



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

NAWAC 71/16

General Meeting

17 August 2016
09:30 am – 4:30 pm

Meeting Room 3.2
Pastoral House
25 The Terrace
Wellington

MINUTES

Committee members: John Hellström (Chair), Julie Wagner, Sue Brown, Ingrid Collins, Graeme Doole, Penny Fisher, Katie Milne, Karin Schutz, Grant Shackell, Alan Sharr, Iain Torrance

In attendance: s 9(2)(a) s 9(2)(a)

Apologies:

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

(J Hellström / Ingrid 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 | J Hellström |
| C 2. | Status of actions arising from previous meetings | J Hellström |
| C 3. | Work programme update | § 9(2) / All |
| C 4. | Animal welfare regulations update | § 9(2) |
| C 5. | Layer hens code of welfare interpretation | J Hellström / § 9(2) |
| C 6. | Greyhounds advice to the Minister | J Hellström / § 9(2)(a) |
| C 7. | Animal welfare issues register and discussion | J Hellström / All |
| C 8. | MPI update and discussion of information circulated by MPI | § 9(2) |

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

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

General subject of each matter to be considered		Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48(1) for the passing of this resolution
C 5.	Layer hens code of welfare interpretation	As above.	As above.
C 6.	Greyhounds advice to the Minister	As above.	As above.
C 7.	Animal welfare issues register and discussion	As above.	As above.
C 8.	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:

s 9(2)(a)

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

C 1. Confirmation of previous minutes

Moved (A Sharr / G Shackell)

That the draft minutes of the general meetings held on 18 May 2016 be adopted as a true and accurate record of those meetings, with the following amendments:

- *Remove error in section O2 (stray letter t)*
- *Correct spelling of Colorado in item O6*
- *Clarify the sentence about cultural practices in the item about snare use*

The motion was put: carried.

C 2. Status of actions arising from previous meetings

The committee reviewed the list of actions (NAWAC 58/16). The following updates were provided:

- Action one, to explore the idea of a new animal welfare forum, is still being debated. ANZCCART is also considering its options in terms of setting up a concordat. Pass the action from J Hellström to s 9(2)(a)

- Actions two and three, to add the code review work to the work programme update and to finalise NAWAC's submission on regulations, are complete.
- Action six, to finish the paper on snares, has been delayed and is now due at the 2017 February meeting.
- Action seven, to meet with GRNZ, is complete and will be discussed.
- Action eight, to follow up on spur use in calves, is complete. s 9(2)(a) asked secretary of the rodeo cowboys association. The issue is not addressed in the code. The rodeo rulebook allows children to use spurs when riding calves, and anecdotal evidence is that people use them.

The Primary Production Select Committee's consideration of the rodeo petition was noted. They contacted MPI last Friday to ask for someone from MPI and NAWAC to attend the hearing on the morning of 15 September. J Hellström will attend. The SPCA's official stance is to ban rodeo outright, but a compromise may be to prohibit calf roping, if the option comes up. It was noted that NAWAC was divided on this issue of calf roping at the time the code was drafted. The recommendation from the rodeo subcommittee was not to allow calf roping.

The spurs issue will be put aside until the Select Committee process is complete.

- Action nine, to summarise the workplan for the Chief Executive's forum, is complete but the forum has not been held.
- Actions ten and eleven, to remove the 2015 work programme from the website and to circulate the Welfare Pulse link to the committee, are complete.

C 3. Work programme update

The work programme update (NAWAC 59/16) was circulated prior to the meeting. For work programme items not already on the agenda, the following updates were provided:

- Codes review – s 9(2)(a) described some changes to the way regulations will be inserted into the codes of welfare. It is now thought that regulations would be best placed in an appendix.
- Dairy cattle – The dairy cattle housing amendment is back from the peer reviewer, and s 9(2)(a) is aiming for recommendation by the end of August or first week of September. The reviewer tidied up some wording and suggested additional points, for example considering cow cleanliness, but no major rewrites are required. Noted that the amendment covers calf housing. The amendment is consistent with the regulations.
- Animals in the wild – A memo had been circulated (NAWAC 61/16).
- Selective breeding – A summary of submissions has been created and the document amended after two subcommittee meetings. A peer reviewer has been identified, Joanne Conington from the University of Edinburgh who is also a member of the Farm Animal Welfare Committee. Expect a final draft ready for the November meeting, and PIANZ has also been invited to the November meeting to talk about broiler breeder genetics.
- Temporary housing – s 9(2)(a) has been leading some final small wording changes from Legal, but no major changes anticipated. SPCA query was noted – they are concerned that practice has moved on since the last time they saw the draft and think that they will want to make changes. It has been suggested that the work goes ahead. The SPCA will receive a copy at the point of recommendation, as a member of the drafting group. Depending of their changes, the Minister can make 'any such changes as he sees necessary', or if it's major it can be referred back to NAWAC. I Torrance noted that on a recent visit to a cattery the owners were waiting for the code to come out and considered it necessary to raise industry standards.
- Shelter – Noted that s 9(2)(a) has taken up the workstream.

- Entertainment – Opinion piece will be ready for NAWAC's February meeting next year. Operational research proposal on pig hunting has been accepted.

C 4. Animal welfare regulations update

It was noted that s 9(2)(a) is at Minister's office discussing the regulatory timeline – she will arrive later.

[The committee moved to item C5 and came back to this item after the greyhound discussion, item C6.]

s 9(2)(a) was welcomed and summarised the work done so far. MPI has delivered seven bobby calf regulations, four of which came into effect on 1 August and the other three to come into effect during 2017. Regulations for live animal export have also been delivered so that there is no gap in coverage on CEPO prohibition of livestock for slaughter.

There are another 77 regulatory proposals remaining. MPI has suggested a work programme that will progress the rest of the regulations at once, aiming for them to be in place at the end of 2017.

The Minister would like to think about it, and is considering cutting off a small chunk of proposals to do first and then consider the rest later. However the overhead for each regulation (in terms of work from the Parliamentary Council Office or drafting Cabinet proposals) is huge.

There is also the issue that all of these problems are interconnected, which means it is easier to progress all of them at once. For example, if you progress transport regulations first, but not pain relief, you might encourage people to dehorn without pain relief.

Hurrying regulations can also have unintended outcomes. K Milne raised one issue around the transport of 1-day old beef calves for fostering (which seems to have been unintentionally prohibited).

Notwithstanding the issue about pain relief, transport regulations are the most likely candidate for working on first, especially since the *Safeguarding* work programme has prepared the industry.

s 9(2)(a) invited NAWAC's view on the regulatory work programme.

It was noted that the success of the calf regulations may be contributing to the view that it can be done; However, SAFE's campaign contributed to industry willingness to work together quickly. The other regulatory proposals don't have this impetus.

Moved (A Sharr / K Milne)

NAWAC to advise the Minister:

- *Welfare gains are not worth the rush and potential for mistakes*
- *Although the calf regulations worked well, the critical mass of support was unique*

The motion was put: carried.

C 5. Layer hens code of welfare interpretation

s 9(2)(a) summarised the memorandum that had been circulated (NAWAC 62/16).

s 9(2)(h)

s 9(2)(h)

Action: s 9(2) to circulate legal advice on the layer hen interpretation and the SPCA's submission for NAWAC to consider in full before the next meeting.

Initial views were discussed. It is true that there is much clearer information now than six years ago about pullet rearing. Although it is convenient to rear in sterile cages it's not best for the birds. The industry may have to face up to this one.

In terms of stocking density, NAWAC does need to reconsider this. The observation was made that welfare is much less to do with animals per square metre than the overall conditions; emphasis of the code is on quality range.

In terms of getting back to the poultry industry, NAWAC will have to say that it does not have a final position yet. The subcommittee should keep working on it, but it will have to be something to discuss as a full committee next meeting.

The regulations review committee is also reviewing the code, to be discussed later in the meeting.

Farrowing crates correspondence

J Hellström added an agenda item for a piece of correspondence received from a member of the public about farrowing crates. They disagree with NAWAC's farrowing crate advice and have presented a well-researched challenge to NAWAC's position.

Action: Draft a response from the NAWAC farrowing crate subcommittee.

Subcommittee will need to bring it back to November meeting or have NAWAC as a whole view the advice. There may be a regulatory review of the farrowing crate advice as well, so NAWAC will need to be thorough.

C 6. Greyhound advice to the Minister

s 9(2)(a) summarised the memorandum (NAWAC 63/16) on the recent work on greyhound welfare. A draft letter and report which will constitute NAWAC's advice had been circulated and was taken as read.

s 9(2)(a) and J Hellström went to meet with GRNZ in June. They were satisfied by this meeting that the information given in the second report by NZRB on the industry progress to address

recommendations from the WHK independent review of GRNZ was reliable. They were also able to learn of more recent developments since the report had been written, and to discuss specifics such as euthanasia numbers in more detail. They have now seen the system that GRNZ uses to track the animals, but the fact remains that they will not make euthanasia figures public.

From the data given, it seems that there are somewhere between s 9(2)(ba)(i)

It was agreed to amend the draft advice to make it clearer that although the system appears to be robust, NAWAC is still unable to confirm how many animals are being euthanised, and at what stage of their life / for what reasons.

It was suggested to remove the word 'thorough' from the sentence "On review, NAWAC is satisfied that NZGRA has put in place thorough systems and processes in order to reach this conclusion". It was also agreed to change the suggestion to revisit the industry from every two years to every year, especially since recent staff changes and recent news from Australia may mean a lot of change over the next year.

NAWAC also noted some concerns about GRNZ backing off their focus on welfare issues; their welfare officer previously had animal welfare as his only job, but now that has other duties, and his powers to attend all races and do certain things has been reduced.

The deregistration form which had been circulated (NAWAC 64/16) was then discussed and it was noted that in the question 'has the dog been humanely euthanised', humane euthanasia was not defined. s 9(2)(a) confirmed that they mean 'euthanised by a vet' and that the deregistration form will be updated to reflect this. In 2014 NZGRA introduced a new rule (132) requiring all dogs euthanased to be notified with the reasons why to NZGRA; using the deregistration form. The notice must be done on the official form and be signed by the veterinarian. Euthanasia without a supporting veterinarian certificate (for example, urgent response by the trainer) are followed up if repeated. There is the option of exhuming, and performing a necropsy on, any dogs where this is questioned. NZGRA report this has only happened once within the last three years. In an emergency situation, shooting will be recommended as the preferred method.

J Wagner noted that from her time as a vet she worked with racing dogs, but never euthanised one. It was suggested that NAWAC approach NZVA and ask whether vets are actually being approached to sign certificates. If there has been a big change then that would be good to know but if not, then perhaps they have all the forms but aren't using them.

s 9(2)(a) questioned whether an MPI or NAWAC representative should attend the GRNZ welfare group chaired by Jim Edwards. It was agreed that NAWAC secretariat should have a seat at the table, representing NAWAC rather than MPI. The next meeting is on the 13th October.

The issue of thoroughbred & harness racing was raised. s 9(2)(a) noted that at the most recent GRNZ welfare committee meeting, they discussed publishing the euthanasia statistics but did note that this would impact other racing industries as they don't have the same capacity for data collection. NAWAC's previous advice is that the horse racing industry requires more scrutiny as well, so if this sets a precedence then that would be welcomed.

Four recommendations were agreed:

- Note that whilst database systems appear robust, NAWAC has concerns over how data is being reported and so how useful this reporting is. Advise that GRNZ should be publishing their data by cohort so it is easier to follow.
- Remove the word 'thoroughly' from the letter.
- A member of NAWAC's secretariat should attend their welfare committee meetings, and NAWAC should report back to the Minister in 1 year.
- Note that how greyhounds are raised, kept and used has an impact on their future. Flag the importance of looking into rehoming and return statistics. Recommend that GRNZ should be reporting t dataon rehoming figures, return rates and reasons for dogs being returned or being found to be unsuitable for rehoming. The return rate on greyhounds is twice the national SPCA average, for behavioural issues such as a strong prey drive and physical issues such as expensive dental problems due to diet.

s 9(2)(a) will circulate the amended advice for approval out of session.

Action: s 9(2)(a) to amend the greyhound advice as discussed, circulate for approval and then send to the Minister's office.

s 9(2)(a) arrived; this was followed by item C4.]

C 7. Animal welfare issues register and discussion

[Discussed directly after the Fish & Game presentation, 01.]

- **Sheep and beef:** Facial eczema was particularly bad this year. Noted that K Milne's animals even got some on the west coast of the South Island.
- **Greyhounds:** Media around the NSW greyhound ban getting some traction. This is becoming a split between the Labour and Liberal parties in NSW, Labour saying that it is unsupportable. Maybe not a done deal and it is thought the racing industry will launch a legal challenge of the decision. ACT is also going ahead with a ban and other states are contemplating one. It is likely that lobby groups in New Zealand will have another try. It is interesting to see how many states in USA have banned it; very few states still allow greyhound racing. Leave on the register.
- **Calf bleeding:** The issue was taken as read. s 9(2)(a) explained that what the company (based in China) wanted to do is to use a penetrating captive bolt and then make a small incision in the neck to collect the blood. They need to use a mobile abattoir to meet biomedical requirements. The concern is that this is neither the normal blood harvesting routine nor the commercial slaughter way. The fact that it's a blood harvest means it needs AEC approval. They also need to remove calves very quickly and give them no colostrum while waiting for the mobile abattoir - lots of risks.
- **Horses:** s 9(2)(a) added one more issue that horses unfit for transport may be being transported so they can be killed on-farm and fed to greyhounds and dogs unfit for hunting.
- **Live exports:** historically, NAWAC has not taken detailed interested in live export. May wish to take an interest in it, now that post-arrival reports are required. J Hellström suggested to keep it on the register to keep an eye on how the commencement and regulation implementaton goes. Live export should stay as a watching brief.

- **Broken shoulders in cattle:** No updates at this time, but keep it on the register; s 9(2)(a) has been keeping an eye on this issue.
- **Cat management:** s 9(2)(a) updated the committee on their latest recommendations which will be announced at the Companion Animal Council Conference 2016 (21 September). The group supports the announcement on Predator Free 2050, noting that there does not seem to be a plan for cats yet. s 9(2)(a) noted that DOC plans to appoint a spokesperson for cats (Nicola Toki). Keep on register.
- **Layer hens:** Countdown is now negotiating with their suppliers about sourcing free-range eggs. s 9(2)(a) had a meeting with Countdown about this – Countdown under pressure because now they're running two different systems for sourcing eggs in Australia and New Zealand. However, the Australian definition of free range is different from ours (they allow 10 or 20,000 birds per hectare). Producers also have specific standards for what is free range and suppliers have been in trouble before for falsely selling free-range that actually wasn't. This is a consumer labelling standards issue. Countdown is accepting that colony systems may not be acceptable to the public in the long term.

The regulations review committee meeting on layer hens was also discussed. Julie Collins (MPI Policy & Trade) and J Hellström appeared before the committee on 11 August. SAFE allege that NAWAC acted unusually in only considering some natural behaviours and not all of them (e.g. considering perching and scratching which are provided for in colony cages, but not sunbathing or dustbathing). MPI argued for NAWAC that the qualifiers in section 4 of the Act (*"being a need which, in each case, is appropriate to the species, environment, and circumstances of the animal"*) allow NAWAC to consider whether their needs are being considered in the circumstances they are kept in i.e. caged or indoors. If the committee finds against MPI, it will create a very interesting precedent for all farming. All animals are restrained in ways which affect specific behaviours, especially aggressive ones. Keep this issue on the register.

- **Zoos:** remove the elephant item.
- **Dairy price:** 13% boost overnight noted. Remove this item.
- **Dairy calves:** Remove this item, though it will be interesting to see improved performance coming through in verification or compliance statistics. Animal activists continue to do things like follow buyers around with cameras and the assumption is that more footage will come out at some point.

C 8. MPI update and discussion of information circulated by MPI

s 9(2)(a) summarised some of the recent staff changes, including the restructure of the animal welfare team. s 9(2)(a) is now a Principal Adviser and a new manager is being recruited.

s 9(2)(a) gave an update on some work going on with the Animal Products team on 2 documents. One code of practice for pre-slaughter activities (from point of unloading at plant, to point of stun) that includes animal welfare requirements. The second document is a review of the pet food processing chapter, which involves all animals and has a section on young calves. It now has a section on killing calves on-farm for pet-food; allowing calves to be killed at younger than 4 days of age, and meaning that they do not need to be transported to be used as pet food.

s 9(2)(a) noted that verification data has been added to the MPI update and the secretariat will aim to provide compliance and verification data to NAWAC regularly (there are quarterly reports available).

PART TWO (OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)

STRATEGY AND PLANNING

O 1. Fish & Game: Generally Accepted Practice (11am)

[Discussed directly after the regulations update, C4]

s 9(2)(a) Chief Executive Fish & Game, arrived and was welcomed to talk to the committee about generally accepted practice in fishing and hunting.

Background – Fish & Game has an old institutional structure with a focus on conservation. Started as the group that aimed made New Zealand 'like England', introducing species to the country. The group is a statutory one, set up under the Conservation Act. The regions have a direction to 'maintain, manage and enhance' sports fishing and game under the Act, and Fish & Game manage this.

Core business – Fish & Game's core business is sustainable use of game birds and sports fish (salmon and trout). DOC and the Game Animal Council covers larger game like deer or wild pigs. There are 140,000 licensed hunters known to Fish & Game, but this number does not include those using their own property in rural areas. There is no easy way to contact them, a weak point that NAWAC may wish to help with.

Fish & Game support New Zealand's pest management strategy and the Predator Free NZ initiative. They consider that they are doing work for animal welfare via habitat protection and working on predator-prey relations. The focus is on populations, not individuals (as animal rights' groups are). Individuals come and go via natural processes, and Fish & Game consider hunting a natural process.

They see it as important to avoid laying an anthropocentric bias over this. Wildlife and nature is brutal.

s 9(2) explained that hunters have a strong incentive to make a clean kill so they can harvest the most possible and handed out a code of conduct for anglers and hunters. There have been very few examples of bad behaviour; one example is the individuals running over swans with a boat in Tauranga Harbour a couple of years ago, but this kind of thing is very rare and they were prosecuted.

Fish & Game do have some enforcement of their own too – when doing any enforcement activity, they generally take the police with them. They have officers warranted under the Wildlife and Conservation Acts. They primarily check for licenses, but do check for unusual behaviour as in the swan case if necessary – this is not common though.

s 9(2) then handed out some presentation notes from a Select Committee presentation that summarises their view.

Fish & Game have had calls to consider the five freedoms. They would describe the state of the 5 freedoms for wild animals as:

- Hunger and thirst - address this by maintaining habitat
- Shelter – address this by maintaining habitat
- Disease and injury – not so good here in terms of hunting
- Behaviour – This is a positive area for wild animals

- Fear and distress – not so good in terms of hunting, but a prey animal in the wild would be hunted anyway

In terms of wounding rates, which s 9(2)(a) had asked him to address, he said that it is impossible to get figures on that. However there is a huge amount of pressure from peers of hunters to recover wounded game and it's in their code of conduct.

Catch and release was then addressed. With baiting, once it is in the gullet, there is essentially no way to do catch and release – the fish will die. With spinner lures, many fishermen will remove the treble hooks, which rip the jaws of the fish, for catch and release. For fly fishing the hook usually gets the fish through the lip and they can be released. Fish & Game will not regulate for catch and release; too difficult and they find it hard to rationalise. They removed all references to it in their documentation. It is the anglers' choice.

There is some regulation around length - anything over 550mm you should put back, as they want them to breed. One of their regions has a zero bag limit, which is an issue, as that is just pushing catch and release and keeping a fishing area open for fun only, which is hard to justify.

G Shackell noted that catch and release is often said to be done for the welfare of the fish and s 9(2)(a) agreed that yes, guides tend to push this line. The alternative is to kill it, which sometimes anglers don't want to do. Instead guides try to give advice on how to release the fish, they sell gloves that don't disturb the scales, etc. Survival of released fish is quite good (according to a DOC trial) but depends a lot on handling, e.g. disturbing the scale opens them up to fungal infection.

P Fisher queried why Fish & Game believe there is no way to investigate wounding rates in ducks for example. There have been studies done on this in Australia and Scandinavia. What about looking at how many birds are brought back dead or alive by dogs? This data is needed for determining what the generally accepted practice in terms of, for example, either a 10% or 0.1% wounding rate. A 10% rate of animals dying slowly from infection would be a big animal welfare issue.

Fish & Game disagreed that this would be useful. They already train hunters to recover wounded game - so why get the data. However s 9(2)(a) agreed to view the research.

Action: P Fisher s 9(2)(a) to send studies on wounding rates to Bryce Johnson.

There was discussion around lead shot banning; this was seen as an animal welfare (poisoning) issue. However there has been pushback from retailers.

G Doole queried whether duck populations are declining? It was confirmed there is a lot of money being spent on water fowl research to find this out. Only declining in some areas and rising in others. Fish & Game support Predator Free NZ because of nest predation.

I Torrance queried their view on 1080. Fish & Game only oppose 1080 to the extent that it kills hunting dogs. Also noted that trout eat mice; anglers report catching trout with mice in their stomachs. Fish & Game struggle to get someone to agree that this is not a potential problem to anglers.

Fish & Game had one question for NAWAC about the overwintering of livestock. s 9(2)(a) shared photographs taken in Southland of animals standing in muddy paddocks. Hunters and fishermen are concerned about sediment runoff. Is NAWAC looking at this?

J Hellstrom confirmed that the work programme which includes some discussion about shelter and muddy paddocks was on the agenda. It is certainly an issue NAWAC is interested in for welfare reasons.

s 9(2)(a) welcomed any ideas for Fish & Game on what they could do practically for example in education.

[Followed by the animal welfare issues register, C7].

O 2. Layer hens: Regulations Review Committee

This was discussed under the animal welfare issues register and discussion.

O 3. NAWAC prioritisation

s 9(2)(a) summarised the memorandum on NAWAC's prioritisation and work programme for the next eighteen months to two years (NAWAC 67/16).

On top of the current work plan items which will roll over, there are three priority areas.

The first is affective mental state and the 'good life' concept, to acknowledge the addition of sentience to the Animal Welfare Act and develop a paper summarising the current state of thinking and proposing a direction for how this work should be incorporated into the development of codes and regulations in the future. . This work would for a component of the Codes Review subcommittees work on what codes will look like in future.

J Hellström noted a recent RadioNZ interview with Ian Robertson on sentience. Ian suggested that the inclusion of the word sentience will fundamentally change the way that we approach regulation in the future. J Hellström suggested setting up a workshop or symposium public meeting to discuss this, as it is too important to let it drift.

Action: s 9(2)(a) to investigate a workshop or symposium public meeting to discuss sentience and its impact on animal welfare in New Zealand with help from MPI

The second priority places shelter, low body condition score and euthanasia in the same workstream. The three are linked in that there are barriers to implementation, not necessarily a lack of standards. This will be led largely by industry. It was also noted that s 9(2)(a) had agreed to take on work in this area, and had had an operation research piece of work accepted regarding barriers to implementation – using shelter as a case example. NAWAC would produce an opinion piece on euthanasia and any recommendations for regulations or amends to the codes of welfare. This opinion piece would be a useful tool to engage with industry. A new subcommittee would need setting up for this work area.

s 9(2)(a) and the committee discussed muddy paddocks. MPI compliance reports a particularly bad year for callouts to 'mud' this year. It's hard to tell if more people are phoning or whether the problem is growing - likely a combination. It's mostly members of the public driving past paddocks and phoning up. Animal welfare inspectors attend and often see that the animals are in fine condition and sometimes have a dry place to lie, however the public is very insistent; they do not take 'we will investigate' as an answer. Sometimes we can't direct the owners to move the animals – there is no place to lie, and if you move them, the new paddock won't be dry for long. This has put pressure on Pastoral House – what are we meant to do here? s 9(2)(a) was therefore asked by compliance to raise it with NAWAC.

Some would argue it's a code or standards issue, but it seems that practical issues kick in and it ultimately comes down to education, changing attitudes etc.

NAWAC agreed to include the issue of sacrifice paddocks/muddy paddocks/standoff pads in the workstream as well as shade and shelter. Don't necessarily have answers yet but it needs to be talked about at least.

The third priority is the condition and fitness of the animal welfare system. This links in with the animal welfare operating model. NAWAC agreed to decide the level of involvement/work necessary, once the final paper on the AW Operating Model has been presented to NAWAC.

One issue included under the third priority is fish farming – this is the only code of welfare work suggested. Ideally any code would be drafted by the industry. It was agreed that MPI should separately progress this issue with the industry and report back to NAWAC outlining progress. This would sit as part of a wider review of the current state of fish welfare for all fish, not just farmed fish.

NAWAC agreed to the suggested priorities.

Action – Add muddy paddocks to priority two

Action – J Hellstrom or s 9(2)(a) take the document to the ABWCC and Chief Executive's Animal Welfare forum to inform stakeholders

O 4. Safeguarding update (2pm)

s 9(2)(a) arrived to give an update on the lifestyle farmer project (filling in for Animal Welfare Liaison Manager s 9(2)(a))

She explained that the Safeguarding programme is running a survey for veterinarians and a lifestyle farmer survey to inform their work programme on educating lifestyle farmers. The vet survey has been run already with help from the New Zealand Veterinary Association and received approximately 200 responses. A summary has been completed and MPI is doing some analysis of the results.

The data will be used to create the survey to send to lifestyle farmers. The website <http://lifestyleblock.co.nz/> will likely be used to share the survey (with approx. 20,000 members). After learning about what they can tell us, *Safeguarding* can then create a communications plan.

The top group of complaints from vets were in regards to sheep, cattle and horses. They agreed that most lifestyle farmers are keen and willing to learn (if it's easy and cheap/free).

G Verkerk queried whether the time spent on properties would be researched, as it seems that there is a high turnover on lifestyle blocks; s 9(2)(a) confirmed that this would be one of the questions.

Jacqui noted that there is a wealth of information available for lifestyle farmers; the website is great, and other groups have great publications and magazines as well.

Action: Safeguarding to share survey results with NAWAC (likely to be available in November).

s 9(2)(a) updated NAWAC on the rest of the work plan. The main focus for Leonie's team is to roll out calf regulations and educate people on their implementation. Leonie has been travelling, accompanied by DaryNZ and MIA, to talk to truckers and farmers around the country.

Truck drivers are concerned about timeline for infringements, specifically how long it would take to get one, as one of their drivers might infringe for a while before they know that they are in trouble. They tended to have very specific questions about how the regime will work.

There has also been confusion amongst farmers over MPI requiring ramps to be installed for trucks – this is not true, raised pens can be used as well, and may be better than ramps, especially some of the ramps being sold (there was one bad example at Fieldays - unsuitably steep)..

A big focus over the next couple of years is making sure that the implementation of the rest of the regulations goes more smoothly and in less of a hurried way. We have a year to go until some of the calf regulations kick in but people are already rushing which may have poor outcomes.

OTHER REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

O 5. *Welfare Pulse* article request

s 9(2)(a) explained that s 9(2)(a) has taken over the organising of *Welfare Pulse* magazine as an MPI contractor. She is always looking for new articles, anything to do with animal welfare is welcome. 3 pieces were offered:

- K Schutz (or someone from AgResearch) can contribute an article;
- J Hellstrom to write a piece about his years as chair of NAWAC;
- s 9(2)(a) to write a corresponding piece to introduce herself as the new chair.

Action: s 9(2)(a) to connect *Welfare Pulse* article volunteers with s 9(2)(a) to organise

O 6. NAWAC correspondence

There were no comments on correspondence that had been sent. Two letters that have been received but not answered yet, one on rodeos from Lynn Charlton and one on NAWAC's farrowing crate decision from an interested member of the public. S Brown and s 9(2)(a) were asked to answer the rodeo correspondence and the farrowing crate subcommittee were asked to answer the question on crates.

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

G Shackell attended a combined New Zealand and Australian conference in Adelaide on animal production focussed on animal welfare (some links were shared in a weekly NAWAC email). The highlight of the conference was keynote speaker s 9(2)(a). Another interesting session was one where a representative from each sector in Australia had to give a one minute talk on their work in animal welfare and attendees voted on how well they were going.

G Shackell also attended an ANZCCART meeting, which is a great way for Animal Ethics Committees to get together, and stopped at zoos in each of the cities he was in (Auckland, Adelaide, and Melbourne).

J Hellström spoke to a group of dairy vets in Auckland in June. He discussed the social license for the dairy industry.

s 9(2)(a) noted that s 9(2)(a) also came to Wellington and gave a talk to about 300 MPI staff and industry representatives on animal welfare auditing. She talked about the need for better words than 'appropriate' or 'sufficient' or 'suitable' in standards, and the importance of managers and policymakers to get out of the office.

J Hellström then presented S Brown with a plaque and thanked her for her time and service for the committee.

With no further items of business, the meeting was closed at 2:40pm.

The meeting was followed by a farewell afternoon tea for John Hellström in room 3.3 at 4:30pm.