



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

NAWAC 20/17

General Meeting

22 February 2017
09:30 am – 4:30 pm

SPCA Wellington
140 Alexandria Road
Newtown
Wellington

MINUTES

Committee members: Gwyneth Verkerk (Chair), Ingrid Collins, Graeme Doole, Penny Fisher, Katie Milne, Frances Russell, Karin Schutz, Grant Shackell, Alan Sharr, Iain Torrance

In attendance: 9(2)(a)

Apologies: Julie Wagner

Welcome: Frances Russell, 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

(G Verkerk / I Torrance):

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	All
C 4.	Animal welfare regulations update	9(2)(a)
C 5.	Options to progress temporary housing	I Torrance
C 6.	Snares: report and recommendations	P Fisher / 9(2)(a)
C 7.	Dog Control Act amendments: update	9(2)(a)
C 8.	Internal review	G Verkerk / 9(2)(a)
C 9.	Rodeo update	G Verkerk
C 10.	Animal welfare issues register and discussion	G Verkerk / All
C 11.	MPI update and discussion of information circulated by MPI	G Verkerk / All

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

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

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 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.	Options to progress temporary housing	As above.	As above.
C 6.	Snares: report and recommendations	As above.	As above.
C 7.	Dog Control Act amendments: update	As above.	As above.
C 8.	Internal review	As above.	As above.
C 9.	Rodeo update	As above.	As above.
C 10.	Animal welfare issues register and discussion	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 / I Collins):

That the draft minutes of the general meeting held on 16 November 2016 (91/16) be adopted as a true and accurate record of the meeting with the following amendments:

- *G Shackell's visit was to Khon Kaen, not Bangkok.*

The motion was put: carried.

C 2. Status of actions arising from previous meetings

The committee reviewed the list of actions (NAWAC 92/16). The following updates were provided:

- Action one, to explore the idea of a new animal welfare forum, is still progressing. G Verkerk recently had to review old minutes of NAWAC and has established that this was something that came up as the Amendment Bill was progressed; it would be a collective forum that would include various parts of MPI as well as other bodies, and possibly connected to the ABWCC. G Verkerk and G Shackell will continue to discuss this.
- Action two, to finish the snares paper, was up for discussion and then will be complete.
- Action three, to respond to a farrowing crate enquiry from 9(2)(a), is now complete. G Verkerk, J Wagner and 9(2)(a) met with the correspondent and two others, all based at Canterbury University. They are a group of academics using NAWAC processes as a case study of collaborative decision making frameworks who also have various views on pig welfare. They presented challenges around the way that NAWAC uses the MCDA decision framework, believing that there is a lot of opportunity to introduce bias (for example, that NAWAC put too much weight on the welfare of the piglets rather than the sow in the farrowing crate decision). The group is proposing to write a scientific paper examining NAWAC's process and have it published. 9(2)(a) is helping them with various bits of info (via the OIA process). It was agreed that NAWAC will open dialogue with them and give some feedback on their paper if possible.

Action: Engage with the Canterbury University group and their review of NAWAC process, or have them present to NAWAC about what they find.

- Action four, to investigate options for the sentience workshop, was up for discussion later.
- Action five, to share the lifestyle survey results, is in progress – 9(2)(a) (MPI) is putting together the report
- Actions six through to seventeen were complete or due to be discussed later in the meeting.

C 3. Work programme update

The work programme update (NAWAC 04/17) was circulated prior to the meeting. For work programme items not already on the agenda, the following updates were provided:

- Regulations – 9(2)(a) gave an update in item C4. The purpose of the regulations subcommittee was discussed. It will be required for upcoming work as specific regulations are worked on.
- Codes Review – A Sharr summarised the subcommittee's work plan. The subcommittee has had one meeting and drafted a terms of reference. They will propose changes to codes of welfare that may be required to help codes of welfare fulfil their intended role. In light of directly

enforceable regulations, codes of welfare may require changes to ensure they continue to be relevant and useful. The next step is to assess the accessibility, readability, usefulness and usage of the codes of welfare, which could be gathered from previous work done in the Act review, by *Safeguarding*, and also from new work such as a survey of code users.

- Dairy housing – Work continues on the amendment. There is a need to meet with DairyNZ and give them an update.
- Wildlife – A paper on glueboard trap usage had been circulated (14/17). The report summarises how many traps were used in the 2015 period and how many animals were trapped. The applications received had dropped by about half, and most remaining users are mostly in food production or conservation. The ultimate goal was to facilitate the industry in developing alternatives, but if this trend of applications dropping continues, the impetus to develop alternatives may go away – users seem to be getting better at the tools they already have (snap traps). It was agreed that the information in the report will go up to the Minister. NAWAC considered that things are progressing well, and will continue monitoring the applications.

Action: 9(2)(a) to organise for the glueboard report and letter to be sent to Minister

- Breeding – the document has been laid out into a PDF with a new format that can also be used for future Opinion documents. A media release is being worked on, and the document and media release will be sent to the Minister's office as soon as a few final changes are made to the document. As an example of a required change, G Verkerk had recently met with the NZKC who described their new Brachycephalic Working Dog group. NAWAC had previously stated that they did not believe that the NZKC understood the problem, so this passage may need to be amended. Sparking this kind of work was one of the purposes of the Opinion paper so this is encouraging to see.
- Layer hens – G Verkerk has conveyed NAWAC's decisions to the EPF/PIANZ. There is a possible sticking point in regards to stocking density in free range systems, which will need to be discussed further as regulations are drafted. For the moment they have accepted the decisions.
- Entertainment, Exhibition and Encounter – A draft opinion piece will be ready for the next meeting. Comments were also invited on the greyhound report (05/17). There was some discussion on the opening in GRNZ for an animal welfare officer, the age that greyhounds are tracked from in the system, and the capacity for rehoming greyhounds in New Zealand.
- Implementation of standards – The subcommittee has had an initial meeting, and the issue at this stage is the work load and how to prioritise and scope the work programme. For each context (BCS, Euthanasia, shelter), the barriers to implementation are diverse. Shelter was discussed. There is a lot of research on this already, new regulations are coming into force for some animals, and 9(2)(a) at MPI is starting an operational research project on the subject; it was suggested this portion of the work could wait for the new research and regulations to be completed. An opinion piece on euthanasia was suggested, especially considering the contradictions in the codes (e.g. blunt force trauma) and the issue of prolonging life unnecessarily. In terms of BCS, work on the drivers behind low or high BCS would be appreciated. The reason that regulations were not considered for the issue was partially because the groundwork had not been done, so NAWAC looking into it may help.
- Animal sentience – The subcommittee has had one meeting and has circulated a memo (04/17). The sentience workshop may be led by this subcommittee as there will be significant links between the workshop and this work programme. At this point, definitions for overlapping concepts are being teased out (e.g. sentience vs. a 'good life' vs. positive welfare). The

subcommittee will then agree on which concepts NAWAC wants to work with and how they fit into the standards.

- Fitness and health of the animal welfare system – 9(2)(a) is going to give an update on the animal welfare operating model in item O2. I Torrance has also done some research on metrics and how welfare is measured around the world. World Animal Protection (WAP) have an index for example, but it looks at rules/standards not enforcement.

C 4. Animal welfare regulations update

9(2)(a) provided an update on the regulations progress.

MPI has finished summarising the approximately 1400 submissions that were received. They will be sent to the Minister and then uploaded to the MPI website.

A lot of lessons have been learned from the calf regulation process: there were many unexpected complexities that extended the work. Drafting the wording was more difficult than originally expected. Minimum standards are not prescriptive, but regulations must be, so converting a minimum standard can be difficult. This also makes working with stakeholders tricky, as they would like the original intent of the minimum standard to be upheld.

To move forward on the remaining regulations, MPI has broken them up into several packages, to be delivered over several years. This plan has not been finalised yet, but at this stage there are 48 regulations to progress this year, aimed at the biggest animal welfare gains in stock transport and animal husbandry. The plan had been discussed with G Verkerk, NZVA, SPCA, industry groups and SAFE in order to determine which 48 to continue with.

NAWAC's view on this approach was invited.

G Verkerk supported the idea that regulations progress a bit slower than the calf regulations in order to ensure they are put into place the right way.

The prioritisation of the 48 regulations was questioned. In general, regulations that were relatively simple and not inflammatory were progressed; other than that reason, transport was prioritised due to high animal welfare risks. The paraprofessional/pain relief regulations were not deemed urgent at this point. Pig and layer hen regulations are to go ahead as soon as possible since the current transition programmes are not well suited to Minimum Standards.

Transport regulations were discussed. It was noted that this potentially ties back into the on-farm euthanasia work programme; there is potential for on-farm killing to increase with stronger transportation regulations.

Concern was raised that the prioritisation exercise was not passed onto NAWAC, though it was good to hear the background at this point. It was agreed that the final list, when approved by the Minister and sure to go ahead, should be shared with NAWAC; and that all regulations work should be shared with the regulations subcommittee at least.

Action: Final regulations work programme to be shared with all of NAWAC.

C 5. Options to progress temporary housing

I Torrance summarised the situation around the code of welfare for temporary housing. The code of welfare had been recommended to the Minister, but in light of recommendations from the Regulations

Review Committee (who reviewed the code of welfare for layer hens), changes may need to be made to the code and the code report in order for it to be issued.

The subcommittee has held a meeting to discuss this, with the aim being to get the code out as soon as possible with the highest chance of success.

The subcommittee proposed modifying the report fully in line with the Regulations Review Committee's recommendations, but modifying the code only slightly, so that it will not need to go through any consultation process again. A letter will be sent to the Minister to ask for the code and report to be returned to NAWAC so this work can be completed.

Doing nothing is not an option, as the code is likely to be returned from the Minister's office anyway once MPI's independent advice is sent to them. Modifying minimum standards is also not ideal; the RRC review focused mainly on the report, so this may not be needed, and it may count as a change that would require further consultation, delaying the code substantially at a time when stakeholders continue to ask for it to be released.

The goal is to have the final code and report modified and back to the Minister's office again by the May meeting.

Moved (I Torrance / A Sharr):

That the process described above is followed in order to progress the code of welfare for temporary housing of companion animals.

The motion was put: carried.

C 6. Snares: report and recommendations

A draft paper on snares and letter to the Minister had been circulated prior to the meeting (06/17).

Gaps in knowledge had been identified while writing the paper. When considering restricting or prohibiting the use of a trap or device, the Minister is required to complete a consultation with affected parties. It was felt appropriate to send the report to the Minister in its current state (on the basis that a prohibition on leg hold snares and a restriction on neck-hold snares will be proposed and individuals will have the chance to respond within a consultation by the Minister / MPI) rather than for NAWAC to undertake a pre-consultation. The main problem is ensuring that all stakeholders are identified – there no snare-trappers association. A restriction on snares may also affect customary harvest for Maori.

Bans on all snares were discussed, and it was explained that banning snares altogether may accidentally stop people from develop traps that have a snare mechanism that is humane. As an alternative, the proposals in the paper are aimed towards restricting certain snare designs and so preventing or reducing problems like catching the wrong species; catching around the wrong body part and injury rates.

Moved (G Verkerk / I Torrance):

To send the paper and cover letter as circulated to the Minister.

The motion was put: carried

C 7. Dog Control Act amendments: update

9(2)(a) reminded the Committee of the Dog Control Act proposals that were made in 2016. The main issue was the potential euthanasia of healthy dogs based on a visual assessment of breed. NAWAC had agreed to make a statement in line with the NZVA and SPCA to support evidence-based standards.

However soon after the last NAWAC meeting, DIA announced further changes to their proposal so the statement was put on hold. The major changes were to introduce mandatory licensing requirements for owners of classified dogs, and then allow rehoming of menacing dogs to people who hold this license (reducing the risk of euthanasia). The other was to enable the development of a dog breeder licensing regime, which as the selective breeding subcommittee has identified, may be useful to find out who is breeding puppies and potentially provide them with information on responsible breeding.

It was noted that the DIA cabinet papers are available on their website if NAWAC is interested in reading them in full. From here, DIA are working on drafting with the Parliamentary Council Office. They still expect introduction on the Bill in 2017. It was agreed that MPI will keep a watching brief on the progress of this Bill. When submissions are open NAWAC will submit on aspects of the Bill that have the potential to affect dog welfare.

C 8. Internal review

The results of the annual internal review had been circulated prior to the meeting (07/17).

G Verkerk endorsed the comments in regards to the support of MPI staff.

Major themes included increasing the community awareness of NAWAC; problems and questions around managing subcommittee work; and a desire to know more about what the Chair was doing.

Subcommittee processes was on the agenda to be discussed later in the meeting. G Verkerk proposed creating a monthly summary of her work and meetings, to be circulated by the secretary, which was agreed.

There were also comments about ensuring the Minister attends NAWAC meetings more regularly. This was agreed and the secretariat was asked to ensure he is invited to at least one meeting per year.

Action: Secretary to invite the Minister to a meeting in 2017.

There was concern that subcommittees are not meeting often enough or that the work was slow. It was noted that NAWAC elected to operate by the subcommittee model; most work should be done there, and if there is not enough action, subcommittees need to schedule more meetings by speaking with their MPI contact. In terms of finances and travel, MPI will always opt to spend the least amount that they can, but if NAWAC subcommittees specifically state that they need a face-to-face meeting then it will be scheduled. The meetings are unlikely to be turned down but they must be justified.

9(2)(a) raised the issue of sharing meeting papers, and suggested trying a solution that the DIA has developed called Shared Workspace Service. It was agreed that NAWAC would try this for the next meeting.

Action: Secretary to sign NAWAC up to the Shared Workspace Service to trial how it works for sharing meeting papers.

C 9. Rodeo update

9(2)(a) and G Verkerk had met with the New Zealand Rodeo Cowboys Association (NZRCA) prior to the meeting. A memo had been circulated (08/17).

The NZRCA have asked for clarification as to how the code applies to practice and training events. The NZRCA have no jurisdiction over a number of these events, which are held by people and organisations outside the NZRCA, though they have worked hard with their animal welfare officers to build up a good network of officers. They view a rodeo as an event that has the full seven events, and training can be for just one event.

In terms of children wearing spurs for calf riding, they say it's largely children dressing up. They are likely to tell their members not to allow them if NAWAC clarified they should not be worn.

In terms of timing of the calf rope event, the longest that a calf goes from release to tied would be 35 seconds now (NAWAC's code states 30 seconds max). They have removed the requirement to hold the calf for 6 seconds. In terms of the continuation of this event, NZRCA do not want it banned.

At the meeting there was a lot of discussion on what they can do to improve their image. They are considering options such as a country calendar episode to show how they prepare their animals. G Verkerk encouraged them to consider the future of rodeo and how to position themselves to be acceptable to society.

NAWAC was invited to comment on the three issues raised (veterinarians at training; spur use; and timing of the calf rope event).

In terms of training, it was agreed to advise NZCRA to have a vet on call. NAWAC agreed with their interpretation that not all training events are a "rodeo" according to the code. They should have animal welfare officers there but not necessarily a veterinarian. The obligations of other groups doing single events e.g. A&P shows was discussed.

Action – NAWAC should ensure groups such as A&P shows are more aware of their obligations.

For spur use, it was agreed to tell the NZCRA that they should advise their members not to allow them to be used on calves.

In terms of timing of the calf roping event, there was discussion over the maximum time in the code vs. the time in reality (most often under 30 seconds, but a minority will be out for several seconds longer). It was agreed that NAWAC supports their efforts to reduce the event time as much as possible.

Action – 9(2)(a) and G Verkerk to summarise these agreements and share a written draft to NAWAC before sending to NZCRA.

C 10 Animal welfare issues register and discussion

The issues register had been circulated under NAWAC 09/17.

Two new issues were added. The issue around muddy paddocks that Fish & Game had previously flagged will be coming up again; Fish & Game plan to go public with their concerns and they will include the animal welfare issues. This should be added as a watching brief.

Rabbit calicivirus was the other addition. Environment Canterbury have submitted an application to release a new strain of calicivirus. The application must be considered under the Agricultural Chemicals and Veterinary Medicines Act, and one of their considerations is animal welfare. They generally look at

whether the tool is worse than any other already approved, and calicivirus is not worse in terms of animal welfare than some other methods. It is highly likely that NAWAC will be asked to look at the issue. The virus can be transmitted from wild rabbits to domestic rabbits, so stakeholders will need to encourage vaccination of pet rabbits as an integrated release strategy. MPI has said there will need to be an effective vaccine in order to register a product.

C 11. MPI Update

The MPI Update had been circulated as 10/17.

The compliance statistics were discussed.

Action – 9(2)(a) to ensure circulation of MPI's quarterly compliance statistics and investigate with 9(2)(a) whether SPCA stats could be circulated

NAWAC requested updates on the progress of the Fitness for Transport App.

Action – Secretariat to update NAWAC on the Fitness for Transport App

The Kaikoura earthquake and Christchurch fires were discussed. This was MPI's first two examples of dealing with animal welfare in emergencies as per their new responsibility under the Civil Defence Emergency Management plan.

PART TWO (OPEN TO THE PUBLIC)

STRATEGY AND PLANNING

O 1. Wellington SPCA tour and presentation

NAWAC were given a tour of the centre, and 9(2)(a) then arrived to give a talk to NAWAC.

Major points:

- There are gaps in codes, the Wellington SPCA would find a rabbit code useful in particular. They are a common animal that can and have been involved in hoarding situations, but without Minimum Standards it is harder to prosecute. A code for entertainment (e.g. to use in the Wellington film industry) is another gap. There is frustration around the length of time the temporary housing code has taken. The Wellington SPCA has started proactive work to visit pet shops and teach them about the draft version.
- One of the longest standing issues that hasn't changed is around dog exercise. The dog code says daily exercise, but this is not measurable. Dogs are tied up and not let out, but inspectors find it difficult to prove that they are not being exercised, and also to answer the question "how much exercise is appropriate?" There is no case law around failing to exercise.
- The Wellington SPCA is increasing surveillance operations, and have started up a programme to appoint community vet nurses to work with people to create animal health plans – helping people to learn how to worm a dog, brush it, exercise it etc.
- The Wellington SPCA is awaiting the release of the new regulations. 70% of their complaints relate to dogs – particularly insufficient food, water, and shelter.
- Heavy "Bulldozer" chains padlocked around security dogs has been another issue. The SPCA has produced new collars rated to 1.5 tonnes so there is no excuse to use such a chain.
- Wellington SPCA has been considering disaster management – how can we reduce the vulnerability of animals through disaster preparedness? E.g. chicken farms after earthquakes. How do you prepare to deal with a million chickens on a property?
- Hoarding and failed rescues are becoming a more common issue.
- The SPCA has found maintaining a good relationship with the local council important. Wellington SPCA is currently seconding a staff member to Wellington City Council one day a week.

O 2. 2:00pm: Animal Welfare Operating Model

9(2)(a) presented on the Animal Welfare Operating Model. Slides are available from 9(2)(a) on request.

The issue of transparency was discussed. A concordant-like option (which NAEAC has also been exploring) may be an option for NAWAC.

O 3. Appointment of the Deputy Chair

At the first meeting of each year NAWAC must appoint a deputy chair. J Wagner had declined to continue as deputy. I Torrance was nominated for deputy.

Moved (G Shackell / K Milne):

I Torrance is appointed as NAWAC's deputy chair.

The motion was put: carried.

O 4. 2017 meetings: discussion on layer hen visit; date for meat chicken tour; date for sentience workshop

New meeting dates for 2017 were agreed.

- 14th November – new date for the NAWAC meeting
- 15th November – set aside at least half for the workshop, and use the rest for NAWAC planning

NAEAC would then meet after the workshop date.

Action - 9(2)(a) to send updated e-invites.

The 17th August date would therefore be cancelled

The layer hen visit was then discussed. Unfortunately several members could not come due to bad weather grounding flights. The members that could come thought it was worthwhile. It was noted that the farms visited were some of the best examples available.

9(2)(a) (EPF) had suggested there could be more visits. Those interested will have another chance to visit farms. There is also the opportunity to visit other farms outside EPF – or to visit SPCA blue tick scheme members. The provision of 2,500 birds per hectare issue discussed. Having seen the chickens, it seems like this may need to be discussed further as regulations are developed.

O 5. Sentience workshop ideas and speakers

Speakers for the workshop were suggested:

- Sentience around birth of animals/litter animals – 9(2)(a)
- Legal view – 9(2)(a)
- 5 Domains, positive emotions and effective state – 9(2)(a), and/or 9(2)(a) from ZAA on how they apply it
- The members of the Chief Executive Animal Welfare Forum on how they view sentience and what it means for New Zealand industry

It was agreed that the meeting would be open to interested members of the public.

Action: Good life subcommittee to shape the workshop and report back next meeting

O 6. NAWAC OIAs and transparency ideas

G Verkerk had raised this topic because the number of Official Information Act requests for NAWAC information seems high.

It was noted that once information is released, the Ombudsman considers the information to be in the public domain. Recipients can go ahead and upload the information to the web or release it further as they please. This may mean NAWAC could look at automatically releasing information that is sent out in response to an OIA request.

The way the minutes are structured was also discussed. NAWAC must be able to speak in a free and frank manner at meetings; automatically releasing the minutes may impact this.

A delayed release was suggested.

The summary of meetings has been successfully implemented, but it hasn't helped reduce the requests for full minutes. It may have even increased the interest in NAWAC discussions.

NAWAC was asked to continue considering transparency vs. privacy. New policies will need to be decided over time.

O 7. Subcommittee processes

P Fisher announced that she has submitted her resignation, so the next meeting will be her last. MPI confirmed that they will look to replace P Fisher with a member that has experience in wildlife welfare.

Subcommittee processes in terms of workload and booking meetings had been discussed under the Internal Review item.

OTHER REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

O 8. Welfare Pulse article request

Article ideas were requested; new articles were needed by the end of March.

- s 9(2)(a) being appointed the inaugural Biosecurity Champion was suggested as a topic.

O 9. NAWAC correspondence

Apart from the already circulated items, several emails had been received from members of the public about NAWAC's stance on rodeos. It was agreed that the secretary would work on a standard response structure with G Verkerk for these emails.

Action: s 9(2)(a) to work with G Verkerk to respond to the group of rodeo emails received in February.

SAFE had also sent a letter, and this would be circulated to all for a formal response.

O 10. Committee members' reports on recent presentations and attendance at conferences

G Verkerk had attended a meeting with NZRCA, as discussed earlier.

She had also attended some DairyNZ welfare workshops, hoping to develop the concept of the future scenario into a farm system. G Verkerk will continue to attend these workshops and may bring K Schutz if possible (as they are based in Hamilton).

On 21st February, G Verkerk met with NZKC and DINZ as the new chair. NZKC had been discussed earlier (especially the new brachycephalic working group). DINZ is proposing to review the national velvetting standards. They want to do some research that looks at post-operative pain.

K Milne has been involved with the earthquake and then fire events, putting out advice to farmers. One of the basic problems is that most resources go to where most people are, which in a rural setting provides different challenges to that shown in the city.

K Schutz has been in Mosgiel working with deer, looking at behaviour in the yards and stress sensitivity. She is also starting a trial soon to look at aspects of providing water to young calves.

G Shackell shared news from the NAEAC meeting.

I Collins will keep NAWAC updated with a project on Maori land ownership and best practices.

P Fisher has been writing funding proposals and one was around Predator Free NZ. One new tool proposed is aerially delivered bait for stoats, which would use a toxin called PAPP. This has led to looking at new ways to test toxicity in birds (other than lethal end-point testing).

With no further items to discuss, G Verkerk closed the meeting at 4:30pm.