



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

General Meeting

18 May 2016
09:30 am – 3:00 pm

Meeting Room 17.2 & 17.1
Pastoral House
25 The Terrace
Wellington

MINUTES

Committee members: John Hellström (Chair), Penny Fisher, Katie Milne, Karin Schutz, Grant Shackell, Alan Sharr, Iain Torrance, Julie Wagner

In attendance: s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

Apologies: Graeme Doole, Sue Brown, Ingrid Collins

Welcome: s 9(2)(a)

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 / K Milne):

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 submission | J Hellström / All |
| C 5. Layer hen code interpretation | J Hellström |
| C 6. Wildlife update | P Fisher |
| C 7. 3E's update | J Hellström |
| C 8. Animal welfare issues register and discussion | J Hellström / All |
| C 9. 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	To maintain the effective conduct	That the public conduct of the relevant

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
	submission	of public affairs through the free and frank expression of opinions of organisations, officers and employees	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 hen code interpretation	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 6.	Wildlife update	As above.	As above.
C 7.	3E's update	As above.	As above.
C 8.	Animal welfare issues register and discussion	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 9.	MPI update and discussion of information circulated by MPI	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.

I also move that:

s 9(2)(a)

s 9(2)(a)

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

C 1. Confirmation of previous minutes

The draft minutes of the general meeting 17 February 2016 (NAWAC 24/16) were reviewed and accepted, with no amendments.

Moved (A Sharr / I Torrance)

That the draft minutes of the general meetings held on 17 February 2016 be adopted as a true and accurate record of those meetings.

The motion was put: carried.

C 2. Status of actions arising from previous meetings

The committee reviewed the list of actions (NAWAC 25/16). The following updates were provided:

- There has been progress on action one, formulating a new forum for animal welfare in New Zealand as part of implementing the animal welfare strategy.

Action: s 9(2)(a) to book a time for J Hellström and G Shackell to discuss (via teleconference)

- Action two is still in progress but can be removed. s 9(2)(a) will circulate the final copy of the operating model once complete.
- Action three, to circulate MCDAs, is complete.
- Action four, for systems review to present a work programme, is complete and will be discussed later.
- Action five, to provide feedback on the GRNZ review, is complete and will be discussed later.
- Action six, for the layer hens subcommittee to work through differing interpretations of the code, is in progress and will be discussed.
- Action seven, to draft a letter on remote monitoring is complete, though the work on this has changed direction. This will be discussed later.
- Action eight, to have a workshop on regulations, is complete.
- Action nine, to release a media statement on rodeos, is complete.

C 3. Work programme update

The work programme update (NAWAC 28/16) was circulated prior to the meeting. For work programme items not already on the agenda, the following updates were provided:

- Regulations – Public workshops have been held in the main centres. Some members went to their local workshops. Engagement was good.
- Dairy housing – The code amendments are at the peer review stage.
- Selective breeding – Submissions on the document have been gathered and the subcommittee was planning a meeting to discuss them. Peer reviewers were discussed and it was suggested they should be contacted as soon as possible.
- Temporary housing – The code, report, and recommendation letter are all drafted. s 9(2)(a) and J Hellström need to have one last look but it is essentially ready to send to the Minister.
- Shelter – An operational research has been put on the table to be funded by MPI s 9(2)(a) explained that it would look at barriers to putting shelter up from farmer's perspective, because

the issue continues and the drivers are poorly understood. Massey University also has a group looking at how farmers are supported with new technology.

- Systems review – to be discussed, but it was noted that work programmes could be done on a financial year basis from now on. This would also help MPI's reporting.
- It was noted that the code review work was missing from the update document.

Action: s 9(2) to add the code review work to the work update document.

C 4. Animal welfare regulations submission

The submission had been drafted and circulated as paper 29/16. It was agreed to go through the submission and members can raise points on each part.

There were no comments on the introduction.

Under general feedback the following comments were discussed:

2.2.1, on low infringements – noted that a question had been added on comparing animal welfare harm to harm under the Biosecurity, Food Safety and Dog Control Acts; NAWAC agreed with this.

2.2.6, on clarifications around tranche two, was discussed. All agreed clarity was needed.

Under specific feedback the following comments were discussed:

Point 3 noted that it has been made clear that NAWAC supports the intent and rationale of the regulations, and the points below only highlight specific proposals. Silence indicates full support for the proposals as they stand.

The point of defences was raised. In the discussion document on page 19, the only available defence for breaching the regulations is where a human life is at risk. It was suggested that animal life could be added to the defences. It was agreed that this should be added under general comments (section 2).

It was noted that point 3.27 on a regulation for tooth extraction should be removed. The regulation was taken off the proposal document because it is already covered by the Act. 3.

There was discussion on the use of the word 'anyone' when it comes to allowing certain painful procedures. Are NAWAC comfortable with 'anyone' being allowed to use pain relief with no direct supervision? It was noted that vets have some responsibility to oversee the way that 'anyone' uses the pain relief; it comes back to the vet if something goes wrong. However it was argued that while MPI may not like to define words like 'competent person' etc., erring on the side of allowing anyone may be too open. Primary ITO has for example indicated that setting up new courses is possible.

In section 2, it was agreed that there should be a sentence that NAWAC has some concerns regarding 'anyone' and would prefer that we move towards a system that defines competent and this should be picked up in Tranche 2.

3.20 on the subject of lameness scoring should be modified to say that the scoring is too subjective 'as it stands'. Other scoring system are clearer, and could perhaps support a regulation. Or state that 'the proposed lameness scoring system is too subjective, but another scoring system could be more effective'.

There was discussion on Proposal 39 (lameness) vs. 38 (defects preventing standing evenly): 38 excludes sheep as part of lameness; 39 is meant to catch sheep that are missed by lameness alone. If lameness is added to 39 then sheep may actually lose protection. It was agreed that point 3.21 should be dropped. NAWAC supports proposal 39 as it stands.

NAWAC supports as it stands the proposed regulation to ban tail docking in dogs by not commenting. This has been the biggest issue in consultation so far. NAWAC should perhaps be more vocal. The Act asks whether a practice is 'necessary', NAWAC considers it unnecessary, therefore unreasonable, therefore it should be banned. NAWAC has the world veterinary profession on the same side.

It was agreed to add a comment that based on our understanding of the science, NAWAC regards this procedure as aesthetic (or not necessary for welfare) not on the welfare of the animals, and so doesn't regard the procedure as necessary.

Dew claws – Breeders want to be able to remove all dew claws, regardless of articulation. Any comment from NAWAC? Not as confident on the science for dew claws. Argument is the same, that injury is more likely. Injury does happen, but it's not common. Groomers have reported at public meetings that they are a major issue. However the Kennel Club suggests that the groomers cause the injuries. NZVA supports the proposal as it stands. NAWAC will remain silent.

Action: s 9(2)(a) to amend the submission as discussed and send around by midday 19 May; NAWAC to comment as soon as possible.

It was noted that the timelines are very difficult. The submission has to be submitted quickly.

Moved (J Hellstrom / I Torrance):

Subject to the above amendments, the submission is finalised and will be sent to MPI

The motion was put: carried.

C 5. Layer hen code interpretation

A general update was provided on layer hens. SAFE took a petition to the regulations review committee late 2015 seeking that the layer code be thrown out because due process was not followed and cages did not meet the purposes of the Act. The Committee considered in March that there was no case to answer, and were challenged - SAFE will resubmit their complaint.

It was also noted that the Victorian State Government has decided that battery cages are acceptable because the science is equivocal and also withholding stock from feed from 48 hours is acceptable. There is very limited national coordination going on for animal welfare. SPCA Australia is concerned and rang J Hellström for a quote. The story will be circulated in a Friday mailout.

In regards to the interpretation of the layer hens' code, it was explained that the SPCA (who run the Blue Tick scheme) and EPF have started to interpret some parts of the codes in different ways and asked for clarification. See paper 30/16 for memo explaining the background to the issue.

Rewriting the code is not the plan, but NAWAC should make it clear what the intent of the codes were.

Winter gardens and litter were explained. Barn birds in this system have 3 spaces. Barns for hens to eat and roost; winter gardens with litter and to socialise; outdoor areas for enrichment. Most free range operators don't have any litter inside the barn.

One of the challenges raised by critics of the large systems is that most birds can't or won't go outside. New research indicates that 80% of birds will actually access the outdoors on a regular basis.

In regards to stocking density, NAWAC had agreed that the density outdoors should be 2,500 birds per hectare, but also that range should be managed to ensure grass cover for disease/parasite reasons and enrichment. It does mean that effectively the birds are running at stocking densities more like 4,000 birds per hectare.

s 9(2) had circulated some information by the peer reviewer for the chicken code, but they came back with contradictory information later. She wrote that pullets are raised in cage systems but found out that actually, matching the system as chicks to those that they will get as adults is the important issue.

s 9(2)(a) from the UK RSPCA provided some guidelines as well. EU guidelines state that stocking density should not be greater than 2,000 per hectare or 1 hen per m². However, where rotation is practiced and hens can access all areas of the flock's life then this is fine.

It was noted that operators will add gravel before the hens access litter to reduce wet litter build-up.

Currently birds are trained to battery cages by being kept in battery cages. Should pullets going into colony cages be raised in those cages? At the moment, special rearing cages are used that are quite sterile.

Chicks will be in the rearing cages for about 20 weeks. The cages are bigger than a battery cage (reared in social groups) but barren. A code amendment is not desirable so advice/position should be drafted. The EU advice is the best we've got: pullets should be reared in such a way so that they're adapted to the environment in which they'll lay. This is not an issue as far as barns are concerned: Rearing already matched. Floor laid eggs are a big expense, so there is a strong incentive to get birds used to laying boxes.

Two main points here:

- NAWAC need to go back and confirm exactly how pullet adaptation is managed in colony cages: both overseas and here. Industry asserts that they are following the same standard as overseas.
- Our advice would be that pullets should be grown in such a way so that they're effectively adapted to the environment that they will lay in. Adapted means – are they using the roosts and laying boxes?

In regards to birds and stocking density, NAWAC took the view when developing was that range management is most important. If the eggs are to be called free-range then they should be able to spend time on range, not barren ground that they will not actually use.

The EU standard was used and agreed by industry.

If NAWAC insisted on full range at all times, farmers may have to add significant land and the hens tend not to use land further from the pophole. It is understood that in the UK, a lot of the time densities are effectively higher as the range is management.

- As long as the birds have access to sufficient area that it's effectively 2,500 birds per hectare across their lifetime, range management is acceptable. NAWAC expects that the range should be managed so that there is regular access to all of the range. Details not specified (% of range shut off, days off range). Birds must have access to quality range (this is already a MS).

In regards to litter management, it was noted that when writing the layer hens code, barns came out as the worst welfare in MCDA because of the litter issue. Litter creates dust or is dirty/ammonia filled.

- It was certainly never NWAC's intention that birds should have access to litter while asleep. NAWAC is comfortable with the current way it operates, with birds having access to litter during the day / in winter gardens. The wording was not thought through but the intention was not to require something different to the current usage. When NAWAC visited barns back when writing it, the free range farms did not have litter inside. Modern barns with no litter have auto scrapers going.

A question was raised - when no winter garden is available, is the outside equivalent to friable litter? Perhaps, but not when the weather is bad. It should be clarified that if no winter garden exists, litter should be inside (at least in some sections). Winter gardens should ideally be added to such barns.

Action: s 9(2) to finalise the advice according to the above discussions. NAWAC should have another chance to see it before sending it out.

C 6. Wildlife update

A number of papers has been circulated under 31/16. See cover memo for background.

The issue of generally accepted practice will continue rolling along in the background for the wildlife subcommittee. Pest control operators have a much more solid idea of generally accepted practice because it's their profession. Hunting groups were more disparate.

It was proposed that NAWAC will continue to raise questions on specific practices that attract attention e.g. hunting with dogs. Progress has been made (see magazine/website items), but specifics have not been agreed. Fishing groups have not been easy to contact.

The subcommittee propose:

- Six-month follow-up with the Game Animal Council on generally accepted practice
- Secretariat would invite Fish & Game to speak at the next NAWAC meeting
- Subcommittee to develop list of 'grey areas' which came out of the stakeholder meetings
- Operational research proposal on pig hunting

The proposals were agreed as appropriate.

The 'grey area' list should be kept and could be considered as part of NAWACs work for the future. This would remain as an internal list for NAWAC to consider and flesh out as things progress.

Remote monitoring: At the moment, the systems seem to be OK. Nevertheless the subcommittee thought that it would be nice to have a minimum standard for such a system. Potentially anyone could go and buy a system like this for themselves in the future. It was noted that the failsafes that ZIP described in terms of traps automatically being 'unsprung' if anything went wrong helps with this a lot.

Information from an electronics or communications expert would be useful to determine an acceptable fail rate for equipment like this. However the summary as it stands is a good list to begin with.

MPI has been talking to the remote monitoring system designers. They are wanting a guideline to safeguard themselves. MPI will not take ownership but councils, MPI DOC and ZIP may write a short paper together.

NAWAC can restrict or prohibit a trap or device under section 32. Could use that pathway to recommend to the Minister that those 5 points described in 31/16 are the restrictions applied to those types of traps.

It would be better for stakeholders to take up the guidelines themselves, but they should be warned that NAWAC has this option.

Action: s 9(2)(a) to check with legal on the possibility of writing regulations for remote monitoring systems.

The position paper on remote monitoring would need to be consulted on before being published. The position is just for NAWAC for now. This has been seen by one internal person to MPI; ZIP hasn't seen it.

Snares were then discussed. The problem with snares is that they are indiscriminate. Is there a difference between a neck and leg snare? Neck is generally killing, legs are for restraining. s 9(2)(ba)(i)

Finally, the subcommittee is considering a proposal to require trap checking within 12 hours of sunrise because even killing snares are not particularly effective. This would require possum master traps to be checked, which they don't have to be right now. They failed NAWAC guidelines; but are potentially better than completely untested traps, and users will be vocal about 'being picked on'.

NAWAC agreed with all three proposals, but number three should be checked with legal – the Act does not require checking of kill traps at the moment.

The need to consult on Maori use of snares within traditional hunting practices was noted. The Treaty of Waitangi gives the Crown the right to govern, but in return requires the Crown to protect the tino rangatiratanga (full authority) of iwi and hapū in relation to their 'taonga katoa' (all that they treasure). Taonga can include physical things such as land, waterways, flora and fauna, but can also include cultural and intellectual treasures. A restriction on snaring, a customary hunting technique, may be considered a restriction on a cultural taonga.

Action: s 9(2)(a) to finish the comprehensive paper on snares and work up a summary letter to the Minister for the August meeting.

C 7. 3E's update

s 9(2)(a) work has meant that the subcommittee has changed tack from a code to an opinion piece (drafted but put on hold due to regulations).

Principles would then be identified on how animals should be used in the 3E's. These principles will be taken to sectors and they will be asked to consider whether they are meeting them. NAWAC would basically say - this is how we think you stack up, these are our areas of concern, what do you want to do about it or should NAWAC do something about it?

NAWAC agreed that the subcommittee was moving in the right direction. It would be good to have principles that means new methods can be used. Zoos will be pleased that they are not lumped in with rodeos and other forms of entertainment.

The opinion piece should be progressed for the November meeting.

It was noted that many people submitted on the Act amendment that exotics in circuses should be banned. This has come up again in the regulations. A blanket prohibition may not be very workable but the principles could work here too.

In regards to greyhounds, another audit has been conducted on GRNZ's progress relative to the recommendations of the select committee.

GRNZ has sent a live baiting response. This is not a specific issue raised by the Minister, but something that should be noted. How confident about live baiting are we? It was noted that facility checks are scheduled not random. Could comment that random would be better but agree that GRNZ are doing as much as they can reasonably do. It's not NAWAC's position to audit or check facilities but can advise the Minister against making categorical statements that live baiting is not occurring.

Statistics have been asked for from GRNZ, obtained and have been circulated. It was noted that there are questions around euthanasia before dogs are tracked at 3 months old. Ultimately, NAWAC is pleased that GRNZ is responding and being helpful but cannot advise the Minister whether euthanasia is dropping or rehoming is going up.

NAWAC asked for these numbers because they were raised in the review; but the numbers alone are not helpful. NAWAC does not know if they're right or wrong. The subcommittee will need to sit down and look at this and go back to GRNZ with yet more questions. Could arrange for a meeting to go to GRNZ, meet the new CEO and be able to discuss and ask follow-up questions as needed. Lots of questions to ask them on how the data is gathered and what they actually follow.

Action: P Fisher, J Hellström and s 9(2)(a) to meet with GRNZ.

In regards to rodeos, s 9(2)(a) letter was discussed. Noted interesting comment on spur use in calf riding.

s 9(2)(a), animal welfare compliance manager had offered to put together compliance statistics for NAWAC if they want them. However, NAWAC does not want to be dragged into a compliance debate. The evidence is concerning but not evidence to re-write the code.

An answer should be drafted to say thank you for your letter which we have referred to MPI compliance. NAWAC is concerned about compliance issues but leave this up to MPI. As far as rewriting the standards is concerned we do not see this as a priority.

Action – Secretariat to follow up on spur use in calves. Ask for evidence for the extent of this problem.

NAWAC would not undertake to amend the code but could write to the Rodeo Association to clarify position.

C8. Animal welfare issues register and discussion

- **Broken shoulders** – there has been an unexplained increase in broken shoulders in heifers only this spring. No reasons found yet – not breed specific. Nutrients perhaps. Maybe thousands of animals affected - not a coincidence. Keep as a watching brief.
- **Cats** – Recent work by the National Cat Management Strategy Group was summarised; they will go public in July or August, and are likely to call on the Government for new legislation on microchipping and desexing. Is it worth having a seat at the table or does NAWAC wait to see what happens and respond? Agreed that NAWAC is a ministerial advisory committee and should not get too far from its advisory role. This should be kept as a watching brief and NAWAC wants to keep up to date. I Torrance happy to work on this as necessary.
- **Elephants** – Noted that NAWAC thought about proposing a ban on elephants, but while it's acknowledged that it might not be the greatest idea to keep them, Auckland gives a lot of care and attention to their elephants (J Hellstrom has visited). Auckland are ZAA accredited. Keep as a watching brief.
- **DEFRA codes** - Useful as an information item. A lesson in that when governments try to deregulate they can rapidly lose support.

C 9. MPI update and discussion of information circulated by MPI

There were no comments.

PART TWO (OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)

STRATEGY AND PLANNING

O 1. Confirm deputy chair

Julie Wagner was nominated as deputy chair.

Moved (J Hellström / A Sharr) :

That Julie Wagner is appointed as deputy chair for 2016

The motion was put: carried.

O 2. NAWAC prioritisation

In February, the long list of items for NAWAC to consider was whittled down to a short list but not sorted into an actual plan. The systems review subcommittee worked on it instead.

The proposed work plan was circulated as paper 35/16 with reasoning for each point. In general, the subcommittee agreed on the severity of each issue which was encouraging.

The old vs. new issues were described. The code review, a new issue, is a large piece of work on its own. This work programme is a multi-year plan.

It was also explained that the systems review subcommittee has completed its terms of reference; A Sharr thanked the subcommittee for its work, and it was agreed to dissolve the subcommittee.

The work programme and priority rankings were accepted.

s 9(2) (a) noted that the wider NAWAC strategic and operational plan still needed to be updated; she will work directly with J Hellström on this.

Action – s 9(2)(a) to summarise the plan with some rationale around each point and send it to the CEOs animal welfare forum. This is a chance for them to give feedback and reduce surprises.

At the August meeting NAWAC will establish which priorities to work on over what time frame and establish working groups to get on with it.

Action – take down last years' programme from the website and insert a statement that the workplan for the next 2/3 years is currently being discussed with key stakeholders.

O 3. NAWAC internal review

The internal review results were circulated prior to the meeting as paper 36/16. s 9(2)(a) noted a typo on page one where it says six respondents (but it was actually five).

J Hellström agreed that personal development plans for committee members was not a bad idea. Could have the chair sit down with each member e.g. after 12 months to check how they are doing and to help committee members better cope with their role.

Welfare Pulse was discussed. NAWAC used to have a standard item; this stopped because there was plenty of content built up. Is there any more desire for NAWAC to write articles? It was explained that s 9(2)(a) is now in charge of gathering articles for the publication. The next issue is June and there is enough for June at the moment. However MPI is always on the lookout for more articles or more ideas. If you have any tell s 9(2)(a) or s 9(2)(a). At the last count it goes to 2,000 subscribers nationally and internationally. Does sometimes get picked up by Farmer's Weekly.

2 pieces were suggested: J Hellström to write about '7 years on NAWAC', also he is doing a paper right now on social license in the dairy industry.

Action – s 9(2)(a) to send Welfare Pulse subscription link and generally make sure that everyone on NAWAC receives it.

O 4. Safeguarding update

The update had been circulated prior to the meeting as paper 37/16. There was nothing in particular to draw attention to but two projects were raised as interesting –educating the educators and lifestyle blocks.

Primary ITO and other tertiary organisations are training people but may not have good knowledge of the codes and animal welfare.

Lifestyle blocks are overrepresented in AW complaints. Also issue in that SPCA are being asked to attend lifestyle callouts now.

The 0800 number campaign was noted – it was explained that ads were put out in newspapers and magazines to promote the 0800 welfare complaints hotline.

OTHER REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

O 5. NAWAC correspondence

There were no comments on the circulated NAWAC correspondence.

It was noted that NZVA have offered to come along to talk to NAWAC about their brand change and increased focus on welfare. This would be a mini-tutorial with s 9(2)(a) and s 9(2)(a). NAWAC is happy with this idea.

It was also flagged that s 9(2)(a) is coming to the NZVA conference and to MPI for a seminar. Chance for NAWAC to see her at MPI; invitations will be circulated.

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

The secretariat visited a broiler farm, broiler breeder farm and slaughterplant. Looked at effectiveness of stunning, injuries in birds – it was interesting to compare reality with code.

s 9(2)(a) went to a conference in California and a pest animal management conference in Colorado. Had dinner with s 9(2)(a) and he had good feedback on NZ animal welfare. Met s 9(2)(a) from

SPCA over there and had similar views on some pest management issues. Some cultural differences in pest control – prefer to get pests out without killing them. Interesting issues about different pests (coyotes etc).

AWBCC – s 9(2)(a) and s 9(2)(a) attended. s 9(2)(a) presented about sustainable animal welfare. s 9(2)(a) reported the selective breeding paper which went down well and they were impressed with NAWAC doing work on that. Pig breeding raised some questions (reflected in their submission). Comments from pig farmers indicate very little awareness of sustainability. Interesting comments on targeting people's behaviour; e.g. the judge who awarded the German Shepherd at Crufts. A culture shift in the way selectively bred animals are viewed is required. There were comments on polled genes; DairyNZ and Feds thought issues with horns was exaggerated. s 9(2)(a) raised that there is a new technology for sex identification of unhatched eggs s 9(2)(ba)(i)

s 9(2)(a) – noted a story about a fisherman on Country Calendar and targeted catches. Feedback from a friend of s 9(2) that worked on the story is that the fisheries people are not aware of fish sentence.

s 9(2)(a) – noted a story about prong collars being regulated on TV 7 Sharp. 7 Sharp also did a piece on pig hunting with dogs.

Several members attended workshops on regulations. At every one, 1 or 2 people said that NAWAC is in the pocket of MPI and only supports what MPI wants to do. Many allegations on selective/biased science that is only there to support what was already written.

Regulations - at 3:30 s 9(2)(a) and s 9(2)(a) will meet with MPI Policy. It is anticipated that NAWAC will get to see bobby calf regulation in 3-4 weeks time with a 24 hour turnaround. The 'easy ones' will be drafted later (after s 9(2) has left) and the 'difficult ones' (dehorning, tail docking) in the new year. NAWAC members were invited to attend if interested.

There will likely be an out-of-session agreement via email for the bobby calf feedback.

With no further items to discuss, the meeting was closed at 3:00pm.