



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

NAWAC 91/16

General Meeting

16 November 2016
09:30 am – 4:30 pm

The Terrace Conference Centre
Lambton Room 3
114 The Terrace
Wellington

MINUTES

Committee members: Gwyneth Verkerk (Chair), Julie Wagner, Ingrid Collins, Graeme Doole [by Skype], Penny Fisher [by Skype], Katie Milne, Karin Schutz, Grant Shackell, Alan Sharr, Iain Torrance

In attendance: 9(2)(a)

Apologies: Frances Russell. Katie Milne left due to other commitments at 2pm.

Welcome:

Any Other Business Part One (Public Excluded Agenda)

Any Other Business Part Two (Open to the Public)

PART ONE (PUBLIC EXCLUDED AGENDA)

DRAFT RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

(G Verkerk / I Collins):

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

C 1.	Confirmation of previous minutes	G Verkerk
C 2.	Status of actions arising from previous meetings	G Verkerk
C 3.	Work programme update	9(2)(a) / All
C 4.	Animal welfare regulations update	9(2)(a)
C 5.	Layer hens code interpretation	9(2)(a)
C 6.	Dog Control Act amendments	9(2)(a)
C 7.	Regulations Review Committee insights	9(2)(a) / G Verkerk
C 8.	Options to progress temporary housing	9(2)(a)
C 9.	Electronic collars	G Verkerk / 9(2)(a)
C 10.	Selective breeding paper: final draft	K Milne / 9(2)(a)
C 11.	Rodeo code interpretation	9(2)(a)
C 12.	Animal welfare issues register and discussion	G Verkerk / All
C 13.	MPI update and discussion of information circulated by MPI	9(2)(a)

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

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

General subject of each matter to be considered		Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
C 3.	Work programme update	To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the protection of Ministers, members of organisations, officers and employees from improper pressure or harassment.	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(g)(ii) of the OIA.
C 4.	Animal welfare regulations update	To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through the free and frank expression of opinions of organisations, officers and employees	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(g)(i) of the OIA.
C 5.	Layer hens code of welfare interpretation	As above.	As above.
C 6.	Dog Control Act amendments	As above.	As above.
C 7.	Regulations Review Committee results and impact on future codes	As above.	As above.
C 8.	Options to progress temporary housing	As above.	As above.
C 9.	Electronic collars	As above.	As above.
C 10.	Selective breeding paper: final draft	As above.	As above.
C 11.	Rodeo code interpretation	As above.	As above.
C 12.	Animal welfare issues register and discussion	As above.	As above.
C 13.	MPI update and discussion of information circulated by MPI	To protect the privacy of natural persons.	That the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 9(2)(a) of the Official Information Act 1982 (OIA).

I also move that:

9(2)(a)

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

C 1. Confirmation of previous minutes

Moved (A Sharr / J Wagner)

That the draft minutes of the general meeting held on 17 August 2016 (71/16) be adopted as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

The motion was put: carried.

C 2. Status of actions arising from previous meetings

The committee reviewed the list of actions (NAWAC 72/16). The following updates were provided:

- Action one, to explore a new animal welfare forum, is in progress.
- Action two, to finish the snares paper, is due for the February meeting.
- Action three, to follow up on spur use in calf riding, is to be discussed under the rodeo item.
- Action four, to circulate legal advice on the layer hen interpretation and share the SPCA's submission, is complete.
- Action five, to respond to the farrowing crate enquiry, is in progress.
- Action six, to finish and send the greyhound advice, is complete. It was agreed that J Jamieson should also send minutes of the Greyhound Racing New Zealand animal welfare board discussions to the committee. The decision of the NSW government to overturn the greyhound ban was noted. It was anticipated that NAWAC would continue regularly updating the Minister on welfare concerns or issues with the greyhound industry. It was also noted that there are two current Official Information Act requests on greyhound-related documents, and that a new campaign from animal advocacy groups was anticipated early in 2017.
- Action seven, to send studies on wounding rates in wildlife to Bryce Johnson, is complete.
- Action eight, to organise a workshop or public meeting on animal sentience, is pending.
- Action nine, to add muddy paddocks to the work programme, is complete.
- Action ten, to inform stakeholders of NAWAC's workplan at the ABWCC and Chief Executive's Animal Welfare Forum, is complete – though the CE's forum was cancelled due to the earthquake, ABWCC was informed and NAWAC will discuss its subcommittees and work plans later in the meeting.
- Action eleven, to share Safeguarding's survey results, is pending.
- Action twelve, to connect *Welfare Pulse* article volunteers with 9(2)(a) (MPI) is complete.

Guest speaker 9(2)(a) arrived. The committee moved to item O1.

C 3. Work programme update

The work programme update (NAWAC 89/16) was circulated prior to the meeting. For work programme items not already on the agenda, the following updates were provided:

- Dairy cattle amendment – this has completed legal and peer review; meetings have been held within MPI (to check with other teams that deal with the issue, for example in terms of water quality). The progress of this code will be somewhat dependent on the Regulations Review Committee discussion.

- Animals in the wild – Snares paper is due in February next year. Glueboards applications for 2017 are being received and a glueboards report for 2015 was circulated prior to the meeting (78/16).
- Shelter – to be led by 9(2)(a). Operational research is being commissioned, this has now been approved to go ahead.
- Entertainment – an opinion piece is under development and is due February. A new subcommittee is needed.

9(2)(b)

C 4. Animal welfare regulations update

9(2)(a) was welcomed to the meeting.

She explained that the Minister has agreed to progress the remaining 77 regulations by the end of 2017. However this is still not long to get regulations together, especially considering how many things have been happening in the meantime (e.g. bobby calf footage, live animal exports, rodeos, greyhounds, layer hens, compliance directorate restructure, earthquakes). The regulation development programme hasn't made the progress that was hoped. The programme is not at risk overall, but there is a possibility of it falling behind. It is possible that MPI will approach NAWAC for their thoughts on what the priority issues are in the next quarter so that the regulations can be done in parts.

In terms of live export regulation, it was noted that SAFE is pushing for mandatory voyage reports and they have said they have footage of live exports going wrong which will form part of an upcoming campaign. They would like to see the lifetime outcomes of the animals, not just a month-after voyage reports.

For bobby calf regulations, the early indications are that bobby calf mortality has dropped by more than 50%. There will be a report on the whole season which MPI considers completely over on 1 December. Have seen a change in the drivers' attitudes; many more calves left behind if they are not fit to transport. A lot more calves are being reared on farm as well. Suspect more calves have been euthanised on farm. The footage from last year has also driven change to pet food operators.

9(2)(a) team is writing an end of season report that will list mortality rates, number of calves, impact of interventions, number of post-mortems, number dead/condemned on arrival and dead/condemned in yards, and the result of post-mortems. Massey University is doing a study looking at this as well (which just finished its first year).

There was some discussion on recent calf footage from SAFE, which was mostly around loading. New regulations on calf loading are due to come into force in 2017. Also noted increase in animal welfare inspectors – MPI is due to have 22 inspectors in mid-2017.

NAWAC then moved to item C7.

C 5. Layer hens code interpretation

A paper had been circulated prior to the meeting (79/16) and was taken as read. There were three areas that NAWAC needed to discuss: the pullet rearing environment, range management in free range systems, and the management of litter in barn systems.

Provision of enrichment for pullets: the legal advice that MPI gathered is that the code should be interpreted at the 'current time', so enrichment should be provided. This was not NAWAC's original interpretation when the code was developed.

It was suggested that NAWAC could stick with the original interpretation and note the problem for the next code review, while focusing on education and voluntary change; but this would ignore the current welfare concerns with unenriched cages for pullets.

It was agreed that the subcommittee would approach the industry groups and verbally share the legal interpretation with them, while asking what they can do to meet this and what NAWAC can do to help the industry provide enrichment for their pullets by 2022. Also flag with them that an enriched pullet rearing environment will unambiguously be included in the next reviewed version of the code.

Range management in free range systems: The subcommittee recommended that the stocking density of 2500 hens per hectare as stated in the minimum standard in the code should be interpreted as the stocking density over the lifetime of the bird, not at any one point in time, to allow for adequate range management.

Concerns were raised over NAWAC's independence and at relying on the industry to self-regulate (e.g. through relying on good stockmanship). All the advice from MPI is that the egg producers need to stock hens at 2,500 per hectare. Discussion continued with concerns that that well-managed farms using range management will be caught up and forced to change; farms stocking at 2,500 birds per hectare, with no structured resting of range for range management purposes may have poor range as a result, and therefore poorer hen welfare.

It was explained that auditors and MPI inspectors use 'land available to them at the time' when auditing farms. Producers don't tend to interpret it that way, which leaves range managed farms open to risk when audited until such time as the code is reviewed.

NAWAC agreed to stick to the interpretation that the code states that stocking density should be 2,500 birds per hectare available to them at any one time.

Management of litter in barn systems: Noted SPCA submission on this issue which had been circulated. They suggest that the Minimum Standard states that litter should be provided in the barn since a number of birds will not go into the winter garden/range area.

The subcommittee sought an agreement that where a winter garden is present, litter does not need to be provided in the barn. If no winter garden is present, producers should provide litter in the barn itself.

There was discussion over ventilation systems and evidence of whether hens access winter gardens/the outdoors.

It was agreed that litter can be provided in the winter garden alone. This is in agreement with MPI and leaves the code as it is.

Essentially, NAWAC agrees with the legal opinion on all three issues. The difficulty with the available science (which has advanced since drafting the code) was acknowledged. NAWAC will continue to encourage best practice (good ventilation etc.) irrespective of these decisions.

It was noted that private auditing schemes like Blue Tick can always continue to set their own standards which are higher than the code of welfare.

Action: G Verkerk / the layer hens subcommittee to discuss these decisions with industry groups and SPCA.

C 6. Dog Control Act amendments

A memo had been circulated prior to the meeting (80/16). In summary, the Department of Internal Affairs has proposed a series of amendments to the Dog Control Act. The most contentious is a proposed ban on rehoming dogs classified as menacing or dangerous, which is currently assessed visually. This may lead to unnecessary euthanasia and have direct (e.g. time spent in council pounds) and indirect (e.g. poorer Government relationship with SPCA) impacts on animal welfare.

Actions were sought from NAWAC on how to respond. Submissions will be called for from the Select Committee that will consider the regulatory proposals.

NAWAC agreed to make a submission at the point when submissions are asked for

Writing to the Minister for Primary Industries was also considered. It was noted that this issue is being dealt with quite reactively by Ministers.

There were concerns raised that SPCA, NZVA, HUHA and other groups are going public. There are now 60,000 signatures on a petition against the proposal. Since NAWAC wants to have some role outside of advising the Minister, what about a public statement?

It was agreed to make some kind of statement on the dog issue, focusing on science, evidence-based decision making and animal welfare. NAWAC stands with the SPCA and NZVA, in that they consider that this is a flawed piece of legislation. NAWAC will need to advise the Minister on this separately.

Action: 9(2)(a) and G Verkerk to draft a statement and advise the Minister of NAWAC's plans.

C 7. Regulations Review Committee insights

Paper 81/16 had been circulated prior to the meeting and was taken as read. It covered the background of the Regulations Review Committee's recommendations after a complaint was received about the layer hen code of welfare from SAFE. The Regulations Review Committee did not recommend changes to the code or report, but did put forward some considerations about how codes and reports can be improved in the future.

The first suggestion of the Committee was that reports and explanatory materials to codes should always use language consistent with the Animal Welfare Act. The committee also asked that reports should not indicate that Minimum Standards were reached through 'trade-offs'. Finally, NAWAC reports should clearly articulate how a particular decision meets the requirements of the Animal Welfare Act.

The Regulations Review Committee's role and oversight was explained. They do have the power to recommend that Parliament disallow regulations. In this case they haven't, and no amendments were suggested; instead they have put forward considerations focused on code reports, especially on the explanation of decisions.

The implications are largely on the reports when trade-offs and essential behaviours are considered. If NAWAC had been clearer, the Regulations Review Committee considered that their decision would have been easier and faster.

NAWAC discussed and agreed that it was important to explain and make stakeholders aware that behaviour-wise NAWAC does have to consider essential vs non-essential behaviour. NAWAC guidelines also describe how to consider trade-offs in welfare, and this guideline should be reflected and referenced in code reports. There was concern that consideration of behaviour in the future will be questioned again if this is not adequately explained; display of some behaviour over others is being considered, for example, in dairy housing.

NAWAC can continue to consider trade-offs but this leaves NAWAC open to judicial review if it cannot adequately explain why. Reports and explanations should always be linked back to concepts in the Act.

Ultimately, NAWAC's decision making was not so much questioned, but its explanations are. Perhaps longer and more detailed reports are required, within the realms of common sense.

It was suggested that the next document/code report should be examined and the proposals from the Regulations Review Committee should be applied. Old code reports will not be reviewed.

Moved (J Wagner / A Sharr)

That NAWAC will not review previous codes and reports to apply the considerations of the Regulations Review Committee decision. Documents from now on will be revised as necessary to comply with the decision.

The motion was put: carried.

NAWAC guidelines were then discussed.

Moved (I Torrance / I Collins)

That NAWAC will review its guidelines for drafting codes of welfare, and NAWAC internal guidelines, for alignment against the Regulations Review Committee. This will be completed by the codes review subcommittee.

The motion was put: carried.

NAWAC moved on to discuss item C8.

C 8. Options to progress temporary housing

A memo on temporary housing was circulated prior to the meeting (88/16).

This code of welfare has already been recommended to the Minister. MPI will therefore look to identify whether changes to the code and code report need to be changed in light of the Regulations Review Committee considerations. MPI is proposing to draw up a checklist of what needs to be considered and then review the code/report, which will be shared with NAWAC. Depending on scale of changes, NAWAC could either withdraw the code or let the code remain with Minister. Minister can still choose to refer it back to NAWAC if he considers that changes need to be made.

9(2)(a) and a policy staff member have already reviewed it and were going to talk to the legal team as well before this meeting; however the meeting was cancelled due to the closure of Pastoral House after the earthquake. MPI will present the completed opinion as a package to NAWAC. From what has been discussed so far, there were a couple of places the wording could be improved but no major amendments needed.

NAWAC discussed whether to withdraw the code from the Minister's office now. It was agreed that the review of the code should go to the NAWAC subcommittee. I Torrance (subcommittee chair) was reluctant to withdraw a code that has already taken so long without knowing how big the changes are. It is possible to explain to the Minister that this code is not likely to be contentious, has already been in development for 6 years, and there is no real need to make changes (if only minor updates are suggested). The timing around dangerous dog legislation and the spotlight that will soon be thrown on council pounds was also noted; to release the code may help with this too. NAWAC is also planning to review all codes anyway as part of another work programme.

Moved (I Torrance / J Wagner)

That MPI will send its report and recommendations as soon as possible; the subcommittee will assess risk and make the decision on whether to withdraw the code; and they will report back to NAWAC.

The motion was put: carried.

NAWAC then discussed item C3.

C 9. Electronic collars

A memo on anti-barking collars had been circulated prior to the meeting (82/16). This had been raised in response to some media interest in pet shop chains stocking electronic collars.

There was discussion on whether this should be an issue addressed by the codes review subcommittee, or whether NAWAC should respond publically.

It was agreed to respond publically with information already in the codes about monitoring their use. The proposed regulation on pinch and prong collars was noted, which got a lot of feedback from people also commenting on e-collars.

NAWAC also agreed that the issue should be kept in mind when regulations and codes reviews are worked on.

C 10. Selective breeding paper: final draft

A memo and draft had been circulated prior to the meeting and was taken as read (83/16).

NAWAC was asked whether they were happy to publish this draft. If so, it was suggested NAWAC should decide to finalise the name, what other documents it should be published with (e.g. the peer review?) and where and how it should be published. This is likely to be the first in a series of similarly structured papers.

NAWAC agreed that they were happy with the changes made in response to peer review but it was requested that a version of the peer review with comments on what was changed should be circulated.

It was agreed not to publish the peer review, that the papers should be called Opinions, that they should be designed into a published PDF with a cover (via MPI publications, e.g. similar to NAEAC occasional papers) and that the document should be sent to the Minister for his information with a cover letter reminding him that NAWAC wishes to publish the document online.

Moved (G Verkerk / I Collins)

That the final draft of the selective breeding opinion paper will be designed for publication, sent to the Minister, and then published on NAWAC's website.

The motion was put: carried.

C 11. Rodeo code interpretation

A memo on rodeo had been circulated prior to the meeting (84/16).

In summary, 9(2)(a) has contacted NAWAC quite regularly about rodeo. She considers that rodeo groups are interpreting aspects of the code incorrectly. There are several areas to discuss: the requirement for veterinarians; the rope and tie event; and spur use in calves.

Veterinarians and animal welfare officers: There was discussion over the practicality of requiring animal welfare officers and/or veterinarians at training as well as at public events. The difference between animal welfare officers and animal welfare inspectors was noted – officers can be industry-appointed people, not necessarily SPCA or MPI staff members.

It was agreed to talk to and negotiate with the rodeo association. The higher scrutiny of rodeo training and schools is not required in the code, but NAWAC will still recommend they have animal welfare officers there, both for animal welfare and for the industry's own protection in upholding animal welfare standards.

Rope and tie event: The code states that the event must not exceed 30 seconds from the release of the calf from the chute. Practically, and in the rulebook; the tie lasts 30 seconds; the calf is then on the ground for 6 seconds being tied up. Is that a breach of the code?

Discussion was had over whether the cowboys can cut the event to 30 seconds in total, including the tie portion. They had already voluntarily reduced the event from 60 to 30 seconds.

It was agreed to work with the rodeo association to get more information on the rope and tie event. NAWAC was not ready to rush into amending the standard at this point.

Concern about the rope and tie event in general was noted. The rodeo NAWAC subcommittee had originally recommended that it should be banned.

Spur use in calves: The use of spurs during the calf riding event was not covered in the code because it was not known that it was common. However the rodeo association does acknowledge calf riding with spurs happens (they have no statistics available, however)

NAWAC agreed to raise the issue with them while talking with the rodeo association about the other two issues. Would prefer them to discourage the use of spurs when riding calves.

It was also agreed that NAWAC should have the rodeo association to a quarterly meeting, as the issue of rodeo had been raised regularly since the codes' release.

Action: invite members of the rodeo association to talk to NAWAC in February / May

C 12. Animal welfare issues register and discussion

The issues register had been circulated under NAWAC 85/16.

- **National Cat Management Strategy** – The draft strategy was discussed. At the most recent National Cat Management Group meeting, the group had decided that new national legislation was unlikely and had agreed to 'operationalise' the strategy themselves. The group had appreciated NAWAC's submission and wanted to talk to NAWAC about how they could help to improve cat welfare and responsible ownership. NAWAC agreed to have members of the group talk to NAWAC in 2017, likely in February or May. NAWAC had also been invited to join the Cat Management Group, but since the group was also focused on conservation which was outside NAWAC's scope this was declined (NAWAC would perhaps consider sending a member to join more welfare-focused subgroups, if they are created in the future).

Action: 9(2)(a) to liaise with the National Cat Management Group and invite them to present their work programme at a 2017 meeting.

- **Rabbit farming** – NAWAC were disappointed in the quality of a rabbit care article published in Lifestyle Farming Magazine. However, a new guidance document is being drafted by an industry group – this could be out in mid-2017.

C 13. MPI update and discussion of information circulated by MPI

There were no comments on the MPI update.

The NAWAC annual report was discussed. G Verkerk and J Wagner will draft the 2016 report.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

PART TWO (OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)

O 1. PIANZ and Cobb: Broiler breeding (10am)

9(2)(a), representing the Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand (PIANZ) and the Egg Producers Federation (EPF), arrived at 10am. The industry representatives were not able to attend due to the earthquake.

9(2)(a) briefly introduced the structure of both industries and explained that he had three items to discuss: the major one being selective breeding, but also the Regulations Review Committee's recent decision and the interpretation of the layer hen code of welfare.

In terms of the Regulations Review Committee consideration of the layer hen code, it was explained that the challenge to the code was of major concern to the Egg Producers Federation. Cage farmers already have to report on their progress to transition each year and are under major pressure, so the challenge to the transition was a source of stress, especially as the length of time for a decision was long.

In the end the EPF welcomed the final decision, in that it gives certainty, but were concerned at some of the comments from the committee. EPF agreed totally with NAWAC's approach to considering the code and that their consideration was not an unusual or unexpected use of NAWAC's powers. SAFE's argument would have banned all forms of commercial egg farming. EPF also believed NAWAC had fulfilled its consultation obligations. 9(2)(a) noted that EPF was concerned enough about the process that it commissioned and provided a legal opinion to the Regulations Review Committee. G Verkerk thanked s 9(2)(a) for his view and noted that the decision will be discussed by NAWAC later in the meeting. There was some discussion on the media interpretation of demand for free-range eggs and the difficulty of farmers in dealing with the Resource Management Act.

9(2)(a) asked about the layer hen code interpretation decision; EPF would like a resolution as soon as possible. G Verkerk explained that there was no resolution date yet but NAWAC appreciated the EPF's concerns and the matter was being discussed later in the meeting.

Finally, the selective breeding work was discussed. It was first explained New Zealand has little control over the genetic decisions for poultry. For example, for the billions of meat chickens in the world, they are all Ross or Cobb birds. It was noted though that Cobb is considering using New Zealand as a base to supply chicks to Asia (potentially millions of birds).

There is a comment in the paper that the poultry codes of welfare contain no references to breeding. That was considered by the industry to be a NAWAC decision. There is a draft code for broiler breeders that is on MPI's files but was never developed further.

It was noted that NAWAC continues to have a view on survivability and feed restriction in broilers and behavioural issues in layers, even after previous submissions. It was explained that in layers there has been a lot of focus in genetics on reducing aggressiveness. A lot of this comes down to production systems; e.g. feather pecking is a bigger issue in free range and barn systems. Feedback from layer companies is that 'we are doing as much as we can'; infra-red beak tipping has been a bonus in terms of that as well. Beak tipping is done at a day old in layers. Feather pecking in New Zealand is not a huge issue relative to other countries.

In terms of survivability, leg health continues to get better. Genetic companies would say - look at all the welfare indicators over the last few decades. They have been getting better. They consider that this is addressing all of the survivability issues that NAWAC has raised. The standard all companies work to is

called EFABAR. Changes in diet also makes a difference. The industries consider that diet changes are addressing the problem of feed restriction, hunger and survivability in broiler breeders.

It was explained that there is a feedback mechanism in that EPF and PIANZ can give feedback to groups like Cobb and Aviagen; they do have staff members in Asia-Pacific and New Zealand.

Questions were welcomed.

Are there any moves to have slower growing birds in New Zealand, which had gained some popularity in the USA? It was explained that New Zealand could seek those genetics, if the market was there; but at the moment the market for slower-growing broilers was small and niche.

The effort of the industry to meet the codes of welfare was explained, and that chickens and pig farming are at the bottom of the complaints in terms of animal welfare. There is oversight in terms of Risk Management Programmes being checked by MPI, though it was also noted that some of the lack of complaints comes from the privacy of the barns.

There is also a cultural difference in demand for certain birds and systems. The huge influence of Avian Influenza in some countries has impacted the free range market; since cages are seen as sterile, cage eggs are actually a selling point in some countries e.g. Singapore.

What can NAWAC do to help progress genetic change to improve welfare? It was explained that EPF and PIANZ can always pass on NAWAC's concerns, and the international companies have been aware of the progress of NAWAC's draft opinion so far. The response has been, in essence, that they are working on it already. They feel aggrieved at the view that there is not a commitment to welfare traits. They think they've been doing this for 20 years already. New Zealand does punch above our weight in terms of our influence – important place in terms of disease free status and regulatory oversight.

Are the improvements in the Canadian paper (circulated prior to the meeting) represented in New Zealand, especially since New Zealand birds grow faster due to our disease-free status? It was explained that the New Zealand reports on broiler leg health were very good, and further reductions in foot pad dermatitis and increases in leg health have been seen since.

Any other welfare indicators recorded? It is mainly foot pads, leg health, and unexplained mortalities.

Do the companies share the results of the genetic changes/measurements and the weighting they give to welfare traits? It was doubted that they share commercial information, but in terms of scientific papers, they might share general measurements etc.

What kind of effect does the new feed have on hunger in feed-restricted birds? With no industry representatives, 9(2)(a) agreed to send information on this later.

What were the economic costs associated with transition?

Action: 9(2)(a) to circulate layer hen transition documents and layer hen lameness review for NAWAC's information.

9(2)(a) arrived for the regulations update item, so NAWAC moved on to item C4.

O 2. 2017 meeting dates

Meeting dates for 2017 were agreed:

- 22 February

- 17 May
- 16 August + 17 August. 17th will be a public meeting hosted by NAWAC and NAEAC on animal sentience and its impact on animal welfare legislation.
- 15 November. Also pencil in half a day on the 14th for a planning day, if it becomes necessary.

Action: 9(2)(a) to send e-invites

Action: All members to bring ideas and thoughts for the sentience workshop to the February meeting

O 3. NAWAC OIAs and transparency

There have been a number of Official Information Act requests. The secretariat is spending a lot of time on this. G Verkerk asked whether NAWAC members could have a think about this issue to discuss in February. This could also help with raising NAWACs profile as the independent voice for animal welfare.

Action: All members to bring ideas for NAWAC transparency to the February meeting

Please also consider how information should be split between NAWAC information and MPI information and who needs to decide what is released when requests come in.

O 4. NAWAC workplan and subcommittees

All work programmes and current subcommittees were written up and new members assigned to subcommittees where necessary.

Action: 9(2)(a) to update and circulate the NAWAC subcommittee list.

There was discussion around the new work item 'condition and fitness of the animal welfare system'. It was considered that this needs to be done to inform NAWAC's decisions going forward, however the work programme is already full and it is not considered the top priority. I Torrance agreed to liaise with 9(2)(a) on the animal welfare operating model in development and once this was done, the work programme may be picked up by NAWAC.

NAWAC requested the operational model for the next meeting (February).

Action: I Torrance / 9(2)(a) to follow up with 9(2)(a) on having the animal welfare operating model completed or at least a presentation on this for the NAWAC February meeting.

O 5. Welfare Pulse article request

Two articles were suggested:

- Agreed that the article on dog collars should be published through Welfare Pulse
- NAWAC's work programme and a reminder that NAWAC and NAEAC are independent

O 6. NAWAC correspondence

Recent correspondence was noted, including correspondence from 9(2)(a) on rodeos and one letter from the Advocateship of Purebred Dog Breeders on the Dog Control Act.

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

G Shackell – visited a crocodile farm in eastern Malaysia. Poor conditions; most animals had injuries, kept on bare wire/concrete. Also visited a zoo near Bangkok which was better, the animals had enrichment provided.

J Wagner – Attended parasitology conference.

K Schutz – went to regional International Society of Applied Ethology meeting, which 9(2)(a) and 9(2)(a) also attended. Many interesting abstract presentations including calf transport, live export, muddy paddocks and farrowing crate.

I Torrance – visited a civet coffee plantation in Bali. The animals were kept in cages at least some of the time. Tourist operations are still pushing elephant rides, breakfast with orangutans, etc.

G Verkerk – has been involved with a DairyNZ group called 'leap 21', who are trying to develop the systems that will be fully accepted in 2021. For example, removing bobby calves from the system by using sexed semen to get replacements and then using beef sires over the remaining herd. Also looking at shade and shelter issues. The group is all about maintaining dairy's social license to operate.