s 9(2)(a) also attended the OIE collaborating centre meeting held in Korea. The main focus was how the Australian/New Zealand collaborating centre can expand the implementation of international animal welfare standards through the Middle East and Asia.

s 9(2)(a) attended the New Zealand Companion Animal Annual Conference. The main focus was on cats and stray/feral cat control, as well as the SPCA's 'Saving Lives' programme. To that end s 9(2)(a) was invited to speak and his talk was very interesting although the fundamental difference of opinion between him and the SPCA on the efficacy of Trap Neuter Return programmes was not resolved. P Fisher stated that Landcare Research is currently doing some research into what feral cats actually eat in the wild. There is also an issue around toxoplasmosis affecting wildlife (especially in Australia). Cat curfews were discussed – do they work? Australia is very progressive in this; in some areas you must keep cats indoors, you can't have cats in apartments, etc. New Zealand is behind on this thinking. The 'Enhancing the Halo' project in Wellington was noted - this is a programme spearheaded by s 9(2)(a) to encourage those who live near the sanctuaries and town belt to own fewer cats or to control them better.

Closing

There being no further items of business to discuss, K Phillips thanked the committee members for their attendance and declared the meeting closed at 4:30pm.

Next meeting: 10 and 11 March 2015



National Animal

Welfare Advisory

Committee

General Meeting

10 March 2015

10:30am – 2:00pm:
Whangara Farms, Gisborne

2:30pm – 5:00pm:
Accountants office, BDO
1 Peel Street
Gisborne

MINUTES

Committee members: John Hellström (Chair), Kathryn Bicknell, Sue Brown, Ingrid Collins, Katie Milne, David Scobie, Alan Sharr, Julie Wagner, Virginia Williams.

In attendance: § 9(2)(a) (Manager, Animal Welfare, Regulation & Assurance), § 9(2)(a) (Manager Standards Programme), § 9(2)(a) (Senior Adviser, Regulation & Assurance), § 9(2)(a) (Policy Analyst, Policy & Trade), § 9(2)(a) (Principal Adviser, Policy & Trade), § 9(2)(a) (NAWAC Secretary).

Apologies: Penny Fisher

Welcome: Julie Wagner, newest member of the Committee, and § 9(2)(a), a new member of MPI's Regulatory Reform & Animal Welfare Team.

§ 9(2)(a) is in attendance to give a talk about shade & shelter and an update on the New Zealand Animal Welfare Strategy.

Any Other Business: Noted that § 9(2)(a) of Whangara farms will give a presentation at 4:30.

C/- MPI, Pastoral House
P O Box 2526
Wellington 6140
New Zealand

Telephone: 0800 00 83 33
Email: nawac@mpi.govt.nz

It was noted that the Agenda contains an error: § 9(2)(a) is attending from Policy rather than § 9(2)(a)

PART ONE
10:30am – 2:00pm
(OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)

O 1. Visit to Whangara Farms

In the morning the Committee visited Whangara Farms.

They were able to see new technology in action (including weather stations and the use of EID tags in sheep) as well as learning about how the station plans to provide more shade and shelter to the animals by starting up their own plant nursery.

Lunch was provided by the marae at Whangara.

PART TWO
2:30pm – 5:00pm
(OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)

STRATEGY AND PLANNING

O 2. Appointment of Deputy Chair

The Animal Welfare Act 1999 (section 67 and Schedule 1, clause 3(1)) requires the committee to elect one of its members as its deputy chairperson at its first meeting each year. J Hellström nominated V Williams.

Moved (J Hellström / I Collins):

That V Williams be elected deputy chairperson of the committee for 2015, pursuant to the Animal Welfare Act 1999 (section 67 and Schedule 1, clause 3)).

The motion was put: carried.

It was noted that V Williams will finish her term at the end of October 2015; MPI and NAWAC will deal with any gap in deputy chairmanship at the last meeting of the year if needed.

Action: Secretariat and Chair to arrange appointment of interim deputy chairperson at the November meeting or the first meeting after Virginia is replaced on the Committee, in accordance with Schedule 1, clause (5) of the Animal Welfare Act.

O 3. The New Zealand animal welfare strategy: an update

(Manager, Animal Welfare, Regulation & Assurance), was invited to give an update on the progress of New Zealand's animal welfare strategy. He handed out a paper (*secretariat note: later circulated and filed as NAWAC 24/15*).

The (draft) paper describes a high-level strategy intended to outline an 'animal welfare system' created from a service design perspective. At the moment much of the work being done is related to pulling together a system within MPI, but the view of this paper is of New Zealand's animal welfare infrastructure as a whole.

The circular diagram in the paper puts animals at the centre, with progressively less involved groups radiating outwards (though even the citizens on the outside can be very interested at times). The idea of depicting it in this way is to create a different viewpoint. Imagine the benefits flowing outwards and the costs pushing back in.

Those further removed from the centre (i.e. animal advocates, general public) may have different expectations and knowledge than those working closely with animals (i.e. farmers); however it is important that the learning and knowledge can go both ways, that farmers continue to listen to those on the outside layers, not simply dismiss them because they "have no idea what we do". On the other hand, those further removed from the food system can place unrealistic burdens on it, expecting welfare/quality to be better and food to be cheaper at the same time.

Problems and opportunities in the system were summarised, which included:

- Husbandry practices that are accepted as necessary but cause pain and distress
- People in charge who are indifferent or unaware of animals needs, or cut corners
- Those experiencing difficult personal circumstances – e.g. health, finances, relationships
- Rascals who are entertained by mistreatment
- People with 'pathological' traits
- Unrealistic or unfair expectations of people, for example, those in charge of animals
- More efficient coordination and use of experiences and resources in addressing priorities
- Equity of costs and benefits across the animal welfare system.

The future state section was then discussed, with focus falling on the statement "Animal welfare inspectors resourced according to expectations". It was noted that SPCA inspectors are resourced in a different way (they are a non-profit); in the future state would this need to change in order to meet the above statement? NAWAC questioned how much MPI contributes to the SPCA inspectorate. It was explained that MPI contributes up to \$400,000 per year for farm animal intervention and for inspector training.

In regards to the drivers of animal welfare, it was acknowledged that cost and economics is a key element; for example eggs have become progressively cheaper, driving farmers to intensify over the decades.

The "Response" section of the future operating model was then discussed. DairyNZ's Early Response System was noted. This system identifies poor performers and brings in bank managers, support, etc., all (hopefully) before the animal welfare situation on farm really falls apart. Response also means emergency responses to earthquakes, droughts, etc.

§ 9(2)(a) then discussed the idea of an animal welfare forum as part of the future state – one that could include NAWAC and NAEAC; can we pull together these and other organisations to create a forum like the Australian and New Zealand Council for the Care of Animals in Research and Teaching (ANZCCART) for airing issues?

Action: Explore the idea of an animal welfare forum (as part of implementing the NZ animal welfare strategy) at the NAWAC/NAEAC joint meeting in August

Governance is another key part of the future state of the animal welfare system. Resourcing will be key, as will delineating roles (e.g. between MPI and NAWAC). The inspectorate between MPI and SPCA needs to work together efficiently.

§ 9(2)(a) sought feedback on the paper from the Committee. Members thought the circular diagram was good because it really places the focus of the system on the animals themselves.

In regards to governance and leadership it was thought that the issue of confidentiality needs to be worked out. This has been a problem and has caused a few 'false alarms' where people thought they were on watch. For industry groups, being able to have a quiet word with the person in question before it gets really bad will make a huge difference for the animals.

It was suggested that one way to get engagement across the system may be to think about the types of people in each layer. It was noted that any one individual is in many layers; a sheep farmer would be considered to be in the second circle, but then when thinking about pigs, would be all the way on the outside layer.

§ 9(2)(a) thanked the Committee for their feedback and discussion. An updated copy will be completed over the next few months.

Action: Secretary to circulate final copy of the animal welfare operating model when complete.

O 4. NAWAC self-evaluation: results and discussion

The results of the review of the committee's performance in 2014 were summarised (NAWAC 09/15). Overall it seemed that NAWAC and the secretariat performed well in 2014 but there were specific issues to discuss.

The first comment on the review was in regards to the difficult-to-find mission statement, which is part of a bigger issue: animal welfare is difficult to find on the MPI website. It was thought that it should be easy to find from the front page.

It was confirmed by MPI that as part of the biosecurity.govt.nz website migration, NAWAC and NAEAC will get their own updated web pages. It could be possible to pursue a separate website, as NAWAC and NAEAC are independent Committees. In the end it was agreed that the chairs of the two Committees would request a joint meeting with Martyn Dunne asking for more visibility or, if not, their own website.

Action: Secretariat to arrange for V Williams and J Hellström to meet MPI's Director-General to discuss the visibility of NAWAC, NAEAC and animal welfare on the new website.

Proactive work was raised in the review several times. NAWAC has already begun this, with the selective breeding, shade & shelter, and entertainment work programmes underway. Of course, the

Animal Welfare Amendment Bill has also caused NAWAC to stop and think about what it does, which has been beneficial. The new meeting paper, "animal issues", to be discussed under agenda item C5 on 11 March, was also explained. The systems review subcommittee had recommended more focus on the agenda item at the previous meeting in November (refer NAWAC 74/14), and this meeting will be the first round of that type of 'horizon scanning', assisted by topics that MPI staff have picked up on. The weekly emails have also been beneficial, and it was agreed that big issues from those should be fed back to MPI to be added to the issues list. Having discussed strategy, it was noted that codes and regulations will continue to be a part of NAWAC's work. However, the codes may become something more like a guidance document in the future.

NAWAC appreciated clear time frames and deadlines from the secretariat. MPI agreed that they can keep this in mind going forward.

There were some comments under the section for external communication. § 9(2)(a) explained that once per year, the Farm Animal Welfare Council (FAWC, UK) runs an open session – would NAWAC want to do something like that? It was noted that while their sessions are widely advertised, not many people come. It may not be efficient to do in New Zealand. As part of the draft regulations process, NAWAC members are meeting with industry stakeholders soon (around 25 groups identified so far). J Hellström will take the opportunity to ensure that the stakeholders know what's coming and why, and will have a chance to say what they want to see regulated. These meetings would be an opportunity to ask the question: do you see value in an open forum, annually for example?

It was noted from § 9(2)(a) that the chairs of NAWAC and NAEAC and the staff at MPI do a lot of the work in this area, and perhaps all need to take more responsibility for sharing what they already do. Other members agreed that while the Chair meets with many external stakeholders, not all members feel so involved.

V Williams explained that NAEAC writes the animal ethics committees a newsletter a few times a year, and it's a good way to connect everybody, but noted that NAWAC has many more stakeholders.

Induction of new committee members was then discussed. It was suggested that there should be a brief document stating exactly what the chair should do when inducting new committee members. They should not just be given material, but have it explained to them along with the background on contentious issues. It was noted that each member does already get a letter from the chair and a meeting with them before the first quarterly meeting that they attend. Another issue however was that members often need 'refreshers' when they begin work on a subcommittee. MPI staff already try to do this but agreed that they could continue to work on it. It was explained that NAWAC members should always refer to the code reports and the NAWAC guidelines in the first instance.

Action: Secretary and Chair to review the introductory letter from the chair and contents of induction pack, with a view to including more information on contentious issues and statutory functions (like operational research).

It was agreed that the work of supporting team in MPI has been much appreciated. § 9(2)(a) raised the score given by the Committee on scientific support; at 4.3/5 it was the lowest score. What can be done to raise it? It was suggested that science on welfare issues (especially the most contentious issues like farrowing) can be contradictory or unavailable, but the score is not a reflection on staff.

Operational research was also discussed. It was explained that NAWAC has twice previously commissioned a review to identify research gaps but this function has recently fallen behind as the

national animal welfare strategy implementation work continues. It is a NAWAC function to provide this advice. It was confirmed that identifying research priorities will be included as part of next years' work plan and strategic plan update. It was also noted that MPI's animal welfare operational research fund will support two studies starting this year: farrowing crates and bobby calves. It was also noted that operational research is included in each MPI Update document and NAWAC can request copies of the reports mentioned within at any time (and eventually they're available to the public).

There were no further comments raised. J Hellström stated that he believed the annual performance review was a good exercise and should continue in the future.

O 5. Agree on final 2015 work plan (including subcommittee structure)

The NAWAC work programme, circulated as paper 10/15, had been finalised at the previous meeting. Members discussed whether there was more to change before it is published.

It was agreed that the Systems Review Subcommittee work should be added to the document (though it starts in August). It was also explained that the farrowing crates work was currently working on advice on options only, rather than proposing already that the code of welfare should be amended. S Brown is a member of the farrowing crates subcommittee and should be added to the list of members on the workplan.

Saleyards has been dropped as a subcommittee but the relevant issues are being picked up as part of the regulations work.

[Secretariat note: at this point ^{s 9(2)(a)} arrived to give their presentation on Whangara farms – the below section of discussion was continued first thing on 11 March]

The subcommittee membership was reviewed. There was a vacancy on the dairy cattle subcommittee, which J Wagner agreed to fill.

Another member would potentially be needed for systems review, but that would be determined later in the year once they know the workload.

It was noted that J Wagner has joined the farrowing crates subcommittee. K Phillips is also staying on for 6 months as an ex-officio member.

^{s 9(2)(a)} explained that the listed MPI contacts would be switching around in May once the new team member has joined the secretariat.

The shelter subcommittee required a new member to replace B Nicholas, and K Bicknell requested that she be removed from the subcommittee due to the workload of the farrowing crates review. Katie M offered to join, I Collins agreed to lead the subcommittee as the new chair. That leaves one space open, but it was noted that there would be a new NAWAC member in May.

The Committee then agreed that the work programme was ready to publish on the web in the format used in previous years.

Whangara Farms Presentation

At 4:30pm ^{s 9(2)(a)}

^{s 9(2)(a)} arrived to give a presentation to NAWAC on the background and functioning of Whangara Farms. Whangara Farms is a partnership between two Maori incorporations Pakarae and Whangara B5. The shareholders are all direct descendants to families associated with the land. Therefore, sustainability is key - the land is not and never will be for sale.

Questions from the Committee after the presentation

Do Whangara Farms feel that an 'animal welfare' label would be beneficial for their products?

Whangara is involved in selling direct to business (via a slaughterhouse in Auckland, Wilson Hellabys Ltd). This provides branding and traceability. Whangara is strict on meeting codes of welfare and other animal welfare guidelines and are often audited by various buyers. They have considered further branding, and the story of the farm that is sold to consumers features good animal welfare. They also strive to meet the high quality BeefEQ threshold, which requires low pH (= low stress animals). The misconception of some labelling terms was noted - many consumers look for labels such as 'organic' or 'green', thinking that it automatically means good animal welfare.

Does Whangara share its success story with other incorporations?

Whangara has always shared its story with other Maori trusts with mixed success (it is difficult to sell the idea of partnerships, boards etc, as it can be perceived as leading to a loss of autonomy). ^{s 9(2)(a)} is currently on the road doing governance training workshops to Maori incorporations and trusts through an SFF partnership.

Questions from Whangara Farms to the Committee

How is the sheep & beef industry as a whole in terms of animal welfare? What can we do better?

Issues raised included horned cattle, tail docking (for now it's the lack of analgesia, but in the long term, will the practice be accepted at all?), low lamb survivability, and shade & shelter. However it was noted that the sheep & beef industry currently do well in terms of animal welfare especially when compared to the other high profile industries in New Zealand.

EIDs in sheep were noted as a good step. It was explained that the EIDs at Whangara are part of a funded trial to gather data to see whether it's profitable; often, there needs to be a motivator such as profitability to change behaviour.

^{s 9(2)(a)} were thanked by the Committee and the chair declared the meeting closed for the day at 5:30pm.

General Meeting

11 March 2015

9:00am – 4:00pm

Accountants office, BDO
1 Peel Street
Gisborne

MINUTES

Committee members: John Hellström (Chair), Kathryn Bicknell, Sue Brown, Ingrid Collins, Katie Milne, David Scobie, Alan Sharr, Julie Wagner, Virginia Williams.

In attendance: s 9(2)(a) (Manager, Animal Welfare, Regulation & Assurance), s 9(2)(a) (Manager Standards Programme), s 9(2)(a) (Senior Adviser, Regulation & Assurance), s 9(2)(a) (Policy Analyst, Policy & Trade), s 9(2)(a) (Principal Adviser, Policy & Trade), s 9(2)(a) (NAWAC Secretary).

Apologies: Penny Fisher

Any Other Business Part One (Public Excluded Agenda): None

Any Other Business Part Two (Open to the Public): None

**PART ONE
(PUBLIC EXCLUDED AGENDA)**

DRAFT RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC
Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

There being no other introductory items of business, it was moved (J Hellström / V. Williams)
That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

- | | | |
|------|--|---------------------|
| C 1. | Confirmation of previous minutes | (J Hellström) |
| C 2. | Status of actions arising from previous meetings | (J Hellström) |
| C 3. | Work programme update | (J Hellström / All) |
| C 4. | Animal Welfare Amendment Bill and draft regulations update | (J Hellström) |
| C 5. | Animal welfare issues register and discussion | § 9(2)(a) / All |
| C 6. | MPI update and feedback on information shared | § 9(2)(a) / All |

THE GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED WHILE THE PUBLIC IS EXCLUDED, THE REASON FOR PASSING THIS RESOLUTION IN RELATION TO EACH MATTER, AND THE SPECIFIC GROUNDS UNDER SECTION 48(1) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL INFORMATION AND MEETINGS ACT 1987 FOR THE PASSING OF THIS RESOLUTION ARE AS FOLLOWS:

<i>General subject of each matter to be considered</i>		<i>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</i>	<i>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</i>
C 1.	<i>Confirmation of previous minutes</i>	<i>To protect the privacy of natural persons.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(a) of the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA).</i>
C 2.	<i>Status of actions arising from previous meetings</i>	<i>As above.</i>	<i>As above.</i>
C 3.	<i>Work programme update</i>	<i>To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for</i>

General subject of each matter to be considered		Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
		employees from improper pressure or harassment.	withholding would exist under section 9(2)(g)(ii) of the OIA.
C 4.	Animal Welfare Amendment Bill and draft regulations update	To maintain the constitutional conventions for the time being which protect the confidentiality of advice tendered by Ministers of the Crown and officials.	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(f)(iv) of the OIA.
C 5.	Animal welfare issues register and discussion	To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the free and frank expression of opinions by or between or to Ministers of the Crown or members of an organisation or officers and employees of any department or organisation in the course of their duty.	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(g)(i) of the OIA.
C 6.	MPI update and feedback on information shared	To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(g)(ii) of the OIA.

I also move that:

s 9(2)(a)

be permitted to remain at this meeting after the public has been excluded, because of their knowledge of meeting procedure and the subject matter under discussion. This knowledge is relevant background information to assist the committee in its deliberations.

C 1. Confirmation of previous minutes

The draft minutes of the general meeting held on 5 November 2014 (NAWAC 03/15) were reviewed and accepted with no comments.

Moved (K Bicknell / V Williams)

That the draft minutes of the general meeting held on 5 November 2014 be adopted as a true and accurate record of that meeting.

The motion was put: carried.

C 2. Status of actions arising from previous meetings

The committee reviewed progress on the list of actions (NAWAC 04/15) agreed at previous meetings. The following updates were provided:

- Action 4: Complete – wildlife work plan circulated as paper 15/15.
- Action 20: Complete – work plan finalised, will be published.
- Action 22: P Fisher and s 9(2)(a) to discuss, but suggested that a speaker would be suitable in November or perhaps at the NAWAC/NAEAC joint meeting.
- Action 23: Complete – invitations to fitness for transport roadshows have been sent.

Further discussion included the animals in public display, exhibition and entertainment work. J Hellstrom explained that he will talk to the Government Administration Select Committee on 25 March about greyhounds. A letter summarising NAWAC's main points has already been circulated and J Hellström will report back on the submission afterwards.

There was a question on sheep riding in rodeos. There has been a lack of clarity among other groups (e.g. A&P shows) about sheep riding. It was noted that there is potential to pass a regulation here once the Animal Welfare Amendment Bill has passed in order to make it consistent. It was interesting to note that at least one rodeo has offered a mechanical sheep instead.

There was discussion on the joint NAWAC/NAEAC meeting. The topic is new technology but not much planning has gone into the day yet. An invitation has gone to one speaker (relating to 3D printing). It was thought that SAFE and the SPCA would be invited, but K Bicknell raised that the meeting will be just before the release of NAWAC's advice on farrowing crates, and the pork industry is already on edge about NAWAC's motives.

Action: J Hellström and V Williams to discuss the planning of the joint meeting further.

C 3. Work programme update

The work programme update (NAWAC 11/15) was circulated prior to the meeting. For work programme items not already on the agenda, the following updates were provided:

Animals in Public Display, Exhibition and Entertainment – this workstream is on hold at the moment, except for some work on greyhounds and some work feeding into regulations (for which there would be an update later in the meeting).

Wild Animals – an update has been circulated in paper 15/15 (via email). In summary, there will be work on snares and generally accepted practice. The key issue is to define 'generally accepted practice'; the subcommittee is proposing to draft a new NAWAC guideline. As part of that work, the subcommittee will hold a workshop with stakeholders, talk about what they do and why, and use that to start the conversation on what generally accepted practice is. Hopefully the draft guideline will be done by December this year. There was a question on the progress of glueboard exemptions.

Action: s 9(2)(a) to bring information on glueboards to the next committee meeting – on how many exemptions have been given and any issues raised from that process.

Members were asked to consider the stakeholder list circulated in paper 15/15. Subcommittee members noted that they had discussed the stakeholder meetings and whether a workshop with many large groups would be better compared to individual meetings with smaller groups. On one hand smaller groups may talk more but larger groups could result in a 'cross-pollination' of ideas.

It was also noted that most people who hunt and fish are not part of these groups; is it worth approaching individuals and communities? There was a mixed reaction – talking to the representatives of industry groups is more of a 'fact finding' mission and they would be suitable for that. However individuals may not join these groups if they feel they don't represent them.

Selective Breeding – The subcommittee has had meetings with all key stakeholders including contact with the New Zealand Kennel Club since there was a recent visit from an Australian representative. The subcommittee has divided up species amongst themselves, and everybody has produced papers that answer key questions within those species - now it's a matter of pulling it together into some kind of paper.

The information that could feed into regulations was discussed. It was suggested that some 'black and white' issues like breeding lethal genes could be banned. The rest – how to breed animals, what traits to choose, etc. – is difficult to regulate. The New Zealand Kennel Club is not very proactive in some areas like brachycephaly, and how would NAWAC even reach the backyard breeders? It was noted that the state of Victoria in Australia has a code for breeding, and it is considered unenforceable and ineffective by the Australian Kennel Club.

There was discussion on the selection of polled genes in cattle. It's a big welfare gain, and the genetics are there, but people are not selecting for it over production values.

J Hellström stated that it will be good to have a NAWAC opinion-type document for the first time. The draft will be presented at the May meeting.

Dairy Cattle Housing Amendment – This amendment is now in the post-consultation stage. NAWAC received lots of feedback, including many comments suggesting it is ridiculous to believe that cattle don't need to graze. Other issues included bedding (riverstones) and access to the outdoors.

The code has been amended and will be sent to the subcommittee to review. The amended code will then hopefully go out to wider industry-NAWAC writing group by the end of March, be back to NAWAC at the May meeting, and released in August. The difficult thing to consider is the timing of the code amendment alongside the development of regulations. It is likely that a recommendation will go to the Minister basically saying "this is how the code should be amended, but we are also looking at regulations for issues x and y".

DairyNZ are working on guideline for dairy housing that covers cow comfort for cows in purpose built housing. It does not cover other off-paddock systems (e.g. feedpads). They're close to finalising it. Does NAWAC think that they should hold off on publishing until the code amendment is recommended? It was agreed that it would be helpful if DairyNZ could wait if possible.

It was explained to NAWAC that MPI doesn't have a collective view on dairy cattle housing, and there is a risk that water quality and climate change colleagues will be saying different things than animal welfare and NAWAC – meaning there is potential for the Minister to receive conflicting advice. ^{§ 9(2)(a)} has been working on informing across MPI. Others need to be aware that there are welfare concerns. Then, the advice to the Minister will consistently be "this is why it works, but here are the concerns".

It was noted that legislation in other areas (e.g. environment, irrigation and water quality) has an impact on farmers that can conflict with animal welfare requirements.

Farrowing Crates – The subcommittee has been busy, having already toured a few systems and with more scheduled in the future.

There has been some industry contact and K Bicknell and ^{s 9(2)(a)} have been looking at scientific literature. The terms of reference came direct from Minister: to summarise what's happened since the code was released in 2010 and see whether or not there is cause to reconsider farrowing conditions. Industry involvement so far has been beneficial because of their data, but they are also concerned with potential future impacts for them. The major next step is to progress the economic analysis on alternative ways of managing farrowing.

The subcommittee's focus has been identifying information gaps and any changes to the information that was available when the committee came to its current position on farrowing crates, which is stated in the pig code of welfare. It was noted that there are other things that affect mortality other than housing – one is litter size (tied in with genetics), so you end up with a cycle where litters are bred to be larger and larger and that's considered to be a reason why crates are justified. This also has consequences for other factors such as body weight at birth and rate of heat loss. The other factor, of course, is management.

The other thing is that all of the focus on piglet welfare is mortality. There is virtually no information on welfare of surviving piglets. How do you compare the loss of for example .5 piglets per litter vs. the increased welfare of 11 other piglets that can spend time with their mother outside of the crate?

As well as this there is the need to future-proof. Right now, if you only look at scientific literature, there are arguments to retain short-term use of farrowing crates. However, there is work on alternatives that could provide significant welfare benefits and there is a risk in providing advice that requires adoption of a management system that could be reviewed again in the future, requiring another change if the Minister was to instigate another review.

The use of induction was mentioned. Sows can be induced with synthetic oxytocin (because when confined, they produce less of the hormone) so that they farrow during working hours. This is not addressed in the pig code. This issue is part of farrowing (as is nest building) – should it be considered?

Another issue is that the data is reported as 'mortality to 10 days', which looks good in crated piglets, but in a longer time scale you can see mortality spikes due to scours. Are piglets in other systems, overall, maybe more robust? Are the piglets who die in other systems actually dying for reasons other than crushing or would they die 'anyway'?

The final point is that enrichment in crating systems is pretty much ignored. It doesn't fit in the management systems and feedback so far is that the farmers are not willing to try.

The subcommittee is summarising these points and the scientific literature to provide a brief update to the Committee.

Horses and Donkeys – MPI Policy has reviewed the draft code and report and identified some areas for updating or discussion with the subcommittee. One example is hot branding, which may be restricted by regulations in the future, and therefore should be carefully considered in the draft code. ^{s 9(2)(a)} is dealing with this, with the subcommittee.

Shade and Shelter – the *Safeguarding our Animals, Safeguarding our Reputation* programme will not be progressing work on shade and shelter in this calendar year, as the work was not supported by the industry operational group for the Programme (the Farm to Processor Animal Welfare Forum). However, it remains on NAWAC's work programme under the new subcommittee chair, Ingrid Collins.

Systems Review – this subcommittee is on hold at the moment, to resume in August according to NAWAC's 2015 work plan. Committee members discussed that NAWAC will need to develop a position on what it wants the codes of welfare and regulations to really look like – how will they be printed, how will they work together? ^{s 9(2)(a)} suggested that when proposals for regulations go out to wider consultation, people may start asking this question, and NAWAC may want to think about it sooner rather than later. As a minimum, would it be helpful to confirm whether codes of welfare/regulations are in one document?

It was noted that the Systems Review subcommittee had earlier proposed having material from the relevant code or codes of welfare and regulations, all in one document..

Stakeholders also should be asked what they would like to see.

Companion Animals in Temporary Housing – The subcommittee has finished considering the code following public consultation and a contractor is drafting the accompanying code report. The subcommittee is planning on bringing a draft for recommendation to the Minister, to the August NAWAC meeting.

C 4. Animal Welfare Amendment Bill and draft regulations update

J Hellström had circulated a paper (NAWAC 12/15) to the Committee before the meeting.

In summary, there are two sets of regulations that NAWAC is involved in: care & conduct and significant surgical procedures. The regulations working group is trying to keep them at the same point of development throughout the process, so it now meets for 2 days each time, spending one day on each.

Appendix one of the paper 12/15 shows which issues/codes have been assessed for potential regulations, noting that further issues/codes have been assessed since this paper was written. Some issues are pretty straightforward, but some are more subjective – for example how do you regulate feed and water objectively in an outcome-based way? What's the symptom that you want to prevent? Do you regulate inputs instead?

Other things considered included issues that are currently not minimum standards (maybe recommended best practice, or for which there is not yet a code or minimum standard) but it's clear that they need to be included in regulations. A simple example is hot branding – this is currently allowed in codes, but there are alternatives, it could be considered outdated, and perhaps should be banned.

The regulations are being developed in at least two tranches. Tranche one offers quick benefits, and will be issued as soon as possible (hopefully within 18 months). Tranche two requires more careful consideration and buy-in from industry and will include 'grey' areas, developed perhaps a year after tranche one. There may be further tranches required for very contentious issues that require long periods of work with affected industries.

The role and format of codes of welfare will need to be addressed in light of regulations, for instance they may become a guidance-type document that helps you avoid getting to the point of breaching regulations.

There are some areas where NAWAC may take a separate view to the wider working group. One example is shechita slaughter. The Minister is entitled to make exemptions for religious reasons but NAWAC has previously recommended that non-stun slaughter is inadequate for good animal welfare.

Breeding was discussed again and, while it was noted that NAWAC is developing advice on breeding issues, there were some immediate problems such as the Scottish Fold cat. These cats have folded over ears, achieved by breeding cats that have a cartilage defect. If cats get two copies of the allele it is a lethal defect; with one copy, their ears will fold over but as the gene affects all cartilage in their bodies not just in their ears, they will also suffer pain and a shortened lifespan. The breed has been banned in the UK and in some other EU countries.

The people in the regulations working group are: ^{§ 9(2)(a)} (MPI Prosecutions Manager), two or three from MPI Policy team, ^{§ 9(2)(a)} (Chief Inspector, Royal New Zealand SPCA), ^{§ 9(2)(a)} (Verification Services, MPI), one from MPI Regulation & Assurance (NAWAC's secretariat), ^{§ 9(2)(a)} (MPI Legal), the members of the NAWAC subcommittee, ^{§ 9(2)(a)} (Veterinary Council of New Zealand) and ^{§ 9(2)(a)} (MPI Compliance).

It was clear that there is no point in having a regulation if it cannot be enforced - and badly-considered ones may not actually hold up the court.

Stakeholder groups are being contacted soon. Some industries are booked for meetings around the table, while others will only need a phone call or notification (e.g. some NGOs), but it is important that everyone knows what's going on.

It was noted that where an issue says "no code to assess", that doesn't mean it's not considered, there is other information to draw on apart from codes of welfare.

By the May meeting the regulations subcommittee should be in a position to put forward a short list of (tranche one) work.

C 5. Animal welfare issues register and discussion

It was noted that there is a typo in the table that goes with the resolution in the agenda – C5 says work programme update. C5 is actually the animal welfare issues register.

Moved (V Williams / A Sharr).

That item C5 be changed to accurately reflect the discussion on 'animal welfare issues register and discussion' and remain closed to the public, to maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the free and frank expression of opinions by or between or to Ministers of the Crown or members of an organisation or officers and employees of any department or organisation in the course of their duty.

The motion was put: carried.

It was explained that this item used to be called 'emerging issues for the public'. There was a suggestion from the systems review subcommittee that the agenda item could be revitalised by MPI

doing a bit more homework and bringing some items along to discuss in order to start the conversation (but of course NAWAC members continue to add their own). Therefore, the paper 13/15 is the list of issues that have come across MPI's desk since the last NAWAC meeting and they are as broad as possible as an exercise in 'horizon scanning'. The proposal was to go through and identify where NAWAC wants more explanation.

Craddock farms layer hens conversion – this was an example of Resource Management Act requirements conflicting with code of welfare requirements. An egg producer needed new premises in order to move hens from conventional cages to colony cages, and resource consent was required to install the new system. Public consultation was undertaken as part of the resource consenting process, which animal activists made full use of. Consent was denied because of the possible odour from the new facility. Craddock farms has indicated they will appeal.

NAWAC considered this potential issue in its advice to the Minister on the layer hen code of welfare. As a result the timeline for shifting to colony cages was discussed extensively and even pushed back by two years. The industry has been updating the Minister on progress. There is nothing further for the Committee to do at the moment except to follow the story with interest.

Nepalese Gadhimai Festival – there is an international movement to stop the festival (which involves extensive non-stun slaughter of sheep). There was some concern from the public that New Zealand animals ended up there.

Only breeding animals have been exported to Nepal. The issue is of interest but NAWAC as part of a general concern about non-stun and religious slaughter, but no further action is required.

Electronic collars - just before Christmas, s 9(2)(a) received a big envelope from the Electronic Collars Manufacturers Association overseas providing a lot of data and promoting the equipment. Notably it also contained information on collars for cats. It was presumed that this Association is feeling the movement around the world towards banning this equipment. They are used in NZ, though there are standards under the dog code of welfare (but not the cat code). There is a risk is that with no answer to correspondence like this, sometimes NAWAC finds out that the group has labelled "NAWAC endorsed" on their products. But it was agreed there would be no action.

Grooming Spitz breeds – s 9(2)(a) is the first point of contact for public enquiries, and received one call from a dog groomer/breeder of spitz breeds (double-coated dogs like huskies). The caller claimed that if you groom certain dogs in the wrong way – e.g. shave a double-coated dog - it disrupts their ability to thermoregulate and on top of that the coat may never grow back. The grooming industry is not regulated and so a code of welfare was requested by the caller - she was advised that this was not likely but wanted the issue passed on anyway. s 9(2)(a) to investigate – does the dog code of welfare successfully address the issue?

s 9(2)(a) had also received a call on untested veterinary devices. A vet physio called to ask whether a handheld 'light therapy' device could be imported into New Zealand for home use. The Agricultural Compounds and Veterinary Medicines Act doesn't cover devices, so there is no barrier to importation. This raises a risk that has come up before with alternative medicines, i.e. people failing to provide effective veterinary treatment. No action identified.

Shade and shelter – NAWAC already aware of this, but with the unusually hot weather and drought there were several calls and complaints about why people are not required to provide shelter from the sun.

In the news – an off-duty policeman shot a dog with a crossbow; both MPI and the SPCA were interested in investigating. Noted that warranted police officers are animal welfare inspectors under the Act. The Committee will be given an update when one is available.

There was also a video circulating that showed a man on a commercial fishing boat apparently bashing a shark to death with a piece of wood. Apparently both he and the cameraman were immediately fired. Again, the Committee will be given an update when one is available.

Rodeos – as identified earlier, enquiries have been coming in from A&P shows on whether the effective ban on sheep riding in the code of welfare for rodeos applies to them. Also, some rodeos are still using sheep but not riding them – whereas under the code, they shouldn't be using sheep at all. MPI was aware of the issue and following up on complaints as necessary.

The Committee discussed other events including dog trials.

The letter from ^{s 9(2)(a)} regarding ongoing pyrotechnics at rodeos was discussed. The response has been circulated (06/15). It is not anticipated that this issue will continue.

Drones – more and more stories are coming through about how animals react to drone use, this time there has been one about seagulls attacking the drones being used to film the cricket. What about using them on farm to check on young animals – does it stress the mothers? Will animal advocates use the tech to survey large farms?

A drone demonstration was suggested for the NAWAC/NAEAC joint meeting, since the topic is 'new technology'. I Collins has a contact through ^{s 9(2)(a)}, and it was noted that Beef + Lamb are trying them out as well. The Secretariat will continue to circulate to the Committee items on drones of relevance to animal welfare.

Live exports – issues continue. NAWAC not directly involved in live exports but will be consulted on the set of regulations that will cover them.

Prodders – there are new handheld prodders that look like Tasers on the market that are being stopped at the border by customs. So, how do you prove they're for animal use?

Also there are 'swine' prodders being sold on TradeMe – but under the code of welfare, they can't be used on pigs.

NAWAC and the National Ethics Advisory Committee (NAEAC) have previously expressed to the Minister a shared concern that traps and devices can be used in NZ until such a time as NAWAC makes regulations or some other Act comes into force that restricts them. So anyone can import anything and use it on an animal until that point. This issue had been ruled out of scope in the recent review of the Animal Welfare Act. It was noted that NAWAC may be called on to develop advice on these electric prodders and also that MPI was working with TradeMe on this issue.

Exotic pet trade – New Zealand has a project on the go looking to agree which animals can be traded based on biosecurity risk. This is led by a group in MPI with relevant stakeholders including pet retailers and the Companion Animal Council. This group is aware that there are also animal welfare concerns with keeping exotic pets.

Cats – the current issue is that vets are being given the responsibility for euthanasia of stray cats brought in by members of the public, as the SPCA moves away from routine euthanasia and towards Trap Neuter Return under its Saving Lives programme. It's a risk to the profession – vets can be pursued by owners if they accidentally euthanise someone's property. Complicating matters, the Act requires animals to be held for 7 days prior to euthanasia or rehoming in certain situations. It would probably be better for a wild cats welfare to euthanase it than hold it.

There is no single piece of legislation for cat management in New Zealand, like there is for dogs, and various groups around the country are dealing with issues relating to cats. These include Lower Hutt city council investigating whether they can introduce a bylaw to enforce microchipping, MPI looking at what they can do to support biosecurity managers who are working with local councils and the NZVA is looking at whether they coordinate some kind of national forum on cats. MPI also receives inquiries from the public on what to do with trapped cats, including whether gassing or drowning is acceptable.

NAWAC agreed to leave this issue on the animal welfare issues register but there was no immediate action.

After the discussion there was a clear consensus that this agenda item is worth continuing, and it was agreed that there would be a fresh list next time (though each list would stay on for one more meeting post-discussion before it is deleted).

The Committee was reminded to send issues that they think of to the secretary to be added to the list.

One more point was raised - how well NAWAC has been informed by compliance data while working through the regulations process. It gives a good evidence base for decisions.

s 9(2)(a) stated that there is a plan for s 9(2)(a) (Verification Services) and s 9(2)(a) (Compliance) to share their reports with industries, and NAWAC could be added to this list.

Action – Secretariat to ensure that NAWAC is included in any upcoming Compliance / Verification reports

C 6. MPI update and feedback on information shared

There were no questions or comments.

**PART TWO
(OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)**

OTHER REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

O 1. Mini tutorial: shade & shelter

§ 9(2)(a) gave a presentation on the provision of shade and shelter for livestock, how it can affect welfare, and options to deal with the problem.

One point that was especially noted and discussed was the information on how to reach farmers in order to educate them on issues such as shade and shelter. A study had been done which listed effective and ineffective ways to reach farmers, and Committee members wanted more information.

K Milne noted that booklets are a great way to distribute information when done correctly (e.g. strong waterproof paper, pictures, ringbinder or can be hung up in the shed).

It was thought that although phone or mobile device apps and texts were ranked quite low, they are still good for the younger farmers but they can be limited by the cellular network.

One way to reach farmers effectively is through their own community – it was noted that vets, stock agents, and other farmers make up some key areas of the community that can share information.

It was emphasised that what is needed to move the shade & shelter issue forward would be data on how respiration rate or live weight is linked to shade.

Action – Circulate Blair et al & Stewart et al. Massey study on how farmers learn.

O 2. NAWAC minutes: sharing with other committees

Secretary § 9(2)(a) explained that MPI has received a request from the government of Singapore to share information on how NAWAC operates, as Singapore looks to set up their own independent advisory committee on animal welfare. As well as sending the publically available guidelines and meeting summaries, the Committee was asked whether they would consider sharing their full minutes.

Moved (J Hellström / S Brown)

That NAWAC shares a year's worth of minutes with Singapore, making sure to note their confidentiality.

The motion was put: carried.

Sharing information with EuroFAWC was also discussed; NAWAC receives their minutes each year, plus major updates from European countries every now and then – see the recent documents circulated from The Netherlands. NAWAC used to send their own minutes to EuroFAWC, but this has dropped off. It was agreed that meeting summaries would be sent to the EuroFAWC secretary along with major documents when required (e.g. new strategic and operational plans, opinions and codes of welfare).

Action: Secretary to share minutes and meeting summaries as discussed (one-off with Singapore, ongoing with EuroFAWC).

O 3. NAWAC correspondence

There were no questions or comments on recent NAWAC correspondence.

O 4. Committee members' reports on recent presentations and attendance at conferences

J Hellström has had an invitation to present to the Australian RSPCA. This would be a provocative talk comparing the state of New Zealand's animal welfare system to Australia's.

He has also been invited by the New Zealand poultry industry to speak to them in May about the new regulations.

V Williams summarised her presentation to the New Zealand Hunts Association. She talked to them about hound and horse welfare but also gave a warning – while their industry is flying under the radar right now, the greyhound industry can be held as a cautionary tale on how fast that can change (and, in New Zealand, a good example of how to proactively work on issues). The Four Corners exposé on live baiting in Australia had broken just before the talk. Discussion moved to this issue. V Williams had asked GRNZ welfare officer ^{s 9(2)(a)} about live baiting, and he stated that there was none in New Zealand. He explained that New Zealand has been more proactive than Australia (see 2013 review), and has no private tracks for members to use.

It was noted that keeping a wild animal captive for hunting (i.e. live baiting) is illegal in New Zealand, but hunting an 'animal in a wild state' (i.e. hunting with hounds) is not.

V Williams also told the New Zealand Hunts Association that the industry should begin to gather data (e.g. on injuries and number of captured animals). The use of live animals as prey would need to be justified in the face of available alternatives.

K Bicknell, ^{s 9(2)(a)} and K Phillips have been invited to an event put on by company EcoPharm, attended by vets and producers. It is quite a closed event but they are able to go along and listen to farrowing-related presentations for part of the afternoon.

There was some feedback on the first few fitness for transport workshops in the South Island. They are going well but transporters are saying 'these issues are the farmers fault' (farmers have not been invited to these workshops).

With no further business, the chair declared the meeting closed at 2:30pm.



National Animal

Welfare Advisory

Committee

General Meeting

20 May 2015
9:30 am – 5:00 pm

Meeting Room 10.5 and 10.6
Pastoral House
25 The Terrace
Wellington

MINUTES

Committee members: John Hellström, Virginia Williams, Sue Brown, Ingrid Collins, Penny Fisher, Katie Milne, David Scobie, Alan Sharr, Iain Torrance, Julie Wagner.

In attendance: § 9(2)(a) (Manager Standards Programme), § 9(2)(a) (Senior Adviser, Regulation & Assurance), § 9(2)(a) (Technical Adviser, Regulation & Assurance), § 9(2)(a) (Specialist Advisor, MPI Verification Services), § 9(2)(a) (Manager, Intelligence and Planning, MPI Compliance), § 9(2)(a) (NAWAC secretary), § 9(2)(a) (Acting Manager, Regulatory Reform and Animal Welfare Policy), § 9(2)(a) (Principal Advisor, Regulatory Reform and Animal Welfare Policy), § 9(2)(a) (Senior Policy Analyst, Regulatory Reform and Animal Welfare Policy), § 9(2)(a) (Senior Policy Analyst, Regulatory Reform and Animal Welfare Policy).

Apologies: Kathryn Bicknell

Welcome: Iain Torrance, new NAWAC member, and § 9(2)(a), new staff member of the secretariat.

Any Other Business Part One (Public Excluded Agenda): Farrowing crates update

Any Other Business Part Two (Open to the Public)

C/- MPI, Pastoral House
P O Box 2526
Wellington 6140
New Zealand

Telephone: 0800 00 83 33
Email: nawac@mpi.govt.nz

**PART ONE
(PUBLIC EXCLUDED AGENDA)**

DRAFT RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC
Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

There being no other introductory items of business, it was moved (J Hellström / I Collins)
That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

- | | | |
|-------|--|-------------------------|
| C 1. | Confirmation of previous minutes | J Hellström |
| C 2. | Status of actions arising from previous meetings | J Hellström |
| C 3. | Work programme update | s 9(2)(a) / All |
| C 4. | Horses & donkeys code of welfare | s 9(2)(a) |
| C 5. | Greyhounds: live baiting | P Fisher / J Hellström |
| C 6. | AW Bill and implementation | s 9(2)(a) |
| | Regulations update | J Hellström / s 9(2)(a) |
| | Information and knowledge sharing with industry | s 9(2)(a) |
| C 7. | 1:00pm: Safeguarding update | s 9(2)(a) |
| C 8. | 1:30pm: MPI compliance update | s 9(2)(a) |
| C 9. | Animal welfare issues register and discussion | J Hellström / All |
| C 10. | 2:30pm: The 2014 bobby calf season summary | s 9(2)(a) |
| C 11. | MPI update | s 9(2)(a) |

THE GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED WHILE THE PUBLIC IS EXCLUDED, THE REASON FOR PASSING THIS RESOLUTION IN RELATION TO EACH MATTER, AND THE SPECIFIC GROUNDS UNDER SECTION 48(1) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL INFORMATION AND MEETINGS ACT 1987 FOR THE PASSING OF THIS RESOLUTION ARE AS FOLLOWS:

<i>General subject of each matter to be considered</i>	<i>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</i>	<i>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</i>
C 1. <i>Confirmation of previous minutes</i>	<i>To protect the privacy of natural persons.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(a) of the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA).</i>
C 2. <i>Status of actions arising from previous meetings</i>	<i>As above.</i>	<i>As above.</i>

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
C 3. Work programme update	To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(g)(ii) of the OIA.
C 4. Horses & donkeys code of welfare	As above.	As above.
C 5. Greyhounds: live baiting	As above.	As above.
C 6. AW Bill and implementation, Regulations update, Information and knowledge sharing with industry	As above.	As above.
C 7. Safeguarding update	To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the free and frank expression of opinions by or between Ministers and officials.	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(g)(i) of the OIA.
C 8. MPI compliance update	As above.	As above.
C 9. Animal welfare issues register and discussion	As above.	As above.
C10. The 2014 bobby calf season summary	To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(g)(ii) of the OIA.
C 11. MPI update	As above.	As above.

I also move that:

s 9(2)(a)



be permitted to remain at this meeting after the public has been excluded, because of their knowledge of meeting procedure and the subject matter under discussion. This knowledge is relevant background information to assist the committee in its deliberations.

C 1. Confirmation of previous minutes

The draft minutes of the general meeting held on 10 and 11 March 2015 (NAWAC 26/15) were reviewed and accepted with the following amendments:

- In section O4, remove section on greyhound rumours; s 9(2)(a) simply stated that there was no live baiting.

Moved (A Sharr / S Brown)

That the draft minutes of the general meetings held on 10 and 11 March 2015 be adopted as a true and accurate record of those meetings.

The motion was put: carried.

C 2. Status of actions arising from previous meetings

The committee reviewed the list of actions (NAWAC 27/15). The following updates were provided:

- Action 3, to explore the idea of a new animal welfare forum, is still pending and will be added to the agenda for the combined NAWAC/NAEAC meeting in August.
- Action 5, to follow up with Martyn Dunne (MPI Director-General) about the new website, is still pending. V Williams had received information that animal welfare would not have a permanent place on MPI's front page and the committee found this disappointing. s 9(2)(a) explained that the animal welfare content had been drafted and would be up in the next month or two, and at that point there may be content on the front page temporarily; many of the icons swap around depending on what's topical. Animal welfare will also have its own 'landing page', and an example of this was passed around. V Williams shared NAEAC's experience in setting up their own wiki page in order to share information. Action will remain pending with another update requested at the next meeting.
- Action 7, to review the induction pack, has started and is still in progress.
- Action 8, to plan the NAWAC/NAEAC joint meeting, has begun. Speakers invited include: the SPCA, WAP and SAFE to give their views on how the committees are doing; AgResearch and a scientist working on 3D bio-printing for an animal testing and science view; s 9(2)(a) from the science media centre who talks about increasing transparency in science; and s 9(2)(a) to talk about ramifications of the Amendment Act and the animal welfare strategy and potential of national animal welfare forum. The venue will be the Royal Society, date 4 August.
- Action 14, to circulate the study on 'how farmers learn', is complete.
- Action 15, to share minutes and summaries with the Singaporean government and EuroFAWC, is complete.

C 3. Work programme update

The work programme update (NAWAC 30/15) was circulated prior to the meeting. For work programme items not already on the agenda, the following updates were provided:

- Dairy cattle housing: On track to be discussed at the August meeting. It was noted that there had been a story about dairy housing on Seven Sharp the night before.
- Animals in the wild: A workshop to discuss generally accepted practice has been lined up for the 16 and 17 June. Stakeholders identified and will be invited as soon as possible. Some work

on snares has been carried out by MPI's graduate staff member. The RNZSPCA continues to supply evidence of misuse of snares.

- Selective breeding: With members also involved in farrowing and dairy housing, it had been too busy and this item will be left until the next meeting.
- Companion animals in temporary housing: The new MPI contact is ^{s 9(2)(a)} Only work needed now is to confirm the final changes. This is anticipated to be considered at the August meeting and then recommended to the Minister.
- Shade and shelter: I Collins has received information and papers on the subject and stated her willingness to get this piece of work underway. A few of the proposed interventions include regulations; some will have an impact on other areas such as resource consents. All angles need to be considered.
- Systems review: ^{s 9(2)(a)} explained a possible new issue - the MPI communications and web teams have kicked off some work to ensure all consultations share a consistent MPI 'voice' when put up on the web. This may not be appropriate for codes of welfare consultations, which are led by NAWAC and only organised/hosted by MPI. It was agreed that the systems review subcommittee would organise a response or solution if required. ^{s 9(2)(a)} asked whether the committee was happy to start the work on re-formatting codes of welfare (with regulations) in August or whether they wanted it sooner, so that it be included in conversations with stakeholders at regulations workshops. It was agreed that there is not a big rush, and it would be better to have draft regulations first. I Torrance agreed to join this subcommittee.

Farrowing crates update

It was first shared that K Bicknell had stepped down as chair due to illness. It was proposed, and agreed, that K Phillips (ex-officio member) should chair the subcommittee.

^{s 9(2)(a)} had shared paper 31/15 which summarised the work of the subcommittee so far. Since the date of the paper, the subcommittee had visited a 'high-health' facility, had a subcommittee teleconference, and had a free and frank discussion with NZPork in regards to farrowing.

At this point, the subcommittee is not sure that a prohibition on crates can work, since the amended Animal Welfare Act allows for a maximum transition period of 10 years and the literature shows that there is no viable equivalent to transition to. The industry is receiving a strong message that when there is, they will need to move quickly.

An economic impact analysis is underway, as requested in the Minister's letter. It will compare a 3-week system (essentially, early weaning) and a one-week system (farrowing pen system).

Selective breeding is another issue that has become evident. Bigger sows means some animals are touching the front and back of their crate at the same time, breaching a minimum standard in the pig code. This standard is being discussed as part of the regulation work. Larger and larger litter sizes are also a problem.

Another minimum standard to allow for nesting behaviour is not being met in many cases. Most farms seem not to providing nesting material because the slatted system cannot handle substances like straw. This standard is being discussed as part of the regulation work. It was noted that there are 120 farms in New Zealand that are with NZPork.

Committee members questioned why sows are in crates for 5 days before farrowing. The reason given by industry is that they need time to settle, and that some sows will farrow earlier than expected.

Discussion moved to the economic analysis. Cooperation from industry has seemed grudging at best, with NZPork contesting decisions. With the loss of K Bicknell, it was suggested that NAWAC needs economic knowledge to push back against their concerns. [REDACTED] suggested an MPI animal welfare policy staff member that has an economics background.

The company contracted to do the analysis, Nimmo Bell, would like a reference group for technical/welfare issues. It was suggested and agreed that NAWAC agrees with the creation of a reference group and that K Phillips or J Wagner be on the group.

In regards to appointing K Phillips as chair of the subcommittee, [REDACTED] noted that she had confirmed with MPI legal that an ex-officio member can chair a subcommittee.

Moved (J Hellström / I Torrance):

That K Phillips be elected chair of the farrowing crated subcommittee

The motion was put: carried.

Moved (J Hellström / Sue Brown):

That the Committee formally acknowledges K Bicknell's work and will send a letter of thanks.

The motion was put: carried.

Moved (J Hellström / V Williams):

That changes to subcommittee membership be made as discussed during the work programme update

The motion was put: carried.

Action – [REDACTED] to update and circulate subcommittee master list

C 4. Horses & donkeys code of welfare

Paper 32/15 containing suggested final changes to this code had been circulated prior to the meeting, and it was explained that the reason these changes are being suggested to the whole committee is because all original subcommittee members have since left NAWAC.

- Minimum standard 6: In general information on using the nose twitch, remove the reference to not using it on other parts of the body, leaving just "the nose twitch is only to be used on the lip".
- Minimum standard 10: In regards to rectal examination, it was noted that there is some cross-over between this minimum standard and potential future regulations. It was explained that MPI would prefer to release the code as-is, since everything can't be on hold for two years while regulations are developed.
- Minimum standard 10d: This refers to seeking expert assistance when a horse is having difficulty foaling, but 10a requires there to be people available who are experienced and competent.

[REDACTED] expressed concern about releasing minimum standards for hot branding and rectal examination that will be out of date or superseded by regulations 18 months down the line. It was agreed that the issues can be flagged within the code with a note from NAWAC that these standards may change soon.

There were no further comments.

C 5. Greyhounds: live baiting

P Fisher summarised the background on the petition presented to Parliament by s 9(2)(a) of the Greyhound Protection League. Further correspondence from s 9(2)(a), after J Hellström presented NAWAC's view on greyhounds to the Government Administration Select Committee, had been circulated to the Committee as paper 33/15.

s 9(2)(a) was concerned about the possibility of live baiting in New Zealand after the evidence was exposed by the programme Four Corners in Australia. A Cross has been reading industry message boards online and thinks there are rumours of the practice within the industry.

It was noted that this issue of live baiting is not restricted to greyhounds – see pig dogs, or even fishing.

It was pointed out that in Australia, authorities received the same kind of assurances that are being given by the New Zealand racing industry now. Should the committee ask for more concrete evidence?

V Williams reminded the committee that she had spoken to the greyhound industry welfare officer s 9(2)(a), who was adamant that there are no private tracks. J Wagner stated that she has had several greyhound clients, and all had private tracks.

It was clarified that live baiting is already clearly prohibited in the Act, i.e. there is no need for new regulation. NAWAC does need to be certain that it is not happening. It was suggested that NAWAC formally seeks evidence (not just assurances) from the greyhound industry that live baiting is not occurring. For example, the way that they have gathered information on private tracks is already a question that needs to be settled.

Action: NAWAC to ask Greyhound Racing New Zealand for evidence that they have investigated the possibility of live baiting occurring in New Zealand (highlighting the severity of the offence under the Act and their obligation to report).

C 6. Animal Welfare Amendment Bill and implementation

The Animal Welfare Amendment Act (No 2) was passed on 5 May and received royal assent on the 9 May.

Paper 40/15, available at the meeting but not circulated beforehand, listed all the changes made to the Animal Welfare Act. J Hellström acknowledged the extensive work by MPI staff to get to this point.

The committee was reminded that s 9(2)(a) is working on care & conduct regulations; s 9(2)(a) on surgical and painful procedures; and s 9(2)(a) on live animal export.

Regulations update – care and conduct

s 9(2)(a) had circulated paper 38/14, the animal welfare regulations progress report, prior to the meeting. She acknowledged the hard work from NAWAC subcommittee on this work.

Consultations with key stakeholders will be in July/August and will firm up proposals in order to get a package together for public consultation in early 2016.

The committee was asked to agree that the NAWAC subcommittee continue with developing regulations with MPI according to the process outlined in the paper, and also to the care and conduct matters to progress as listed in Table 1.

The suggestion to list recommended best practice in the dairy code – that recumbent cows should have vet assistance within 24 hours – was questioned, as well as the suggestion for caustic disbudding under 5 days. It was explained that this is why some of these potentially more controversial requirements are listed in 'tranche 2', and that concerns can also be raised in consultation.

The amended Animal Welfare Act requires the Minister to consult with NAWAC when he releases regulations (these first rounds are being released by the Minister – future regulations will be developed by NAWAC alongside codes). It was explained that formal consultation will happen next year, in that the Minister will formally write to NAWAC. This will run alongside public consultation.

Preconsultation was discussed and it was noted these are almost complete except for the greyhound industry and SAFE due to scheduling.

Regulations update – surgical and painful procedures

s 9(2)(a) had circulated a paper prior to the meeting, 38/14 (3).

It was explained that a lot of focus has been on provision of pain relief. The other main focus is who should do each procedure: a vet, an 'accredited person' (current setup for deer velvetting), or a 'competent person'. There are some controversial topics in this area – see tail docking across species. Black and white definitions can be hard to write.

It was noted that the SPCA and the Veterinary Council of New Zealand are on the working group but will also be able to make their own submissions.

The time frames are that informal conversations will be held with key stakeholders July/August; public consultation early 2016; and first tranche expected to be issued by end 2016.

Regulations update – live animal exports

It was explained that live exports are in a bit of a different area to the other regulations. They are governed under a separate part of the Act with less NAWAC input, since NAWAC's influence is limited to domestic issues.

These regulations are at the scoping stage. The big focus is exporting for slaughter, currently prohibited with exemptions given by the Director-General of MPI. However, this prohibition is under the Customs Act and it expires at the end of 2016. This will be lifted into regulations under the Animal Welfare Act.

The scope for the prohibition on export for slaughter currently includes only cattle, sheep, goats, and deer. However, a wider scope and standards around age, pregnancy, and stocking density are currently contained in guidelines which are also being examined. Other species would be considered as part of a second tranche of regulations.

Regulations are intended to be in place by March/April 2016, so will need to be publically consulted in September/October this year.

NAWAC will definitely be involved during that public consultation period. The committee was asked whether they wanted to be involved at a higher level– by having someone on the working group, or being considered a stakeholder on the same level as exporters. It was agreed to accept MPI's invitation to be more involved; NAWAC elected A Sharr to be on the working group.

Information and knowledge sharing with industry

Regulations are a tool at the sharp end of the enforcement process. MPI is working hard to find out how to drive compliance/behaviour change without getting to that point.

The industry has been very engaged in 'early warning' systems that can deploy industry resources and help. It was explained that MPI is hoping to involve the willing resources of industry to drive behaviour change before we have to get to enforcement.

Moved (V Williams / S Brown) that NAWAC:

- agrees to the care and conduct tranche 1 matters to be progressed in Table 1
- agrees to the care and conduct activities to propose banning in Table 1

- agrees that the NAWAC sub-committee continue with developing the regulations with MPI according to the process and timeline outlined in this paper

The motion was put: carried.

Moved (D Scobie / I Torrance) that NAWAC:

- agrees that the NAWAC sub-committee continuing to work with MPI in the development of the surgical and painful procedures regulations with MPI according to the process and timeline outlined paper 38/15 (3).

The motion was put: carried.

Moved (A Sharr / S Brown):

That NAWAC formally acknowledges the work that MPI staff, NZVC, SPCA and the NAWAC subcommittee have done so far on regulations.

The motion was put: carried.

O 2. Glueboard traps update

With time to go until speakers arrived for item C7, NAWAC moved on to item O2.

§ 9(2)(a) summarised the paper 36/15 that explained the history of glueboards regulations. In January of 2015, glueboards were finally prohibited for all users except for exemptions issued by the Minister (delegated to the Ministry). Approval to sell or use can only be granted where there is no viable alternative and it is in the public interest. The paper provides more detail on these examinations. Exemptions are issued with a list of conditions.

There are 3 main groups: Department of Conservation, using boards on boats/planes/islands; multinational companies, that may have rules from overseas or other countries/companies to use glueboard traps; and smaller players that use them because they always have and don't see alternatives (whether true or not). It would be ideal to use the resources available to that second group to find alternatives to glueboards for the third group.

There was some question around how to distinguish between intentional and accidental targeting of rodents (because glueboards for insects are allowed). Ultimately, it is up to animal welfare inspectors to decide on a case-by-case basis. However, there are different types of traps marketed to different species, places where you expect only one variety of rats, etc.

It was agreed that it is not ideal to have to give exemptions, but at least now MPI maintains a clear list of users. Approval is only for a year and users will have to justify their use again with each application.

NAWAC had previously discussed approaching the Minister with their concerns over exemptions being granted. It was agreed that this could wait for the next update; if NAWAC did approach the Minister it could be in February i.e. after the next round of applications.

Action: § 9(2)(a) to give another update in November with NAWAC to provide further advice to the Minister afterwards.

§ 9(2)(a) is planning another meeting of the glueboards alternatives working group.

C 7. Safeguarding update

§ 9(2)(a) arrived to give NAWAC an overview of the last six months.

In the last few months, focus has been on the 12 fit for transport roadshows across the country. There were more than 600 attendees – transport operators/stock agents rather than farmers. The key messages were: animals need to be fit for transport as part of a whole-of-supply approach (not just from farmers); if they're your livelihood, their welfare is their responsibility; consumer perception is reality; slaughterhouses are food processors, not dumping grounds; and doing nothing/ignoring problems is not appropriate. One action pushed was to ask the farmer: "Are your animals fits for transport?" Just asking, and noting the answer, would help to defend the transport operator in any investigations and may make the farmer stop and think.

An unintended consequence was a significant spike in veterinary certificates issued to transport sick animals to saleyards, but these certificates are only supposed to be used to get animals to slaughter. Some vets are issuing certificates with destination unspecified which is illegal (s14).

Attendees were also encouraged to work on their relationships with clients (i.e. farmers), as the transport operators can see problems developing over time. There were some promising examples of businesses saying no to transporting animals and not losing clients.

The workshops cost \$30,000 and there was great feedback. One side effect has been many more codes of welfare being printed and distributed. A future challenge is how to maintain this good engagement. Less than a dozen attendees knew about the Amendment Bill, but all were pleased about the potential ability to fine the bad operators.

The next big chunk of work is on bobby calves. Statistically speaking, it is reported that there is 99% compliance – sounds good, but that still means thousands of bobby calves dead/injured every year. Research is being commissioned to find welfare indicators for calves, since it tends to be measured via mortality at the moment.

Questions and suggestions were welcomed.

There were some questions around animals being sent to slaughterhouses that are far away from the farm, dramatically increasing travel time, in order to get more money. The bottom line is that MPI will investigate the welfare of the animals without regard to contractual arrangements.

I Collins invited the *Safeguarding* programme to future open days at Whangara Farms and nearby properties, run by Silver Fern Farms and local FarmIQ members.

It was suggested that the messages need to be shared in pictures – examples of conditions that need a veterinary certificate, videos of lameness scores, even photos of animals after a long journey or after suffering backrub, because farmers never get to see the outcome. MPI does not like to share graphic pictures (market access) but DairyNZ does have good information out there.

It was noted that industry groups are saying things like "when you transport a heavily pregnant animal you need to consider A, B and C" but in fact the pregnant animals should not be transported at all; there's a logic to saying "it's happening anyway so we just want to help" but they are opening themselves up to prosecution or consumer backlash.

Any further suggestions via email were invited. It was noted that shade and shelter was back on the agenda with I Collins leading.

C 8. MPI compliance update

s 9(2)(a) arrived to give a compliance update.

There has been a steady increase of complaints so far - a 46% increase in Jan-Apr from 2014. It was noted that glueboards, drought, and rodeo account for a few of the extra. It is expected that drought-related complaints will rise. It was also noted that animal activists seem to have developed a strategy of laying complaints, then making an OIA, then taking the OIA to ombudsman, which has the effect of wasting compliance time.

Lifestyle block-related complaints are on the increase. There is a need to get animal welfare messaging out to them. There are a lot of well-meaning people that don't know enough, and about 30% of total complaints relate to this group. The question of the definition of lifestyle block was raised. Compliance does not have a definition, and NAWAC/MPI is coming up against this problem as they try to draft regulations. An ad-hoc definition by the animal welfare coordinators, who answer the hotline, is whether the block is their primary source of income. Another possibility is anything 'less than 100 acres' (except for chickens/pigs). It is thought there are about 30,000 lifestyle blocks in NZ.

Complaints were broken down by species. There has been an increase in dairy (underfeeding), horses (lifestylers), glueboards, and sheep (rodeo).

It was thought that increased awareness has led to the increase in complaints in 2015 – for example, inspectors are now uniformed staff. Social media has generated more complaints. There is also an increasing number of urban visitors to rural areas, who tend to generate less reliable complaints. About 21% of complaints annually are trivial or aren't followed up. About 50% of this set can be dealt with on the phone, and the other 50% still require a callout which wastes time.

As part of the animal welfare budget bid, compliance is hoping to hire 6 additional inspectors (i.e. not cross-warranted), 3 regional trauma vets, and a new animal welfare compliance manager based in Pastoral House. With this set up, more proactive work can be done (e.g. links with *Safeguarding*).

C 10. The 2014 bobby calf season summary

s 9(2)(a) was welcomed to talk to NAWAC about the bobby calf project and results. The Bobby Calf project aims to reduce the number of calves that die before they can be processed. It focuses on ensuring all members of the supply chain (farmers, transporters and processors) meet their animal welfare responsibilities and protect the health and welfare of the calves. This project has been running for four years and has targeted all aspects of the supply chain.

Situations of poor animal welfare are identified by MPI VS veterinarians at processing plants. Recurring incidents (when a trigger is exceeded a third time) will be referred to the Compliance Branch for investigation along with sufficient supporting evidence.

The trigger level for individual suppliers is either:

- A mortality rate of 5% or higher within a three week moving window for all calves submitted by a supplier during that three week period, or
- A mortality rate of 5% or higher in each of any two consignments from that supplier within a three week period.

For transporters, when the mortality rate from any transport load exceeds 1.5% of that load, the meat processor is expected to immediately investigate that incident.

For processors, the total daily mortality of all calves associated with any day's processing should be less than 0.7%. If this level is exceeded, the meat processor is expected to immediately complete an investigation.

In 2014, mortality rates dropped even with more total calves. It was noted that next year may be interesting with the ban on blunt-force trauma to kill calves on farm.

Issues arising from the project include: young female vets are much less tolerant of bobby calf issues than the generation before; there is concern from processors around the potential to make them move to same-day processing; and there is some resistance to these types of projects from the Meat Industry Association.

There needs to be further analysis on impact of preparation, fitness, and lairage. It was found that more calves were condemned in the yards than on arrival.

NAWAC questioned why calves were not all processed same-day. s 9(2)(a) responded that it is up to NAWAC to change the rules (currently, calves must be processed within 28 hours and verification works to encourage this as a maximum amount of time rather than a routine occurrence). *Safeguarding's* aforementioned research project on welfare indicators may help to build an evidence base for changing this.

It was noted that mortality rates tend to go up as the season progresses. Some of this is to do with procurement - calves are trucked further near the end of the season as plants shut. It was noted that farmers who truck their calves further may never even know they have a dead calf (since they're paid on pickup).

An interesting finding was that the premises that do well have vets that rule 'with an iron fist', while collaboratively working with stakeholders and encouraging proactive employees.

In 2015, there will be no change to the trigger setup. However, actions taken as a result of breaching triggers will be more serious, with less educational responses and more enforcement responses. A communications strategy is in place, and proactive farm visits will be carried out, including audits of petfood and slinkskin operations.

The roadshows have been done, and *Safeguarding* has the operational research on welfare indicators in the works. There has also been an industry agreement to stop shipping bobby calves across the Cook Strait.

s 9(2)(a) noted MPI's new Primary Growth Partnership Programme, which aims to try crossing dairy cattle with Wagyu beef to make calves that are better for raising as beef animals.

s 9(2)(a) was thanked for his time.

C 9. Animal welfare issues register and discussion

A list of wide-ranging national and international animal welfare issues had been shared with the committee (paper 34/15) prior to the meeting. The following issues were discussed:

- Skinny cattle on the Interislander: This story went viral. MPI found no breaches of the Act. The outstanding issue is whether it was right that they were transported between islands at all; this has been identified as a focus of the second tranche of regulations. No immediate actions identified.
- Paw Justice's Don't TradeMe puppy mill campaign: s 9(2)(a) has had a meeting with TradeMe. They are looking at limiting the number of puppies an account can list per year and introducing a voluntary code. They had requested an OIA to find out how many puppy mills MPI is actually aware of; there are not many cases found by compliance. MPI's view is that the alleged issues raised by Paw Justice can be managed under the Act or codes of welfare. The only thing with no hard and fast rule is the number of litters a bitch should have per year, which is contained under recommended best practice in the dog code.

- Chained Dog Awareness letter and new website: there were big assertions made in the letter – any substance behind them? I Torrance is not aware of specific numbers, but the SPCA responds to many reports of chained dogs, and the main tool is education. Tethering (not just for dogs) is on the radar under the regulations workstream.
- Stock-X: s 9(2)(a) had taken a call from a start-up from Stock-X who are starting up an online marketplace for livestock; they were sent the relevant codes of welfare and links to animal welfare information. No actions identified.

C 11. MPI update

The MPI update was circulated prior to the meeting (35/15). There were no comments or questions.

PART TWO (OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)

STRATEGY AND PLANNING

O 1. Mini-tutorial: farrowing crates

Massey PhD student s 9(2)(a) was welcomed. She had previously given a good presentation to the farrowing subcommittee at Waratah Farms, and it was thought this information would be useful for all of NAWAC.

Her research objectives were to compare performance, behaviour and welfare between traditional farrowing crates (where sows are confined 5 days before birth and then a maximum of 4 weeks afterwards) and temporary confinement (where the sows are released into a farrowing 'pen' 4 days post-partum).

Indoor farrowing systems can include simple pens - containing a temporary crate, heated creep area and feed trough – to pens with separate nesting and dunging areas and a sloped wall to discourage crushing (as the sow will lean against the wall while lying). Waratah uses temporary crating in a simple pen with slatted floors. Many of the sows had been moved from crating only to the pen system.

Weaning weight was higher in the pens than a farrowing crate (hypothesised to be due to behaviour differences), but mortality was higher in pens than the crate. Farrowing systems had no effect on the sows' reproductive performance.

Videos of the pens in action were shared with the committee and questions were welcomed.

The first question was whether any data was collected on the stress levels of sows. The study staff wasn't able to collect cortisol, due to practical difficulties of conducting research on a commercial farm. They did record behaviours like bar biting. This data is still being reviewed and will be shared with NAWAC when available. Gilt behaviour was also observed – to see whether their behaviour differed when they were raised in a different environment to that which they gave birth in (i.e. do they learn to be bad mothers)?

It was clarified that the data collected is with the intervention of the staff during crushing events or poor health of animals, meaning there could be an interaction between staff/system/pigs. If there is one, it is at least consistent across both systems.

It was pointed out that no nesting material was visible in the video. Waratah had trialled nesting material, but the effluent system could not handle it.

Was the cause of death recorded? It was judged by farm staff, with the vast majority of deaths being crushing/suffocation. Weakness/starvation piglets are generally euthanized.

How many piglets born per litter? At this farm, there were on average around 13, with around 12 born alive. Farrowing pens equated to around 0.5 extra deaths per litter. There are 2.4 litters per sow per year. After that initial extra mortality event, it is expected that all other piglets will make it to market.

It was clarified that there is no difference in mortality rate when following sows through more than one round of farrowing in pens – i.e. no subsequent reproductive effect.

Is there an increase in scours in 'freer' systems? There was no effect found in this study, but anecdotally staff found that piglets that didn't find the udder and got cold and died from chilling/starvation. They had to restrict the space that piglets had by modifying the pen.

In farrowing crates, can a piglet approach the sows head? Yes, and it is the only interaction they can have (the piglet has to initiate).

Are Waratah's farrowing crates better than in general? They are definitely modern – as seen in the flooring materials, for example.

Do the sows learn to use the sloped sides - is the reason that they lie down quickly because they were so used to the crate? In general sows will almost always look to lie down against a surface. The sows observed would have farrowed in crates before, so it is a possibility. That's why the study is looking at gilts born and raised in a pen and whether that affects lying behaviour. The general rule is that in the pens, a good mother will become a better mother; a poor mother will become a poorer mother. In crates you can't see the difference.

Why didn't the sow respond to squawking piglet in video? Have they learned not to respond (because most of the time, when they hear that noise it's not their own piglet)? Not clear from the study.

It is possible to breed sows (strain called GenoMum) that reduce crushing behaviour. Genetics will get more and more attention, in regards to temperament as well as maternal behaviour.

s 9(2)(a) was thanked for a helpful presentation.

OTHER REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

O 3. Discussion of information circulated by MPI

No comments were made on any information circulated by MPI.

O 4. NAWAC correspondence

Correspondence was received from Chained Dog Awareness (with a response sent) and s 9(2)(a) (greyhounds – potential response discussed above). There were no comments.

O 5. Committee members' reports on recent presentations and attendance at conferences

J Hellström was invited to speak to the Australian SPCA in Canberra on why "animal welfare matters to New Zealanders". There were a range of speakers talking about why animal welfare is important in their sectors. It was a bit of a sombre meeting given that the federal government had dropped leadership in

animal welfare, leaving it to the states. J Hellstrom was proud to talk about the Amendment Bill, the recognition of animal sentience, and the 1st-equal ranking given by World Animal Protection.

J Hellström also presented a paper to the New Zealand poultry industry in Palmerston North the week before the meeting about regulations and the Amendment Bill. Feedback was that the broiler industry does not want to be regulated by the number birds per area, but rather the weight of birds per area. Not much controversy elsewhere.

J Jamieson attended a talk at Wellington Zoo by ^{s 9(2)(a)} [REDACTED] called 'wild welfare'; he had interesting views on the negative presentation of zoos in social media and the true role of a zoo – primarily entertainment, followed by education, then conservation.

I Collins had been invited to an executive 'boot camp' at Stanford. Unfortunately can't attend this year, but will try again next year.

V Willaims had chaired NAEAC meetings earlier in the week. They visited the research institutes at Palmerston North and had the incoming chair, ^{s 9(2)(a)} [REDACTED], at that meeting. He will be taking over in November.

V Williams was also invited to ANZCCART, and talked to them about the research, testing and teaching system and whether it's working. Had a really good conversation about potential holes in the system, the main one being that there is no requirement for competency testing people working in research conditions.

I Torrance had attended the national SPCA conference and AGM. It was agreed at the meeting to launch a strategy to bring the many member societies into one entity. As well as achieving economies of scale and lowering inspector turnover, this will standardise the complaints process, as it was agreed earlier this year to roll out Shelter Buddy, a software that tracks all complaints, inspectors, and animals that come through the door. The organisation is going through the Amendment Act in relation to their own policies.

With no further items of business, the meeting was closed at 4:15.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



National Animal Committee

Welfare Advisory

General Meeting

5 August 2015
9:00 am – 4:00 pm

Meeting Room 10.5 and 10.6
Pastoral House
25 The Terrace
Wellington

MINUTES

Committee members: John Hellström, Virginia Williams, Kathryn Bicknell, Sue Brown, Ingrid Collins, Penny Fisher, Katie Milne, David Scobie, Alan Sharr, Iain Torrance

In attendance: s 9(2)(a) (Manager Animal Welfare, Regulation & Assurance), s 9(2)(a) (Manager Standards Programme), s 9(2)(a) (Senior Adviser, Regulation & Assurance), s 9(2)(a) (Technical Adviser, Regulation & Assurance), s 9(2)(a) (NAWAC secretary), s 9(2)(a) (Acting Manager, Regulatory Reform and Animal Welfare Policy), s 9(2)(a) (Principal Adviser, Regulatory Reform and Animal Welfare Policy), s 9(2)(a) (Senior Policy Analyst, Regulatory Reform and Animal Welfare Policy), s 9(2)(a) (Policy Analyst, Regulatory Reform and Animal Welfare Policy).

Apologies: Julie Wagner

Welcome: s 9(2)(a), new to the Regulatory Reform and Animal Welfare Policy team, here to observe NAWAC's meeting.

Any Other Business Part One (Public Excluded Agenda):

Any Other Business Part Two (Open to the Public): Farmed fish welfare

C/- MPI, Pastoral House
P O Box 2526
Wellington 6140
New Zealand

Telephone: 0800 00 83 33
Email: nawac@mpi.govt.nz

**PART ONE
(PUBLIC EXCLUDED AGENDA)**

DRAFT RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC
Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

There being no other introductory items of business, it was moved (J Hellström / D Scobie)
That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

- | | | |
|-------|--|-------------------|
| C 1. | Confirmation of previous minutes | J Hellström |
| C 2. | Status of actions arising from previous meetings | J Hellström |
| C 3. | Work programme update | s 9(2)(a) / All |
| C 4. | Dairy housing amendment | J Hellstrom |
| C 5. | Companion animals in temporary housing draft code | K Bicknell |
| C 6. | 11:00am: Farrowing crates | K Phillips |
| C 7. | Selective breeding paper | V Williams |
| C 8. | Animal welfare regulations progress report | J Hellström |
| C 9. | Subcommittees – departing NAWAC members | J Hellström / All |
| C 10. | Animal welfare issues register and discussion | J Hellström / All |
| C 11. | MPI update and discussion of information circulated by MPI | s 9(2)(a) |

THE GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED WHILE THE PUBLIC IS EXCLUDED, THE REASON FOR PASSING THIS RESOLUTION IN RELATION TO EACH MATTER, AND THE SPECIFIC GROUNDS UNDER SECTION 48(1) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL INFORMATION AND MEETINGS ACT 1987 FOR THE PASSING OF THIS RESOLUTION ARE AS FOLLOWS:

<i>General subject of each matter to be considered</i>		<i>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</i>	<i>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</i>
C 1.	<i>Confirmation of previous minutes</i>	<i>To protect the privacy of natural persons.</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(a) of the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA).</i>
C 2.	<i>Status of actions arising from previous meetings</i>	<i>As above.</i>	<i>As above.</i>
C 3.	<i>Work programme update</i>	<i>To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting</i>

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
	<i>protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.</i>	<i>would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(g)(ii) of the OIA.</i>
C 4.	<i>Dairy housing amendment</i>	<i>As above.</i>
C 5.	<i>Companion animals in temporary housing draft code</i>	<i>As above.</i>
C 6.	<i>Farrowing crates</i>	<i>As above.</i>
C 7.	<i>Selective breeding paper</i>	<i>As above.</i>
C 8.	<i>Animal welfare regulations progress report</i>	<i>As above.</i>
C 9.	<i>Subcommittees – departing NAWAC members</i>	<i>To protect the privacy of natural persons.</i>
C 10.	<i>Animal welfare issues register and discussion</i>	<i>That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(a) of the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA).</i>
C 12.	<i>MPI update and discussion of information circulated by MPI</i>	<i>To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.</i>

I also move that:

s 9(2)(a)



be permitted to remain at this meeting after the public has been excluded, because of their knowledge of meeting procedure and the subject matter under discussion. This knowledge is relevant background information to assist the committee in its deliberations.

C 1. Confirmation of previous minutes

The draft minutes of the general meeting held on 20 May 2015 (NAWAC46/15) were reviewed and accepted with the following amendments:

- Remove Barbara Nicholas from attendees

Moved (V Willaims A Sharr)

That, subject to the above amendments, the draft minutes of the general meetings held on 20 May 2015 be adopted as a true and accurate record of those meetings.

The motion was put: carried.

C 2. Status of actions arising from previous meetings

The committee reviewed the list of actions (NAWAC 47/15). The following updates were provided:

- Action 1, to advise the speaker of an appropriate wildlife speaker, is still pending. Fish & Game didn't come to the recent wildlife workshop and they were the preferred speaker. P Fisher to follow up.
- Action 3, to discuss a new animal welfare forum, was done at the joint meeting. It was clear that the committees wish to have joint meetings more frequently (annually was proposed). There is the potential to liaise with other groups such as ABWCC (the Animal Behaviour and Consultative Committee), which started as an advisory group to AgResearch Ruakura and grew to include many industry representatives from there. The new forum could be the home for New Zealand's Animal Welfare Strategy. s 9(2)(a) offered to take paper to the next ABWCC meeting. Action to be left as 'in progress'.
- Action 5, to discuss the new website with MPI, to be closed. NAWAC still disappointed that animal welfare is not easy to find from the front page, but is satisfied that the new pages are easy to navigate and have good information.
- Action 7, reviewing the induction pack, is in progress. The idea is to add a briefing on current issues so that each new member is more prepared for their first meetings. The idea was welcomed and it was suggested that contact points for subject matter in each area should be added.
- Action 8, to plan the joint meeting, is complete and can be removed.
- Action 10, to bring information on glueboards, will be discussed later in the meeting and is then complete.
- Action 13, to ensure the committee is included in MPI compliance/verification reports, is complete. NAWAC will receive quarterly reports.
- Action 14, to update and circulate subcommittee list, is complete.
- Action 16, to ask Greyhound Racing New Zealand for evidence that they have investigated the possibility of live baiting is completed, but in person. This is to be followed up with a formal letter.

Action – Secretariat to draft letter from John Hellstrom for Greyhound New Zealand.

- Action 17, on sharing glueboard information, also complete.

C 3. Work programme update

The work programme update (NAWAC 51/15) was circulated prior to the meeting. For work programme items not already on the agenda, the following updates were provided:

- Animals in public display, exhibition, and entertainment: A work plan has been pulled together. [REDACTED] has looked at the scope but has a few questions – the next step is to organise a subcommittee meeting to further discuss scope. ^{s 9 (2)}
- Systems review: An updated terms of reference had been circulated prior to the meeting (NAWAC 52/15). One meeting has been held and recommendations from this will be written up and presented in November. There was some discussion on the role of science in NAWAC's decision making and ^{s 9(2)(a)} [REDACTED] work on positive welfare. It was suggested that he (or ^{s 9(2)(a)} [REDACTED]) could be invited to the next meeting.

Action – secretariat to invite ^{s 9(2)(a)} [REDACTED] to present the five domains model at a NAWAC meeting.

- Horses & donkeys: The code has been commented on by Policy, and is now in a legal review. Expected to be issued by the end of the year.
- Wild animals: The wild animals subcommittee held a workshop in June with two groups: pest managers and game hunters. Some were wary about the purpose of the meeting at first, but realised quickly that NAWAC was there simply to encourage thinking around generally accepted practice. It was noted that Game Animal Council stated that something like 80% of hunters are not associated with any organisation – the normal approach of approaching representatives might not work here, however there is some obligation on these organisations to contact or promote this issue alongside promoting the practice of hunting.

There was good discussion around general principles of generally accepted practice, and it was thought it would be best to leave it up to individual groups to further define it for their own purposes. The Game Animal Council have convened a group to discuss the issue (ungulates only). Meeting notes are due out to whole committee in the next few weeks.

One interesting issue was remote monitoring (electronic) of traps; under the Act that's OK for kill traps, but a live capture trap must be inspected every day, and there is question around whether this form of monitoring counts as an 'inspection'. There is a potential need to amend the Act if it turns out that remote monitoring does not count and we want to allow it. The Subcommittee is reviewing this issue.

C 4. Dairy housing amendment

The papers 49/15 (proposed amendment), 63/15 (Federated Farmers and DairyNZ submissions), and 62/15 (draft code report) had been circulated prior to the meeting.

It was explained that the industry groups have reiterated their opposition to the amendment on dairy housing, stating that the science to support outdoor access as a behavioural need for dairy cattle is not valid or doesn't exist, and that the consultation process was too short. Comments had not been

received from the New Zealand Veterinary Association, but other comments had been forwarded to the Committee.

What NAWAC has put forward is a proposal that cows should not be housed for life, and in general where cows are kept indoors they should get outdoor access sometimes, e.g. by not being housed during their dry period. The draft code report describes the basis for the proposal: NAWAC does not maintain that access to the outdoors is a need, as such, but notes benefits from access to the outdoors contrasting with risks of insufficient system design and management that are magnified when cows are permanently housed.

Only one farmer is apparently housing cows (or intending to) for longer than one lactation currently in New Zealand, so there does not appear to be a strong drive for permanent housing. There are, however, more farmers housing cows for several months with daily access to the outdoors, or with a period out of doors each year.

J Hellström met with the Minister on August 3rd and advised him of on-going industry opposition to constraints on permanent housing. The next step is for the subcommittee to meet with industry face-to-face to explain why they have interpreted the science the way they do. The Minister would also like a further briefing from NAWAC before he receives the Committee's final advice on the revised code.

§ 9(2)(a) explained that the report and code had been reviewed by MPI staff and will be externally peer-reviewed (by § 9(2)(a) at Massey).

In the past, industry bodies have said many times that NAWAC is being unscientific and pandering to the public when it has proposed policies they don't agree with. It seems unclear what farmers want compared to what the industry says that they want. Farmers themselves may not be interested in moving to lifetime housing.

There is a national reputational risk as well, and industry groups may not have considered this aspect in developing their position. The subcommittee has noted that overseas dairy is moving back outdoors or providing access to the outdoors for loafing, and considers that if we recommend allowing permanent housing now, this is likely to be going against future international developments.

It was agreed that subcommittee goes back to these groups stating that the amendment has been reviewed again, but after consideration of the science, public submissions, overseas progress, and the precautionary principle, NAWAC will still recommend this amendment to the Minister for Primary Industries in November, pending external peer review and final comments from sector representatives.

§ 9(2)(a) raised the issue of the dairy goat industry. They are already housing full-time. It is worth looking at this and making sure it's not totally at odds with this decision. The difference is that goats run outside get footrot, and the sheds for goats tend to have more space and have enrichment. It was noted that sheep milking is also an emerging industry.

Action – subcommittee to look at codes of welfare for other housed animals to consider alignment.

The NAWAC guideline on Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis was discussed, and how the process to develop the code of welfare for layer hens included a MCDA approach where the 5 domains of welfare were overlaid with other considerations, and public submissions.

Action: Dairy housing to be put through the MCDA decision making process, as documented in NAWAC Guideline 08.

C 5. Companion animals in temporary housing draft code

This code, originally drafted by a group convened by the New Zealand Companion Animal Council, originally contained a tremendous amount of detail. It has been through a number of iterations and is now considerably slimmed down.

The most recent discussion was around the definition of companion animal – broadened to include horses and donkeys and other animals that might find their way into a stock pound.

A number of submissions wanted vets' clinics included as a 'temporary housing facility', but they are excluded (they are medical facilities and subject to Veterinary Council sanctions). It was noted that SPCA does sometimes investigate vets' clinics anyway. Boarding facilities that are attached to vets' clinics are covered by the code.

The suggested changes were:

- Training exclusion: what is the logic in not including training facilities? There had been a lot of debate here. Some members have seen kennels etc. with training facilities associated. Also, there are places offering 'training while you're at work'. The main stumbling block however was how difficult it would be to include horses that are sent away for training. It was noted that the training facility itself could be considered differently from the associated housing. It was also explained that with horse training for racing (or greyhounds), this facility is not 'temporary'; the facilities are housing animals permanently. It was decided to keep the exclusion as it is.
- Emergency management: Is having someone on site at all times impractical? It was decided to keep this, as it is recommended best practice not a minimum standard.
- Lighting: recommended best practice (a) is essentially the same as minimum standard (a) – could delete the recommended best practice. (d), under recommended best practice, is essentially already covered by minimum standard (a), but is included for more information – could be moved to introduction or kept as an example indicator. It was also questioned why (b), 'care should be taken to ensure that lights do not cause excessive heat for animals', and (c), 'lighting should be installed safely and securely, and be inaccessible to animals', were considered best practice.
- Hygiene: recommended best practice (k), 'hot and cold water should be available in sufficient quantities to enable the area and feeding utensils to be thoroughly cleaned', does not specify which area it is talking about. Should be changed to indicate 'adequate cleaning' of everything, i.e. without specifying utensils or areas at all.
- Sale and rehoming: should recommended best practices (d) and (e) become minimum standards? "Animals should not be released for sale or rehoming if there is any doubt about the ability of the potential owner to care for them appropriately." And "Animals should not be made available for sale if temperament evaluation indicates a lack of suitability, unless the new owner has experience and the ability to manage and correct the unwanted behaviours." It was agreed that the 'any doubt' statement sets too high a bar, especially when people can get animals from anywhere at the moment. It would be too difficult to enforce as a minimum standard.
- Sale and rehoming: is minimum standard 16 (e) realistic (desexing)? Subcommittee considered that it was, and noted extensive public support for the standard.

- General Health: recommended best practice (b), vaccination – should this be a minimum standard? It was thought there are welfare arguments for it, but there are legal arguments around on imposing things like vaccination on to people and their pets. It was noted that the New Zealand Veterinary Association had discussed this issue in the regulations workshops and also were not ready to require this via regulation.
- Desexing: What about animals that are not common but end up in shelters (turtles, llamas, etc?) It was noted that the wording allows an 'out' by saying desexing must be done only "if they are of a species and an age for which such procedures are surgically possible."
- Behaviour: Is enrichment a recommended best practice or should it be a minimum standard? It was agreed to move this sentence to be an example indicator.

Moved (K Bicknell / V Williams)

That, subject to the above changes and a legal and peer review, NAWAC recommends the proposed code of welfare for temporary housing of companion animals to the Minister for Primary Industries.

The motion was put: carried.

The subcommittee should note in their letter to the Minister their thanks for the New Zealand Companion Animal Council's work, which was led by § 9(2)(a).

C 6. Farrowing crates

§ 9(2)(a) (MPI) and Karen Phillips (co-opted member and subcommittee chair) arrived for the discussion of farrowing crates at 11am.

Farrowing was also discussed at the May NAWAC meeting. Since then, the economic analysis has begun. The scope has been narrowed down quite a bit so they are looking quite specifically at certain areas that NZPork and the subcommittee have identified.

NAWAC 54/15 was discussed, and the following points raised:

The biggest problem is that the modern sow has been bred for maximising piglet production not for mothering ability. Minimising piglet mortality is a challenge to the farmer and is met through confinement in farrowing cages.

The subcommittee looked at keeping sows in a crate for a shorter period of time (at the moment farmers keep them in crates for up to 5 weeks – 4 weeks farrowing + a few days before). Nimmo Bell, the company contracted to do the economic analysis, is looking at the economic side of shortening the time to 3 weeks. NAWAC has looked at the welfare impacts. One issue is that sows aren't farrowing on the same day, so weaning at the same time 3 weeks after the first sow farrows is not ideal for younger piglets whose sows farrowed later. Introducing parturition inductions is not a good option. Another way is to open up the side of the crate after a few days/a week to allow more movement. However, the sow still can't walk, all she can do is turn around, and this system is associated with higher rates of piglet death.

The problem is that where modified confinement systems provide a welfare benefit to the sow, there's a trade-off in reduced welfare for the piglets. Scientific consensus supports that there is no ideal solution; even with substantial investment.

Sow welfare may be improved in out-door systems but piglet mortality is much higher. A number of issues affect the welfare of the sows and piglets, including environmental temperature, as piglets can't

thermoregulate for several days after birth and wet and muddy conditions have an impact. Sows also have much higher food requirements to keep themselves warm in outdoor systems.

Selective breeding has a major part to play. Litter size is a major factor in survivability. Piglet size is going up at 1.5 piglets per year, and teat number by only ¼ per year. Further, more piglets means more frail piglets. The industry is against change in regards to genetics which are controlled by breeding companies based overseas, but if NZ industry never says anything, how will it change? The genetic manipulation is an ethical issue that is creating a welfare problem.

Nurse sows were also identified as an issue, with industry reporting it has difficulty complying with current code requirements in regard to the length of time nurse sows are held and the percentage of sows held as nurse sows at any one time.

The minimum standard requiring manipulable material in new farrowing crates is also an issue, with farmers telling NAWAC that they will not use straw because it doesn't fit with their systems – but the code of welfare doesn't require straw, specifically so that farmers could innovate if needed. Also, there is only quite a small window (pre-farrowing) where they have the instinct to nest and require the material.

It was noted that the only country that has banned farrowing crates is Sweden (but they have exemptions in place for farmers to use them for 4 days, which are widely used), and they are investigating whether crates should be allowed for longer again.

It was also explained that the Act no longer allows minimum standards to be written below the level of the Act in exceptional circumstances.

Exporting the welfare problem (increasing NZ production costs so that people buy more imported pork) is also an issue, but this is not within NAWAC's influence.

NAWAC, therefore, is in a position to advise that the crates are not acceptable, but there is no alternative, so for now they must remain in place. There is currently no need for transition as there is nothing to transition to.

The fact that the industry seems to be systemically ignoring parts of the code will go in the report.

The ultimate direction could be towards smaller litter sizes. Denmark has started this move. It was explained that Australia has been closed to new genetic material for quite some time. Their litter size is lower. Ours is averaging 13.5 or so, theirs is around 11.

It was noted that the Minister's request including asking for advice on older-style farrowing crates. The newer crates seen by the subcommittee were better/bigger – sows were not touching the edges. NAWAC's advice would cover this aspect.

It was suggested that NAWAC continues to work with the industry outside of the regulations and codes, for example in the style of/with the help of the *Safeguarding* programme. The industry needs to keep working on many aspects.

It was noted that the view that the welfare of the sow is more important than that of the piglets is not ethically defensible. It was questioned whether there is a need to justify why NAWAC prioritises piglet welfare more than other interested groups, since the decision is likely to be criticised. Is a neonatal piglet mortality caused by starvation, hypothermia or crushing really comparable to 12-15 weeks of confinement a year of a production sow? An ethical component should be included in the report.

Action: Farrowing should be put through the MCDA decision making process, as documented in NAWAC Guideline 08, to document the rationale in comparing piglet vs. sow welfare.

C 7. Selective breeding paper

The draft paper on selective breeding and animal welfare was circulated prior to the meeting (NAWAC 56/15). This is a new type of work for NAWAC; an opinion/statement is something that NAWAC hasn't done to this extent before and is a landmark approach that allows NAWAC to consider social and strategic issues, not just rules and minimums.

V Williams explained the work process: The subcommittee went through different industries and highlighted issues. At the end of each section, there is comment on what NAWAC thinks.

It was agreed that the structure of each section was good, as was separating the two fish sections.

The final report will need an executive summary at the beginning for being sent to the Minister.

A peer review was discussed and it was agreed that this paper should be peer reviewed before release. Several names were suggested including ^{s 9(2)(a)} and someone related to the poultry industry like ^{s 9(2)(a)}.

It was suggested that the teats issue (increasing number of teats rather than reducing litter size) should be added to the pig section.

V Williams welcomed further feedback.

Action: Committee to read and send feedback to V Williams by the end of August.

C 8. Animal welfare regulations progress report

Paper 55/15, the regulations progress report, was circulated prior to the meeting and was taken as read.

^{s 9(2)(a)} summarised the recent meetings by the regulations working group where they discussed penalties with prosecutions and compliance. The group really had to test that they weren't accidentally 'downgrading' any minimum standards and existing offences in the Act. Regulations are, after all, for mid-lower level offending.

MPI staff are now organising a series of workshops, for fact-finding and for stakeholders to get the chance to consider what matters need to or should be regulated.

There were some questions on specific matters proposed for regulation:

Must not be lifted by the tail – it was noted that some cows may sometimes be encouraged to stand or stand still by lifting the tail, which is in the best interests of the animal. Further, lab mice and rats are commonly lifted by the tail.

Difference between species – why prohibition on drowning only for dogs and cats? It was explained that this is because there already are minimum standards so the regulations will start here and roll it wider later if needed. It is also still much more common to drown cats and dogs than other species.

Dentistry in horses – some equine dentists are well qualified. Although they are not vets, should they be allowed to operate? What about requiring vet supervision? It was explained that this is something that has been looked at extensively and will no doubt be discussed further in workshops/consultation. At the moment, there is no requirement for qualification at all.

Restrict blunt force trauma – why is this infringement only, rather than regulatory offense? This offense is written for the person who wasn't really in an emergency situation. It was noted that baby dairy goats are also killed by blunt force trauma.

Docking dogs vs. declawing cats – why does docking have an exemption for 'therapeutic' reasons but declawing has an exemption for when it's in 'the best interest of the animal'? What's the difference? Explained that when cats are brought to vets for declawing, there are instances where owners will choose to put down a cat if declawing is refused – so it may not be therapeutic (as in medically necessary) but could still be argued to be ultimately in its best interest.

There will be one or two more working group meetings before November; with an updated provided at the November meeting.

Moved (A Sharr / Ingrid Collins)

That the regulations subcommittee:

- continues through the process set out in 55/15
- holds workshops with stakeholders

The motion was put: carried.

C 9. Subcommittees – departing NAWAC members

With three committee members finishing at the end of October, the membership of the subcommittees was reviewed.

Regulations: It has been suggested to ^{s 9(2)(a)} that D Scobie stays until the public discussion document is launched. During that period, ^{s 9(2)(a)} will sit in, and then take over from there. V Williams will stay on until the public submissions have been analysed (mid-2016), then the subcommittee will be reviewed again.

Breeding: V Williams plans to get the paper to a pretty good stage for someone to take over. J Wagner was volunteered due to veterinary expertise. K Milne to chair. New animal science nominee to be the third member.

Farrowing: No need to change, since the work is just about finished.

Temporary housing: I Torrance appointed new chair; one of the new members should also join.

Wildlife: There are three remaining members and it was agreed that this is enough.

C 10. Animal welfare issues register and discussion

A list of wide-ranging national and international animal welfare issues had been shared with the committee (paper 57/15) prior to the meeting. The following issues were discussed:

- Ag-gag laws: so-called 'ag-gag' laws have been a big deal in America, with laws preventing employees of factory farms from going to the media unless they have first complained to the authorities. We have had some of the same issues around footage getting to the media before MPI but MPI considers our current laws are sufficient. No further action required.
- Traps: Can live animals be used as lures? This has been asked by DOC. For example, in other countries trappers may attach a mouse hutch to a snake trap, who only eat live animals. The

animals cannot actually be eaten and will have food/water but will that be true in all cases? MPI is pursuing this issue. No further NAWAC action required.

- Wildlife: MPI was asked by a pet food operator whether they can shoot wild animals for pet food in a commercial way. There was discussion over whether this would be considered a commercial slaughter or a wild animal/hunting issue. No further action required.
- Wildlife: There has been another enquiry from DOC about freezing reptiles due to new research. While the AVMA still says no chilling and freezing, this new research suggests it might be OK. DOC points out that people are uncomfortable about blunt force, and there is a risk that trapped (pest) skinks will just be let go instead. Keep this issue on the register as a watching brief.
- Cat café: Agreed that NAWAC were fine with this new business; clarified that cats are owned by the café so it is essentially the same as a home environment. No further action required.
- Crayfish: Consumption of live crayfish at restaurants in Auckland has been in the media, with MPI investigating for potential breaches of the Animal Welfare Act. No further NAWAC action required.
- Live export: NAWAC already aware of the large export to Mexico; it has been in the media extensively. Keep on the list.
- RTT: A public enquiry from a staff member at a university sought to clarify whether the layer hen code applied to chickens when not actively in an experiment. It does, so this is a reminder that animals kept in research facility, when not being manipulated, may be covered by NAWAC's codes. Note the meat chickens code would not apply because it's only for commercial purposes, but the layer hens code is meant to cover all layers, including backyard chickens, and so the code will also apply to chickens in research facilities. No further action required.
- TradeMe: The working group with TradeMe, MPI, NZVA, SPCA, has finished the 'welfare code' for TradeMe users selling animals. It's based on codes of welfare – it contains requirements on breeding of the animals (no father/daughter, brother/sister, etc.). If they don't meet the requirements, they could be charged under the Consumer Guarantees Act, but it is voluntary. Traders can still list an animal to re-home at no fee and not subject to the code. No further action required.
- Cattle on the interislander: There was no prosecution. One issue raised that is of concern is that they were travelling under a vet certificate, so why were they going across the Cook Strait? Keep on register.

C 11. MPI update and discussion of information circulated by MPI

There were no comments on the MPI update.

PART TWO (OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)

STRATEGY AND PLANNING

O 1. Glueboard traps update

There will be a summary of the next meeting on alternatives to glueboard traps ready by the next NAWAC meeting.

OTHER REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

O 2. NAWAC correspondence

Correspondence was received from s 9(2)(a) on rodeos, s 9(2)(a) on cow pacifiers, and s 9(2)(a) on zoos, which was sent to D Scobie and answered by J Hellström.

s 9(2)(a) had submitted a book chapter that he had drafted on New Zealand zoos and welfare. J Hellström reviewed it and fixed some factual errors. D Scobie also commented on it in his personal capacity, not as a member of NAWAC.

s 9(2)(a) also sent some emails on behalf of the group Advocateship of Purebred Dog Breeders. This is in regards to the regulations workshops being organised by MPI and feeling as if they were left out.

O 3. Committee members' reports on recent presentations and attendance at conferences

J Hellström met with members of the Zoos and Aquarium Association at their conference. It was a good meeting; they have growth, but there are issues around their 'social license to operate'. For a while, it was grim and there were entire generations that were turned off and maybe never went back. They recognise this issue and are working on going way beyond minimum standards and into affirmative states.

I Torrance and J Jamieson attended the 'Wild Future' talk by s 9(2)(a) in Wellington. He is pushing zoos to think about their function – entertainment, education, or conservation? How much do they really do in those areas?

V Williams attended the Australian and New Zealand Council for the Care of Animals in Testing and Teaching (ANZCCART) conference on the Gold Coast. It was a worthwhile conference, one of the main takeaways being the training and how people are trained to handle/deal with animals is a major area for NAEAC and others to continue working on. There is an issue with culture at different institutions. Some see Animal Ethics Committees (AEC's) as a license for what they do, and others see them as a barrier to research.

Any Other Business: Fish welfare

s 9(2)(a) reminded the Committee of reports in the media about 'fish mortality events' on fish farms in the Marlborough Sounds in 2012 and again this year. MPI is investigating possible links to disease.

Mortality in these events is very high, with morbidity leading up to mortality as well. It seems likely that these events will continue periodically. NAWAC has long had on its work programme that there needs to be a code of welfare for fish and MPI encourages this. MPI has also recently been approached by the industry body Seafood Standards Council, who want to work more proactively on biosecurity and welfare. With this in mind, s 9(2)(a) have been tasked to take something back to the

Seafood Standards Council on what can be done. This is likely to include suggestions for regulatory and non-regulatory interventions, possibly including a code of welfare. NAWAC agreed that it could consider a paper from MPI and should look to including fish welfare on their programme in 2016.

Action – ^{s 9(2)(a)} to coordinate paper to NAWAC for November meeting, with a view to including a farmed fish standards on the work programme for 2016.

It was noted that the blue-tick scheme for salmon was ended because of perceived lack of consumer interest; though it was thought that in other countries (e.g. Canada) there is a lot of interest in welfare-friendly salmon so this may change.

Closing

With no further items of business, it was acknowledged that this is the last meeting for K Bicknell, D Scobie and V Williams. They were thanked for their work and expertise that all three brought to the table during their time on NAWAC; all made fantastic contributions during their time.

The meeting was closed at 3:10pm.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



National Animal

Committee

Welfare Advisory

General Meeting

4 November 2015
9:30 am – 4:00 pm

Meeting Room 10.5 and 10.6
Pastoral House
25 The Terrace
Wellington

MINUTES

Committee members: John Hellström, Sue Brown, Ingrid Collins, Penny Fisher, Katie Milne, Grant Shackell, Alan Sharr, Iain Torrance, Julie Wagner

In attendance: [redacted] (Manager Standards Programme), [redacted] (Senior Adviser, Regulation & Assurance), [redacted] (Technical Adviser, Regulation & Assurance), [redacted] (NAWAC secretary), [redacted] (Manager, Regulatory Reform and Animal Welfare Policy), [redacted] (Manager, Animal Welfare Regulation & Assurance), [redacted] (Principal Adviser, Regulatory Reform and Animal Welfare Policy),

Apologies: Katie Milne

Welcome: Grant Shackell and Karin Schutz were introduced and welcomed to NAWAC as new members.

Any Other Business Part One (Public Excluded Agenda)

Any Other Business Part Two (Open to the Public)

C/- MPI, Pastoral House
P O Box 2526
Wellington 6140
New Zealand

Telephone: 0800 00 83 33
Email: nawac@mpi.govt.nz

**PART ONE
(PUBLIC EXCLUDED AGENDA)**

DRAFT RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

There being no other introductory items of business, it was moved (J Hellström / I Torrance)
That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting, namely:

- | | | |
|-------|--|-------------------|
| C 1. | Confirmation of previous minutes | J Hellström |
| C 2. | Status of actions arising from previous meetings | J Hellström |
| C 3. | Work programme update | s 9(2)(a) / All |
| C 4. | Dairy housing amendment | J Hellström |
| C 5. | Farrowing crates | s 9(2)(a) |
| C 6. | Systems review report | A Sharr |
| C 7. | Strategic plan in 2016 | J Hellström / All |
| C 8. | Animal welfare regulations progress report | J Hellström |
| C 9. | Animal welfare issues register and discussion | J Hellström / All |
| C 10 | Farmed fish | s 9(2)(a) |
| C 11. | Work programme 2016 | J Hellström / All |
| C 12. | MPI update and discussion of information circulated by MPI | s 9(2)(a) |

THE GENERAL SUBJECT OF EACH MATTER TO BE CONSIDERED WHILE THE PUBLIC IS EXCLUDED, THE REASON FOR PASSING THIS RESOLUTION IN RELATION TO EACH MATTER, AND THE SPECIFIC GROUNDS UNDER SECTION 48(1) OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL INFORMATION AND MEETINGS ACT 1987 FOR THE PASSING OF THIS RESOLUTION ARE AS FOLLOWS:

<i>General subject of each matter to be considered</i>	<i>Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter</i>	<i>Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution</i>
C 1. Confirmation of previous minutes	To protect the privacy of natural persons.	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(a) of the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA).

General subject of each matter to be considered		Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
C 2.	Status of actions arising from previous meetings	As above.	As above.
C 3.	Work programme update	To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(g)(ii) of the OIA.
C 4.	Dairy housing amendment	As above.	As above.
C 5.	Farrowing crates	As above.	As above.
C 6.	Systems review report	As above.	As above.
C 7.	Strategic plan in 2016	As above.	As above.
C 8.	Animal welfare regulations progress report	As above.	As above.
C 9.	Animal welfare issues register and discussion	To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(g)(i) of the OIA.
C 10.	Farmed fish	As above.	As above.
C 11.	Work programme 2016	As above.	As above.
C 12.	MPI update and discussion of information circulated by MPI	As above.	As above.

I also move that:

s 9(2)(a)

be permitted to remain at this meeting after the public has been excluded, because of their knowledge of meeting procedure and the subject matter under discussion. This knowledge is relevant background information to assist the committee in its deliberations.

C 1. Confirmation of previous minutes

The draft minutes of the general 05 August 2015 (NAWAC 77/15) were reviewed and accepted.

Moved (A Sharr / I Collins)

That the draft minutes of the general meetings held on 05 August 2015 be adopted as a true and accurate record of those meetings.

The motion was put: carried.

C 2. Status of actions arising from previous meetings

The committee reviewed the list of actions (NAWAC 78/15). The following updates were provided:

- Action 1, to advise the secretary of an appropriate wildlife speaker, is complete with ZIP at the current meeting
- Action 2, to appoint a new deputy chair, to be completed later in the meeting
- Action 3, to explore the idea of a new animal welfare forum, is in progress. J Hellström and V Williams met with the Animal Behaviour and Welfare Consultative Committee (ABWCC) and discussed it with them. There is an appetite to move ahead, as ABWCC is also looking to expand its remit. There is recognition that the new forum would meet as a joint group annually rather than every few years. Discussions will continue with stakeholders.
- Action 4, to circulate a final copy of the operating model, is in progress. ^{s 9(2)(a)} explained that there is a draft which lays out the animal welfare situation within MPI. It is set up along the lines of key activities: rules, education, enforcement, response (e.g. emergency), international, performance, and forums. ^{s 9(2)(a)} is due to present it to ABWCC in March. After finalising the MPI area, the next steps are to bring in stakeholders and then the general public, possibly in conjunction with NAWAC and NAEAC.
- Action 5, on the new website and NAWAC's visibility, is complete. NAWAC is happy with the functionality of the website. It was agreed that a letter should be sent to the Director-General with positive feedback.

Action – Secretary / J Hellström to send a letter to the Director-General of MPI with positive feedback on the new website.

- Action 6, to review the induction pack, is complete. New members received summaries and memos of the top-priority issues alongside the normal set of codes and other documents. J Hellström is due to meet with K Schutz, G Shackell and new member Graeme Doole for the usual induction meeting with the chair.
- Action 7, to draft a letter to Greyhound Racing NZ to ask formally that live baiting does not occur, still in progress.
- Action 12, to read the breeding paper and send feedback to V Williams, is complete.
- Action 13, for ^{s 9(2)(a)} to coordinate paper on farmed fish, complete and will be discussed later (agenda item C10).

C 3. Work programme update

The work programme update (NAWAC 79/15) was circulated prior to the meeting. For work programme items not already on the agenda, the following updates were provided:

- Wild animals: the Game Animal Council (GAC) has written a recommendation to member societies to write their own generally accepted practice. The subcommittee also had a meeting with groups that deal with large game animals, and they are now formally thinking of putting together a guideline/statement on animal welfare. The fishing and game bird industries are the next step.

There was further discussion on how difficult it is to reach hunters and fishermen who are not members of any society. One suggestion to reach people was to insert information into the training that you must take to obtain a gun license. Another way is through the media, and the SPCA has taken two hunting cases recently. Finally, DOC has agreed to refer to animal welfare whenever anyone applies for a permit to hunt on DOC land (but NAWAC haven't yet seen wording).

In regards to glueboard traps, § 9(2)(a) reported that it looks like about ½ of the exempted groups will not reapply. MPI is about to send out a reminder letter about re-applying and providing the data that MPI requires (e.g. on numbers of animals caught etc). This data can be difficult to get, so it was asked whether this would lead to people using the traps illegally. It was explained that commercial pest control operators can only buy glueboard traps through particular suppliers, and the suppliers can only operate under Ministerial approval. Residential use of glueboard traps bought in cut-price retailers remains an issue but is being addressed by MPI and SPCA animal welfare inspectors.

- Selective breeding: A memo has been circulated suggesting a couple of courses of action [NAWAC 81/15]. NAWAC was impressed with the paper, and agreed to wait until 2016 to finalise and consult, which provides an opportunity to take it to the Animal Behaviour and Welfare Consultative Committee, which is discussing breeding and sustainability. The paper can also be discussed in detail at the first meeting in February. The regulations working group has been discussing selective breeding in regards to Scottish fold cats.
- Temporary housing: § 9(2)(a) at Massey University has agreed to do the peer review; unfortunately he is not available until January, but he has said that the report can be ready by mid-February (first NAWAC meeting in 2016).
- Shelter: I Collins has contacted § 9(2)(a) (PhD Agricultural Science) to help write a paper on this; the *Safeguarding* programme will also take part in the shelter workstream.
- Entertainment, Exhibition and Encounter § 9(2)(a) acknowledged as providing excellent support and a new life to the newly-named '3E's' code. A memo has been circulated, explaining that there are two pieces of work being developed: one will be an opinion piece in the style of the selective breeding paper, and the other to develop the code of welfare, which will incorporate the zoo, circus and rodeos code of welfare as well as bringing in racing [NAWAC 80/15]. At this point it looks feasible, but it will be a huge code and a lot of work. NAWAC noted the approach and agreed that it should continue.
- Horses & donkeys: § 9(2)(a) has been talking to the Equine Health Association about a few last minute queries, hence the delay, but the code should be issued before Christmas.

O 1. 11:00am: Remote monitoring of traps

§ 9(2)(a) (Zero Invasive Predators) and § 9(2)(a) (Massey University) arrived for the open items O1 and O2.

§ 9(2)(a) thanked NAWAC for the opportunity to share their work in remote trap monitoring and asked for any feedback on animal welfare during their presentation.

Zero Invasive Predators (ZIP) is a non-profit organisation spun out of the Department of Conservation and funded by DOC, the Morgan Foundation, and various dairy cooperatives and businesses.

ZIP's purpose is to eradicate predators, defined as rats, stoats and possums.

Their current focus is at Bottle Rock Peninsula in Queen Charlotte Sound. Using leghold traps and the Trapinator, they are setting up intensive lines of traps across the peninsula; they have managed to eliminate possums from it, and have now set up intensive lines separating it from the mainland to keep it pest free.

The leghold trap was displayed. It is linked to a wooden platform with space routed out, so the trap is flush with the platform and the chain can run freely when the animals' leg is caught. The transmitter is attached to the trap with a magnet, and it is set up so that when the magnets no longer touch anymore (meaning the trap has been separated somehow), the trap is registered as triggered. This information travels along all transmitters along the trap line in a daisy chain until reaching the last node, which sends the information to a web server.

The failsafe built into the system is that the default state for a trap is always 'triggered'. Each trap must confirm multiple times that they are not triggered before that information will be sent.

Once received by the web server, the information is collated and sent to the field ranger one hour after sunrise. This is how the system is currently set up, but the information is available immediately and could be viewed sooner.

Information will be sent even if no traps are sprung, to avoid the receiver wondering if the server is broken. Managers are able to see the trap information and the time at which traps are reset.

If the message is not received by the fieldworker, it will be sent to the manager (and automatically escalate further as needed).

If the daisy chain message system fails, for whatever reason, (e.g. trees down, system failure) then all traps that are not responding will automatically register as triggered. If no message is ever sent, then that is a failure of the satellite, and it means that every single trap must be checked.

The reason to use leghold traps is that they are much more effective than their kill-trap (the Trapinator) in catching possums. Catch rates can be estimated using chew cards to detect possums that get past the trap lines.

There is a visual lure, a white chew card, that is enough to get the possums up off the ground and onto the leghold trap at the top of the platform (traps must be off the ground in order to eliminate non-target species from being trapped – having no bait is also useful for this).

Current statistics show that using a remote trapping system reduces the labour cost by 20 times.

The average time to dispatch was queried. All possums in the trial so far have been dispatched by 1pm. Most are within 4 hours of sunrise.

NAWAC thanked ^{s 9(2)(a)} for their time. The wildlife subcommittee will be continuing to work in this area and is developing an opinion on remote monitoring.

O 2. 11:30am: Mini tutorial: The Five Domains Model and positive welfare

^{s 9(2)(a)} (Massey University) gave a mini-tutorial on the five domains model and how to incorporate positive welfare into welfare assessments.

It was explained that the general movement in animal welfare has been in the direction of positive welfare. The first laws were to protect animals from cruelty, then they required responsibility, and now alleviating negative states is no longer enough.

The idea of meeting behavioural needs may already require positive experiences (depending on the definition of 'needs'). ^{s 9(2)(a)} have therefore been using the five domains model to look at how to assess positive welfare.

Behaviour and mental state is seen as the area that lags behind in the research – work is happening now, but scientists don't want to be anthropomorphic and it is a difficult area to study.

It was noted that alleviating negative experiences may cause some positive experiences (by causing a feeling of relief) but doesn't necessarily lead to long-lasting positive feelings.

How are positive experiences identified?

- Species ecology/evolutionary value
- Motivation to work to gain access to a reward
- Activation of reward areas in brain
- Observing behaviour

Opportunities only enhance welfare if utilised. When animals are severely welfare compromised, there are also often few opportunities for enhancement (e.g. an animal in pain will not play with a toy). There is also individual animal variation – individuals value different things; need to provide choices.

Trade-offs can become very complicated when adding positive dimensions. Weighing whether a positive experience will 'cancel out' a negative one is comparing apples and oranges, then you have to consider the individual variation on top.

NAWAC thanked ^{s 9(2)(a)} for her presentation, as it was very informative and timely.

C 4. Dairy housing amendment

A verbal update was provided.

The subcommittee have nearly finalised the draft amendment to the code of welfare. At this point it is the issue of access to the outdoors that remains. Sector organisations first agreed that a requirement for outdoors time was obvious, but more recently decided that farmer's choice should not be restricted.

There are a few farmers already doing long-term housing (and at least one that is apparently housing indoors permanently). However it was noted that industries are trying to move away from this overseas. This is a risk that needs to be taken into account.

The subcommittee are waiting for the New Zealand Veterinary Association to get their comments in on the final draft at the moment. J Hellström is also due to speak to the Minister shortly. It is hoped that the draft amendment can be recommended by Christmas.

It was explained that there is plenty of research saying time outdoors is good for cattle, but not how much, and research saying spending all time indoors is not so good; but sector groups are still opposed, though it is unclear how farmers stand.

NAWAC will need to make an out-of-session resolution to confirm that version of the code will be recommended to the Minister. ^{s 9(2)(a)} reiterated the importance of committee members being able to request a meeting if they were not comfortable with making the decision out of session.

The Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis according to NAWAC Guideline 08 has been completed for off-paddock facilities for dairy cattle and will be received alongside code report.

C 5. Farrowing crates

A verbal update was provided. Interim advice has been provided to the Minister based on the August meeting [NAWAC 54/15]. The advice made it clear that NAWAC hadn't yet made a final decision in the absence of the economic analysis which has been delayed.

There has been a recent meeting between contractors Nimmo Bell, the subcommittee and NZPork to discuss the first results. Everyone seemed fairly happy with the process. The second part of the report, the industry level report, is due on 10 November. An out-of-session decision will be required.

It was also noted that K Bicknell had visited some pig farms in Switzerland to look at free farrowing systems. She has reported back to the subcommittee that the trip was useful, and that sows and piglets looked relaxed and content, but there was a high fly burden. A Swiss researcher that she talked to believed that the mortality levels were comparable to crates. However, the way pigs are farmed is very different. Approximately 40% of gross farm income is from the government. Each herd is limited to 150 sows. Cost of pork in Switzerland is 2x that of the rest of the world.

The Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis according to NAWAC Guideline 08 will be completed once the final Nimmo Bell report has been received and will be circulated with the decision.

It was also confirmed that NAWAC did not have to recommend transitional regulations for the use of farrowing crates up to four weeks after farrowing: the current code of welfare notes that the use of farrowing crates is not acceptable for extended periods but it allows use up to four weeks.

It was clarified that the advice will include how NZ can work on creating a future where there are alternatives to farrowing crates. NAWAC will also make it clear that the problem stems from a drive for profitability from larger litters.

C 6. Systems review report

A Sharr summarised the report with agreements that had been circulated to NAWAC (83/13)

Each agreement was discussed and agreed to:

- The guideline on level of intervention is underway with help from MPI policy and legal; it will be ready to discuss at the next meeting.
- Examples of how to include regulations in codes were discussed. The committee agreed to publish regulations inside codes of welfare, and agreed to use layout option 2.

- NAWAC appreciated the new process diagram.
- The updated guidelines should be circulated to all members and discussed at the next meeting.
- NAWAC agreed that the 'guidelines for writing codes of welfare' need to be updated, and decided that it should not suggest that members of the public can recommend regulations alongside draft codes (but acknowledged they are likely to do it anyway)
- NAWAC agreed that the difference between 'general information' and 'introduction' should be made clearer, and the secretariat should support them in this, but that neither section should be removed entirely.
- NAWAC discussed the role of science in its decision making; this will be discussed further when creating the next strategic plan in February 2016.

Moved (A Sharr / S Brown)

That the recommendations in paper 83/15 are agreed to, subject to the NAWAC guidelines being shared, and that option 2 is selected as the layout format for reprinting regulations.

The motion was put: carried.

C 7. Strategic plan in 2016

s 9(2)(a) discussed NAWAC's strategic plan, which expires in 2015. NAWAC was asked what kind of format they wanted to discuss the plan – a facilitator was suggested to guide the discussion in a way that ends in a useable document.

Action – s 9(2)(a) / J Hellström to come up with approach for working on the strategic plan. To be circulated to the rest of the Committee by early 2016

C 8. Animal welfare regulations progress report

A paper had been circulated to the committee (87/15) prior to the meeting. It also had links within to two other papers that were provided to the regulations working group.

NAWAC was asked to note the progress and share any comments on the paper, the matters for regulation, or on how MPI has been working with NAWAC.

Action – All to share feedback on 87/15 by Wednesday 11 November

MPI is aiming to report back to the Minister by end of November to update on the workshops and to share the results of the latest meeting. MPI then needs to switch to consultation stage before Christmas so that the consultation can be carried out in April 2016.

There is one outstanding issue on consultation: NAWAC will be specially consulted, but if they disagree with anything that is released, MPI and NAWAC will need to sort out how this will be handled. MPI cannot share the consultation document before it goes out to the public.

J Hellström explained that the 87 matters had been cut to 67 at the latest meeting, and outlined reasons why 20 were removed.

MPI hopes to have the discussion document prepared by end 2015, but Cabinet may not be able to consider it until February. Noted that MPI must not share drafts as part of regulatory process.

After consultation, the timing of the next steps depends on number of submissions and time to summarise them. NAWAC will be kept well informed.

Tranche 2 has no timeline yet. It is clear that there are groups of issues (e.g. bobby calves, shelter, transport, breeding) to be addressed; it may be best to go one issue at a time. Each will trigger a large debate.

J Hellstrom noted that the consultation process was managed by MPI very well, and both MPI and NAWAC's reputations were enhanced by the process.

C 9. Animal welfare issues register and discussion

The issues register was circulated as paper 88/15.

- **Dairy price:** there have definitely been issues with pregnant cows transported, as well as calves sent for calf serum (since the price increased). Leave it on for next time.
- **Sheep shearing and PETA:** Hasn't been new news in NZ, but probably won't go away; PETA still releasing videos, putting increased pressure on high-value suppliers. Rumour that new SAFE campaign on the way.
- **Bobby calves:** Some processors have done very well, but a few of the individual plants have not been able to decrease mortality rates. MPI has a working group on it to work it out before next calving season. There is a reputational issue as well. Calf serum is marketed as NZ origin, and buyers are increasingly concerned with animal welfare.
- **Compliance:** The case of a dairy farming employee cutting the teats of cows in Te Aroha was noted as one that generated a lot of public interest.
- **Compliance:** The highest ever sentence indicated more appetite to prosecute animal welfare cases.
- **Drought:** Drought indicated for 2016 due to El Nino. West Coast is having a wetter season; East coast drier. Some farmers have been trucking their animals across the island to the West Coast. Leave it on for next time.
- There were no other issues to add.

C 10 Farmed fish

A memo (89/15) had been circulated to explain why farmed fish will be suggested to be added to the work programme.

Farmed fish have been on NAWAC's work programme for a long time, but it is consistently pushed back onto 'next year's programme'. MPI is meanwhile pushing aquaculture as a growth industry and is keen to consider biosecurity and animal welfare alongside productivity, so now is suggested to be the right time to engage with industry and write a code. The industry has come to MPI to ask to work with them on animal welfare, so whether NAWAC engages or not, MPI will need to continue to work on this.

C 11. Work programme 2016

Historically, the secretariat have prepared a written paper to discuss in November and ratify in February. This year, it has been different on one hand because of the regulations process and on the other because the strategic plan also needs to be updated.

Some ideas for how a 2016 work plan might look were discussed:

- **On the go** – regulations; reviewing the codes once regulations are added (this encompasses thinking around shelter, saleyards and bobby calves); the 3E's code
- **New** - On-farm slaughter, snares, farmed fish – or all fish?, lifestylers (also on Safeguarding's programme)
- **Finalising** – breeding; temporary housing

It was agreed that there was no need to finalise now, but there is clearly a range of issues to discuss in February.

The method of problem identification was noted. The regulations working group had been using compliance statistics, but it was thought that this may be missing major areas of welfare compromise where there are still animal welfare risks – it is just that the problems have not been recognised or formally reported.

NAWAC's PR/Comms strategy was discussed. At the moment, NAWAC tended to be in the news to respond when things went wrong – it was suggested this could be looked at. Noted good engagement has been achieved, for example with the wildlife sector (see magazine write-up and feedback from stakeholders).

C 12. MPI update and discussion of information circulated by MPI

There were no comments on the MPI update.

PART TWO (OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)

STRATEGY AND PLANNING

O 3. 2016 meeting dates

The following dates were suggested and agreed:

- 17 February
- 18 May
- 17 August
- 16 November

O 4. Appointment of Deputy Chair

J Hellström nominated J Wagner, due to her extensive experience on other advisory committees.

Moved (J Hellström / I Collins)

That J Wagner be elected deputy chairperson of the committee for the remainder of 2015 and 2016, pursuant to the Animal Welfare Act 1999 (section 67 and Schedule 1, clause 3).

The motion was put: carried.

OTHER REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

O 5. NAWAC correspondence

There were no comments on recent NAWAC correspondence.

O 6. Committee members' reports on recent presentations and attendance at conferences

J Hellstöm attended an Australasian poultry veterinary practitioners association conference in Queenstown and presented a paper on social license for intensive hen production (to be circulated). Another paper, by researcher ^{§ 9(2)(a)} from Melbourne, was very interesting. The study looked at the behaviour of birds in free range operations (RFIDs to track wandering). About 80% birds spend time outdoors, contrary to the thoughts of some critics of free range systems.

^{§ 9(2)(a)} has attended two meetings of the newly formed National Cat Management Forum, convened by the NZVA. Currently very early days, but there should be more updates by the next NAWAC meeting.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982