



Systems Audit Team

FINAL REPORT

Audit Report

Annual audit of RNZSPCA

National Office and Selected Regional Centres

April - May 2017

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Summary

Under the Animal Welfare Act 1999 (the Act), Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) must carry out audits of RNZSPCA (SPCA) as an approved organisation for the purpose of this Act. The Director General sets terms of reference for audits of approved organisations in order to assess; the organisation's compliance with animal welfare law; compliance with any memorandum of understanding established between the Ministry and the organisation; compliance by an organisation and its Inspectors and auxiliary officers with any relevant performance and technical standards for inspectors and auxiliary officers, and the inspectors and auxiliary officers exercising of any power, and the carrying out of any functions or duties.

This audit focused on the RNZSPCA National Office in Auckland (the National Office) and five Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals centres (SPCA Centres).

The main finding of this audit is that within the terms of reference the RNZSPCA remains in substantial compliance with requirements of the Act, Memorandum of Understanding between the RNZSPCA and MAF 2010 (MoU), and the Performance and Technical Standards for Inspectors and Auxiliary Officers (PTS). The auditor has raised one MPI Issue for failing to provide feedback on the progress of investigation of complaints transferred from SPCA. This is non-compliant with the MoU, Section 72.

The National Office and regional SPCA Centres effectively implemented the majority of the recommendations made by SAT auditors in the last two years. The National Office and MPI postponed the implementation of two recommendations; to review the MoU and PTS due to a planned restructure of the RNZSPCA in 2017. The National Office has not yet implemented the recommendation to establish an internal audit but has a strategy to implement it once the new structure is in place. The National Office has reviewed its complaints process against inspectors and auxiliary officers but the audit showed that two Centres' staff were still discontented with the process. There is no noticeable improvement in MPI communicating with the SPCA on animal welfare complaints transferred to MPI, which was previously recommended by SAT.

Since the 2016 audit, the National Office has launched a number of initiatives aimed at developing resources to assist Centres in a number of areas. It has expanded its documented procedures for selection, training and appointment of inspectors and auxiliary officers. The office has continued improving its communication with, and the support to, regional centres. Reporting to MPI appears to be well maintained.

The number of trained auxiliary officers (AO) has increased but the recruitment of new inspectors is limited in some remote locations. Similarly, the provision of post warranting training is more difficult in small centres due to unavailability of experienced inspectors. The National Office provides many opportunities for ongoing, refresher training for inspectors but only limited refresher training for auxiliary officers.

There has been a significant increase in the uptake of the electronic administration tool, "Shelterbuddy" by the Animal Shelters in comparison with the last year.

All Centres' staff demonstrated their full engagement, dedication and often a passion for animals they care for. The same must be said about volunteers who appear to be an essential workforce of the SPCA. The Inspectors knowledge of welfare priorities and relevant animal welfare and administrative requirements were acceptable. Similarly, AOs were conversant with their statutory powers and actions in regards to dealing with animal welfare complaints.

Recently, one of the Centres has been heavily involved in managing a crisis situation due to a severe flooding in Whakatane region. This event killed and threatened lives of hundreds of domestic and farm animals. That situation was managed alongside the MPI response team.



The audit was able to achieve its goals however the auditor(s) raised one MPI issue and identified several areas for improvement. Eight recommendations have been made; four of these being carried over from the last year and four are new ones.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Important Note

This report may discuss Topics, i.e. subjects of particular interest. The discussion can include positive and negative elements. In some cases, the negative elements are such that Non-compliances result.

All deficiencies discussed as Non-compliances are expected to be resolved by auditee or the auditee's organisation, whether or not they are described as Serious Non-compliances. Serious Non-compliances constitute a system failure. They have a profile such that the effectiveness of the corrective actions will be measured in subsequent Systems Audit Team audits. Inadequate resolution can lead to failure of the subsequent audit.

Recommendations may appear in the report. These are non-binding, and do not affect subsequent audits. Their implementation may provide efficiencies for both the auditee and MPI. The presence of recommendations to change existing specifications does not excuse the absolute requirement to conform to the existing specifications. Changes to specifications that may result from these recommendations will be promulgated officially.

The Auditee is reminded that audit reports are subject to the *Official Information Act 1982*. The Auditee may highlight any information considered confidential during the course of the audit however the Auditor cannot provide any assurance to the Auditee that the information considered confidential will not be disclosed as a result of an enquiry under the Official Information Act.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Terms of Reference

Goal(s)

To assess the effectiveness of Royal New Zealand Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Incorporated (RNZSPCA) national procedures to ensure that obligations and requirements of the *Animal Welfare Act 1999* (AWA) are being met by RNZSPCA/SPCA branches and member societies (centres).

To evaluate how the systems and procedures implemented by the RNZSPCA are meeting the requirements outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the RNZSPCA and the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI).

To assess the effectiveness of the RNZSPCA/SPCA branches in managing the requirements of the AWA and MOU for appointments, training and monitoring of Inspectors and Auxiliary Officers.

To assess corrective actions undertaken by the RNZSPCA national body and/or RNZSPCA centres in response to the previous MPI systems audit findings, and if appropriate to recommend further improvements to ensure requirements of the AWA are met.

To make recommendations to MPI for improvements to the MOU, and AWA ancillary notices and specifications and guidance as required.

Scope

Shall include interviews with the RNZSPCA national and regional offices staff and a review of methods used for the assessment and recommendation to MPI for appointment of their Inspectors and Auxiliary Officers.

Shall include an examination of reports submitted by the RNZSPCA national office to MPI, and if the reporting satisfies requirements of the MOU.

Shall include an examination of the follow-up actions taken by the RNZSPCA in response to the findings of 2016 round of audits.

A sample of locations included in this audit shall consist of the national RNZSPCA office and five regional centre offices and facilities.

Standards / Legislation

1. *Animal Welfare Act 1999*
2. Memorandum of Understanding between the RNZSPCA and MAF, 2010
3. RNZSPCA Performance and Technical Standards for Inspectors of RNZSPCA, 2012
4. Performance and Technical Standards for Auxiliary Officers of RNZSPCA, 2012.

Initiator

s 9(2)(a), Manager Animal Welfare, Regulation and Assurance, MPI

Specialist / Observers

The auditor may call upon the services of other parties as deemed appropriate to facilitate the audit. The Initiator or representatives nominated by the Initiator may attend audits in this domain as Specialists / Observers.

Response to Critical Situation

If a critical situation is identified, the provisions of the MPI Systems Audit Team (SAT)



procedure for management of critical situations (SAAM-SAT-004-PRO) shall be implemented. The Initiator shall be contacted immediately and any actions will be determined in consultation with the Initiator and/or Manager, Systems Audit.

A Critical situation is defined as follows: "Any situation which, in the professional judgement of the auditor, Initiator or Manager Systems Audit places food safety, market access, official assurances, animal welfare or MPI Directors' credibility at risk. A critical situation may result from information received from a number of sources as well as SAT audit findings."

Other Terms of Reference

The audit will be conducted according to SAT operating procedures (SAAM-SAT-002-PRO).

Non-conformance Management

The mechanism for resolving any identified serious non-compliances will be recorded in the Serious Non-Compliances, Corrective Action Requirements section of this audit report. Closure of any non-compliances raised will be as agreed with, and to the satisfaction of, the Initiator.

MPI Issues

Issues identified and raised during the audit that require MPI attention will be specified in the final audit report. The Initiator must identify the relevant accountable persons to manage any required follow-up.

Reporting Considerations

The auditee may receive Location Finding or a site report. Upon completion of the audit the lead auditor will submit a draft audit report to the Initiator and to the Manager Systems Audit for comment. The draft may also be submitted to the RNZSPCA for comments, at the Initiator's discretion.

The final report shall be distributed to:

Allan Kinsella - Director Systems Audit, Assurance and Monitoring
s 9(2)(a) - Manager Systems Audit, Regulation and Assurance
s 9(2)(a) - Manager Animal Welfare, Regulation and Assurance
s 9(2)(a) - Manager Animal Welfare Compliance, Operations

Further distribution of the final report will be at the discretion of the Initiator.

Other

All travel costs associated with this audit and undertaken by the allocated auditor(s) are approved by the Manager Systems Audit on approval of these Terms of Reference.

The auditor will notify auditees of the impending audit and provide them with a copy of these Terms of Reference prior to the audit date.



Audit Date (Last Day)

31 May 2017

Audit Number

4495

Location(s)

Royal New Zealand Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals t/a: RNZSPCA, 3047 Great North Road, PO Box 15349, Auckland
SPCA North Taranaki t/a: SPCA North Taranaki, 75 Colson Road, New Plymouth
SPCA Canterbury t/a: SPCA Canterbury
Whakatane SPCA t/a: Whakatane SPCA, 15 Gateway Crescent, Whakatane
Hastings and District SPCA t/a: Hastings and District SPCA, 8 Heathcote Rd, RD5, Hastings
Gisborne SPCA t/a: Gisborne SPCA, 14 Nursery Rd., Gisborne

Lead Auditor

s 9(2)(a), MPI Systems Audit Team, Systems Auditor

Auditor(s)

s 9(2)(a), MPI Systems Audit Team, Systems Auditor

Auditee(s)

s 9(2)(a), RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support
s 9(2)(a), RNZSPCA, Animal Welfare Coordinator
s 9(2)(a), RNZSPCA, Regional Manager
s 9(2)(a), SPCA North Taranaki, Area/Centre Manager
s 9(2)(a), SPCA North Taranaki, Centre Coordinator, Inspector
s 9(2)(a), SPCA North Taranaki, Senior Inspector
s 9(2)(a), SPCA Canterbury, Chief Inspector
s 9(2)(a), SPCA Canterbury, Operation Manager
s 9(2)(a), Whakatane SPCA, Centre Manager
s 9(2)(a), Whakatane SPCA, Senior Inspector
s 9(2)(a), Whakatane SPCA, trainee Auxiliary Officer
s 9(2)(a), Hastings and District SPCA, Centre Manager
s 9(2)(a), Hastings and District SPCA, Inspector
s 9(2)(a), Hastings and District SPCA, Centre Committee Chair
s 9(2)(a), Gisborne SPCA, Centre Manager
s 9(2)(a), Gisborne SPCA, Auxiliary Officer
s 9(2)(a), Gisborne SPCA, Inspector

Audit Type

Allocated Audit



Background

Introduction

The audit took place between 26 April and 9 June 2017 and included the SPCA National Office in Auckland and the following five SPCA centres: North Taranaki, Canterbury, Whakatane, Hastings & Districts and Gisborne.

Two SAT auditors, s 9(2)(a) and s 9(2)(a) visited the first two locations, Auckland and New Plymouth, after which s 9(2)(a) visited the remaining four locations, in Christchurch, Whakatane, Hastings and Gisborne. s 9(2)(a), the RNZSPCA Regional Manager was an observer during the audit at those last four locations.

The SPCA National Manager selected and recommended to MPI the centres, taking into considerations the length of time since the last audit and the size of the centres. The recommended centres represented those that had not been audited previously or for many years and were of various sizes, from small to large, both rural and urban.

All individuals that were spoken with during the course of the audit are shown in the Auditees list. s 9(2)(a), the Gisborne SPCA Inspector was not present during the audit but provided written answers to questions that the auditor prepared for her prior to the audit.

Location findings were created at each centre and they are appended to the report.

Requirements

The MoU between the SPCA and MPI stipulates requirements for selection, appointment, training of SPCA inspectors and auxiliary officers, enforcement of the Act, management of animal welfare complaints and complaints against inspectors or auxiliary officers, records keeping, and management and accountabilities of the SPCA as an MPI approved organisation.

The MoU requires annual audits of Branches and Member Societies (MS). Branches or Member Societies are selected for audit with the agreement of, and input from, the National Office. The audits have been carried out by the Systems Audit Team (SAT) or its predecessors.

Historically, the MPI annual audits included three locations proposed by the SPCA National Office and agreed to by MPI. Following the SAT recommendation from the 2015 audit the scope had been expanded and five locations were selected for the audit in 2016. Similarly, the scope of this year audit included six locations - the SPCA National Office, and five branches (Centres).

The SAT audit includes assessment of corrective actions and changes undertaken by the SPCA national body and regional centres in response to the previous MPI audit, and if appropriate, recommends further improvements.

The PTS for Inspectors and AOs detail the requirements noted in the first paragraph of this topic. These standards were reviewed in 2012 and signed by both parties (MPI and SPCA) in February 2013, but are referred to as versions 2012 of the PTS.

SPCA

At the time of the audit the SPCA had 40 Branches and 6 Member Societies (MSs) operating in New Zealand. Branches and Member Societies are referred to as "Centres" by the National Office and this terminology is adopted by the auditor in this report. The Centres are overseen on a regional basis by four SPCA Regional Managers. The Branches and Member Societies (Centres) cover all geographical areas of NZ and currently there are no gaps between them.



SPCA Branches operate under SPCA constitution and funding, and MSs have their own constitution and independent funding. Each SPCA Centre has a chief executive or manager as well as a management board (Centre committee). The Centres are supported by local communities, volunteers, and their own fundraising.

The SPCA National Executive Committee is a part of the National Board that runs on a day-to-day basis its National Support Office in Auckland (National Office). The accountability for management of the National Office stays with the CEO, who reports to the National Board and manages the National Office. The National Office is run according to Board and Executive Directives. The National Manager, Inspectorate & Centre Support works closely with a Chief Scientific Officer (CSO) who sets animal welfare policies and manages the integration with MPI. There are two Animal Welfare Coordinators based in the National Office who liaise with the Centres and provide them with technical and operational support. A bi-monthly newsletter is published by the Marketing and Fundraising team that is distributed to all Centres and includes a variety of information from general news to events and national updates including information relevant to Inspectors and Auxiliary Officers.

Currently, there are 79 warranted Inspectors and 5 trainee Inspectors, and 81 warranted Auxiliary Officers plus 14 trainee Auxiliary Officers (AOs). The number of Inspectors and AOs employed by the visited Centres vary, from one Inspector and one AO in Whakatane to seven Inspectors and 10 AOs in Christchurch. There are between 25 and 150 volunteers affiliated with each of those Centres. The Gisborne Centre came out of RNZSPCA administration in April 2014, just over 3 years ago.

SPCA restructure

The SPCA restructure has been on the agenda for several years with a number of workshops and consultation meetings being held between the National Office and Centres. During the AGM meeting in June 2017 delegates from all Centres have voted for the proposed new constitution and new rules governing the SPCA. According to the passed resolution the “new” SPCA is to commence its operation from 1 Nov 2017.

Under new rules all Centres will cease to exist as independent entities and a new organisation, RNZSPCA (or similar name) with its new Centres will be created. The country will be divided into 3 regions, and 11 areas within the regions. There will be one CEO, 3 regional general managers and 11 area managers. There is an intention that the Centre managers should be the current managers of existing Centres.

There may be some Centres that will choose not to join, and those areas will lose the legal SPCA status and will become separate entities with names other than SPCA. The biggest change for the National Inspectorate will be the one employer for all inspectors (rather than the Inspectors being employed by each separate Centre).

Abbreviations

AO - Auxiliary Officer
AWA - Animal Welfare Act 1999, the Act
CEO - Chief Executive Officer
CSO - Chief Scientific Officer
IoA - Instrument of Appointment
MAF - Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
MoU - Memorandum of Understanding
MS - Member Societies
MPI - Ministry for Primary Industries
PTS - Performance and Technical Standards
RNZSPCA - Royal New Zealand Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
SAT - Systems Audit Team
SPCA - Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals



Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Topics

1.0 Follow up to Previous Audits

There were seven recommendations made to SPCA and MPI during the audit in 2016. The auditors also looked at two recommendations made by the SAT auditor in 2015.

1.1 Expanding the scope of the audit (2015 audit)

The scope of the annual audit had been expanded and there were five SPCA Branches and Member Societies audited in 2016 and six centres audited during this 2017 round of audits. The day-to-day supervision of Inspectors, and working relationship between the Centres and National Office, have been included in the scope of the audits since.

1.2 Internal Audit (2015 audit)

A specific internal audit programme has not yet been established. While the auditees agree overall with that recommendation, the implementation of such a programme in the current environment is limited by various factors. Additional funds and training of SPCA auditors continue to be the main limitations. The National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support has indicated that RNZSPCA does not have sufficient experience in internal auditing and that MPI assistance with training of SPCA internal auditors would be very valuable.

Under the current structure where SPCA Centres run their own operating model imposing an internal audit process was difficult. Under the proposed changes all independent Centres will fall under one umbrella of the SPCA and the National Office has a strategy to build an internal audit process into that new structure.

Nonetheless, since the 2016 audit, the National Office has launched a number of initiatives aimed at developing resources to assist Centres in a number of areas. One of them is a Centre Checklist; a tool that can assist Centres in measuring their performance against wide set of animal welfare parameters, identifying areas of success and areas for development. In addition, the National Manager and Centre Support sends all Centres the summary of findings and recommendations from the MPI annual audit to ensure those issues have been addressed on the regional level, where applicable.

All Centres had used the Centre Checklist and they all confirmed substantial compliance with the checklist. Three of five Centres were familiar with the findings from the previous MPI audit. In one case, a newly appointed manager was not aware of the findings and in another case, the Centre committee most likely failed to pass that information on to the manager.

Recommendation - 1. To Manager, Animal Welfare Team – Assistance in training of SPCA auditors

It is recommended to the Manager, Animal Welfare Team that MPI considers providing assistance to SPCA with training of the internal auditors.

Training of internal auditors has been identified by SPCA as one of the main limitations in implementing their internal audit programme. The National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support has indicated that SPCA does not have sufficient experience in internal auditing and that MPI assistance with training of SPCA internal auditors would be very valuable.

MPI has a great deal of expertise in auditing animal welfare related fields and in the auditor's opinion these could be utilised in assisting SPCA in training their own resources. Having effective internal audit programme would facilitate SPCA in effective delivery of their national programme and provide MPI with confidence the SPCA as an approved organisation meets their duties and obligations in relation to the Act.



1.3 Review of the MoU (2016 audit)

During a pre-2017 audit meeting with the Initiator, s 9(2)(a), s 9(2)(b) advised the SAT auditor that the review of the MoU was to be further delayed until SPCA decides on the new structure.

Recommendation - 2. To National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support, RNZSPCA and Manager Animal Welfare, MPI - Review of the MoU

This recommendation is carried over from the previous 2016 audit.

It is recommended to the RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support and the Initiator, the Manager Animal Welfare, MPI that review of the MoU is carried out to ensure the proposed changes of SPCA structure are incorporated into that agreement. As previously recommended, that review should be done within one year of the restructure. Depending on the outcome, the ongoing review period could be extended to a period determined at MPI discretion.

1.4 Review of the PTS (2016 audit)

This recommendation is linked to the review of MoU and it has also been delayed until the proposed SPCA restructure is implemented.

Recommendation - 3. To National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support, RNZSPCA and Manager Animal Welfare, MPI - Review of the PTS

This recommendation is carried over from the previous audit.

It is recommended to the RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support and the Initiator, the Manager Animal Welfare, MPI that review of PTS documents is carried out.

Part A: It is recommended that the SPCA reviews the PTS documents, to ensure they accurately describe how the Centres, Inspectors, AOs, and the National Office interact to meet the MoU and AWA. A review of the reporting to and communication with MPI should be included.

Part B: It is recommended that MPI reviews the proposed changes and determine if they are appropriate and manageable prior to the documents being finalised. Further changes and communications may be required before the documents can be signed e.g. differences between the Complaints Bylaw and the PTSs for managing complaints against Inspectors and AOs should be aligned.

1.5 Training and Mentoring of New Inspectors (2016 audit)

The National Office has reviewed the training programme for inspectors and the overall SPCA Inspectorate framework. As a result, a National Inspector Competency Training Programme for inspectors has been developed. That programme has been already trialled at three main centres; Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch.

Due to small numbers of staff at many remote locations, the problem of monitoring and training of new Inspectors in small centres is ongoing. However, to improve the support for inspectors the National Office developed and provided all Centres with a suite of technical and operational procedures and templates, as guidance. All these documents are available on the SPCA website as part of the Inspectorate web resource.

1.6 Auxiliary Officer Approval (2016 audit)

It was recommended that MPI and RNZSPCA review the frequency of AO training in order to increase the number of AOs.



The National Office runs two intakes of trainee AOs per year and training is carried out in May and October. If the trainees fail the first online assessment they have one further opportunity to re-sit the assessment. In total there are 4 assessments for AOs per year – 2 regular assessments and 2 repeat assessments if required. Taking into consideration the amount of work and time that is needed for carrying out police checks, filling out the SPCA and MPI application forms and sending them to MPI it is logistically difficult to organise more training sessions for AOs.

The number of trainee AOs has increased from approximately 20 in 2016 to 30 in 2017. Currently, there are 81 AOs and 14 trainees for the next course. The number of AOs has doubled from 40 trained AOs in 2015.

1.7 Review of the Complaints Process (Complaints against Inspectors and AOs) (2016 audit)

It was recommended that the review of the MoU and PTS documents include the procedures for managing complaints against Inspectors and AOs in a timely and appropriate manner, taking into consideration any potential employment issues.

As advised by the National Manager, there are variations in the way complaints against Inspectors and AOs are handled as there are differences between the Complaints Bylaw and the PTSs for managing complaints. When the PTSs are reviewed then these should be aligned. The National Office has now drafted a new procedure that blends those two documents. An example of a recent, closed complaint against an Inspector demonstrated that procedure was correctly followed.

However, the staff at two Centres reported they had been dissatisfied with the National Office managing the complaints. An Inspector in one Centre felt the National Office staff's enquiry was inadequate and the conclusion prejudiced. An AO in another Centre felt strongly that the support provided by the National Office for the AO to handle the complaint was inadequate.

Recommendation - 4. To National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support, RNZSPCA – Review of the Complaints Process

This is an extension of the recommendation made in the previous audit.

It is recommended to the RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support that SPCA revisits their complaints process to ensure the enquiries are full, and objective and their own staff is treated fairly and supported throughout the process.

Due to comments made by the key personnel at two Centres the auditor is in the opinion that SPCA should be more considerate when handling complaints against inspectors and AOs in order to avoid alienating their own staff.

1.8 Review of PTS (Animal Welfare Complaints) (2016 audit)

It was recommended that: a) the review of the PTS includes consideration of the grading of complaints b) the implementation of "Shelterbuddy" is included in the review c) the implementation of "Shelterbuddy" is monitored and reviewed.

The "Shelterbuddy" system (electronic animal register and complaint database) has been already adopted and used by 32 of 46 Centres (in comparison with only 5 of 46 centres a year ago). The grading of cases used by the "Shelterbuddy" system is based on the PTS. The National Office developed a Dispatch Shelterbuddy Manual; a guidance document which includes a summary on the types of questions that should be asked in order to obtain the right information for the complaint's risk assessment and grading. The manual was distributed to all Centres that took up the "Shelterbuddy" system. The guidance documents pertaining to the



essential animal welfare complaint questions, as in the manual, has been distributed to all Centres regardless of whether or not they use "Shelterbuddy". In addition, all Centres have been provided with a Dispatch Request form; a two page sheet that summarises and classifies the received calls including grading of cases. The National Office can view most of the Centres' "Shelterbuddy" systems online.

Three of the visited regional Centres have adopted the "Shelterbuddy" system and were familiar with the Dispatch Shelterbuddy Manual. The remaining two Centres use a combination of paper and electronic records and registers (e.g. electronic "AWSOM" system).

In the majority of Centres the grading of animal welfare complaints is done directly by Inspectors or under the supervision and guidance of Inspectors. In some Centres the initial grading is done by receptionists/dispatchers; some being warranted AOs themselves, and reviewed by the Inspectors when they are available. Personal experience is the main determinant by which the grading of complaints is done by the non-warranted administration staff. During interviewing the non-warranted staff they all demonstrated the grading of animal welfare cases follows, to a large extent, that of the PTS.

1.9 Communication Improvements between MPI and SPCA (2016 audit)

It has been recommended that the communication channels for complaints formally transferred to MPI be reviewed and that the requesting SPCA Centre be kept informed of the progress and outcome of cases transferred via National Office.

Since approx. 2012 MPI has not been providing SPCA (National Office or Centres) with information relating to complaints that were transferred to MPI. In earlier discussions MPI has advised the SPCA that it was prepared to share investigation outcomes only (e.g. Closed, Verbal Advice Given, Written Warning issued etc.). For all MPI-SPCA transfers, the SPCA provides MPI a report summary of the full investigation and would appreciate a reciprocal arrangement. According to the SPCA a brief summary or investigation overview on all transfers would benefit individual Inspectors and Centres involved and would assist in managing complainants (e.g. advise them if MPI is still conducting its investigation or if it has been concluded). According to the National Manager, that matter has been discussed with MPI but so far there has been no change in the MPI approach.

During the 2016 SPCA audit SAT made recommendation to the MPI to review its policy and provide the SPCA with information on the progress and outcome of cases handed over.

MPI Issue - 1 - Transfer Policy

According to the MoU, Section 72 MPI, as the agency accepting the transfer of complaints is obliged to provide feedback to the SPCA, the transferring agency, on the progress of the investigation of the complaints. MPI has advised the SPCA that it was prepared to share investigation outcomes only with no further details.

During the 2016 SPCA audit SAT made recommendation to the MPI to review its policy and provide the SPCA with information on the progress and outcome of cases handed over. No information on the progress of transferred cases is provided.

A brief summary or investigation overview on all transfers would fulfil the collaborative partnership agreement between SPCA and MPI and would benefit individual Inspectors and Centres and assist in managing complainants.

2.0 Policies and Procedures

The National Office has standardized a number of policies and procedures that apply to functions carried out by the office as well as regional centres. These include key procedures such as euthanasia and animal welfare investigation but also policies related to: safe system of



work, effective communication, training etc. The resources and templates that National Office developed are available on the SPCA website for the centres to use.

Section 290 of the PTS (Inspectors) and Section 189 of the PTS (Auxiliary Officers) requires all SPCA Centres to have up-to-date Policy and Procedure Manuals kept at the premises and complied with by all staff and volunteers.

The Centres have adopted the SPCA national policies and procedures and adjusted these to local circumstances however, these differ significantly between the Centres. In one Centre the Policy and Procedure Manual was very comprehensive and covered almost every area of the Centre activity and potential risks the Centre may face. In another Centre the policies and procedures were minimal and not providing adequate information. Similarly, in some Centres the policies and procedures were regularly updated, discussed and acknowledged by the staff. In other Centres the procedures were outdated and there was no evidence the staff and volunteers had discussed/acknowledged the changes.

The lack of updated policies and procedures made it difficult to ascertain if correct ones were complied with by all staff including volunteers.

Section 220 of the PTS (Inspectors) requires every SPCA Centre to have its own policy regarding euthanasia that follows the SPCA National Euthanasia Policy. The majority of the sites had documented their own euthanasia policy but in one Centre the policy was a copy and paste of the SPCA national euthanasia policy without specifying the roles or names of the people making euthanasia decisions (euthanasia panel).

The auditor has made a recommendation in the Location Findings to those Centres where policies and procedures were identified as deficient (see Appendixes E and F) but is also making here a similar recommendation to the National Office to ensure the implementation is consistent across the centres.

Recommendation - 5. To National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support – Policy and Procedure Manual

It is recommended to the RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support that the SPCA National Office ensures up-to-date policy and procedure manuals are maintained at each centre. Consideration should be given to a minimum list of policies and procedures that should be kept by each centre.

3.0 Memorandum of Understanding, MoU

The MoU requires the National Chief Inspector to maintain and ensure all Centres, Inspectors and AOs comply with various provisions of the Act, the MoU and PTS. While the SPCA can ensure the majority of these provisions are complied with some policies are out of the SPCA control. The National Office develops policies and procedures but their uptake is up to individual centres (as reported above). More meaningful control over these provisions will be in place once the restructure of the SPCA takes place and the National Office has a line of control over the branches (internal audit).

4.0 Selection, Training and Appointment

One of the Animal Welfare Coordinators (SPCA National Inspectorate) looks after the Centres for training, appointing and warranting Inspectors and AOs. Inspectors must attend mandatory training each year to maintain their warrants.

4.1 Selection

Criteria used by all the Centres when selecting candidates for training as Inspector or AOs generally follow those listed in the PTSS. Some Centres reported they do not have a luxury of



having a group of people interested in applying for the positions and all candidates are carefully considered.

Generally, the candidates are selected from amongst the existing staff that have been known to the Centres and that have been working in the Centres in various capacities for some time. While this is true for most, one Centre employed a person that was not known to the staff prior but spent a month at the Centre during her training before applying for the job as an Inspector.

The criminal history, NZ citizenship and residency status of the candidates are checked by the National Office upon receiving recommendations for training from the regional centres. The National Manager explained his, and delegated person's role, in the interviewing of selected candidates for training.

One of the Centres even organises monthly induction sessions for people interested in volunteering at the Centre.

4.2 Training

Training policies and procedures are established for different types of applicants for inspectors e.g. those that are new to the industry with no qualifications, those that are new to the industry with previous qualifications, those that are returning graduates of Unitec etc. In order to facilitate training and appointment processes the National Office developed extensive check lists, separate for initial training, first appointment and renewal appointment.

All trainee inspectors undergo training that is delivered by UNITEC Auckland. The Centre Inspectors spoken with during the audit were all complimentary about the UNITEC training programme.

As reported under the Follow up to Previous Audits section, the National Office has developed a National Inspector Competency Training Programme for inspectors. The programme has been already trialled at three main Centres (Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch) and is to be implemented in other Centres once the new structure is in place. For other Centres the National Office developed a suite of technical and operational procedures and templates, as guidance. All these documents are available on the RNZSPCA website as part of the Inspectorate web resource.

Some Centres have organised, of their own initiative, other forms of training e.g. Canine Temperament Testing at Hastings and District SPCA.

There is a high level of support for newly appointed Inspectors in larger centres that employ many Inspectors, and in locations where at least one experienced Inspector is available. Inspectors at three Centres confirmed they had received satisfactory support in the first year of the appointment. In one small Centre, an Inspector was placed on the job straight away after completing her training programme with no opportunity to work alongside any experienced Inspector. That Inspector was employed part-time only, one day a week, and that limited her exposure to the Centre's daily activities and handling of animal welfare complaints. Although such a situation arose from the lack of availability of an experienced inspector in the region, in the auditor's opinion the National Office and the Centre should have arranged for practical training with an experienced inspector at a different location.

The training programme for auxiliary officers is based on online modules that have been prepared by the National Office, and which the AO candidates have to complete within a required time. While the Centre AOs assessment of this type of training was positive, two of them commented that feedback from the National Inspectorate on their performance would be appreciated.



Recommendation - 6. To National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support, RNZSPCA – Support for Inspectors during the post-warranting period

It is recommended to the RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support that the National Office and Centres provide the newly appointed inspectors with support and access to an experienced inspector, during the post-warranting period. At present this is not happening at all locations esp. in small centres where the availability of experienced inspectors for training is limited.

4.3 Appointment and Reappointment

The National Office manages the recommendations for appointments and renewal of appointments of inspectors and AOs, as per Sections 22 and 23 of the MoU.

The SPCA Animal Welfare Coordinator maintains a reminder list of expiry dates of appointments for all Inspectors and AOs and sends e-mail notifications, with attached renewal application forms, to Centres 3 months prior to the expiry date. All Centre managers also monitor the due dates for renewal of appointments of their Inspectors and AOs, and in one Centre, Canterbury SPCA, a computer "VAULT" program is used as a tool for identification and notification of incoming renewal of appointments for Inspectors and AOs.

All SPCA inspectors' appointments are valid anywhere within New Zealand' as per PTS Section 124 (3) (b) (ii). When an inspector changes the area of jurisdiction he/she works in, the National Office notifies MPI of the transfer. MPI records and acknowledges such transfers but no longer replaces the existing Instrument of Appointment, as described in MoU, Section 45. Validity of that requirement should be also included in the recommended review of the MoU.

One Inspector, from Whakatane SPCA is also contracted as an Inspector by Kawerau SPCA and at times she operates outside the Whakatane SPCA area of jurisdiction. However, that is done with permission from both Centres.

The National Office is generally successful in retrieving Certificates of Appointment from Inspectors and AOs that cease to work for, volunteer at or otherwise be affiliated in that capacity to the RNZSPCA or their Centres.

During the audit the auditor viewed Instruments of Appointment (IoA) of selected Inspectors and AOs, and all presented IoAs were valid.

The National Office and all Centres demonstrated compliance with appointment and reappointment processes for Inspectors and AOs and the Centres' managers were overall complimentary about the National Office running these processes.

4.4 Ongoing Training

The SPCA National Office organises refresher training workshops for appointed Inspectors. This training focuses on various areas of interest and is run in different locations, sometimes more than once per year to ensure all inspectors attend. There are four training sessions scheduled for the period between June and October 2017.

Last year, the SPCA organised an 'Emerging Leaders' course for selected inspectors at the Edmund Hillary outdoor activity centre at Tongariro. The main purpose of this course was to train future leaders in dealing with large scale crisis situations. The same type of course is scheduled for September this year for current senior inspectors in leadership positions.

The National Office sends reminders to inspectors that didn't attend annual training sessions and places their names on the list for the next year's training. As a rule, the Inspector may skip the attendance at the annual training session, if justified, but repetitive absences may result in the National Office not recommending the Inspector for renewal of appointment.



All Inspectors from the audited Centres are on the list to attend the scheduled refresher training workshops this year. Generally, all Centre managers and all but one Centre committee appeared to be supportive of the ongoing training for inspectors. One Centre manager reported that the Centre committee was dissatisfied with the Inspector's absence during training and additional costs involved.

While the National Office manages the ongoing training for inspectors well the same cannot be said about refresher training for AOs. Four AOs from three Centres advised the auditor they had not attended any refresher training since their appointment, although one of them has been in the role of AO for less than a year. The Canterbury SPCA organises refresher trainings for their AOs as part of ongoing training. The Gisborne SPCA AO attended a Centre Management course run by the National Office which included some specific units for AOs.

Lack of ongoing training for AOs is not in line with PTS for AOs Section 93 that requires AOs to attend training workshops at least once in every 3-year period.

Recommendation - 7. To National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support, RNZSPCA - Ongoing Training for Auxiliary Officers

It is recommended to the RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support that the National Office provides all AOs with the opportunity to attend training workshops as defined in the PTS for Auxiliary Officers. At present AOs from several Centres have not participated in any ongoing training workshops.

4.5 Day-to-day Supervision of Inspectors and Evaluation of Inspectors' Performance

Day-to-day supervision of Inspectors' activities is simple in small Centres where direct contact with the manager is frequent during a day. Communication with the use of mobile phones between Inspectors and Centre managers is common. In the Canterbury SPCA the managers also use the Navman tracking system to monitor the geographical location of the Centre's fleet cars. All their Inspectors have a "Find Me" app in their smart phones that's similar to a panic button, to ensure health and safety for each individual.

Evaluation of inspectors' performance and their ongoing suitability for the role is done differently by the Centres and ranges from informal meetings and discussions with the Centre manager to more structured, regular one-on-one meetings and/or annual performance reviews. The inspectors' evaluation is also done during their attendance at the refresher training sessions.

As reported by all Centres' managers there have been no cases recently where their Inspectors or AOs failed to comply with their Terms of Appointment, PTS, MOU, or cases of a serious misconduct.

5.0 Complaints against Inspectors/Auxiliary Officers

The National Office has recently issued new national procedures for complaints. The new procedures separate complaints against Inspectors and AOs from complaints against SPCA Centres and personnel. A separate part of those procedures is Complaint Management Process, an administrative guidance for the National Office on categorising and maintaining, and managing the complaints database. The majority of complaints against inspectors or AOs are minor in nature and dealt with successfully by regional centres without notifying the National Office. Serious complaints are notified to, and dealt by the National Office with notifications to MPI. There have been no complaints of serious misconduct by inspectors or AOs and only one minor complaint notified to National Office in the last 12 months or so.

All Centres have adopted the SPCA national procedure for dealing with complaints against inspectors and AOs.



Two of the five audited Centres received no formal complaints against their Inspectors or AOs. Remaining three Centres received one complaint each:

- in one Centre a member of the public has made a complaint against the Inspector and that was dealt with by the Centre and SPCA Regional Manager. That complaint was resolved to the satisfaction of the complainant and the Inspector,
- in one Centre a volunteer has made a formal complaint against the Centre AO/ Centre Manager directly to the National Office. Despite the National Office following the newly issued procedure, the Centre Manager felt strongly that the support she had received was inadequate and the final outcome reached by the National Office made her feel victimised.
- in one Centre a complaint has been made against an Inspector of which the National Office was notified. The Inspector assessed the National Office staff's enquiry as inadequate and their conclusion prejudiced.

The auditor has made a recommendation in relation to the complaints process, see Recommendation 4 – Review of the Complaints Process.

6.0 Animal Welfare Complaints

All complaints investigated by the SPCA follow the procedures as outlined in the PTS for Inspectors and AOs. Detailed information on receiving, grading and managing of complaints is provided in the Dispatch Shelterbuddy Manual. A Dispatch Request form summarises and classifies the received calls including grading of cases.

The National Office is currently reviewing the "Shelterbuddy" system training. In order to ensure proper classification of animal welfare complaints and appropriate and timely corrective actions, a guidance document, Cruelty Complaint Dispatch Code - Welfare Issues has been developed and issued to all Centres.

In addition, the National Office developed and issued workflow sheets for assisting Inspectors in their decision making process. These sheets specify legislative powers the Inspectors can use under the Animal Welfare Act 1999 and Search and Surveillance Act 2012.

Centres' policies and procedures that relate to receiving and managing animal welfare complaints are developed to a various degree and range; from comprehensive in some Centres to minimal procedures in other Centres. The auditor has made recommendations in relation to documented policies and procedures in Location Findings for those Centres where deficiencies were identified (see Appendixes E and F).

Three of five visited Centres have adopted the "Shelterbuddy" system and were familiar with the Dispatch Shelterbuddy Manual. The remaining two Centres use a combination of paper and electronic records and registers (e.g. electronic "AWSOM" system). In the majority of Centres the grading of animal welfare complaints is done by Inspectors or under the supervision and guidance of Inspectors. In some Centres the initial grading is done by receptionists/dispatchers, some being warranted AOs themselves, and reviewed by Inspectors when they are available. Personal experience is the main determinant by which the grading of complaints is done by the non-warranted administration staff. During interviewing the non-warranted staff demonstrated their familiarity with receiving complaints procedures and their grading of animal welfare complaints was in line with the PTS.

Animal welfare complaints that relate to animals being exported, animals in zoos and animals used in research, testing or teaching would be referred to the National Office and then further, on to MPI. However, none of the audited Centres have received these.

For complaints where the Inspectors know or believe the case is being investigated by MPI the Inspectors follow the Centre transfer policy (transfer forms completed and sent to the National Office).



All interviewed Inspectors demonstrated satisfactory knowledge of welfare priorities as specified in PTS for Inspectors, Sections 203-212 and relevant requirements of the AWA. Similarly, all interviewed AOs were conversant with their statutory powers as AOs and actions in regards to dealing with animal welfare complaints.

In all Centres the inspectors and managers reported that they had access to equipment necessary to do the day-to-day work, but one Centre was seeking to obtain the Global Positioning System as they serve remote locations. The recent Edgcombe flood revealed deficiencies in protective clothing (safety and weather proof gear) in Whakatane SPCA and they are in the process of replenishing the used equipment. SPCA Regional Manager and observer of this audit, § 9(2)(a) informed the auditors the National Office has been surveying the regional centres on their provision of basic equipment for handling animal welfare complaints.

6.1 Euthanasia

All but one Centre have the documented euthanasia policy that include names or roles of persons that are on the euthanasia panel. One Centre has a copy of the SPCA national euthanasia policy but does not have a local policy nor description of who is on the euthanasia panel.

The auditor has made a relevant recommendation in one Location Finding (see Appendix F).

One Centre reported that the number of animals that were put down by the Inspector outside the shelter e.g. on the owner's property, or where the Inspector instructed the owner to put down the animal on his/her property are not included in the statistics. Although Section 142 of AWA1999 requires that records of animals destroyed must be kept, it applies to situation where the SPCA obtains the custody of an animal, as per Section 141 of the AWA. During further discussion with the SPCA Regional Manager (observer) he explained that all euthanized animals should be recorded and reported to the National Office and that had to be reiterated to all Centres.

6.2 Search Warrants

All visited Centres confirmed they routinely contact or would contact the National Office before applying for and executing a search warrant, to enable the office to check in the search warrant database for any previous search warrant applications at that property. The National Office also checks with MPI if the property to be searched has livestock and if there has been any search warrant already executed on that property by MPI.

Only one of the Centres audited has executed several search warrants in recent years.

6.3 On Farm Inspections

The SPCA may request assistance from MPI Compliance Animal Welfare investigators at two levels, one – for transfer of animal welfare investigations from SPCA to MPI (commercial livestock properties, large scale investigation), and two – for direct support of SPCA personnel by MPI investigators. The National Office developed a procedure, Complaint Transfer Process and corresponding flowchart for managing cases transferred from SPCA to MPI. The office staff also developed a template transfer form for all Centres to use.

Only a couple of Centres deal routinely with complaints that relate to farm animals while the remaining three Centres do not see such complaints frequently. All Centres were familiar with the SPCA national transfer procedure and some have used the transfer form template. Transfer of complaints is also recorded in "Shelterbuddy" at Centres that use it.

The recent Edgcombe flood that killed and threatened lives of hundreds of domestic and farm animals was an example of a situation that could not be handled by the Whakatane Centre itself and where assistance from other agencies, including MPI was requested.



There have been occasions where MPI requested help from the Centres and these usually were related to single production animals (cattle, goat).

6.4 Prosecution

The RNZSPCA and Ben Vanderkolk and Associates signed a MoU in 2013 to provide legal representation for SPCAs throughout New Zealand. Currently 29 out of 46 SPCAs have signed up to the scheme. The remaining 17 SPCAs are responsible for their own prosecution cases but they must provide a prosecution detail report to national office at the completion of sentencing.

Four of the Centres audited have adopted the national SPCA prosecution scheme and would liaise with the National Inspectorate or Regional Manager for assistance before any case is recommended for prosecution. One Centre uses their own Crown prosecutor and is responsible for managing their own prosecution cases. That Centre provides the prosecution details to the National Office at the completion of the prosecution.

The National Office keeps a register of all SPCA prosecution cases. There are approx. 30-60 prosecutions per year. If a file fails to meet the prosecution threshold a formal warning letter may be issued to resolve investigation.

Three of the Centres reported no cases were referred for prosecution in recent years. In one Centre the staff commented that there could have been cases referred for prosecution however due to limited time and resources available for processing of each case other solutions such as issuing a notice of direction under the Section 130 of the AWA, were used. That Centre was hoping that the planned restructure of SPCA would result in the head office directing more funds and human resources (trained Inspectors) to the Centre.

6.5 Records and Reporting

As per Section 142 of the AWA all Centres keep records of all animals handled. Some Centres use the new electronic register, "Shelterbuddy", some others use its predecessor "AWSOM", and some keep paper registers.

These registers are kept for various lengths of time by different Centres, from 2 years to 7 years. Nevertheless, they all keep it for longer than the minimum required time of 1 year. Each Centre provides the National Office with annual statistics on the number of complaints received, number of cases investigated and referred to another agency, number of prosecutions and number of person charged with or proceeded against. The SPCA National Office collates each Centre's annual statistics report and provides MPI with national statistics, as per Section 89 of the MoU and Section 268 of PTS.

There were 14,809 animal welfare complaints made to SPCA in 2016.

SPCA New Zealand receives funding from MPI to assist with costs incurred by SPCA centres and inspectors while attending rural animal welfare complaints. As part of the SPCA's funding agreement with MPI, the SPCA is obligated to provide detailed quarterly reports. Examples of the reports have been demonstrated to the auditors. The reports showed a breakdown of the complaints into regions, type of problems, commercial vs. non-commercial premises, outcomes of complaints, types (class) of animals involved.

One Centre kept hard copies of records related to animal welfare complaints unsecured. That creates a potential risk that other staff may access confidential information stored there. The auditor has made a recommendation to eliminate that risk in the Location Findings for that Centre (see Appendix E).



7.0 Premises, equipment, services

Overall, shelter facilities at all visited Centres were presented fit for purpose and in an acceptable state of repair and maintenance, and cleanliness. There were different type of facilities present at the visited Centres and these included: reception, hospital, adoption, quarantine/recovery, isolation, exercise etc.

There was adequate separation between facilities of different disease status and adequate prevention of disease spread. In some Centres there was a strict separation between personnel working with healthy and diseased animals.

There was a different type and level of enrichment in cages for dogs and cats and overall the standard of facilities and cages ranged from acceptable to good. However, in one Centre the cat adoption facility was not adequately protected from cold temperatures and there was no proper dog isolation area. In another Centre, the dog adoption facilities were not adequately protected from wind. The auditor has made relevant comments in Location Findings for those two Centres.

One Centre had so called amnesty facilities for dogs and cats. These are an outdoor kennel for dogs and a box for cats where people can place unwanted, abandoned or stray dogs and cats without being asked questions. These facilities seem to provide a convenient option for persons that do not want or cannot care for their animals but also for the community to look after animals that are abandoned. In addition, the Centre provide a de-sexing voucher for the people that drop the animals in to use the free option of de-sexing their other animal(s) rather than continuing breeding their pets and adding unwanted offspring.

Three of the visited Centres have plans for improvements of their shelters and these range from modifications and additions in two Centres to building an entire new Centre, in the third.

It is worth mentioning here a successful initiative by Whakatane SPCA whose staff brought together local communities from local low socio-economic areas in order to help them understand and deal with issues related to animal husbandry and welfare. The Centre has organised an event, called a "Big Day Out" in which they involved SPCA staff and various animal health professionals such as veterinarians, horse dentists and farriers. They all gathered in one place in Ruatoki and provided the community with a range of professional advice, demonstrated and conducted minor veterinary procedures and offered free animal feed and other items. After the event the Centre received a positive feedback that the initiative had been very well received and valued by the community, especially as the attendees were provided with help and advice without being judged or asked questions. Following the event, the number of animal welfare complaints from those traditionally problem areas dropped but the number of enquiries about animals' needs and future initiatives increased.

8.0 MPI/ SPCA Liaison

Most of the Centres maintain close relationships with local MPI Animal Welfare Compliance Investigators and they contact MPI when required. There is no MPI Animal Welfare Compliance person available in Whakatane.

Section 85 of the MoU refers to minimum two formal discussions a year between RNZSPCA National Executive and MPI. According to the SPCA National Manager there is one, at best, meeting per year. SPCA values those meetings especially the operational aspects and would welcome more meetings per year.

According to Section 86 of MoU, each organisation should invite and attend the other organisation's conferences and training workshops. On the local level the SPCA invites representatives from MPI Animal Welfare team to attend their annual conference (AGM) and the MPI representative usually attends. Six SPCA inspectors have attended 2 combined trainings in



recent years at Burnham and at Taratahi, and the SPCA National Manager also presented at an MPI AWI course in Napier a couple of years ago. There have been no reciprocal invitations to SPCA to attend MPI conferences or training workshops recently. This may be because the MPI Animal Welfare team has not held any conferences or workshops.

Recommendation - 8. To Manager Animal Welfare, MPI - MPI/ SPCA Liaison

It is recommended to the Manager Animal Welfare, MPI that a meaningful liaison between MPI Animal Welfare and SPCA Inspectorate is reinstated.

Section 85 of MoU refers to minimum two formal discussions a year between RNZSPCA National Executive and MPI. According to the SPCA National Manager there is one, at best, meeting per year.

Section 86 of MoU, each organisation should invite and attend the other organisation's conferences and training workshops. While the SPCA invites representatives from MPI's Animal Welfare team to attend its annual conference there have been limited reciprocal invitations to the SPCA to attend MPI conferences or workshops.

Effective liaison and appropriate feedback will assist with maintaining a close relationship between MPI and the SPCA. This liaison should include Representatives from both MPI's Animal Welfare Team and Compliance Directorate.

9.0 Annual auditing of RNZSPCA activities

In 2015 the SPCA developed and published an SPCA MPI Audits procedure/form that facilitates resolving any non-compliances that are identified in the annual SAT audit reports. In addition to the non-compliances, the procedure also includes MPI recommendations that are made to the SPCA in the final report. The progress of the proposed resolution for each finding is being rated on a quarterly basis.

10.0 Conclusions

Findings from the audit sample (selected sites) can be considered as generally representative of all SPCA centres nationally.

Addressing the Terms of Reference:

Goal 1- To assess the effectiveness of RNZSPCA national procedures to ensure that obligations and requirements of the AWA are being met by RNZSPCA/SPCA branches and member societies (centres).

Since the last audit there has been a significant improvement in the SPCA National Office standardizing its policies and procedures and enabling centres with access to these and various other resources. The communication between the National Office and Regional Manager, and the Centres has been improving. The National Office, via its Regional Managers, aims to have contact with each Centre at least three times a year. The National Office publishes and distributes to all Centres a bi-monthly newsletter that includes a variety of information from general news to information relevant to inspectors and auxiliary officers.

The Centres' staff acknowledge the positive changes and stressed that National Inspectorate staff and Regional Managers are always available for assistance.

The requirements of the AWA are being substantially met. There was no evidence to suggest that animal welfare is being compromised. That goal would not have been achieved without the Centres' staff engagement and dedication. That equally applies to volunteers who, although not being the scope of this audit, appear to be an essential workforce at the Centres.



The auditor has made a recommendation to the SPCA in regards to internal audits and to MPI in regards to assistance in training SPCA internal auditors.

Goal 2 - To evaluate how the systems and procedures implemented by the RNZSPCA are meeting the requirements outlined in the MOU between the RNZSPCA and MPI.

The requirements of the MOU are being substantially met but there are some deficiencies and inconsistencies in administering these policies and procedures between Centres. The majority of visited Centres developed and effectively implemented policies and procedures. In one Centre the policies and procedures were outdated and some procedures were lacking. One Centre had no evidence the updated policies and procedures were discussed and acknowledged by the staff.

The auditor has made recommendations to those Centres where deficiencies were identified but has also made a similar recommendation to the National Office to ensure the up-to-date Policy and Procedure Manual is maintained at each centre with consideration to be given to a minimum list of policies and procedures required.

Goal 3 - To assess the effectiveness of the RNZSPCA/SPCA branches in managing the requirements of the AWA and MOU for appointments, training and monitoring of Inspectors and AOs.

The findings of this audit indicate the processes of selection, training, appointment and monitoring generally meet the requirements of the AWA and MOU however the auditor identified areas for improvement. In one Centre, the newly appointed Inspector was placed on the job straight away after completing her training with no opportunity to work alongside any experienced Inspector. The auditor is making a recommendation to the National Office and the Centres to ensure the appropriate level of support from an experienced Inspector is available during the post-warranting period. Several Auxiliary Officers have not attended any refresher training since their appointment more than 3 years ago. Although details of ongoing training for AOs do not constitute part of AWA or MoU these requirements are documented in PTS for AOs Section 93, which requires AOs to attend training workshops at least once in every 3-year period. The auditor is making a recommendation to the SPCA to that effect.

Goal 4 - To assess corrective actions undertaken by the RNZSPCA national body and/or RNZSPCA centres in response to the previous MPI systems audit findings, and if appropriate to recommend further improvements to ensure requirements of the AWA are met.

The majority of recommendations that SAT has made during the last two audits were addressed by SPCA. Great progress has been made in the process of training and mentoring new Inspectors and securing the number of applicants for AOs positions. Similarly, the uptake of the administration tool, "Shelterbuddy" by the Centres has increased six fold. Due to the lengthy debate on the restructure of the SPCA the reviews of the MoU and PTS have been postponed and the auditor renewed those recommendations. The internal audit programme has not been implemented yet but some internal audit processes were put in place. The SPCA has a strategy to implement the internal audit programme once the new structure is in place. The auditor is making a recommendation that the SPCA is more considerate when handling complaints against inspectors and AOs to avoid alienating its own staff.

Goal 5 - To make recommendations to MPI for improvements to the MOU, and AWA ancillary notices and specifications and guidance as required.

Due to the planned SPCA restructure MPI has not reviewed the MoU and PTSs as recommended the previous year, and these recommendations are carried over.

One recommendation is made to MPI to reinstate a meaningful liaison between MPI Animal Welfare and SPCA Inspectorate. I suggest that the inspectors should be meeting with MPI



Compliance while the National Office deals with MPI AW team.

The auditor raised one MPI issue due to a lack of an adequate feedback to the SPCA on the progress of the investigation of the complaints.

In order to facilitate the SPCA implementing its own internal audit programme MPI should consider providing SPCA with assistance in training internal auditors.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Recommendations

Recommendation - 1. To Manager, Animal Welfare Team – Assistance in training of SPCA auditors

It is recommended to the Manager, Animal Welfare Team that MPI considers providing assistance to SPCA with training of the internal auditors.

Training of internal auditors has been identified by SPCA as one of the main limitations in implementing their internal audit programme. The National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support has indicated that SPCA does not have sufficient experience in internal auditing and that MPI assistance with training of SPCA internal auditors would be very valuable.

MPI has a great deal of expertise in auditing animal welfare related fields and in the auditor's opinion these could be utilised in assisting SPCA in training their own resources. Having an effective internal audit programme would facilitate SPCA in effective delivery of their national programme and provide MPI with confidence the SPCA as an approved organisation meets their duties and obligations in relation to the Act.

Recommendation - 2. To National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support, RNZSPCA and Manager Animal Welfare, MPI - Review of the MoU

This recommendation is carried over from the previous 2016 audit.

It is recommended to the RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support and the Initiator, the Manager Animal Welfare, MPI that review of the MoU is carried out to ensure the proposed changes of SPCA structure are incorporated into that agreement. As previously recommended, that review should be done within one year of the restructure. Depending on the outcome, the ongoing review period could be extended to a period determined at MPI discretion.

Recommendation - 3. To National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support, RNZSPCA and Manager Animal Welfare, MPI - Review of the PTS

This recommendation is carried over from the previous audit.

It is recommended to the RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support and the Initiator, the Manager Animal Welfare, MPI that review of PTS documents is carried out.

Part A: It is recommended that the SPCA reviews the PTS documents, to ensure they accurately describe how the Centres, Inspectors, AOs, and the National Office interact to meet the MoU and AWA. A review of the reporting to and communication with MPI should be included.

Part B: It is recommended that MPI reviews the proposed changes and determine if they are appropriate and manageable prior to the documents being finalised. Further changes and communications may be required before the documents can be signed e.g. differences between the Complaints Bylaw and the PTSs for managing complaints against Inspectors and AOs should be aligned.

Recommendation - 4. To National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support, RNZSPCA – Review of the Complaints Process

This is an extension of the recommendation made in the previous audit.

It is recommended to the RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support that SPCA revisits their complaints process to ensure the enquiries are full, and objective and their own staff is treated fairly and supported throughout the process.

Due to comments made by the key personnel at two Centres the auditor is in the opinion that SPCA should be more considerate when handling complaints against inspectors and AOs in



Recommendations

order to avoid alienating their own staff.

Recommendation - 5. To National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support – Policy and Procedure Manual

It is recommended to the RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support that the SPCA National Office ensures up-to-date policy and procedure manuals are maintained at each centre. Consideration should be given to a minimum list of policies and procedures that should be kept by each centre.

Recommendation - 6. To National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support, RNZSPCA – Support for Inspectors during the post-warranting period

It is recommended to the RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support that the National Office and Centres provide the newly appointed inspectors with support and access to an experienced inspector, during the post-warranting period. At present this is not happening at all locations esp. in small centres where the availability of experienced inspectors for training is limited.

Recommendation - 7. To National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support, RNZSPCA - Ongoing Training for Auxiliary Officers

It is recommended to the RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support that the National Office provides all AOs with the opportunity to attend training workshops as defined in the PTS for Auxiliary Officers. At present AOs from several Centres have not participated in any ongoing training workshops.

Recommendation - 8. To Manager Animal Welfare, MPI - MPI/ SPCA Liaison

It is recommended to the Manager Animal Welfare, MPI that a meaningful liaison between MPI Animal Welfare and SPCA Inspectorate is reinstated.

Section 85 of MoU refers to minimum two formal discussions a year between RNZSPCA National Executive and MPI. According to the SPCA National Manager there is one, at best, meeting per year.

Section 86 of MoU, each organisation should invite and attend the other organisation's conferences and training workshops. While the SPCA invites representatives from MPI's Animal Welfare team to attend its annual conference there have been limited reciprocal invitations to the SPCA to attend MPI conferences or workshops.

Effective liaison and appropriate feedback will assist with maintaining a close relationship between MPI and the SPCA. This liaison should include Representatives from both MPI's Animal Welfare Team and Compliance Directorate.

MPI Issues

MPI Issue - 1 - Transfer Policy

According to the MoU, Section 72 MPI, as the agency accepting the transfer of complaints is obliged to provide feedback to the SPCA, the transferring agency, on the progress of the investigation of the complaints. MPI has advised the SPCA that it was prepared to share investigation outcomes only with no further details.

During the 2016 SPCA audit SAT made recommendation to the MPI to review its policy and provide the SPCA with information on the progress and outcome of cases handed over. No information on the progress of transferred cases is provided.

A brief summary or investigation overview on all transfers would fulfil the collaborative partnership agreement between SPCA and MPI and would benefit individual Inspectors and Centres and assist in managing complainants.



Appendices

Appendix A - Location Findings for RNZSPCA National Office, Auckland - for MPI use only

Appendix B - Location Findings for SPCA Canterbury - for MPI use only

Appendix C - Location Findings for SPCA North Taranaki - for MPI use only

Appendix D - Location Findings for Whakatane SPCA - for MPI use only

Appendix E - Location Findings for Hastings and District SPCA - for MPI use only

Appendix F - Location Findings for SPCA Gisborne - for MPI use only

Appendix G - Final Report - draft - feedback from the Initiator - for MPI use only

Distribution

s 9(2)(a), Manager Animal Welfare, MPI Regulation and Assurance

s 9(2)(a), Manager Systems Audit, MPI Regulation and Assurance

Allan Kinsella, Director Systems Audit, Assurance and Monitoring, MPI Regulation and Assurance

s 9(2)(a), Manager Animal Welfare Compliance, MPI Operations

s 9(2)(a)
Systems Auditor

MPI Systems Audit Team

s 9(2)(a)
Systems Auditor

MPI Systems Audit Team

Electronically Signed by s 9(2)(a) *Auditor on the 20 Oct 2017 9:57 am*



Systems Audit Team

FINAL REPORT

Location Findings

RNZSPCA National Office

Annual audit of RNZSPCA

National Office and Selected Regional Centres

April - May 2017

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Audit Date (Last Day)

26 April 2017

Audit Number

4557

Location(s)

Royal New Zealand Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals t/a: RNZSPCA, 3047 Great North Road, PO Box 15349, Auckland

Lead Auditor

s 9(2)(a), MPI Systems Audit Team (SAT), Systems Auditor

Auditor(s)

s 9(2)(a), MPI Systems Audit Team (SAT), Systems Auditor

Auditee(s)

s 9(2)(a), RNZSPCA, National Manager Inspectorate and Centre Support

s 9(2)(a), RNZSPCA, Animal Welfare Coordinator

s 9(2)(a), RNZSPCA, Regional Manager

Audit Type

Location Findings

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Topics

Follow up from previous audits:

There were seven recommendations made to RNZSPCA (referred to as SPCA) and MPI during the previous SPCA audit in 2016. The auditors also looked at two recommendations made by the SAT auditor in 2015.

Rec 1 (2015 audit) – Scope of the Audit– as recommended the scope of the annual audit had been expanded and there were five SPCA Branches and Member Societies (referred to as Centres) audited in 2016 and there are also six centres (incl. the SPCA National Office) designated for the 2017 round of audits. The day-to-day supervision of Inspectors, and working relationship between the Centres and the National Office, although not specifically mentioned in Terms of Reference, have been included in the scope of the audits since.

Rec 2 (2015 audit) - Internal Audit– a specific internal audit programme has not yet been established. While the auditees agree overall with that recommendation and see the internal audit as a valuable tool in improving the performance of, and calibration between Centres, the implementation of such a programme in the current environment is limited by various factors. Additional funds and training of SPCA auditors are the main limitations. The National Manager-Inspectorate and Centre Support (referred to as National Manager) has indicated that MPI assistance for training of internal auditors would be very valuable.

It is noted that this is a recommendation only, and is not part of the MoU or the PTS.

The current structure is that the SPCA Centres are independent charities and most of them run their own operating model and imposing an internal audit process was difficult under those circumstances. In June 2017 the SPCA will hold an AGM meeting during which the vote on the proposed new structure of the SPCA will occur. If passed, this would consolidate all independent centres under one umbrella of the RNZSPCA (see more details the General section). The National Office has a strategy to build internal audit under the new structure. The proposed structure would substantially change the ownership and relations between the National Office and Centres and the internal audit is likely to be an important tool for measuring the performance and calibrating the Centres operations.

However, since the 2016 audit, SPCA National Office has launched a number of initiatives aimed at developing resources to assist Centres in a number of areas. One of them is a Centre Checklist, a useful support tool which can assist Centres in measuring their performance against wide set of animal welfare parameters, identifying areas of success and areas for development. This checklist is aligned with the MoU and in general, with Terms of Reference of MPI annual audits. It has also been used to follow up on issues identified at Centres (troubleshooting). All Centres have a copy of that checklist. In addition, each year the National Manager - Inspectorate and Centre Support sends all Centres the summary of findings and recommendations from the MPI annual audit. This can then be used as a measure of the operations for all Centres.

The auditors will raise the issue of assisting with training for internal auditors in the final report for MPI consideration.

Rec 1 (2016 audit) – Review of the MoU - this recommendation is to the Initiator (MPI) and SPCA. In response, the Initiator of the SPCA audit 2016, s 9(2)(a) advised the SAT Auditor, s 9(2)(a) that MPI decided to wait for the AWA changes (AWA Amendment 2015) to settle down and SPCA to have more clarity in regards to their proposed national structure. During a recent meeting with the Initiator of the SPCA audit 2017, s 9(2)(a), s 9(2)(a) advised the SAT auditor, s 9(2)(a) that the review of the MoU is to be further delayed until SPCA decides on the new structure.



Rec 2 (2016) – Review of the PTS– this recommendation is linked to the review of MoU and similarly, it is also further delayed until the proposed SPCA restructure is voted on and implemented.

Both above recommendations should be reviewed in the 2018 SPCA annual audit.

Rec 3 (2016) – Training and Mentoring of New Inspectors– the National Office has reviewed the training programme of Inspectors and the overall SPCA Inspectorate framework. As a result, a National Inspector Competency Training Programme that maps the existing framework, and the plans for the future to give a career path options for inspectors has been developed. A new Competency Standard checklist is a part of that programme. The objectives of the new programme are to sign off new Inspectors on theoretical parts of all competencies within 12 months and on practical parts within 24 months of the appointment. That programme is a part of the new Inspectorate strategy that will be presented to the SPCA Executive Board for approval in May 2017. Under the new structure the Inspectorate managers will be instructed to use this document, whereas now they can only be asked / have it suggested. The programme has been already trialled at three main centres, Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch with the Competency Standard checklist being adjusted accordingly. Currently, in Auckland Centre new graduate Inspectors have assigned a mentor and a senior Inspector to look after them.

Due to small numbers of staff at many remote locations, the problem of monitoring and training of new Inspectors in small centres is ongoing. However, to improve the support for Inspectors the National Office developed and provided all Centres with a suite of technical and operational procedures and templates, as guidance. Another guidance document, a Compliance Manual is ready for publishing for all Centres to use. All these documents are available on the RNZSPCA website as part of the inspectorate web resource as all Centres including small ones have access to internet. The auditee and auditor who had made the recommendation concluded the reference to 20 hrs of mandatory practical training was in fact related to the training programme as delivered by Unitec, prior to the appointment of a trainee as an Inspector and not training that was done with an experienced SPCA Inspector /designated person.

Rec 4 (2016) – Auxiliary Officer Approval- it was recommended that MPI and RNZSPCA review the frequency of AO training in order to increase the number of AOs. The National Office advised that SPCA Centre managers and committees recommend the prospective AOs for training. The National Office runs two intakes of trainee AOs per year and training is carried out in May and October. If the trainees fail the first online assessment they have one further opportunity to re-sit the assessment. In total there are 4 assessments for AOs per year – 2 regular assessments and 2 repeat assessments if required. Taking into consideration the amount of work and time that is needed for carrying out police checks, filling out the SPCA and MPI application forms and sending them to MPI it is logistically difficult to organise more training sessions for AOs. The number of AO trainees has increased from approximately 20 in 2016 to 30 in 2017. Currently, there are 81 AOs and 14 trainees for the next course. The number of AOs has doubled from 40 trained AOs in 2015.

Rec 5 (2016) – Review of the Complaints Process (Complaints against Inspectors and AOs)– it was recommended that the review of the MoU and PTS documents include the procedures for managing complaints against Inspectors and Auxiliary Officers in a timely and appropriate manner, taking into consideration any potential employment issues.

There are variations in the way complaints against Inspectors and AOs are or would be handled. When the MoU and PTS are reviewed then these should be aligned.

There was one complaint the last year that took a long time to notify the Inspector. As explained by the National Manger, there are differences between the Complaints Bylaw and the PTS for managing complaints. The SPCA has now drafted a new procedure that blends those two



documents and it is followed up consistently. There are two types of procedures – one for dealing with complaints against Inspectors and AOs and one for dealing with complaints against the Centres. Sec.6 g) of the SPCA Complaints against Inspectors and Auxiliary Officers procedure states: Notify the Inspector/Auxiliary Officer and the SPCA Centre of its findings/decision, within 5 working days of its report being finalised. Sec. 8, Process Overview, of the same procedure states: Notify Inspector/AO and SPCA Centre within 5 working days of finalised report – include information regarding the right of review. An example of a current, closed complaint against the Inspector was sighted. The complaint was closed and notified (feedback provided) to the Inspector against whom the complaint has been made, on the same day.

Rec 6 (2016) – Review of PTS (Animal Welfare Complaints)– it was recommended that a) The review of the PTS includes consideration of the grading of complaints , b) The implementation of Shelterbuddy is included in the review, c) the implementation of the Shelterbuddy is monitored and reviewed.

The Shelterbuddy system (electronic animal register and complaint database) has been already adopted and used by 32 of 46 Centres (in comparison with only 5 of 46 centres a year ago). Auckland SPCA is now acting as a call centre for some of the other Centres. They enter the complaints into Shelterbuddy on behalf of the other Centres, even though they are yet to use this platform for recording complaints their inspectors investigate. The grading of cases used by the Shelterbuddy system follows that of the PTS. The National Office developed a Dispatch Shelterbuddy Manual, a guidance document which includes a summary on the types of questions that should be asked in order to obtain the right information for the complaint's risk assessment and grading. The manual was distributed to all Centres that took up the Shelterbuddy system. The guidance documents pertaining to the essential animal welfare complaint questions, as in the manual, has been distributed to all Centres regardless of whether or not they use Shelterbuddy. In addition, all Centres have been also provided with a Dispatch Request form, a two page sheet that summarises and classifies the received calls including grading of cases. The National Office can view online most of the Centres' Shelterbuddy systems.

Rec 7 (2016) – Communication Improvements between MPI and SPCA– it has been recommended that the communication channels for complaints formally transferred to MPI be reviewed and that the requesting SPCA Centre be kept informed of the progress and outcome of cases transferred via National Office. For some time (since approx. 2012) MPI have not been providing SPCA (National Office or Centres) with information relating to cases that were transferred to MPI. In earlier discussions with MPI they advised MPI is prepared to share with SPCA the investigation outcome only e.g. Closed, Verbal Advice given, Written Warning issued etc. For all MPI-SPCA transfers, the SPCA provides MPI a report summary of the full investigation and would appreciate a reciprocal arrangement. Although, Par.72 of the MoU states: 'The agency accepting the transfer of a complaint shall provide written feedback, on request, to the transferring agency, on the outcome and/or progress of the investigation of the complaint', providing a brief summary or investigation overview on all transfers would benefit individual Inspectors and Centres involved and would assist in managing complainants (e.g. advise them if MPI is still conducting their investigation or if it has been concluded). According to the National Manger, that matter has been discussed with MPI but so far there has been no change in the MPI approach. There were 116 cases transferred from SPCA to MPI in 2016 and 17 cases to date, in 2017. There were 81 cases transferred from MPI to SPCA in 2016 and 13 cases to date, in 2017.



1. General

The SPCA Animal Welfare Coordinator demonstrated and explained to the auditors the RNZSPCA National Office structure and terminologies. The official RNZSPCA is externally known as SPCA NZ. The SPCA National Executive Committee (4 persons plus the CEO) is a part of the National Board that consist of 9 people including CEO. Currently the National Executive is somewhat obsolete as they delegated responsibilities to National Manager – Inspectorate & Centre Support. The National Manager works closely with a Chief Scientific Officer (CSO) that has approx. 10 staff. The CSO sets animal welfare policies and manages the integration with MPI. There are two Animal Welfare Coordinators based in the head office who liaise with the Centres and provide them with technical and operational support. There are four Regional Managers that are responsible for supporting Inspectors and Centres in all areas and functions. The National Office employs two RNZSPCA Inspectors that are based in Te Kuiti and Taupo Centres, currently under administration (the National Board took over the administration of the Centres after the resignation of their Committees). SPCA Branches operate under SPCA constitution and funding, and Members of Societies have their own constitution and independent funding. These two entities are collectively called Centres. There are 40 Branches and 6 Member Societies (MS) operating in New Zealand. They employ 79 Inspectors plus 5 trainee Inspectors, and 81 Auxiliary Officers plus 14 trainee Auxiliary Officers. Three of the Inspectors are volunteers and approximately 20% of AOs are volunteers. According to the annual report 2016, there are 480 paid SPCA employees, 4500 SPCA volunteers and over 5000 SPCA members, nationwide. A large number of volunteers work as animal attendants and fundraisers.

The Branches and MSs (Centres) cover all geographical areas of NZ and currently there are no gaps between them. If a centre does not have an Inspector then there is an agreement with another Centre to provide the coverage.

The National Office and Regional Managers communicate with the Centres regularly. The aim is to contact each Centre at least 3 times a year (a spreadsheet of all visits is maintained). The contacts can have various forms, from visits to the Centres, to phone calls and e-mails. A bi-monthly newsletter is published by the Marketing and Fundraising team that is distributed to all Centres and includes a variety of information from general news to events and national updates including information relevant to Inspectors and Auxiliary Officers. The Animal Welfare Coordinator (Inspectorate) looks after the Centres for training, appointing and warranting Inspectors and AOs. Inspectors must attend mandatory training each year to maintain their warrants.

Selection of the Centres for the annual MPI audit is done by the National Manager who recommends to MPI the Centres. The National Manager presented the auditor with the spreadsheet of all Centres with dates of last audits on it. This is used for selecting Centres for audits.

Considerations when selecting sites for MPI audits include the length of time since the last audit and a selection of large, medium and smaller sized centres.

2. Proposed SPCA restructure

The SPCA restructure has been on the agenda for at least a couple of years with a number of workshops and consultation meetings being held by the National Office and Centres. During the AGM in May 2016 the SPCA received a formal mandate to proceed but delegates requested additional information and more time for the decision. This year AGM meeting is set for 17th June 2017 during which delegates from all Centres will vote on the proposed new constitution and new rules governing SPCA. If the resolution is passed with minimum $\frac{2}{3}$ of votes the “new” SPCA is to commence its operation from 1st Nov 2017.

Under new rules all Centres will cease to exist as independent entities and a new organisation,



RNZSPCA (or similar name) with its new Centres will be created. The country will be divided into 3 regions, and 11 areas within the regions. There will be one CEO, 3 regional general managers (suggested the current CEO and current managers of Auckland, Christchurch and Wellington Centres) and 11 area managers. The Centre managers should be the current managers of existing Centres.

The technical support for the Inspectors would mirror the administrative changes (managers) but in the interim the Centres would need to rely on selected, experienced Inspectors as experts for other Inspectors in the area.

There may be some Centres that will choose not to join, and those areas will lose the legal SPCA status and will become separate entities with names other than SPCA. The warrants of the Inspectors and Auxiliary officers in those Centres will be revoked. The National Office developed a procedure for revoking of appointments for Inspectors no longer working for the approved organisation (post 1st Nov 2017). Any areas not covered by existing Centres will be picked up by other Centres so the country will be fully covered. SPCA staff will be guaranteed the same employment conditions. The biggest change for the Inspectorate will be the one employer for all Inspectors (rather than the Inspectors being employed by each separate Centre).

3. Policies and Procedures

One of the SPCA KPIs is to develop QA systems. The National Office has documented a number of policies and procedures that apply to functions carried out by the office as well as regional Centres. Many of these procedures are supported by flow charts and diagrams that facilitate the understanding of the “whole picture” and details of the more complex procedures. There is a check list of all Inspectorate standards that are divided in four categories: General, Training, Uniform & PPE Clothing and Vehicles & PPE Equipment. The resources and templates that National Office developed are placed on the SPCA website (password protected) for the Centres to use. These include important procedures on euthanasia and animal welfare investigation flow chart for Inspectors. The auditors also viewed new documented policies on Safe System of Work and Effective Communication, Minimising Risk to Inspectorate Lone Workers, Vehicle Maintenance, and Training.

4. Memorandum of Understanding, MoU

The MoU, Sec.9 requires the National Chief Inspector, to maintain and ensure all Centres, Inspectors and AOs comply with various provisions of the Animal Welfare Act, the MoU and PTS. While the SPCA can ensure the majority of these provisions are complied with some e.g. policies are out of the SPCA control. The National Office develops policies and procedures but their uptake is up to individual centres. More meaningful control over these provisions will be in place once the restructure of the SPCA takes place and the National Office has a line of control over the branches.

MPI will develop the first draft of the new MoU once the restructure has occurred.

5. Staff, Induction and Training

Training policies and procedures are established for different types of applicants (Inspectors and AOs) e.g. those that are new to the industry with no qualifications, those that are new to the industry with previous qualifications, those that are returning graduates of Unitec etc. All trainee Inspectors undergo the training programme that is delivered by UNITEC Auckland. That programme is approved by the DG. Evidence of the training programme being completed to an acceptable standard is provided to MPI prior to the appointment. Upon request, warranted inspectors can also sit in on the training course at UNITEC, to refresh their legislation knowledge in the Block 1 training course.

In order to facilitate training and appointment processes the National Office developed extensive



check lists, separate for initial training, first appointment and renewal appointment, with tick boxes for all steps of the processes and documents needed.

Recently, the National Office has reviewed the training programme and developed a map of the existing training framework with plans for the future. One of the goals is to expand on the current mandatory training for Inspectors, which their warrants depend on. The law and attending the 'initial warranted officer' and 'safety and tactical communications' courses are the baseline competencies required by a new inspector. The SPCA discovered that the long term staff were intuitive tactical communicators so this has now been also incorporated into training for Inspectors. An important, new element of this programme is a career path and career options for Inspectors. A non-mandatory training process framework has been also established for personal growth and development of the SPCA staff. The new training programme is a part of the new Inspectorate strategy that will be presented to the SPCA Executive Board for approval in May 2017. The programme has been already trialled at three main Centres, Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch – see more under Rec 3 (2016) – Training and Mentoring of New Inspectors.

An example of the Centre Committee meeting minutes that affirmed the selection of suitable candidates for training was viewed. The National Manager explained his or delegated person's role in the interviewing selected candidates for training. An example of unsuitable candidate due to a conflict of interest (extensive involvement in hunting activities) was given.

All Inspectors and AOs sign agreements with the RNZSPCA before they are appointed. A copy of a signed agreement for one of the Inspectors renewing their appointment was viewed.

Training workshops for appointed Inspectors focus on various areas of interest. Training sessions for on-going training are run in different locations and sometimes more than once per year to ensure all inspectors attend. There are four training sessions scheduled for the period between June and October 2017. Due to a large number of equine cases received by SPCA each year (approx. 1100 cases) SPCA scheduled training in equine response for Inspectors. Last year, the SPCA organised an 'Emerging Leaders' course for selected inspectors at the Edmund Hillary outdoor activity centre, at Tongariro. The main purpose of this course was to train future leaders in dealing with large scale crisis situations. The same type of course is scheduled for September this year for current senior inspectors in leadership positions.

6. Appointments and Renewal Appointments of Inspectors and AOs

Separate documented procedures apply to appointments and renewed appointments for Inspectors and AOs.

The recommendations for appointments and renewal of appointments of Inspectors and Auxiliary Officers are managed by the National Office, as per Sec.22 and 23 of the MoU. Examples of records that are supplied to MPI for were viewed and discussed. Police checks are carried out as part of the process. These sometimes raise issues for further consideration.

When the Inspector changes the area of jurisdiction they work in the National Office notify MPI of the transfer. MPI record and acknowledge the transfer but no longer replace the existing Instrument of Appointment as per MoU Sec.45. All SPCA Inspectors' appointments are valid anywhere within New Zealand' as per PTS par.124(3)(b)(ii).

The AW Coordinator maintains a reminder list of expiry dates of appointments for all Inspectors and AOs and sends e-mail notifications with attached renewal application forms to Centres, 3 months prior to the expiry date.

The same register that is used for monitoring the appointments dates is used for recording the Inspector's attendance and satisfactory completion of conferences, training workshops or other professional development opportunities. The National Office send reminders to Inspectors that



didn't attend annual training sessions and place their names on the list for the next year training. As a rule, the Inspector may skip the attendance at the annual training session, if justified, but repetitive absences may result in the National Office not recommending the Inspector for renewal of appointment.

The National Office is generally successful in retrieving the Certificate of Appointments from Inspectors and AOs that ceased to work for, volunteer at or otherwise be affiliated in that capacity to the RNZSPCA or his or her Centre. A case where the National Office revoked the Certificate of Appointment of AOs in the Waikato region due to misconduct was demonstrated to the auditors.

7. Complaints against Inspectors/Auxiliary Officers

The National Office has drafted new SPCA procedures, separate for Complaints against Inspectors and AOs, and for Complaints against SPCA Centres and Personnel. A separate part of those procedures is Complaint Management Process, an administrative guidance for the National Office on categorising and maintaining and managing the complaints database. The majority of complaints against Inspectors or AOs are minor in nature and dealt with successfully by regional Centres without notifying the National Office. Serious complaints are notified to, and dealt by the National Office with notifications to MPI. There have been no complaints of serious misconduct by Inspectors or AOs and only one minor complaint notified to National Office in the last 12 months or so.

There is more detail in Rec 5 (2016) – Review of the Complaints Process (Complaints against Inspectors and AOs).

8. Animal Welfare Complaints

The management of animal welfare complaints has been described in more details under Rec 6 (2016) – Review of PTS (Animal Welfare Complaints) - Shelterbuddy system. The National Office is currently reviewing the Shelterbuddy system training as there has been a case recently where an incorrectly recorded animal welfare case of a horse (the call taker incorrectly filed the complaint under the wrong inspector region so it was 'missed' by the inspector) resulted in the lack of timely follow up by the Centre. In order to ensure proper classification of animal welfare complaints and appropriate and timely corrective action, a guidance document, Cruelty Complaint Dispatch Code - Welfare Issues has been developed.

All complaints investigated by SPCA follow the procedure as outlined in PTS for Inspectors and AOs. More detailed information is included in the Dispatch Shelterbuddy Manual, a guidance document that National Office issued to Centres that use the Shelterbuddy system. In addition, the National Office developed a detailed workflow sheets for Inspector decision process showing powers under Animal Welfare Act 1999 (AWA) and Search and Surveillance Act 2012 (SSA). These documents have been provided to all inspectors and will be available on SPCA intranet for Inspectors to use.

SPCA Centres contact the National Office before applying for and executing a search warrant to check the SPCA national search warrant database for any previous applications at that property. The National Office will also check with MPI if the property to be searched has livestock to see if there has been any search warrant already executed on that property by MPI.

The SPCA may request assistance from MPI Compliance Animal Welfare investigators at two levels, one - the transfer of animal welfare investigations from SPCA to MPI (commercial livestock properties, large scale investigation), and two – direct support of SPCA personnel by MPI investigators. The National Office developed a flowchart explaining the procedure for managing cases transferred from SPCA to MPI and also for cases transferred from MPI to SPCA.

The National Office keep a register of all SPCA prosecution cases. RNZSPCA and Ben



Vanderkolk and Associates (BVA) signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) in 2013 to provide legal representation for SPCAs throughout New Zealand. Currently 29/46 SPCAs have signed up to the scheme. The remaining 17 SPCAs are responsible for their own prosecution cases but they must provide a prosecution detail report to national office at the completion of sentencing. Under the BVA scheme the prosecution files are reviewed by national office Regional Manager (Prosecutions) before the final evidential sufficiency and public interest test are provided by BVA, who is the Crown Prosecutor in Palmerston North. BVA attend or engage the local Crown solicitor as an agent and conduct all court hearings for prosecutions within the scheme. There are approx. 30-60 prosecutions per year. If a file fails to meet the prosecution threshold a formal warning letter may be issued to resolve investigation.

9. MPI/ SPCA Liaison

National level - Sec.85 of the MoU refers to minimum two meetings a year between RNZSPCA National Executive and MPI. According to the National Manager there is one, at best, meeting per year. SPCA values those meetings especially the operational aspects and would welcome more meetings per year.

Local level – according to Sec.86 of MoU, each organisation should invite and attend the other organisation's conferences and training workshops. On the local level the SPCA invites representatives from MPI Animal Welfare team to attend their annual conference (AGM) and an MPI representative usually attends. Six SPCA inspectors have attended 2 combined trainings in recent years at Burnham and at Taratahi, and s 9(2)(a) also presented at an MPI AWI course in Napier a couple of years ago. Otherwise, there have been no reciprocal invitations to SPCA to attend MPI conferences or training workshop recently. This may be because the MPI Animal Welfare team has not held any conferences or workshops.

SAT auditors recommend to MPI that a meaningful liaison between MPI Animal Welfare and SPCA Inspectorate is reinstated.

10. Reporting

SPCA National Office collates each Centre's annual statistics report and provides MPI with national statistics. There were 14,809 animal welfare complaints made to SPCA in 2016.

SPCA New Zealand receives funding from MPI to assist with costs incurred by SPCA Centres and Inspectors while attending rural animal welfare complaints. As part of the SPCA's funding agreement with MPI, the SPCA are obligated to provide detailed quarterly reports. Examples of the reports have been demonstrated to the auditors. The reports show a breakdown of the complaints into regions, type of problems, commercial vs. non-commercial premises, outcomes of complaints, types (class) of animals involved.

11. Annual auditing of RNZSPCA Activities

In 2015 SPCA developed and published an SPCA MPI Audits procedure/form that facilitates resolving any non-compliances that are identified in the annual audit findings. In addition to the non-compliances, the procedure also includes MPI recommendations that are made to SPCA in the final report. The progress of the proposed resolution for each finding is being rated as completed, in progress and no progress, on a quarterly basis. An example of the follow up form to MPI audit of SPCA Otago Centre, in 2015 was demonstrated to the auditors. The only recommendation In Progress was the lack of implementation or maintenance of policies and procedures.

12. Conclusions

The following is a summary of comments / issues that may be included in recommendations to MPI and / or SPCA in the final report:



MPI annual audits. The auditor were impressed with the efforts and extent to which SPCA National Office responded to recommendations made by MPI auditors in the last couple of years. Recommendations that were not fully implemented appeared to be justified.

SPCA Inspectorate Strategy, Policies & Procedures. It was obvious the Inspectorate strategy has been driven for some time by proposed changes to the RNZSPCA structure, nationwide. In preparation for the implementation of the new structure (once approved) a new strategy has been drafted. Many old policies and procedures have been reviewed and new procedures have been developed. Some of the procedures have been already implemented and some are being trialled or waiting for the implementation. Main emphasis of the new strategy and policies appears to be training and support for individual Inspectors and Centres.

Communication Improvements between MPI and SPCA. It was the auditor recommendation to MPI in 2015 that the communication channels for cases handed to MPI be reviewed and that any SPCA Centre involved, including the National Office, be kept informed of the progress and outcome of cases handed over. For some years MPI have not been providing SPCA (National Office or Centres) with details of cases that were transferred to MPI. The only information MPI is prepared to share with SPCA is the outcome.

SAT auditors recommend that MPI re-consider that matter when reviewing the MoU and PTS.

MPI/ SPCA Liaison. Invitations to SPCA to attend MPI conferences or training workshop have not been made recently.

SAT auditors recommend that MPI review the MoU and ensure a meaningful liaison between MPI Animal Welfare and SPCA Inspectorate is reinstated.

MPI and SPCA Issue. The SPCA has limited resources for managing and internal audit programme. No suitable internal auditor training courses have been found. SPCA has requested assistance from MPI with the training of some staff so that an internal audit programme can be implemented.

MPI could consider providing training and mentoring of some SPCA staff to achieve this.

The audit team would like to thank the National Office's staff for participating in this audit.

s 9(2)(a)

Systems Auditor

MPI Systems Audit Team (SAT)

s 9(2)(a)

Systems Auditor

MPI Systems Audit Team (SAT)



Systems Audit Team

FINAL REPORT

Location Findings

SPCA Canterbury

Annual audit of RNZSPCA

National Office and Selected Regional Centres

April - May 2017



Audit Date (Last Day)

2 June 2017

Audit Number

4558

Location(s)

SPCA Canterbury t/a: SPCA Canterbury

Auditor(s)

s 9(2)(a) , MPI Systems Audit Team (SAT), Systems Auditor

Auditee(s)

s 9(2)(a) , SPCA Canterbury, Chief Inspector

s 9(2)(a) , SPCA Canterbury, Operation Manager

Other Personnel

s 9(2)(a) , RNZSPCA, Regional Manager

Audit Type

Location Findings

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Topics

Follow up from previous audits:

There were several recommendations made to RNZSPCA (referred to as SPCA) during the previous SPCA audits in 2016 and 2015, and those applicable to regional Centres include:

Rec 2 (2015 audit) - Internal Audit - a specific internal audit programme has not yet been established. However, since the 2016 audit, SPCA National Office has launched a number of initiatives aimed at developing resources to assist Centres in a number of areas. One of them is a Centre Checklist, a useful support tool which can assist Centres in measuring their performance against wide set of animal welfare parameters, identifying areas of success and areas for development.

Canterbury SPCA (the Centre) has used the Centre Checklist to review their own performance and compliance with requirements and ticked all the listed areas green (functional). The Centre has received an e-mail from the National Office advising on findings and recommendations from the previous MPI audit.

Rec 3 (2016) – Training and Mentoring of New Inspectors – it was recommended that MPI and the RNZSPCA monitor the training and support of new inspectors.

The Centre used the new Competency Standard checklist that was developed by the National Office as a part of the new training programme. Those competencies were assessed by senior Inspectors and monitored and signed off by the Chief Inspector within the Centre. The Centre also has a non-mandatory, training programme that was delivered in 2016 to all Inspectors by the Chief Inspector. One example of this is the rifle range training that was provided by the Chief Inspector and the Chair of the board.

Rec 5 (2016) – Review of the Complaints Process (Complaints against Inspectors and AOs) – it was recommended that the review of the MoU and PTS documents include the procedures for managing complaints against Inspectors and Auxiliary Officers in a timely and appropriate manner, taking into consideration any potential employment issues.

There have been no formal complaints against Inspectors or AOs received by the Centre in recent years that required a notification to the National Office.

Rec 6 (2016) – Review of PTS (Animal Welfare Complaints) it was recommended that a) The review of the PTS includes consideration of the risk ratings, b) The implementation of Shelterbuddy is included in the review, c) the implementation of the Shelterbuddy by monitored and reviewed.

Canterbury Centre adopted the Shelterbuddy system and their staff are familiar with the Dispatch Shelterbuddy Manual. All animal welfare complaints are recorded to the Shelterbuddy system without filling in paper Dispatch Request forms. s 9(2)(a), the Chief Inspector, trains all staff that receive animal welfare complaints on grading these complaints. The staff can also consult with s 9(2)(a), the Operations Manager or Senior Inspectors if unsure about the grading. The grading in the PTS is being adopted.



1. General

SPCA Canterbury is a large size Centre that employ 40-45 people including 7 Inspectors and 10 Auxiliary Officers. There are approximately 150 volunteers affiliated with this Centre and they are looked after by a dedicated SPCA officer for volunteers. Some of the volunteers provide foster care to animals waiting for adoption.

The Centre can house 30 dogs, approximately 100 cats, 30 sheep and goats, 12 horses, and 60 chickens. There are several paddocks available for horses and other grazing animals. The Centre is open to the public on Mon - Sat, 10am - 4pm, and 10-2pm on Sun.

SPCA Canterbury cooperates closely with neighbouring SPCA branches, Mid Canterbury, Marlborough, Greymouth and Hokitika. Currently the Marlborough branch is assimilated with SPCA Canterbury.

The centre deals with all sorts of animal welfare complaints including farm animals and companion animals.

The Centre communicates with the National Office via e-mail or phone calls and their contact is very frequent, sometimes daily.

The Inspectors use the SPCA website but the Centre has also their own website on the internet.

2. Policies and Procedures

The Centre has in place an impressive suite of policies and procedures and these are kept as hardcopies and electronic forms. These documents are divided in 5 groups: Health & Safety, Emergency Procedures, Human Resources, General and Inspectorate. These procedures address not only the day-to-day complex operation of the Centre but also reflect potential problems, risks and threats the Centre needs to deal with and be prepared for, e.g. Compassion Fatigue Policy, Earthquake, Whistle-blower Policy, Cybersecurity, Body Worn Cameras etc. Each documented procedure has a date when it was created and updated, the name of the person authorising it and the date of review. The procedures are reviewed once a year and all staff get familiar with those updates. The Centre uses an electronic system, VAULT as a database for all policies and procedures, personal training and staff competencies.

The Centre has a lot of hard copies of documents that are supplied by the National Office. Copies of MoU, PTs and amended AWA are available for use.

The SPCA Canterbury has a Memorandum of Understanding with four local councils: Christchurch City, Waimakariri District, Hurunui District and, Selwyn District Councils. These MoUs clarify the roles and responsibilities and provide a framework for positive, collaborative relationship between SPCA and the councils.

3. Staff, Induction and Training

The candidates for Inspectors or AOs are drawn from the pool of the existing staff that is known to the Centre and that have been working in the Centre in various capacities for at least a year. Various criteria for applicants are being considered, even the credit card history, and these criteria are in line with those listed in PTS for Inspectors and AOs. The Centre would not recommend any applicant that is unknown to them and new to the industry with no previous experience. The Centre has processed and endorsed one application from a candidate with minor criminal conviction.

Once a month the Centre organises an induction evening for prospective volunteers that is attended by 30-40 people with 50% of these applying for the volunteer positions. These applicants are police vetted and enquiries are made about their experience, reason for



volunteering etc.

All trainee Inspectors undergo training that is delivered by UNITEC Auckland. That training programme consists of 5 blocks and trainees have opportunities to provide feedback after the end of each training block.

Training programme for Auxiliary Officers is based on online modules that have been prepared by the National Office. Currently, there are two people in training as AOs in the Centre.

Copies of Instrument of Appointments of current Inspectors were viewed.

4. Appointments and Renewal Appointments of Inspectors and AOs

During the first 12 months of the appointment the Inspectors' undergo a practical training under the supervision of experienced Inspectors during which the trainees Inspectors obtain necessary skills and are assessed on a number of competencies. That programme was developed by the National Office as a part of the new national training programme. The Chief Inspector commented that UNITEC training of candidates for Inspectors is just the start but on its own it is not enough. The practical training during which newly appointed Inspectors assist the experienced Inspectors on the job and their competencies are assessed is necessary for the candidates to successfully fulfil their roles as Inspectors.

The VAULT system identifies and notifies the users of incoming renewal of appointments for Inspectors and AOs. In addition the National Office monitors the due dates for renewal of appointments.

All Inspectors from the Centre attend ongoing training sessions that are organised by the National Office. The participation in training sessions is recorded in the VAULT system (demonstrated) and s 9(2)(a), who is also present at those courses is aware if any of s 9(2)(a) Inspectors fail to attend. Evaluation of the Inspectors is done during the training sessions, monthly one-on-one meeting with s 9(2)(a), the Centre Chief Inspector, and during annual KPI meetings. The Inspectors organise refresher trainings for AOs and the Centre AOs attend those, as their ongoing training. Training/workshop sessions are arranged where there is two way communication. The Chief Inspector and a Senior Inspector go through a power point presentation regarding the powers of an AO and explain the difference between this and the powers of an inspector. Some scenario based questions are then workshopped. Training records are kept by the Centre's humane resource department, the responsible manager (e.g. Operations Manager or the Chief Inspector) but also by the National Office. That includes records of past Inspectors and candidates that failed the training. Inspectors notify s 9(2)(a) of their daily activities so that s 9(2)(a) is aware of what is going on. The Centre use a white board on which Inspectors indicate they are "Out" or "In" the office. The Inspectors can be contacted via smart phones or RTs when they are out on the job. s 9(2)(a) also has access to Navman and can see where the fleet currently is and s 9(2)(a) can track where the Inspectors are. This is helpful for effectiveness for dispatching jobs and check for H&S purposes. All staff in the Inspectorate team also have a 'Find me' app, that's similar to a panic button to ensure H&S for each individual.

The Centre is not aware of any instances where their Inspectors operated outside the district. The Inspectors are aware of their district boundaries but do not use any device that would check the site's location in real time.

The Centre has not needed to use Inspectors from other Centres and would "lend" their own Inspectors to other Centres, if requested. Any transfers of inspectors would be notified to the National Office.

There have been no cases in recent years where Canterbury SPCA Inspectors or AOs failed to comply with their Terms of Appointment, PTS, MOU, and no cases of serious misconduct.



5. Complaints against Inspectors/Auxiliary Officers

The Centre staff have adopted the national SPCA procedure for dealing with complaints against Inspectors and AOs. There have been no formal complaints received by the Centre in recent years but s 9(2)(a) would discuss any cases that may potentially turn up serious with s 9(2)(a), RNZSPCA National Manager. Minor complaints have been dealt with by the Centre themselves.

6. Animal Welfare Complaints

The procedure for receiving animal welfare complaints constitutes a part of the Customer Service handbook. The procedure specifies different types of questions that should be asked for cases affecting pets or farm animals. Three customer service persons (some are warranted AOs) receive animal welfare complaints and record them directly into the Shelterbuddy system. The grading of complaints is initially done by the customer service staff but if need be they would contact s 9(2)(a), the Chief Inspector or senior Inspectors for assistance. The Chief Inspector monitors the response times in respect to the graded complaints on monthly basis and in April 2017 the response time for grade 1 was 0 days, grade 2 was 0.4 day, and for grade 3 was 2.8 days. This is being included in the monthly reporting for the CEO and is being presented to the board for each monthly Board meeting.

s 9(2)(a), the Operations Manager was conversant with s 9(2)(a) powers as AO and actions in regards to dealing with animal welfare complaints.

Once the complaints are recorded the customer staff e-mail them to the Senior Inspector who would assign them to individual Inspector(s) for action. The Chief Inspector spot checks these complaints and assignments on a weekly basis.

Information related to complaints is confidential to Inspectors.

Animal welfare complaints that relate to animals being exported, animals in zoo and animals used in research, testing or teaching would be referred to the National Office and then further, on to MPI. For complaints that affect commercial operations s 9(2)(a) would check with the National Office if these need to be transferred on to MPI.

The Centre receive anonymous complaints occasionally and always endeavour to identify the owner or person in Charge (PIC). Irrespectively, all these complaints are followed up. Every time a complaint is dealt with the Inspector in Charge has the responsibility to call the complainant with the results (within the boundaries of privacy).

Previous history of a complaint can be brought up by the Shelterbuddy system and if necessary the Centre can search the previous database system, AWSOM.

According to s 9(2)(a), the Centre Inspectors have access to all equipment ("toys") necessary to handling the complaints.

The Inspectors are provided with copies of flow charts on Inspector's Decision Process that specify legal powers under AWA and Search & Surveillance Act. These flowcharts together with other resources (compliance framework triangle, SPCA pocket book, and Search and Surveillance guidelines) are taken with Inspectors when they attend animal welfare complaints.

The Inspectors can call local veterinarians where a special expertise or assistance is required. Veterinarian visits occur at the Centre twice a week.

Euthanasia

The Centre's euthanasia policy is aligned with the SPCA National Euthanasia Policy. The



Disposal panel consists of 3 people, one from each of the following groups: Centre, Inspectorate and Veterinary. They will meet to discuss all options for the animal and if euthanasia is agreed to be the 'best' outcome they will sign the Euthanasia sign off form. This form is then uploaded to ShelterBuddy and given to the Operations Manager to file. When a large number of animals is considered for euthanasia the decision would be made by the Centre management however, the transfer of animals to other Centres would always be part of that consideration. There is also a Euthanasia panel, which is separate to the Disposal Panel. This group meets every six months and discusses euthanasia policy, ways to improve procedures and new initiatives to do with euthanasia. The average euthanasia rate of animals that were accepted to the shelter is 25% and the rate is lower than that of the previous year.

The Inspectors have firearm licences and have been trained to use the captive bolt guns and fire arms. The preference is to use a veterinarian for humane euthanasia of animals. A captive bolt gun has been used by most of the Inspectors. There have been incidents where fire arms had to be used, but in most cases animals are taken to the vet clinic for euthanasia. Inspectors or AOs record reasons for euthanasia for each animal and for animals that are destroyed within the mandatory 7 days holding period the euthanasia panel members sign an approval.

On Farm Inspections

Farm cases are routinely managed by the Centre, although some can be passed over to MPI. The Centre follows the national procedure for MPI-SPCA Complaint Transfer Process. Commercial farm complaints are always being transferred to MPI.

Search Warrants

The Centre communicate with the National Office before applying for and executing a search warrant. There have been several search warrants executed in recent year. The police are sometimes involved and that depends on the police willingness to assist.

Prosecution Policy

The Canterbury SPCA branch is a part of the RNZSPCA and Ben Vanderkolk and Associates (BVA) Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) to provide legal representation for SPCA. The Centre has a guidelines for assessing complaints before they can be referred for prosecution and each case is discussed with the Inspector involved. At present there are 11 cases pending for passing on to the National Office for processing. They will either be a formal warning or a prosecution depending on BVA's recommendations.

Records and Reporting

Details of each animal welfare complaint are kept in Shelterbuddy, and that includes scanned copies of documents, notes and check sheets. Hard copies of documents are kept secure in the Inspectors separate office. Access to the Shelterbuddy system is password protected and only Inspectors have unlimited access to all information; other staff have only a limited access to that system.

Information that relate to the number and types of animals sold, re-homed, destroyed or otherwise disposed is kept in the Shelterbuddy system and a periodic summary (e.g. monthly register) can be generated off that system.

The National Office provided the Centre with an electronic check sheet for entering the data on number of complaints received, number of cases investigated and referred to another agency, number of prosecutions and number of person changed with or proceeded against. That data is sent to the National Office on monthly basis. The collated annual national statistics are provided then to MPI, as per Sec.89 of the MoU and Sec. 268 of PTS.



7. Media Policy

The Centre has a media policy that follows the national policy and has a media and marketing person.

8. MPI/ SPCA Liaison

The Centre maintains a good relationship and cooperation with local MPI AW Compliance Investigator. No Centre Inspector has been contracted to MPI yet. Similarly, a good relationship is maintained with police, TA and other stakeholders.

9. Reality check

During the reality check the auditor visited following facilities: separate adoption wards for cats and dogs, separate quarantine wards for cats and dogs, isolation unit for cats, recovery/adoption unit for cats recovering from sickness, and housing for rabbits and birds. In the quarantine building dogs can sleep inside indoor kennels that have overhead heating. In the puppy areas there is a heat pump for the inside the building. There was no isolation unit for dogs and as informed by the auditees sick dogs can be kept in the quarantine area, separated from others.

The facilities were fit for purpose and of acceptable standard. There were some good quality cages for cats, made of plexi glass and many of the cages were enriched with equipment and toys to keep the animals stimulated. The facility and cages were in good state of repair and maintenance and kept clean and tidy. There is a cleaning and sanitation programme in place and the cleaning is done by volunteers. There was adequate separation of facilities with different hygiene status and personnel working there. The auditees demonstrated the traffic light colour system that is used for identification of facilities and personnel (esp. volunteers) - e.g. green colour representing facility for healthy animals, ready for adoption, orange colour – for quarantine facilities, and red colour for sick animals' facilities. Large paddocks surround the buildings and the hay for grazing animals is supplied.

Interviewed Inspector on duty and customer service staff were conversant with their respective policies and procedures.

s 9(2)(a) informed the auditor of a new project that includes new unit for dogs with maternity ward, quarantine area, and isolation area is on plans and should be under construction soon.

10. Conclusions

The Canterbury SPCA appears to be very well run by a team of appropriately qualified, experienced and dedicated personnel. The systems and procedures are well documented and kept up to date, and staff are familiar with their respective procedures. The Centre management work closely with their crew of Inspectors, AOs and animal attendants including volunteers. There is an electronic database system for staff training and competencies (VAULT) in place and the Centre use effectively the national SPCA electronic data register for animals and complaints (Shelterbuddy). The selection of candidates for Inspectors or AOs is robust and the Centre provides them with practical training and support throughout their appointment and puts emphasis on the competency training in the first year. The Inspectors and AOs participate in ongoing training and their professional development is supported by the Centre. The Centre provides all necessary equipment for their Inspectors for handling animal welfare complaints.

The Centre is conveniently located on the outskirts of the city, away from residential areas or noisy environment. Animal holding facilities are fit for purpose and properly maintained especially the facilities for cats that are of a high standard. New units for dogs are on plans and the auditees are hopeful the construction will start soon.



Overall, the information provided by the Centre demonstrates that:

- RNZSPCA national procedures are effective in ensuring the requirements of the Animal Welfare Act 1999 (AWA) are being met by the SPCA Canterbury the systems and procedures implemented by the SPCA Canterbury are meeting the requirements outlined in the MOU between the RNZSPCA and the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI),
- the SPCA Canterbury manage very well the requirements of the AWA and MOU for the appointments, training and monitoring of Inspectors and AOs, and
- the corrective actions undertaken by the Centres in response to the previous MPI Systems Audit Team findings have been implemented, where applicable.

The auditor would like to thank the staff of Canterbury SPCA for participating in this audit and excellent preparation of resources and records.

s 9(2)(a)

Systems Auditor

MPI Systems Audit Team (SAT)

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Systems Audit Team

FINAL REPORT

Location Findings

North Taranaki SPCA

Annual audit of RNZSPCA

National Office and Selected Regional Centres

April - May 2017

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Audit Date (Last Day)

1 June 2017

Audit Number

4556

Location(s)

SPCA North Taranaki t/a: SPCA North Taranaki, 75 Colson Road, New Plymouth

Lead Auditor

s 9(2)(a), MPI SAT, SAT auditor

Auditor(s)

s 9(2)(a), MPI SAT, SAT auditor

Auditee(s)

s 9(2)(a), SPCA North Taranaki, Area/Centre Manager
s 9(2)(a), SPCA North Taranaki, Centre Coordinator, Inspector
s 9(2)(a), SPCA North Taranaki, Senior Inspector

Audit Type

Location Findings

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Topics

Follow up from previous audits:

There were several recommendations made to RNZSPCA (referred to as SPCA) during the previous SPCA audits in 2016 and 2015, and those applicable to regional Centres include:

Rec 2 (2015 audit) - Internal Audit – a specific internal audit programme has not yet been established. However, since the 2016 audit, SPCA National Office has launched a number of initiatives aimed at developing resources to assist Centres in a number of areas. One of them is a Centre Checklist, a useful support tool which can assist Centres in measuring their performance against wide set of animal welfare parameters, identifying areas of success and areas for development.

North Taranaki Centre has used the Centre Checklist to review their own performance and as a troubleshooting tool. Although s 9(2)(a) was not familiar with the previous MPI audits (s 9(2)(a) took the role of the Centre Manager in Oct '16) s 9(2)(a) was able to locate an e-mail from the National Office advising the Centres of findings and recommendations from the MPI annual audit.

Rec 3 (2016) – Training and Mentoring of New Inspectors - it was recommended that MPI and the RNZSPCA monitor the training and support of new inspectors.

s 9(2)(a) was already working at this centre prior to doing the inspector training. s 9(2)(a) was appointed as an Inspector in 2016. s 9(2)(a) confirmed that s 9(2)(a) had been well supported by, the Senior Inspector during s 9(2)(a) training period at North Taranaki SPCA. During that time s 9(2)(a) was also given an opportunity to go to Wellington SPCA to learn and calibrate with their Inspectors. This year, s 9(2)(a) is going to attend the mandatory equine and canine training session. s 9(2)(a) is familiar with the SPCA website and various guidance documents that are placed there.

Rec 5 (2016) – Review of the Complaints Process (Complaints against Inspectors and AOs) – it was recommended that the review of the MoU and PTS documents include the procedures for managing complaints against Inspectors and Auxiliary Officers in a timely and appropriate manner, taking into consideration any potential employment issues.

There has been one complaint recently made against an Inspector of which the National Office was notified. Although the National Office response by e-mail was timely the Inspector felt the National Office enquiry was inadequate and the conclusion that was unfavourable for the Inspector, prejudiced.

Rec 6 (2016) – Review of PTS (Animal Welfare Complaints)– it was recommended that a) The review of the PTS includes consideration of the risk ratings, b) The implementation of Shelterbuddy is included in the review, c) the implementation of the Shelterbuddy by monitored and reviewed.

North Taranaki Centre adopted the Shelterbuddy system and there is a Shelterbuddy trainer on site. The staff are familiar with the Dispatch Shelterbuddy Manual and they use the Dispatch Request form, both documents developed and distributed to Centres by the National Office. The grading of cases is either done by s 9(2)(a) or monitored by s 9(2)(a), s 9(2)(a) is the Inspector with 9 years of experience in animal welfare risk assessment and grading of animal welfare complaints.



1. General

North Taranaki SPCA branch is a medium size Centre that employs 14 people – three Inspectors, one Auxiliary Officer/Centre Manager, a Centre administrator, animal attendants and four Op-shop/ market attendants. There are 101 volunteers affiliated with this centre plus approximately 40 volunteers at the Op-shop centre, and 60-70 foster homes registered on the database. The Centre can house 8 adult dogs, approximately 60 cats, 10 ducks, and several rabbits. There are 12 acres of paddocks available for horses and other grazing animals. The Centre is open to the public Mon- Sat, 10am - 4pm.

South Taranaki Centre in Hawera is the neighbouring SPCA branch with which the North Taranaki Centre cooperates closely including taking their animals in.

The majority of animal welfare complaints involve dogs (pet, working and hunting dogs), cats and horses (small life style blocks).

The Centre communicates regularly with the National Office via e-mail or phone calls. While the Centre appreciates the help and assistance from the Inspectorate they would like to see a similar level of support from the human resources department.

2. Policies and Procedures

The Policy and Procedure manual is well developed and kept up to date. Each procedure has a date when it was created or reviewed and a date when it is due for review. Procedures are reviewed every 2 years and are signed off by staff; that information goes into the staff files. As an example, the Euthanasia Policy was renewed in May 2017 and majority of key personnel acknowledged that policy/procedure by signing off the register. In addition to hard copies the electronic version of policies and procedures are kept on the computer. Policies and procedure are discussed at fortnightly staff meetings. Inspectors are familiar with the SPCA website and its contents. The Centre have a lot of hard copies of documents, the stock is maintained by the National Office. Copies of MoU, PTSs and amended AWA are available for use.

3. Staff, Induction and Training

Criteria used by the Centre when selecting candidates for training as Inspector or Auxiliary Officers (AOs) match those listed in the PTS for Inspectors and AOs. Generally, the candidates are selected from amongst the existing staff that is known to the Centre and that has been working in the Centre in various capacities for some time. The applicants for Inspectors complete a form A (education, experience /knowledge of animals, law, SPCA work, etc.) and the Centre committee/selection panel completes the form B (assessment of the candidate suitability) before the recommendation for training are put forward to the National Office – copies of completed applications for an Inspectors were viewed. Once the applications are accepted by the National Office, a delegated national staff come down and interviews the applicant.

The criminal history, NZ citizenship and residency status are checked by the National Office. The Centre would not recommend any applicant that is unknown to them and new to the industry with no previous experience. The Centre have not had any awareness of applicants with criminal conviction.

All trainee Inspectors undergo training that is delivered by UNITEC Auckland. The trainee Inspectors have opportunities to provide feedback on the UNITEC training programme. [§ 9(2)(a)] was happy with the contents and the quality of the UNITEC training and commented on the high intensity of that training. [§ 9(2)(a)] was glad to be placed in the Centre where as a new Inspector [§ 9(2)(a)] could learn from an experienced Inspector ([§ 9(2)(a)]). [§ 9(2)(a)] was a private student some years ago, then volunteered at the Centre before getting a job.



Training programme for Auxiliary Officers is based on online modules that have been prepared by the National Office and which the AO candidates have to complete within required time. The auditor viewed the copy of the national training programme and appointment process for AOs. s 9(2)(a) has passed that online training the last year.

Copies of Instrument of Appointments of current Inspectors were viewed.

4. Appointments and Renewal Appointments of Inspectors and AOs

The Centre decision to appoint another Inspector was necessary as before s 9(2)(a) had been all alone, and the 24/7 nature of the job was too much for one Inspector to cope with. After s 9(2)(a) first appointment, for 12 months, s 9(2)(a) would go out with s 9(2)(a) who would assist and monitor s 9(2)(a) performance.

The Centre Manager is aware of due dates for renewal of appointments for Inspectors and s 9(2)(a) as an AO, and these due dates are also tightly monitored by the National Office. At least 2 months prior to the renewal of appointments the National Office delegate comes down to carry out re-appointment interviews.

The Centre have no issues related to Inspector's and AO's training and appointment processes and are very complimentary about these.

There is lots on the agenda of this year ongoing training for Inspectors and they will attend several of these (compulsory equine, canine and law training sessions). s 9(2)(a), who has been in the role of AO for less than a year hasn't attended any refresher training for AO yet.

Daily supervision of Inspectors' activities is easily done by the Centre Manager as there are only three Inspectors operating from the New Plymouth office. Two are part time Inspectors.

In order to ensure the Inspectors operate within the district the Centre equipped them with a Google Earth mobile app and a hard copy map of the district.

In the past, one of the Inspectors operated in another area with permission from the Centre and the National Office to cover an Inspector's leave in the South Taranaki branch. The Inspector from the South Taranaki district also notified the police and dog control authorities.

There have been no cases where North Taranaki Inspectors or AO failed to comply with their Terms of Appointment, PTS, MOU, or cases of a serious misconduct. Last year, a former Inspector, s 9(2)(a), resigned and surrender s 9(2)(a) Instrument of Appointment to the National Office.

5. Complaints against Inspectors/Auxiliary Officers

The Centre have adopted the national SPCA procedure for dealing with complaints against Inspectors and AOs. A flow chart of that procedure is printed and displayed on the wall in the office. Minor or frivolous complaints have been dealt with by the Centre manager without a need to inform the National Office. Facebook niggles occur, nothing against the centre though. These would be referred to the centre committee.

There has been no formal complaints against Inspectors or AOs received by the Centre in recent years however, there was one complaint made directly to the National Office after which the complaint was referred to the Centre. It was related to animal welfare however, it appeared the complainant's perception of the animal needs was incorrect.

6. Animal Welfare Complaints

There is a "Procedure for Taking a Complaint" that has been signed by staff. The procedure is due for review in June 2017. For transfer of complaints to another Centre there is a Transfer of Cases process flow chart on the wall that relates to the national transfer policy.



Each time, when receiving animal welfare complaints the Centre advise the complainants of confidentiality and the Privacy Act. Animal Welfare complaints are often received by s 9(2)(a) who enters the information into the electronic Shelterbuddy system. Other people who are less experienced with the electronic system may fill up a dispatch form first before transferring the information into the Shelterbuddy. The Inspectors would call the complainant back if they are not clear about the complaint. Information related to complaints is confidential to Inspectors.

The Centre receive reasonably frequent anonymous complaints and all these are followed up.

Animal welfare complaints that relate to animals being exported, animals in zoos and animals used in research, testing or teaching would be referred to the National Office and then further on to MPI.

Both inspectors interviewed on the day of the audit, s 9(2)(a) and s 9(2)(a), and the AO, s 9(2)(a) were conversant with their powers and actions in regards to dealing with animal welfare complaints.

The grading of animal welfare complaints is either done by s 9(2)(a) or monitored by s 9(2)(a), and discussion with s 9(2)(a) on grading made the auditors confident the process is correct including the urgency of responses. The Inspectors would advise the complainant if there is a delay for less urgent cases.

One of useful features of the Shelterbuddy system is its ability to quickly bring up the previous history of a complaint so that Inspectors do not have to search the whole database for that purpose.

The Inspectors have access to equipment necessary to do the day-to-day work, but are looking at things like GPS as there are a lot of work in remote locations. This should improve once the restructure of SPCA is approved and implemented.

On the office wall there are printed flow charts on Inspector's Decision Process specifying legal powers under AWA and Search & Surveillance Act. These flowcharts have been developed by the National Office to assist Inspectors in the animal welfare investigations.

The inspectors keep handy laminated reminder cards on AWOCA process (Ask, Why, Options, Confirm, Act) and Tactical Communication.

The Inspectors call local veterinarians or territorial authority (animal control) for cases where special expertise or assistance is required. In last few years the Centre relationship with Police has improved and currently it is in much better shape than before. The Centre maintains also a good relationship with Fire Department, and Animal Control.

Euthanasia

The Centre has their own North Taranaki (NT) SPCA Euthanasia Policy that follows the SPCA National Euthanasia Policy. That policy was revised in May 2017 and has been acknowledged and signed by all staff but the 3rd Inspector, s 9(2)(a) (all staff sign off the revised policies not just Inspectors and AOs so that all staff have an awareness on the Centre euthanasia policy). The chairman of NT SPCA is yet to formally sign the revised policy.

The euthanasia panel consists of 3 people – two SPCA inspectors or AO, and the veterinarian. The panel meet frequently (informal meetings) and discuss euthanasia policy and individual cases.

In most cases animals are taken to the vet clinic for euthanasia. The Inspectors been trained to use the captive bolt gun and have firearms licence but don't have a fire arm and haven't had to do it yet.



Reasons for euthanasia are recorded for each animal and for animals that are destroyed within the mandatory 7 days holding period the Inspectors sign an approval – the auditors viewed examples of these.

On Farm Inspections

Farm cases are routinely managed by the Centre, although these can be passed over to MPI. In the last year there has been one requests from MPI in regards to transfer of a case of one sheep to the Centre.

Transfer Policy

The above transfer was done through the National Office and was formally recorded in the Centre Shelterbuddy system.

Search Warrants

The Centre always contacts the SPCA National Office before applying for and executing a search warrant. The National Office would check the relevant database if a search warrant has been issued previously for the land or property.

The Centre Inspector executed one search warrant approximately 6 months ago and it involved the assistance from police.

Prosecution Policy

The North Taranaki SPCA is not part of the RNZSPCA and Ben Vanderkolk and Associates (BVA) Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) to provide legal representation for SPCAs. The Centre staff use the New Plymouth based Crown prosecutor and are responsible for managing their own prosecution cases. The Centre provide the prosecution details to the National Office at the completion of the prosecution. Currently, there are two complaints getting ready for prosecutions.

Records and Reporting

Details of each animal welfare complaint are kept in the Shelterbuddy, and notes are kept in the Inspectors' notebooks. Notes are transferred into the Shelterbuddy system. New notebooks have the Bill of Rights in them.

Records relevant to a complaint, an investigation or prosecutions are kept secured in locked cabinets in the Inspectors' office. The office is also kept locked. Access to the Shelterbuddy system is password protected and only Inspectors have access to all information saved there; other staff have only a partial access to the system.

Animal register contains the number and types of animals sold, re-homed, destroyed or otherwise disposed of and the data is generated off the Shelterbuddy system.

The Centre provides the National Office with annual statistics, as per Sec.89 of the MoU and PTS 268 (a national template check sheet is completed). The collated national statistics are provided then to MPI.

7. Media Policy

The Centre has a media policy and a media person. s 9(2)(a) , a staff member and authorised person is the Centre spokesperson and is also responsible for running the centre Facebook page. s 9(2)(a) is the back-up media person.



8. MPI/ SPCA Liaison

The Centre maintains a good relationship with local MPI AW Compliance Investigator, s 9(2)(a) whom they meet on regular basis.

9. Reality check

The auditors were shown the Centre facilities, Inspectors' ambulance, and were demonstrated the Shelterbuddy system and access controls for staff.

The Inspectors explained how various procedures are applied to different categories of animals (healthy abandoned, stray, sick and injured etc.) and how the identification of animals is maintained. All dogs and cats must be healthy, dewormed, vaccinated, neutered, and microchipped before being put up for adoption. Suspect parvo dogs are tested on-site and results must be negative before dogs can be accepted to the shelter. Sick animals are medicated by trained staff and also trainee vet nurses (there is always a centre assistant with the vet nurses). Animals are routinely taken to the vet clinic for procedures but when large numbers of cats are involved the vet would to the Centre. Waste from animals in isolation is closely managed so it does not affect other animals; foot baths are also used.

All facilities were clean and the cleaning was done by staff and volunteers.

The holding facilities for cats are fit for purpose and cats have access to climbing ramps, platforms, sleeping shelves and scratching pads etc. Tarpaulin sheets that are stretched on the sides of cages in the outside cat adoption area provide protection from weather. The Centre Manager noted that this is not an ideal set up, and there are plans to improve the facilities. However, heat pads and heating lamps are used in the dog quarantine facilities when needed. The dog quarantine is not far from the cat hospital and currently there is no isolation ward for dogs (a dog isolation unit is set up in a shed).

The Centre Manager informed the auditors of several improvement projects on the plans for the near future, this include the new cat ward, dog isolation unit and relocation of the dog adoption area to the front of the building.

10. Conclusions

The North Taranaki SPCA branch (the Centre) appears to be well run by appropriately qualified, experienced and dedicated personnel. The Inspectors and AO hold valid Instruments of Appointment and are aware of their powers and responsibilities. The systems and procedures are well developed and up to date, and the staff is adequately informed of any changes. The Centre provides adequate training and support for the recently appointed Inspectors. The Inspectors participate in ongoing training and their professional development is encouraged and supported by the Centre committee.

The Centre is conveniently located on the outskirts of town, away from residential areas or noisy environment. Animal holding facilities are generally fit for purpose but the cat adoption facility would benefit from a better protection from cold temperatures. Similarly, the Centre should have a proper dog isolation area.

Overall, the information provided by the Centre demonstrates that:

- RNZSPCA national procedures are effective in ensuring the requirements of the Animal Welfare Act 1999 (AWA) are being met by the North Taranaki SPCA,
- the systems and procedures implemented by the North Taranaki SPCA are meeting the requirements outlined in the MOU between the RNZSPCA and the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI),
- North Taranaki SPCA manage well the requirements of the AWA and MOU for the appointments, training and monitoring of Inspectors and AOs, and



- the corrective actions undertaken by the Centres in response to the previous MPI Systems Audit Team findings have been implemented, where applicable.

The following comments may be included in recommendations to MPI and / or RNZSPCA in the final report:

Rec 5 (2016) – Review of the Complaints Process (Complaints against Inspectors and AOs) – although, as explained by the National Manger, the SPCA had reviewed the Complaints Process and in one particular case of a complaint against the Centre’s Inspector advised the Centre of the outcome within the mandated time frame, the Inspector felt the National Office’s enquiry was inadequate and the conclusion prejudiced.

The recently appointed AO (Centre manager) has not participated in any ongoing training yet and there seem to be no plans for AO training in the National Office schedules. Note that this report will also be sent to s 9(2)(a) , Regional Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support. s 9(2)(a) had planned to attend but could not due to flight disruptions.

The audit team would like to thank the staff of SPCA North Taranaki for participating in this audit.

s 9(2)(a)
SAT auditor
MPI SAT

s 9(2)(a)
SAT auditor
MPI SAT

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Systems Audit Team

FINAL REPORT

Location Findings

Whakatane SPCA

Annual audit of RNZSPCA

National Office and Selected Regional Centres

April - May 2017



Audit Date (Last Day)

6 June 2017

Audit Number

4559

Location(s)

Whakatane SPCA t/a: Whakatane SPCA, 15 Gateway Crescent, Whakatane

Auditor(s)

s 9(2)(a), MPI Systems Audit Team (SAT), Systems Auditor

Auditee(s)

s 9(2)(a), Whakatane SPCA, Centre Manager

s 9(2)(a), Whakatane SPCA, Senior Inspector

s 9(2)(a), Whakatane SPCA, trainee Auxiliary Officer

Other Personnel

s 9(2)(a), RNZSPCA, Regional Manager

Audit Type

Location Findings

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Topics

Follow up from previous audits:

There were several recommendations made to RNZSPCA (referred to as SPCA) during the previous SPCA audits in 2016 and 2015, and those applicable to regional Centres include:

Rec 2 (2015 audit) - Internal Audit - a specific internal audit programme has not yet been established. However, since the 2016 audit, SPCA National Office has launched a number of initiatives aimed at developing resources to assist Centres in a number of areas. One of them is a Centre Checklist, a useful support tool which can assist Centres in measuring their performance against wide set of animal welfare parameters, identifying areas of success and areas for development.

Whakatane SPCA (the Centre) has used the Centre Checklist to review their own performance and compliance with requirements and ticked the majority of listed areas green (functional), with the exception of Health and Safety. The Centre has received an e-mail from the National Office advising on findings and recommendations from the previous MPI audit.

Rec 3 (2016) – Training and Mentoring of New Inspectors– it was recommended that MPI and the RNZSPCA monitor the training and support of new inspectors.

This recommendation is not applicable to this Centre as s 9(2)(a) has been working as an Inspector for 12 years and there has been no new Inspector working at the Centre in recent years. There is currently one Auxiliary Officer in training, at the Centre.

Rec 5 (2016) – Review of the Complaints Process (Complaints against Inspectors and AOs)– it was recommended that the review of the MoU and PTS documents include the procedures for managing complaints against Inspectors and Auxiliary Officers (AO) in a timely and appropriate manner, taking into consideration any potential employment issues.

There was a formal complaint against the Centre AO in 2016 made by a volunteer directly to the National Office. Although the National Office followed their own procedure by providing the AO with opportunity to explain and sending down the Regional Manager in order to help the Centre deal with the issue, the AO/Centre Manager felt strongly that the support was inadequate. According to the AO/Centre manager the National Office approach was different to that of the Centre and that s 9(2)(a) was left alone to bear the weight of undue pressure from the social media.

Rec 6 (2016) –Review of PTS (Animal Welfare Complaints)– it was recommended that a) The review of the PTS includes consideration of the risk ratings, b) The implementation of Shelterbuddy is included in the review, c) the implementation of Shelterbuddy be monitored and reviewed.

Whakatane SPCA has not adopted the Shelterbuddy system yet and the staff continue using the paper Dispatch Request form when receiving animal welfare complaints. Relevant information from the Dispatch Forms are then transferred into the computer register (Excel spreadsheet). s 9(2)(a) provides advice for trained receptionists on questions that need to be asked when receiving animal welfare complaints. The grading of animal welfare complaints is generally done by s 9(2)(a).



1. General

Whakatane SPCA is a small Centre that employs 4 people on part-time contracts. The crew consists of one Inspector, one Auxiliary Officer/Centre Manager, one Auxiliary Officer in training, and one Op-shop manager. There are approximately 45-50 volunteers affiliated with this Centre including 5 foster carers for animals waiting for adoption.

The Centre can house up to 20 dogs and puppies and approximately 50 cats and kittens. During the recent flood in the area the Centre arranged for housing of over 900 animals. Due to the staff having part-time work contracts the Centre is open to the public in the mornings only, Mon- Sat, 9.00am –11.30pm, and it is closed on Sundays.

Whakatane SPCA co-operates closely with neighbouring SPCA branches, Kawerau, Opotiki, Tauranga, and Rotorua and that co-operation was very intense during the recent flood. [§ 9(2)(a)] is also contracted as an Inspector by the Kawerau Centre.

The majority of animal welfare complaints received by the Centre involve dogs (town dogs, hunting dogs), horses and some farm animals.

The Centre communicates with the National Office via e-mail or phone. According to [§ 9(2)(a)] the Centre Manger, the National Inspectorate provides the Centre with excellent day-to-day support.

The Inspector uses the national resources that are accessible through the SPCA website.

2. Policies and Procedures

The Centre has a Policy and Procedures Manual 2017 in place and all staff including volunteers are required to read it and sign it. Some of the policies and procedures follow the national SPCA procedures e.g. Euthanasia Policy, Health and Safety Policy, Firearm Policy.

The Centre has copies of MoU, PTSs and amended AWA available for use.

3. Staff, Induction and Training

The Centre has never had the luxury of having a group of people interested in applying for the position of an Inspector or AO and all candidates would be considered. Nevertheless, each applicant would need to meet several criteria, as listed in PTS, and be known to the Centre. The Centre Manager would not recommend any applicant that is unknown to the staff and is new to the industry with no previous experience. Instead, the Centre would have such a person working in the Centre for some time before recommending him/her for training.

The criminal history, NZ citizenship and residency status are checked by the National Office upon receiving the recommendation from the regional Centre. The Centre has not had any awareness of applicants with criminal conviction.

The training programme for Auxiliary Officers is based on online modules that have been prepared by the National Office. Currently, [§ 9(2)(a)] is the AO in training. [§ 9(2)(a)] provided the auditor with some information about [§ 9(2)(a)] training for the role.

[§ 9(2)(a)], the only Inspector at the Centre, has 12 years of experience and [§ 9(2)(a)] is often involved in training of new, incoming inspectors. A couple of trainee inspectors from other Centres had spent some time here doing practical training with [§ 9(2)(a)].

[§ 9(2)(a)] keeps [§ 9(2)(a)] valid Instrument of Appointment on [§ 9(2)(a)] at all times when on duties (the auditor viewed the IoA).



4. Appointments and Renewal Appointments of Inspectors and AOs

§ 9(2)(a), the Centre Manager has daily contact with § 9(2)(a) and § 9(2)(a) is aware of all cases in which § 9(2)(a) is involved. § 9(2)(a) attends the mandatory training sessions for Inspectors and will attend an equine and canine refresher training this year. While the Centre Manager is supportive of § 9(2)(a) attendance at those training sessions § 9(2)(a) is concerned the same level of support is not provided by the Centre Committee. They have expressed their dissatisfaction with the Inspector's absence during that time and the costs involved.

Evaluation of § 9(2)(a) performance is done informally during frequent meetings with the Centre Manager.

§ 9(2)(a), in § 9(2)(a) capacity as AO has not attended any SPCA refresher training for Auxiliary Officers, since 2012.

§ 9(2)(a), who is also contracted as the Inspector by Kawerau SPCA, at times operates outside the Whakatane SPCA area of jurisdiction, however, that is done with permission from both centres.

From time to time the Centre uses help from Inspectors from neighbouring Centres and sometimes delegates its own Inspector to help the other Centres.

There have been no cases in recent years where the Whakatane SPCA Inspector or AO failed to comply with their Terms of Appointment, PTS, MOU, and no cases of serious misconduct

5. Complaints against Inspectors/Auxiliary Officers

The Centre has adopted the national SPCA procedure for dealing with complaints against Inspectors and AOs. All complaints are dealt with by § 9(2)(a) and /or § 9(2)(a) and not all the complaints require to be notified to the National Office.

There was a formal complaint against the Centre Manager/AO in 2016 made directly to the National Office. The complaint was related to the AO allegedly not following the Centre's procedure for fostering a puppy. Although the complaint has been resolved with assistance from the National Office the handling of the case by the National Office left the Centre's AO with a bitter aftertaste. See above: Rec 5 (2016) -Review of the Complaints Process (Complaints against Inspectors and AOs).

6. Animal Welfare Complaints

There is no written procedure for receiving animal welfare complaints but instead the staff employment contract includes two related tasks: reception and attending to customers; and answers and attendance to all incoming phone calls. All persons attending the incoming calls are familiar with the procedures and back each other up (the trainee AO used to be the Centre manager prior).

Upon receiving a call, the receptionist fills in an Action Request form and that form is passed on to the Inspector when § 9(2)(a) is available. As part-time Inspector, § 9(2)(a) is not always available to attend animal welfare cases immediately. Routine cases are scheduled for § 9(2)(a) to attend within 7 days however, Immediate and Priority cases are either referred to the veterinarian, police, or other territorial authority (animal control) during § 9(2)(a) absence.

As described in Rec 6 (2016) – Review of PTS (Animal Welfare Complaints) § 9(2)(a) provides advice for trained receptionists on questions that need to be asked when receiving animal welfare complaints.

Animal welfare complaints that relate to animals being exported, animals in zoos and animals used in research, testing or teaching would be referred to the National Office and then further, on to MPI. However, none of these have been received by the Centre.



§ 9(2)(a) demonstrated § 9(2)(a) was conversant with § 9(2)(a) powers as AO and § 9(2)(a) responsibilities in dealing with animal welfare complaints. The recent complaint made against § 9(2)(a) by one of the volunteers made § 9(2)(a) and other staff aware of the importance of the confidentiality of information related to animal welfare cases.

Recorded details of animal welfare complaints are kept secure in the Inspector office. That information remains generally confidential to the Inspector however, handling of repetitive or serious cases is discussed with § 9(2)(a) the Centre Manager.

Retrieving the potential history of a complaint without any electronic database is challenging and the Centre staff have to rely on their memory in order to identify repetitive complaints from the same property or the same owner. The Centre would enquire about the previous history at the National Office only when cases are prepared for prosecution or prior to a search warrant being executed.

For complaints where the Inspector knows or believes the case is being investigated by MPI the Inspector would work with MPI for the best solution and if need be, would follow the Centre transfer policy (transfer form completed and sent to the National Office).

The recent Edgecumbe flood revealed the Centre's deficiencies in protective clothing (safety and weather proof gear) and currently the Centre is in the process of replenishing the used equipment. RNZSPCA Regional Manager and observer of this audit, § 9(2)(a) advised the National Office has been surveying the regional centres on their provision of basic equipment for handling animal welfare complaints.

During questioning § 9(2)(a), the Inspector, demonstrated an in depth knowledge of welfare priorities as specified in PTS for Inspectors, par.203-212 and relevant requirements of the Animal Welfare Act. In cases where there is a disagreement between the Inspector and the owner of an animal § 9(2)(a) would try to solve the problem § 9(2)(a), on the spot, rather than involving a third party. However, § 9(2)(a) would ask for assistance from other Centre personnel or local veterinarians if necessary. § 9(2)(a) would use the police as the last resort as that could inflame the conflict rather than resolve it.

The staff informed the auditor of their successful initiative to bring together local communities from low socioeconomic areas in order to help them understand and deal with issues related to animal husbandry and welfare. That event was called a "Big Day Out" and involved SPCA staff and various animal health professionals such as veterinarians, horse dentists, farriers. They all gathered in one place in Ruatoki and provided the community with a range of professional advice, demonstrated and conducted minor veterinary procedures and offered free animal feed and other items, etc. The Centre received a positive feedback that the initiative had been very well received and valued by the community, especially as the attendees were provided with help and advice without being judged or punished where they might not have fully complied with the animal welfare standards. Following the event, the number of animal welfare complaints from those traditionally problem areas dropped but the number of enquiries about animals' needs and future initiatives increased.

That initiative demonstrates that the Centre staff has a good understanding of the local communities' needs and focuses on their education and support rather than on their compliance with legal requirements.

Euthanasia

The Centre's euthanasia policy follows the SPCA National Euthanasia Policy. The Euthanasia panel consists of 3 people including: the Inspector, veterinarian and AO/SPCA staff.

§ 9(2)(a) has been trained to use firearms and has a firearm licence. § 9(2)(a) is competent in shooting



animals with use of the .22 calibre rifle and can perform a cervical dislocation of some species, if need be. [redacted] carries [redacted] own rifle and renews [redacted] firearm licence every 7 years, as per the SPCA National Firearm Policy.

Inspectors or AOs record reasons for euthanasia for each animal and for animals that are destroyed within the mandatory 7 days holding period. The latter cases would have [redacted] signing approvals for emergency euthanasia.

On a couple of occasions [redacted], has used [redacted] power as an AO and authorised the territorial authority to euthanase impounded animals. Any sick or injured animals are delivered by the territorial authority to SPCA.

A private offal pit located at the Centre Manager's property is used for disposal of animal bodies as otherwise the Centre would have to bear the cost of body disposal.

The Centre keeps a monthly register of all animals that were euthanased within the Centre but that excludes animals that were put down by the Inspector outside the shelter e.g. on the owner/Person in Charge (PIC) property, or where the Inspector instructed the owner/PIC to put down the animal on his/her property. This finding will be directed to the National Office for discussion if such categories of euthanasia should be included in the monthly register.

On Farm Inspections, Transfer Policy, Assistance Policy

For any production animal welfare complaints that need to be transferred to MPI the Centre follows the national procedure, MPI-SPCA Complaint Transfer Process and uses a template transfer form.

The recent Edgecumbe flood that killed and threatened lives of hundreds of domestic and farm animals was an example of a situation that could not be handled by the Centre itself and assistance from other agencies was required. It was frustrating for the Centre that the police and fire departments were initially not very cooperative and it wasn't until the Centre notified MPI via the National Office that the rescue and emergency response team arrived.

[redacted] is also a member of the Whakatane Emergency Response Team that deals with all sorts of emergencies including those affecting animals.

There have been occasions where MPI requested the help from the Centre for dealing with issues related to beef and goat stock. Those cases were handled as any other animal welfare complaints including logging in details and the Inspector providing a feedback to MPI via the National Office.

Search Warrants

The Centre would communicate with the National Office before applying for, and executing a search warrant. The National Office would check relevant database for any investigation on the property that is to be searched.

Prosecution Policy

For an animal welfare complaint that is considered for prosecution the Inspector would discuss that with the 8 person Centre committee and then, if approved, with the National Office. There hasn't been any prosecution since 2014. According to the Centre staff there could have been cases referred for prosecution however due to limited time and resources available for processing of each case other solutions such as issuing a notice of direction under the Section 130 of the AWA, were used.

The Centre is hoping that the planned restructure of SPCA would result in more funds and



human resources (trained Inspectors) directed to this Centre by the head office.

Records and Reporting

The Inspector keeps details of each animal welfare complaint in ^{s 9(2)(a)} notebook. These notes have the outcome for each case but there are no notes of the grading of the complaint. Files for each case are kept in the file folder, in the Inspector's office. These files would be kept for a minimum of 7 years.

Information that relates to the number and types of animals sold, re-homed, destroyed or otherwise disposed is kept.

The National Office provides the Centre with an electronic check sheet for entering data on a number of complaints received, number of cases investigated and referred to another agency, number of prosecutions, and number of persons charged with offences or with actions proceeded against. That check sheet is filled in by ^{s 9(2)(a)} and ^{s 9(2)(a)} and sent to the National Office.

7. MPI/ SPCA Liaison

No Centre Inspector has been contracted to MPI to date.

Occasionally, the Centre gets in touch with MPI AW Compliance Investigator in Gisborne and the staff are not aware of any MPI AW Compliance person available in Whakatane.

8. Reality check

During the reality check the auditor visited following facilities: dog adoption wards, dog exercise areas, dog isolation unit, cat adoption areas, cat isolation area, cat reception area and nurseries. All animal holding facilities were fit for purpose, clean and tidy. There were adequate separation of cages and exercise areas in the dog isolation unit and cages in the cat isolation area preventing sick animals from contacting each other. Heated rooms (heated floors, lamps, heaters) were provided in areas where sick, recovering and young animals are kept. Sick cats are often placed in the foster homes rather than being kept in the Centre.

A unique feature of this Centre is the so called amnesty facilities for dogs and cats. These are an outdoor kennel for dogs and a box for cats where people can place unwanted, abandoned or stray dogs and cats without being asked any questions. Both facilities are supplied with fresh food and water. There is information attached regarding de-sexing vouchers for animals.

Experienced in dealing with animal welfare issues, the Centre staff is convinced such facilities provide a convenient option for persons that do not want or cannot care for their animals anymore but also for the community to look after animals that are abandoned. Providing a de-sexing voucher is an encouragement for the people that drop the animals in to use the free option of de-sexing their other animal(s) rather than continuing breeding their pets and this then eliminates unwanted offspring. Overall, the availability of such an amnesty facility is likely to contribute to less animals being abandoned, mistreated and/or inhumanely destroyed. This is in direct line with the SPCA ultimate goal.

9. Conclusions

The Whakatane SPCA branch has a small number of trained personnel and limited resources available but the staff's passion and dedication seems to counterbalance those limitations to some extent.

The Centre was heavily involved in the animal rescue operation during the recent Edgecumbe flood and provided for housing of approximately 900 rescued animals. The staff's engagement with local communities in order to maintain and improve animal welfare, and reduce the



number of complaints is commendable.

Despite all of the above, the limited availability of the part-time Inspector to attend all animal welfare complaints or prepare potential cases for prosecution is a weakness of the Centre. Having another trained Inspector or a full-time Inspector would likely make the Centre more effective in delivering the goals. Similarly, the lack of the electronic database such as Shelterbuddy makes the administration work unwieldy.

Although the Centre hasn't selected and trained any candidates for the role of an Inspector for years, the system is in place and the staff had a detailed understanding of the selection and training processes. The Inspector participates in ongoing mandatory training but the AO has not attended any refresher training.

The Centre involvement in the recent flood rescue operation revealed some deficiencies in the provision of safety gear that is necessary for handling animal welfare complaints and currently the Centre is in the process of replenishing the used equipment.

The Centre's animal holding facilities are fit for purpose and properly maintained. The idea of providing the amnesty facility for dropping off abandoned or unwanted animals seems to be accepted and used by the community and would have prevented suffering and saved lives of many animals.

The auditor recommends that the Inspector records in ^{s 9(2)(a)} notebook/file the grade of each complaint when the complaint was attended.

Overall, the information provided by the Centre demonstrates that:

- RNZSPCA national procedures are effective in ensuring the requirements of the Animal Welfare Act 1999 (AWA) are being met by the Whakatane SPCA
- the systems and procedures implemented by the Whakatane SPCA are meeting the requirements outlined in the MOU between the RNZSPCA and the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI),
- Whakatane SPCA manage the requirements of the AWA and MOU for the appointments, training and monitoring of AO but have not been involved in training of an Inspector for some time.
- the corrective actions undertaken by the Centre in response to the previous MPI Systems Audit Team findings have been implemented, where applicable.

The following comments may be included in recommendations to MPI and / or RNZSPCA in the final report:

Rec 5 (2016) – Review of the Complaints Process (Complaints against Inspectors and AOs) – Although, as explained by the National Manger, the RNZSPCA had reviewed the Complaints Process there was a formal complaint against the Centre Manager/AO in 2016 and in the opinion of the affected AO the final outcome reached by the National Office made ^{s 9(2)(a)} feel victimised rather than supported by the office.

The Centre AO /Centre Manager has not participated in any refresher training for AO since 2012 and there seems to be no plans for AO training in the National Office schedule.

The auditor recommends to the SPCA that staffing of the Centres (under the new structure) is reviewed in order to ensure the Centres' effective delivery of the expected outcomes.

The auditor would like to thank the staff of Whakatane SPCA for participating in this audit.



s 9(2)(a)

Systems Auditor

MPI Systems Audit Team (SAT)

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Systems Audit Team

FINAL REPORT

Location Findings

Hastings and District SPCA

Annual audit of RNZSPCA

National Office and Selected Regional Centres

April - May 2017



Audit Date (Last Day)

8 June 2017

Audit Number

4562

Location(s)

Hastings and District SPCA t/a: Hastings and District SPCA, 8 Heathcote Rd, RD5, Hastings

Auditor(s)

s 9(2)(a), MPI Systems Audit Team (SAT), Systems Auditor

Auditee(s)

s 9(2)(a), Hastings and District SPCA, Centre Manager

s 9(2)(a), Hastings and District SPCA, Inspector

s 9(2)(a), Hastings and District SPCA, Centre Committee Chair

Other Personnel

s 9(2)(a), RNZSPCA, Regional Manager

Audit Type

Location Findings

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Topics

Follow up from previous audits:

There were several recommendations made to RNZSPCA (referred to as SPCA) during the previous SPCA audits in 2016 and 2015, and those applicable to regional Centres include:

Rec 2 (2015 audit) - Internal Audit: A specific internal audit programme has not yet been established. However, since the 2016 audit, SPCA National Office has launched a number of initiatives aimed at developing resources to assist Centres in a number of areas. One of them is a Centre Checklist, a useful support tool which can assist Centres in measuring their performance against wide set of animal welfare parameters, identifying areas of success and areas for development.

Hastings and District SPCA (the Centre) has used the Centre Checklist to review their own performance and compliance with requirements and ticked all the listed areas green (functional). The Centre has received an e-mail from the National Office advising on findings and recommendations from the previous MPI audit.

Rec 3 (2016) – Training and Mentoring of New Inspectors: It was recommended that MPI and the RNZSPCA monitor the training and support of new inspectors.

The Centre Inspector as well as the AOs have been trained and appointed in the last a couple of years and all were complementary about the training process and support provided by the existing Centre's staff and National Inspectorate. They have often been in touch with the SPCA Regional Manager, ^{s 9(2)(a)}, and used the support of an Inspector from the neighbouring Centre in Napier. The Centre also provides training programmes for all Inspectors, an example of this is Canine Temperament Testing.

Rec 6 (2016) – Review of PTS (Animal Welfare Complaints): It was recommended that a) The review of the PTS includes consideration of the risk ratings, b) The implementation of Shelterbuddy is included in the review, c) the implementation of Shelterbuddy be monitored and reviewed.

The Centre has adopted the Shelterbuddy system very recently after using AWSOM system in the years prior. The Centre's staff are getting familiar with the new system and sometimes use the Dispatch Shelterbuddy Manual as a guidance. The grading of animal welfare complaints is done routinely by Inspector and when the Inspector is not available the staff would seek the Inspector's opinion when necessary. During interviewing the staff demonstrated they were familiar with the grading of complaints, as per PTS

1. General

Hastings and District SPCA employs 6 people, 4 full-time and 2 part-time. Currently, there is one trained Inspector and 2 Auxiliary Officers (AO), and one person recommended for AO training working at the Centre.

^{s 9(2)(a)}, was warranted as an Inspector in October 2015 and the last year ^{s 9(2)(a)} was re-appointed for the next period of 3 years. ^{s 9(2)(a)}, the Centre Manager and ^{s 9(2)(a)}, the Centre Committee Chair have recently completed their training as Auxiliary Officers, and were appointed for the period of 12 months in December 2016 and March 2017, respectively. ^{s 9(2)(a)} has just been appointed as the Centre Manager.

^{s 9(2)(a)} is also a veterinarian/co-owner of the veterinary clinic that is contracted to provide veterinary services to this Centre. In order to avoid potential conflict of interest ^{s 9(2)(a)} withdrew herself from the Centre Committee's tender process for veterinary clinics. That aspect of the



SPCA activity is not part of this audit's scope.

In addition to paid staff there are 25 volunteers, including foster carers affiliated with this Centre.

The shelter can house 12 dogs and puppies, and approximately 70-75 cats and kittens. Large grazing animals such as cattle and horses can be placed on pre-arranged, private farms in the area. The Centre is open to the public between 10.30am - 4pm, on Mon - Fri, and 10.30 - 2.30pm on Sat- Sun.

Hastings and District SPCA has a Memorandum of Understanding with the local District Council in regards to dealing with abandoned, sick and injured dogs. When the Centre capacity is exceeded some cats can be placed in several foster homes.

The Centre cooperates closely with neighbouring SPCA branches, Napier and Hawkes Bay, Waipukurau and Dannevirke.

Two thirds of animal welfare complaints received at this Centre come from farms (dogs, cats, horses) and the remaining one third from small farm blocks (horses).

The Centre communicates with the National Office via e-mail or phone calls. s 9(2)(a) reported that there had been a significant turnaround in regards to the National Office's support for the Centre in the last a couple of years.

s 9(2)(a) frequently uses technical resources that are available on the SPCA Inspectorate website.

2. Policies and Procedures

The Centre has a suit of policies and procedures documented in the 87 page folder. s 9(2)(a) was involved in drafting the Centre's procedures. Some of the policies follow the national SPCA policies e.g. Euthanasia Policy and Media Policy. An orientation checklist is used for new employees to ensure they read the applicable policies and procedures. Any amendments and updates of those documents are discussed with the Centre staff during weekly meetings. However, the Centre does not have any records to confirm that all staff, including volunteers acknowledged the current versions of those policies and procedures or conversely, that some of the staff has not done it yet. The auditor will make a recommendation to that effect.

The Centre has copies of MoU, PTSs for Inspectors and AOs and amended Animal Welfare Act (AWA) available for use.

3. Staff, Induction and Training

The Centre Committee decides if a new Inspector or AO is needed for the Centre. Candidates for Inspectors or AOs are drawn from the pool of the existing employees that are known to the Centre and that have been working in the Centre for some time. The candidates have to meet certain criteria and these explained by s 9(2)(a) and s 9(2)(a) are in line with criteria listed in the PTSs.

The criminal history, NZ citizenship and residency status are checked by the National Office upon receiving the recommendation from the regional Centre. The National Office representative interviewed the Inspector when s 9(2)(a) applied for the role but didn't interview one of the current AOs prior to s 9(2)(a) training. The interview of the latter was done by the Centre.

s 9(2)(a) completed s 9(2)(a) training for Inspectors via UNITEC Auckland. s 9(2)(a) was satisfied with the quality and delivery of that training and had opportunity to provide feedback after the end of each training block.

The training programme for Auxiliary Officers is based on completing online modules that have been prepared by the National Office. While the Centre AOs thoughts about this type of training



were overall positive they also commented that a feedback from the National Inspectorate on their completion of these modules would be appreciated. Currently, there is one person in training as AO in the Centre.

4. Appointments and Renewal Appointments of Inspectors and AOs

During first 12 months of the appointment as an Inspector § 9(2)(a) spent 50% of § 9(2)(a) time in Horowhenua SPCA and 50% in the Hastings SPCA. The Centre policy is to keep all communication channels open and the former manager, and the Committee frequently communicated with § 9(2)(a) during that time to ensure § 9(2)(a) had the necessary support. Once a month § 9(2)(a) would write a report to the Centre in which § 9(2)(a) was encouraged to identify any issues for discussion. § 9(2)(a) could also rely on support from local veterinarians and the Inspector from Napier SPCA.

§ 9(2)(a) has done a lot of training during the first year of § 9(2)(a) appointment and § 9(2)(a) is planning to attend more training sessions this year. In contrast, the Centre AOs, § 9(2)(a) and § 9(2)(a) have not attended any refresher training yet.

The RNZSPCA has provided training programmes from time to time, an example is Centre Operations Training, Civil Defence Emergency Management of which Centre manager, AO's and Inspectors have attended.

§ 9(2)(a) confirmed the Centre Committee's commitment and support of their staff participating in ongoing training.

Copies of Certificates of Appointments for § 9(2)(a), the Inspector and § 9(2)(a), the AO were viewed. § 9(2)(a) also showed § 9(2)(a) Instrument of Appointment (IoA) that § 9(2)(a) keeps on § 9(2)(a) at all times when on duties. That IoA is valid nationwide.

The Centre Committee evaluates their Inspector and AOs during the annual performance review of their employment contracts and that also includes technical aspects of the roles.

When the Inspector is unsure if the location to be visited is within the Centre's district § 9(2)(a) would check in on the Google map on § 9(2)(a) office computer.

§ 9(2)(a) shares the office with § 9(2)(a) and § 9(2)(a) is aware of any Inspector's activities and issues. In addition, § 9(2)(a) meets with § 9(2)(a) during weekly meetings.

There have been no cases in recent years where Hastings SPCA Inspectors or AOs failed to comply with their Terms of Appointment, PTS, MOU, and no cases of serious misconduct.

5. Complaints against Inspectors/Auxiliary Officers

The Centre has adopted the national SPCA procedure for dealing with complaints against Inspectors and AOs. There have been no formal complaints received by the Centre in recent years but § 9(2)(a) would contact the National Office if complaint were serious or may become serious. Minor complaints have been dealt with by the Centre staff themselves.

6. Animal Welfare Complaints

The procedure for receiving animal welfare complaints is documented in the Training Notes. These notes have references to use of a Dispatch Request form. Customers can select three persons to talk to when calling the Centre: the Inspector, manager or receptionist. The complaints are recorded first in the paper Dispatch Request forms and then, within the next 7 days are transferred into the electronic Shelterbuddy system. The grading of complaints is generally done by the Inspector. At times when the Inspector is not available and the Centre receive urgent calls the staff would contact Inspectors from other Centres if possible or the police.



During questioning the staff didn't confirm they verbally confirm facts back to the complainant while receiving calls. The auditor will make a recommendation to that effect.

Both AOs, s 9(2)(a) and s 9(2)(a) appeared conversant with their powers as AOs and actions in regards to dealing with animal welfare complaints.

Previous history of a complaint can be brought up by the search of the Shelterbuddy system however as this system is relatively new to the staff, they would also check the previous database system, AWSOM. The latter does not have the ability to search through all cases unless they were flagged for some reason, though.

For complaints where the Inspector knows or believes the case is being investigated by MPI the Inspector would contact the local MPI AW Investigator and if need be, would follow the Centre transfer policy.

Animal welfare complaints that relate to animals being exported, animals in zoo and animals used in research, testing or teaching would be referred to the National Office and then further, on to MPI. To date the Centre hasn't received any complaints in those categories.

During questioning s 9(2)(a), the Inspector, demonstrated an in depth knowledge of welfare priorities as specified in PTS for Inspectors, par.203-212 and relevant requirements of the Animal Welfare Act. s 9(2)(a) would apply those priorities accordingly, taking into considerations various types, grades and individual circumstances of animal welfare complaints. In approx. 50% of cases where there had been a disagreement between the Inspector and the owner of an animal s 9(2)(a) sought advice from local veterinarians. s 9(2)(a) would never decide on euthanasia of an animal on s 9(2)(a) own and would always involve a veterinarian, including allowing the owner for a second opinion if requested.

s 9(2)(a) has printed copies of flow charts on Inspector's Decision Process that specify legal powers under AWA and Search & Surveillance Act. These flowcharts together with other resources are taken with s 9(2)(a) when attending animal welfare complaints.

According to the Centre Manager and Inspector they have adequate supply of equipment necessary for handling animal welfare complaints. The Centre cooperates closely with the local veterinary clinic that is always ready to assist and by provide access to their facilities and equipment.

Euthanasia

The euthanasia policy, Appendix 7. Euthanasia Protocols is a merged national SPCA policy and local Centre's policy. There are two protocols, one for animals that are kept in the Centre for up to 7 days and one for animals that are kept for over 7 days. The 3 persons' euthanasia panel meets and discusses euthanasia matters regularly (more frequently than 6 monthly).

Euthanasia is performed by contracted veterinarians that visit the shelter twice a week. Some animals may be taken to the veterinary clinic for that purpose. s 9(2)(a), the Inspector does not perform euthanasia s 9(2)(a) although s 9(2)(a) has been trained to use a captive bolt gun, perform pithing, and in other approved methods for destruction of small rodents.

Reasons for euthanasia for each animal are recorded on the Authority to Process forms. The Inspector signs an approval when an animal is destroyed within the 7 days holding period (signature on the Animal Surrender form, records in the Shelterbuddy system).

On Farm Inspections

Production animal welfare complaints are rare but the Inspector is aware these need to be reported to and discussed with the National Office in order to determine if a transfer to MPI is



required. ^{s 9(2)(a)}, hasn't dealt with any cases of that category to date.

Search Warrants

The Centre staff are aware of the need to seek an advice from the National Office before applying for and executing a search warrant and there have been no search warrants applied for or executed in the last 2 years.

Prosecution Policy

Hastings and District SPCA is a part of the RNZSPCA and Ben Vanderkolk and Associates (BVA) Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) to provide legal representation for SPCA. The Centre has adopted the national SPCA prosecution policy and would liaise with the National Inspectorate or Regional Manager for assistance before any case is recommended for prosecution. There has been no animal welfare complaint recommended for prosecution recently however, some formal warnings have been issued to offenders.

Records and Reporting

Details of each animal welfare complaint are recorded and kept in the Inspector's notebook. These notes are later transferred on to the Shelterbuddy system. The auditor viewed an example of notebook records and corresponding Shelterbuddy records of a complaint related to pigs and a set of documents related to other completed complaint.

^{s 9(2)(a)} keeps ^{s 9(2)(a)} notebook on ^{s 9(2)(a)} at all times and the access to Shelterbuddy is controlled by different logging to different levels of information so that a full information is accessible only to the Inspector and limited information is accessible to the other Centre staff. However, hard copies of records of complaints are kept in the Centre office unsecured. That creates a potential risk that other staff may access confidential information stored there. The auditor will be making a recommendation to the Centre to eliminate that risk.

Information that relate to the number and types of animals sold, re-homed, destroyed or otherwise disposed is kept in Shelterbuddy and a periodic summary, Animal Status report, can be generated of that system. That Animal Status report however, had no dates when animals were disposed of. In the week following the audit ^{s 9(2)(a)} e-mailed the auditor copies of documents demonstrating that the dates of disposal are recorded on individual kennel cards that are stored in the Shelterbuddy system and these can be traced by opening individual animal ID numbers.

^{s 9(2)(a)} provides the National Office with annual statistics of number of complaints received, number of cases investigated and referred to another agency, number of prosecutions and number of person changed with or proceeded against. Similar statistics plus statistics related to euthanized animals are provided to the Centre Committee on monthly basis.

7. Media Policy

There Centre's media policy follows the national policy.

8. MPI/ SPCA Liaison

The Inspector knows the local MPI AW Compliance Investigator but the contacts with MPI are infrequent and as per need basis. The Centre Inspector has not been contracted out to MPI to date.

As reported by the Centre Manager, the Centre accepted MPI complaint transfers. These have been completed and reported back to MPI as required.



9. Reality check

During the inspection facilities for cats and dogs were fit for purpose and with adequate separation where prevention of disease spread is necessary. There was no heating in the dog isolation area and in the auditor's opinion some form of heating should be used if sick dogs are kept there. Overall, the facilities were presented clean and tidy but presence of cobwebs in the cat receiving/sick bay has slightly distorted that picture. The Inspector's van was adequately equipped in gear for handling of animal welfare complaints and had a set printed documents (standards, policies, procedures, record templates etc.).

10. Conclusions

Hastings and District SPCA (the Centre) appears to be well run by a team of appropriately qualified and dedicated personnel. Although the Inspector and Auxiliary Officers are relatively new to their roles they were conversant with the relevant standards, requirements and responsibilities. The systems and procedures are well documented and records kept up to date. The Centre Committee demonstrates a "hands on" approach in setting the Centre's goals and directions and participating in drafting Centre's policies and procedures. The Centre has recently adopted the national SPCA electronic data register for animals and complaints (Shelterbuddy). The selection of candidates for Inspectors or AOs is appropriate and the Centre staff's and Committee's support for the new Inspector appeared to be adequate. The Inspector participates in ongoing training and the Centre Committee is supportive of their staff's professional development.

The Centre is conveniently located on the outskirts of Hastings, away from residential areas. Animal holding facilities were fit for purpose and properly maintained. The dog isolation area would benefit from having some form of heating. The provision of equipment for handling animal welfare complaints is satisfactory.

The auditor is making several recommendations in relation to procedures, records keeping and security of records:

- i) The Centre should keep records of its staff including volunteers acknowledging the updates of policies and procedures to ensure they comply with current versions.
- ii) The Centre should keep records of animal welfare complaints secure to ensure the confidentiality of information.
- iii) The receptionist/dispatcher receiving complaints should confirm receipt of the complaint verbally with the complainant to enable verification of facts reported.

Overall, the audit demonstrated that:

- RNZSPCA national procedures are effective in ensuring the requirements of the Animal Welfare Act 1999 (AWA) are being met by Hastings and District SPCA
- the systems and procedures implemented by Hastings and District SPCA are meeting the requirements outlined in the MOU between the RNZSPCA and the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI),
- the Hastings and District SPCA manage well the requirements of the AWA and MOU for the appointments, training and monitoring of Inspectors and AOs, and
- the corrective actions undertaken by the Centre in response to the previous MPI Systems Audit Team findings have been implemented, where applicable.

The following comments may also be included in recommendations to RNZSPCA in the final report:

The Centre AOs have not participated in any refresher training for AOs and there seem to be no plans for AO training in the current National Office schedule.

The auditor would like to thank the staff of Hastings and District SPCA for participating in this



audit.

s 9(2)(a)

Systems Auditor

MPI Systems Audit Team (SAT)

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Systems Audit Team

FINAL REPORT

Location Findings

Gisborne SPCA

Annual audit of RNZSPCA

National Office and Selected Regional Centres

April - May 2017



Audit Date (Last Day)

9 June 2017

Audit Number

4563

Location(s)

Gisborne SPCA t/a: Gisborne SPCA, 14 Nursery Rd., Gisborne

Auditor(s)

s 9(2)(a) , MPI Systems Audit Team (SAT), Systems Auditor

Auditee(s)

s 9(2)(a) , Gisborne SPCA, Centre Manager

s 9(2)(a) , Gisborne SPCA, Auxiliary Officer

s 9(2)(a) , Gisborne SPCA, Inspector

Other Personnel

s 9(2)(a) , RNZSPCA, Regional Manager

Audit Type

Location Findings

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Topics

Follow up from previous audits

There were several recommendations made to RNZSPCA (referred to as SPCA) during the previous SPCA audits in 2016 and 2015, and those applicable to regional Centres include:

Rec 2 (2015 audit)- Internal Audit: A specific internal audit programme has not yet been established. However, since the 2016 audit, SPCA National Office has launched a number of initiatives aimed at developing resources to assist Centres in a number of areas. One of them is a Centre Checklist, a useful support tool which can assist Centres in measuring their performance against wide set of animal welfare parameters, identifying areas of success and areas for development.

Gisborne SPCA (the Centre) has received the Centre Checklist and after having a quick look at the questions ^{s 9(2)(a)}, the Centre Manager identified no issues. ^{s 9(2)(a)} has not been aware of an e-mail from the National Office advising on findings and recommendations from the previous MPI audit but it is likely that the Centre Committee Chairman (^{s 9(2)(a)}) has received it.

>B>Rec 3 (2016) – Training and Mentoring of New Inspectors : It was recommended that MPI and the RNZSPCA monitor the training and support of new inspectors.

The Centre Inspector, ^{s 9(2)(a)}, was warranted as an Inspector in March 2017 and has been working in the Centre for 3 months. On the list of questions provided by the auditor ^{s 9(2)(a)} confirmed that during those 3 months ^{s 9(2)(a)} was adequately supported by the Centre. However, the auditor is not convinced that support was sufficient in regards to ^{s 9(2)(a)} practical knowledge and abilities to work as a solo Inspector. ^{s 9(2)(a)} was placed on the job straight away after completing ^{s 9(2)(a)} training programme with no opportunity to work alongside an experienced Inspector prior to that. Although the Unitec training programme for Inspectors consist of 20 hours of practical training that alone seems to be inadequate for an inexperienced person to take on the role of the Inspector.

The auditor accepts such a situation is undesirable and the Centre had to put up with the reality of a high demand and limited availability of applicants. The auditor feels that the National Office and Centre should have considered arranging for ^{s 9(2)(a)} some practical training with an experienced Inspector at a different Centre prior to placing ^{s 9(2)(a)} in ^{s 9(2)(a)} position. That gets even more important when taking into consideration that ^{s 9(2)(a)} works at the Centre only one day a week and has a limited exposure to the Centre's daily activities and handling animal welfare complaints.

Rec 5 (2016) – Review of the Complaints Process (Complaints against Inspectors and AOs): It was recommended that the review of the MoU and PTS documents include the procedures for managing complaints against Inspectors and Auxiliary Officers in a timely and appropriate manner, taking into consideration any potential employment issues.

There was a formal complaint against the Inspector made by ^{s 9(2)(a)} directly to the National Office. The National Office followed their own procedure by providing the Inspector with opportunity to explain the situation and sending down the Regional Manager in order to help the Centre deal with the issue. According to ^{s 9(2)(a)}, the Centre Manager, the complaint has been resolved to the satisfaction of the complainant and the Centre Inspector.

Rec 6 (2016) – Review of PTS (Animal Welfare Complaints) : It was recommended that a) The review of the PTS includes consideration of the risk ratings, b) The implementation of Shelterbuddy is included in the review, c) the implementation of the Shelterbuddy by monitored and reviewed.



Gisborne SPCA has not adopted the Shelterbuddy system yet and the staff continue using the electronic register, AWSOM. The Centre has a copy of the Dispatch Shelterbuddy Manual but the staff haven't used it yet. The grading of animal welfare complaints is done by the Inspector when ^{s 9(2)(a)} is available but for any other times it is done by AOs. Personal experience is the main determinant by which the grading of complaints is done.

1. General

Gisborne SPCA came out of administration by RNZSCAP 2 years ago.

The Centre employs 5 people on part-time employment contracts. Currently, there is one trained Inspector, 3 Auxiliary Officers (AO), and one administration person working at the Centre. In addition to paid staff there are approximately 50 volunteers, including foster carers affiliated with this Centre.

^{s 9(2)(a)} was appointed as an Inspector in March 2017 and this first appointment is valid for the period of 12 months. ^{s 9(2)(a)} works in the Centre for only 10 hours a week, on Saturdays. ^{s 9(2)(a)}, ^{s 9(2)(a)}, and ^{s 9(2)(a)} are trained Auxiliary Officers (AOs). As informed by ^{s 9(2)(a)} Regional Manager, RNZSPCA (the observer) the National Office had recognised there is a need for more Inspectors for this Centre, preferably someone from within the region who is familiar with local communities and their needs. Due to the lack of a full time Inspector and the large geographical area to be covered the Centre at times requests the Animal Control officer to inspect and gather details of a complaint. In particular complaints up the East Coast. ^{s 9(2)(a)} who is currently an AO but is now awaiting ^{s 9(2)(a)} warrant for an Inspector has at times visited sites of complaints and been able to take photos from outside the property. Once all details have been collected The Centre could then determine whether the complaint should be attended by an Inspector or transferred to MPI. If the complaint could be attended by an Animal Control Officer under the Dog Control Bylaw the Centre would contact the Gisborne District Council and request a 'Referral for Service' as per Council protocol.

Due to safety concerns complaints have to be attended by two persons, an Inspector and an AO or ambulance services attended by two AO's.

The shelter can house 10 dogs, and approximately 50 cats plus some birds and rabbits. Horses can be placed on pre-arranged, private farms in the area. When the Centre capacity is exceeded some cats and dogs (10) can be placed in several foster homes. The Centre is open to the public between 10.00am - 1pm, on Mon - Sat, and it is closed on Sundays. The neighbouring SPCA branches are Napier and Opotiki, and the Centre has recently worked together with the Napier Centre.

The Centre has regular contact with the National Office by e-mail or phone.

2. Policies and Procedures

The Centre has a suite of their own policies and procedures that have been around for a long time and these require updating. Some SPCA national policies such as Euthanasia Policy are used but there is no local component of that policy e.g. no Centre's composition of the euthanasia panel. Updates to the Centre procedures are made verbally to staff but there are no records/evidence the staff have acknowledged these.

Although the Centre Manger is aware of the need for updating the policies and procedure the auditor will reinforce that by making a recommendation to address these.

The Centre has copies of MoU, PTSs for Inspectors and AOs and amended Animal Welfare Act (AWA) available for use.

3. Staff, Induction and Training



The Centre would consider any person applying for the position of an Inspector or AO providing that person meets criteria that are in line to the criteria listed in respective PTSs. Preferably, these candidates would be drawn from the pool of the existing employees or volunteers that have been working in the Centre for some time and are known to the Centre staff. According to s 9(2)(a) the SPCA jobs are not well paid and it is hard to get quality people to the Centre and retain them. Volunteers are often elderly people or people with special needs and many of them are not suitable for the job of an Inspector or AO. For the latter group the Centre often has to redirect their own staff to ensure these people are safe while working at the Centre and welfare of animals they care for is maintained.

s 9(2)(a) was not known to the Centre staff prior but spent a month at the Centre during s 9(2)(a) training before applying for the job as an Inspector. s 9(2)(a) was a private student on the training programme through Unitec in 2016 and during the course s 9(2)(a) had had opportunity to provide feedback on the training programme.

s 9(2)(a) and s 9(2)(a) have been working as AOs for over a year. s 9(2)(a) has been working in the Centre as AO for several years.

The SPCA Regional Manager, s 9(2)(a) interviewed s 9(2)(a) an applicant for the Inspector training.

4. Appointments and Renewal Appointments of Inspectors and AOs

There is no formal monitoring of AOs' or Inspector's performance during the first 12 months of their appointments although a lots of informal monitoring takes place – all animal welfare complaints are signed off by s 9(2)(a) who can then assesses the Inspector's /AOs performance; the Centre Committee monitors s 9(2)(a) performance as the new Centre Manager/ AO; s 9(2)(a) is due for a performance review soon.

Copies of Instruments of Appointments (IoA) are printed and displayed on the office's wall and s 9(2)(a) as the Centre Manager is aware of the due dates for re-appointments. In addition, the National Office monitors the due dates and sends the Centre notification letters for more than 2 months before the expiry dates.

The Centre obtained and surrendered to the National Office the IoA of the previous Inspector that had resigned the last year.

s 9(2)(a) and s 9(2)(a) have attended equine refresher course in June and will be attending a Tactical Communication course in August, and Equine and Canine courses in October. s 9(2)(a) has attended a Centre Management course which included units for Auxiliary Officers.

The Centre Committee evaluates their Inspector and AOs during the annual performance reviews.

The Centre has a map of the district that dispatchers, or the Inspector can compare with a Google map when unsure if the location to be visited is within the Centre's district.

s 9(2)(a) monitors the Inspector's daily activities as much as possible however, due to limited contact with the Inspector (s 9(2)(a) works at the Centre on Saturdays only) their communication is not always effective. s 9(2)(a) is aware that communication requires improvement.

There have been no cases recently where the Gisborne SPCA Inspector or AOs failed to comply with their Terms of Appointment, PTS, MOU, and no cases of serious misconduct.

5. Complaints against Inspectors/Auxiliary Officers

The Centre has adopted the national SPCA procedure for dealing with complaints against Inspectors and AOs.



Since 2015 there have been two complaints, one about § 9(2)(a) the Centre Manager and one about § 9(2)(a) the Inspector. Both complaints were made to National SPCA. § 9(2)(a) complaint was referred back to local committee to deal with whilst § 9(2)(a) was dealt with by the National Office. SPCA Regional Manager assisted in handling the latter complaint and the case was resolved to the satisfaction of the complainant and the Inspector. The complaint was related to animal welfare and records and evidence related to that is kept in the Centre's office.

6. Animal Welfare Complaints

The Centre does not have any documented procedure for receiving animal welfare complaints however, the persons that receive those complains (mainly § 9(2)(a) and § 9(2)(a) know the drill well as they rehearsed that procedure many times. They also have a laminated note stuck on the office wall on WHO, WHAT, WHEN, WHERE, HOW, WHY, in relation to handling animal welfare complaints.

Animal welfare complaints that relate to animals being exported, animals in zoo and animals used in research, testing or teaching would be referred to the National Office and then further, on to MPI. To date the Centre hasn't received any complaints related to those categories.

Complaints are recorded in the register by the dispatcher/receptionist and then are transferred into the electronic AWSOM register, within 7 days. Due to the limited availability of the Inspector many of the complaints are dealt with by the AO. Similarly, the grading of complaints is done by the Inspector and AOs, whoever is available. The Inspector would review the complaints § 9(2)(a) to ensure correct grading has been applied and § 9(2)(a) would often participate in calibration talks with the other Centre's staff. At times when urgent calls need to be attended and the Inspector is absent and cannot be contacted the Centre staff would contact the Animal Control officer or the police.

There have been no animal welfare complaints transferred to Gisborne from other Centres in recent years.

Both § 9(2)(a) and § 9(2)(a) appeared conversant with their statutory powers as AOs and actions in regards to dealing with animal welfare complaints. § 9(2)(a) would contact the SPCA Regional Manager, § 9(2)(a) if unsure of § 9(2)(a) powers and decisions.

As reported by the Inspector in § 9(2)(a) answer sheet, the previous history of a complaint can be checked by the Centre staff in the AWSOM register.

For complaints where the Inspector or the Centre staff know or believe the case is being investigated by MPI they would contact the local MPI AW Investigator, whom the Centre maintains a good relationship with. The Centre also cooperates closely with the local veterinary clinic.

Printed copies of flow charts on Inspector's Decision Process that specify legal powers under AWA and Search & Surveillance Act are displayed on the wall. As advised, this resource is very helpful and often used by the Inspector as well as AOs.

The Inspector's answers to questions provided by the auditor prior to the audit demonstrate that § 9(2)(a) has a sufficient knowledge of welfare priorities as specified in PTS for Inspectors, par.203-212 and relevant requirements of the Animal Welfare Act. Similarly, during questioning § 9(2)(a), AO/ Inspector in training, was very conversant with those requirements. § 9(2)(a) also fosters some incoming animals to the Centre.

In cases where there had been a disagreement between the Inspector and the owner of an animal § 9(2)(a) would seek advice from local veterinarians and would discuss the situation with the Centre Manager. § 9(2)(a) has been trained on the use of the captive bolt gun and cervical dislocation and would performed euthanasia of some animals if § 9(2)(a) could, when there is a



need to mitigate pain and suffering.

According to § 9(2)(a) the access to equipment necessary for handling animal welfare complaints is quite lacking and would rate it as 4 on the scale from 1 to 6, where 1 indicates a very poor and 6 an excellent access.

Euthanasia

The Centre has a copy of the SPCA national euthanasia policy but does not have any local policy and no description on who is to be on the euthanasia panel. According to § 9(2)(a) two AOs plus a veterinarian are on the euthanasia panel. An Incoming Animal Register form is used for recording the names of three people of the euthanasia panel. However, a veterinary clinic's name rather than a name of veterinarian was showing on the completed form.

The auditor will be making a recommendation to improve the documented procedures and records.

Euthanasia is either performed by a contracted, retired veterinarian or local veterinary clinic.

Reasons for euthanasia for each animal are recorded routinely as either health or temperament. While this seems to be sufficient for animals that are euthanized after the mandatory period of 7 days the auditor recommends recording a more detailed reason explaining the urgency for animals that are put down within the mandatory 7 days holding period.

Euthanasia rates in relation to animals admitted to the Centre are relatively low and have remained at the same level, in low 20% range, for the last 4 years.

On Farm Inspections

Production animal welfare complaints are rare and the Centre would consult the SPCA Regional Manager, § 9(2)(a) to check if a case requires transfer to MPI. If confirmed, the Centre would follow the SPCA national procedure MPI-SPCA Complaint Transfer Process and would fill in the template transfer form. There has been no transfer of cases to MPI recently.

Search Warrants

The Centre staff are aware of the need to seek an advice from the National Office before applying for and executing a search warrant and there have been no search warrants applied for or executed in the last 2 years.

Prosecution Policy

The Centre would contact the National Office for advice on the prosecution but that decision would have to be approved by the Centre Committee, as they would be covering expenses of the process. The decision on issuing a written warning instead of prosecution would also be consulted with the National Office. There was one animal welfare complaint recommended for prosecution in 2016.

Records and Reporting

Records of animal welfare complaints are kept secure in the Centre Manager's office. According to § 9(2)(a) these records would be kept for min. 2 years, likely for 3-4 years, but the observing Regional Manager, § 9(2)(a) advised those records needed to be kept for 7 years, for legal reasons.

An animal register with information that relate to the number and types of animals sold,



re-homed, destroyed or otherwise disposed is generated off the AWSOM system monthly.

§ 9(2)(a) collates and provides the National Office with annual statistics of number of complaints received, number of cases investigated and referred to another agency, number of prosecutions and number of person changed with or proceeded against.

7. Media Policy

The Centre has its own media policy which in essence does not permit anyone from the Centre to make public statements without permission from the Centre Committee.

8. MPI/ SPCA Liaison

The Centre maintains a good relationship with local MPI AW Compliance Investigator and MPI Verification Services Regional Technical Manager.

9. Reality check

During the reality check the auditor visited following facilities: reception for cats and dogs, adoption areas for dogs and cats, isolation/quarantine units for dogs and puppies, isolation for cats, quarantine for cats and hospital for cats. The facilities were fit for purpose with adequate separation where prevention of disease spread is necessary. Some of the dog adoption facilities were not adequately protected from wind and would benefit from having some form of a wind breaker, especially in cold winters. There was no heating in the cats quarantine area but according to § 9(2)(a) a portable heater can be placed there if required. Cat cages were of a high standard and made of a durable stainless steel. It was impressive to see a separate hospital for cats in which a contracted veterinarian spays/neuters cats and performs other minor surgical procedures. Overall, the facilities were presented clean and tidy following the morning cleaning and sanitation by animal attendants.

As informed by § 9(2)(a) the Centre has approved plans for building an entire new Centre by the airport and if everything goes according to the plans the new Centre should be up and running within 2-3 years.

10. Conclusions

After the Centre's coming out of the administration by RNZSCA 2 years ago and the Centre Committee employing new key personnel the Centre appears to be delivering the expected outcomes. The new Centre's AOs and Inspector are appropriately qualified and despite of being relatively new to their roles they appeared conversant with relevant standards, requirements and responsibilities. The staff's limited availability due to their part-time employment contracts as well as the lack of the Inspector's familiarity with realities of rural communities will continue challenging the Centre in achieving their goals. The Centre is currently training one of its AOs in the role of an Inspector.

Documented policies and procedures require updating and some records require refining. The selection of candidates for Inspectors or AOs is appropriate but the number of applicants for the roles remains low. The newly trained Inspector commenced § 9(2)(a) the new job shortly after the completion of § 9(2)(a) training with no opportunity to learn from experienced Inspectors on how to apply the newly acquired skills.

The Centre is conveniently located on the outskirts of Gisborne, away from residential and noisy areas. Animal holding facilities are fit for purpose and properly maintained. The presence of the hospital for cats enables the delivery of a wider range of veterinary procedures at the Centre. Some of the dog facilities would benefit from having effective wind protection, though. The provision of equipment for handling animal welfare complaints is average as some equipment is lacking.



Overall, the audit demonstrates that:

- RNZSPCA national procedures are effective in ensuring the requirements of the Animal Welfare Act 1999 (AWA) are being met by Gisborne SPCA,
- the systems and procedures implemented by Gisborne SPCA are meeting the requirements outlined in the MOU between the RNZSPCA and the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI), although their documented procedures and policies require updating,
- the Gisborne SPCA manage the requirements of the AWA and MOU for the appointments, training and monitoring of Inspectors and AOs however, the post-warranting practical training for the Inspector was scarce; this was due unavailability of an experienced Inspector within the Centre,
- the corrective actions undertaken by the Centre in response to the previous MPI Systems Audit Team findings have been implemented, where applicable.

The auditor is making several recommendations in relation to provision of resources, documentation and records keeping:

- i) Due to a large geographical area and specificity of the region the Centre should increase the availability of its Inspector(s) to ensure there is adequate provision of trained staff to manage animal welfare complaints. Ideally, the Inspector(s) should be able to perform their duties in the whole district.
- ii) The Centre should review their documented policies and procedures to ensure they are current versions (esp. the euthanasia policy and euthanasia panel).
- iii) The Centre should keep records of its staff, including volunteers, acknowledging the updates of policies and procedures to ensure they comply with the current versions.
- iv) The euthanasia records should have a name of the veterinarian rather than a name of the veterinary clinic. The auditor recommends the Centre to state a detailed reason for euthanasia for animals that were destroyed within the mandatory 7 days holding period.

The auditor would like to thank the staff of Gisborne SPCA for their warm welcome and participation in this audit.

s 9(2)(a)

Systems Auditor

MPI Systems Audit Team (SAT)