



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

Te Komiti Tohutohu Hauora Kararehe ā-Motu
The National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

Tikanga hui: General Meeting

Whaitua o rēhia: Level 1 Board Room (1.06),
1 The Terrace, Wellington

Rā: 7 November 2023

Tāima: 09:00 – 17:15

MENETI | MINUTES

Komiti / Committee: Matthew Stone (Kairuruku/Chairperson), Arnja Dale, Peter Mason, Grant McCullough, Tracy Brown, Mhairi Sutherland, Ruth Palmer, Natalie Waran, Sandra Faulkner, Craig Johnson, Carolyn Eyre

Nuinga / Attendees: s9(2)(a)

[Redacted list of attendees]

Manuhiri / Guests: s9(2)(a)

Tūmatanui tangata I tae atu / Public Attendees:

Matangaro / Apologies:

Any Other Business (Open to the Public):

Any Other Business (Public Excluded):



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

PART 1: OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

GENERAL

O 1. Welcomes and Farewells.

M Stone opened the meeting at 09:04am with a karakia. C Eyre was welcomed to her first meeting since appointment to NAWAC and introduced herself to the other members. It was acknowledged that this was G McCullough's final meeting as a member of NAWAC. M Stone thanked him for his work on the committee and presented a plaque to commemorate his time as a NAWAC member.

O 2. Confirmation of previous minutes.

The document [34.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read.

Corrections noted included:

- Under welcomes and farewell, it should read that motions will be carried based on consensus *without* requesting a seconder. The committee discussed reviews of codes of welfare in subcommittees and moments of dissent or division of agreement. This should always be recorded and reported even if consensus reached.
- Page 16, change 'clarified on the working group that drafted the group'. Whilst Federated Farmers did not participate in the working group, they had received and commented on the draft dog Code as a stakeholder.

RESOLUTION:

M Stone moved:

That the minutes dated 1st August 2023 are a true and accurate record, with agreed amendments.

The committee approved the motion by consensus.

O 3. NAWAC Correspondence.

The document [35.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read.

The committee discussed the correspondence log. S Faulkner talked to correspondence regarding cat management. The committee agreed to hold this topic until the cat code of welfare review is progressed.



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

A Dale joined the meeting at 09:21am.

It was noted that MPI Policy made a submission on the petition submitted by Erica Rowlands calling for desexing and microchipping of companion cats and are expecting a report back within the next few months.

The remaining correspondence was noted.

O 4. Status of actions arising from previous meetings.

The document [36.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read.

All actions marked as completed were noted and can be carried over into the master actions list.

The committee discussed action 2 *"Include feedback from MPI Sector Liaison on feedback they are receiving from industry on pastoral codes at public events in the next MPI update."* It was noted that Sector Liaison are booked to present to NAWAC in the March 2024 meeting on their codes implementation plan. The committee requested to receive an update from MPI Sector Liaison team at every NAWAC meeting as they are perceived to be the eyes and ears in the industry. NAWAC indicated they would see value in inviting Sector Liaison to attend meetings in the future.

M Stone provided an update on action 5. He noted that a letter he drafted regarding sheep washing was circulated as a draft to MIA and NZFS before being sent to MIA, along with the report provided to NAWAC by MPI Verification Services. Furthermore, M Stone had had a face-to-face meeting with the MIA staff member responsible. M Stone expects a formal response to come through shortly and noted that the matter will need deeper investigation during the review of the slaughter Code.

N Waran joined the meeting at 09:29am

M Stone shared that he discussed the draft letter on sheep washing with MPI Chief Food Safety Officer who intimated NAWAC might be over-stepping its role, since it is not the AW regulator, which is MPI's responsibility. NAWAC is an advisory body, and in their capacity, can advise stakeholders of their concerns, but cannot call for change directly as this is the purview of the regulator.

M Stone provided an update on the draft opinion paper on emerging Agritech. The paper has been drafted and peer reviewed by a select number of NAWAC members as well as the Animal Welfare Science Secretariat. In line with the previous process for the opinion paper on selective breeding, M Stone has decided to put the paper through a targeted stakeholder consultation process. A Dale noted that the stakeholder list should be broadened to include animal welfare advocacy groups. A shortlist was proposed, including SPCA, NZVA, WAP, NZALA, VAWA, and SAFE, in addition to those previously



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

identified by M Stone. M Stone briefly introduced the content of the paper, and the committee requested to review it before endorsing for stakeholder consultation. It was agreed that the paper will go to NAWAC for 2 weeks for review, after which it will go to the stakeholder list for feedback.

No progress was noted on the sentence opinion paper. P Mason and C Johnson shared they were happy to support, however M Stone affirmed that one person should take the lead on drafting the paper and this was not resolved.

MPI Policy shared an update on the Code of Recommendation and Minimums Standards for ostrich and emu. The draft wording of the disclaimer for the MPI website was shared for which the committee provided edits. A Dale noted that she is in the process of reviewing the guidance provided in the Code and has connected with an ostrich expert.

The remaining actions in progress were noted.

Actions:

- Secretariat to discuss with Sector Liaison about providing an update at every NAWAC meeting.
- NAWAC to review the draft opinion paper on emerging Agritech for 2 weeks after which it will go to stakeholders for feedback.
- MPI Policy to update disclaimer wording for ostrich and emu CRMS on the MPI website.

O 6. MPI Update.

The document [37.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read.

The Secretariat talked to the update and provided a brief overview of key points, including:

- Two new senior advisers within the Animal Welfare Science team.
- s9(2)(a) has formally resigned from MPI, and s9(2)(a) has taken on the Animal Welfare Manager position on a permanent basis.
- s9(2)(a) is taking up a 1-month secondment as Manager for the MPI Animal Health team.

M Stone thanked the Secretariat for the inclusion of items related to animal exports within the update, noting it will be an interesting area to watch with the change of Government. M Stone requested recognition by MPI that this falls within NAWAC's area of interest and broad mandate to advise the Minister on animal welfare in New Zealand (without limitation) including legislative proposals, while acknowledging that this work falls outside of the Animal Welfare team's scope. MPI Policy noted that whilst NAWAC are



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

welcome to have an opinion and provide advice on animal exports, NAWAC's function under the Act is "to advise the Minister on any matter relating to the welfare of animals in New Zealand". NAWAC noted that even considering this specific limitation, the preparation, loading and shipping to the limits of the EEZ would therefore clearly fall within the NAWAC legal mandate. NAWAC therefore requested that MPI Animal Exports recognise NAWAC's interest in the welfare of animals being exported and keep NAWAC informed as a mandated advisor to the Minister on such matters. The policy reversal with change of government will be a challenging process for regulators and stakeholders during design, codification, and implementation, and NAWAC's support in the process would help to ensure good animal welfare risk management and outcomes. MPI Policy noted that the existing code *Transport within New Zealand* and its exclusion of any minimum standards or regulations around live exports implied that previous iterations of NAWAC had seen the export trade as falling outside its functions.

MPI Policy provided a verbal update. As there is no new Minister yet, there are no substantial updates. It was noted that the team will be resubmitting their advice on the proposed regulations on dog tethering to the incoming government.

Actions:

- Manager, Animal Welfare to discuss with Animal Health & Welfare Director & Animal Exports team the continued interest of NAWAC into the welfare of animals being exported from New Zealand.

O 5. Issues register.

The document [37.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read.

The committee noted that the current Chair of the Racing Industry Board has retired, and the position is currently vacant. M Stone noted that any new issues can be added to the register, and anything of note seen by members can be forwarded to the Secretary for inclusion in the Weekly Update.

FOR APPROVAL

O 7. NAWAC Meeting Dates 2024.

The document [38.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read.

The committee reviewed and discussed the proposed meeting dates for 2024. It was noted that it is the dates that are to be approved, but not locations at this time.



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

The committee agreed to the proposed date for both the March and August meetings and requested the following changes:

- Change the February meeting to 5th March.
- Change the May meeting to 14th May.
- Change the November meeting to October 30th.

It was noted that the dates still need to be aligned with NAEAC, and placeholders will be sent out once NAEAC have confirmed their dates.

M Stone addressed expense claims with the committee and requested that the committee attend to claims and reimbursements in a timely manner.

The committee adjourned for morning tea at 10.32 am.

The committee reconvened at 10.50am.

O 8. NAWAC Guideline – Assessing the welfare performance of restraining and kills traps.

The documents [41.23A, 41.23B] were circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. A Dale shared that the review of this guideline, originally NAWAC guideline 9, had been worked on by the wildlife SC for approximately three years. It was noted that this guideline is already on the website, and this review is to update the guideline, with no further consultation required.

The committee discussed that as testing of traps before sale is voluntary, most traps are untested. It was noted that DOC do use approved traps. NAWAC would prefer for both the use and sale of traps to go through welfare performance testing, but this is not currently required and there is a cost involved with testing. It was noted that traps are not licenced in New Zealand meaning there is no guarantee that the traps used have been tested. This contrasts with the UK where traps have to be licenced.

Trap experts at DOC and Landcare Research were consulted on this guideline. The guideline has been improved to include traps which hold animals before killing, and to 'futureproof' the guideline to ensure it will cover new traps coming on to the market. Maintenance and upkeep including trap degradation and gas leakage is also covered. It was noted that the main traps that are currently approved tend to be for species such as rats, possums, and some mustelids, and that there are no approved traps for mice.

The committee discussed the sample sizes, power calculations and study design for trap testing, and that the need for statistical significance means that sample sizes are variable, depending on the categorisation of the trap to be tested.



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

It was noted by the Wildlife SC that there is a list which identifies trap types that have undergone testing. The committee discussed the need for support on this guideline from groups likely to be contacted for advice, e.g., Predator Free NZ. A Dale shared that PFNZ are on board with recommending approved traps but may not have the knowledge of how to do so.

The committee discussed how traps that have failed the testing should be managed and noted that if NAWAC have a concern about a particular type of trap, they can develop advice to present to the Minister.

A correction was noted to change the phrase 'kill trap' to 'restraining trap' on page 7, section 6.

No further comments were noted.

RESOLUTION:

M Stone moved:

That the proposed draft updated NAWAC Guideline "Assessing the welfare performance of restraining and kill traps", be approved for finalising and publishing with the discussed amendments and distributed to stakeholders.

The committee approved the motion by consensus.

M Stone talked about how to feature the guideline on the website, considering the other NAWAC guidelines are about operational business. This should be a stand-alone guideline, to which the committee agreed.

Actions:

- Secretariat to amend the guideline as minuted prior to progressing for publishing.

PRESENTATION

O 9. NAWAC Focus Topics Discussion Series: Animal Welfare Emergency Management

The document [42.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read.

M Stone welcomed s9(2)(a) and expressed that NAWAC were interested in understanding the functioning of the animal welfare emergency management team, as well as learnings from recent events.



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

Key points of s9(2)(a) presentation included:

- An introduction to her background.
- The Animal Welfare Emergency Management (AWEM) team and their distribution around New Zealand.
- Why animals are an important part of emergency management:
 - o Ethically, it is necessary to consider the impacts of emergencies on animals.
 - o Owners will risk their lives for their animals: saving animal lives saves human lives.
 - o Animals have a protective factor and can facilitate recovery of people and communities.
- The welfare cycle: 1. needs identification, 2. needs assessment, 3. welfare delivery co-ordination. The welfare cycle looks to identify what the needs of people and animals are during emergencies, and that those needs are delivered.
- The welfare function is not always activated, depending on the emergency, and can be activated on a scale.
- MPI teams involved in emergency response include: rural communities and farming support, compliance, and biosecurity team.
 - o Roles – MPI is the lead agency for drought, animal and plant pests and diseases, the responsible agency for animal welfare sub-function, and the support agency for other subfunctions.
- There are fifteen regional animal welfare sub-groups across the country. The national-level responsibility is to provide support network for regional groups and people on the ground.
 - o Every region may have a different makeup depending on the types of animals in the region.
- Disasters are increasing in frequency.
- The national animal welfare emergency management strategic plan 2020-2030, sets out goals for 10 years, and was written in conjunction with the animal welfare subfunction.
 - o It has a vision of a resilient nation that protects animals in emergencies and is written in plain English.
- The strategic plan includes tips for what people can do to increase resilience in an emergency.
- Levels of response: national, regional, local, incident, and community.
- The 4 Rs of emergency management: risk reduction, readiness, response, and recovery.
 - o Goals and objectives to meet the 4Rs, and what success looks like.
- Regional plans are tailored for the region and are available on the MPI website.

s9(2)(a) opened the floor for questions.



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

A query was raised regarding financial arrangements with support agencies, and how much of an impediment to rapid action this generates. s9(2)(a) noted that a lack of funding does create roadblocks, and animal welfare management in emergencies relies on the goodwill of communities and support agencies. There are a few volunteer organisations and often the support agencies working in the human space are complementary. It was acknowledged that with an increase in emergency events, they are becoming a financial burden for voluntary organisations.

The committee queried AWEM's review process post response, and how learnings are taken on board. s9(2)(a) noted that this falls within the risk reduction and readiness phase, and that the 4 Rs occur in a cycle. As the frequency of responses increases, the team may be pulled straight from the recovery stage in one response, to another response, removing the opportunity to work through the final stages of the cycle.

It was noted that no one disaster is like another and the importance of creating individual community response plans and that people can learn lessons from each other and work together. s9(2)(a) noted that she sits on welfare coordination groups and has had some involvement in assisting territorial authorities with community plans and working with council to identify vulnerable communities.

The committee discussed the vision of the strategic plan, and queried whether it should be expanded to include planning, response, and recovery, not just resilience, to install a planning mantra at the community level, and the importance of recovery and learning. s9(2)(a) responded that this is laid out in the goals and mission of the strategic plan, whereas the vision sits at a higher-level with language aligned with the national disaster resilience strategy.

A question was raised regarding data collection and management across different responses. s9(2)(a) noted that the AWEM team provide information when requested to do so by civil defence for needs assessment support, but that they are not the responsible agency in this area. It was shared that there is a geographical information system being worked on within the AWEM team looking at how to better share data with support agencies. s9(2)(a) noted that they are still building this mapping and noted the importance of collecting information with privacy provisions to allow sharing of information with other agencies.

It was noted by the committee that some NAWAC members were closely affected by cyclone Gabrielle and would like to be included in any review process, with the added intention of understanding around fit for purpose plans in the context of Codes of Welfare. s9(2)(a) shared that the strategy for the debrief following cyclone Gabrielle is still being established, considering that many different teams across MPI were involved. The findings have been gathered, and MPI are working through how to publish this information.



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

A request to find out when rural advisory groups would be consulted was raised, to which s9(2)(a) noted that this doesn't sit with AWEM but that she is happy to take this question to the rural teams within MPI and will touch base with NAWAC. The option of having a representative from NAWAC on the national subfunction, to join streams of work was raised, to which both s9(2)(a) and NAWAC were happy to discuss.

M Stone requested that as plans for animal welfare after-action reviews are completed, NAWAC's interest is noted.

s9(2)(a) updated that a draft Emergency Management bill has been proposed to replace the CDEM Act 2002, which AWEM submitted on. s9(2)(a) is happy to keep NAWAC updated as it progresses.

M Stone thanked s9(2)(a) for her time and briefing and for keeping engaged with NAWAC in the future.

The committee adjourned for lunch at 12:06pm

The committee reconvened at 12.49pm

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

PART 2: PUBLIC EXCLUDED AGENDA

RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PUBLIC

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

Section 48, Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987

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

- C 1. NAWAC Guidelines 1-3
- C 2. Dairy code of welfare
- C 3. Painful husbandry procedures code memo
- C 4. Submission – draft updated dog code of welfare
- C 5. NAWAC In-Committee
- C 6. Deer code – update on key issues
- C 7. Subcommittee updates

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. – C 3.	To enable the local authority to deliberate in private on decisions or recommendations where it is required to make a recommendation by any enactment.	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 48(2)(a)(ii) of the OIA.
C 4. – C 7.	To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through —	the free and frank expression of opinions by or between or to Ministers of the Crown or members of an organisation or officers and employees of any public service agency or organisation in the course of their duty

I also move that: s9(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.

The committee agreed by consensus.



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

FOR APPROVAL

C 1. NAWAC Guidelines 1 - 3

The documents [40.23A – 40.23F] were circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read.

Guideline 1

M Stone noted the alignment of the steps within the guideline align with the 13 steps in the NAWAC workplan and identified four key touch points for NAWAC decisions in the code review process: during development of the high-level plan, approval of the draft to recommend for public consultation, identification of key issues within the subcommittee after public consultation, and approval of the final code to recommend to the Minister.

A few editorial notes were addressed, including:

- Consistency of spelling style (i.e., American versus English spelling)
- Consistency in punctuation.
- It was noted that in section 5, last paragraph, the last sentence should stop at 'the'.
The committee agreed.

The committee discussed further potential amendments.

M Stone confirmed that within Step 4, the phrase "understood and referred to" is referring to everyone, however, no change to wording was suggested.

The Secretariat noted that the guidance document for external drafters has been flagged for review and update. M Stone noted that NAWAC can refer to it within Guideline 1 after it has been updated.

Section 'Targeted stakeholder engagement', last bullet point mentions appropriate version control, which may need to be mentioned earlier in the process. The committee agreed this should be addressed.

Guidance on RBPs: MPI Policy noted the statement that RBPs are something that are realistically and practically achievable for all New Zealand farmers and advised that this could be discussed with MPI Legal. N Waran noted that RBP is defined in the codes, and her view of their role as demonstrating superior welfare practice. The definition of a RBP as written in the dairy code was read out by the Secretariat. The committee discussed this may need updating at some point in the future. M Stone noted that the intention of the content in Guideline 1 is to provide practical support to the drafting process so that RBPs are practically achievable in New Zealand as demonstrated by current implementation by the best practitioners. It was noted that RBPs should encourage going further than minimum standards. The committee agreed to amend the wording of the Guideline to include "*they should be practically achievable for the circumstances they purport to cover*".



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

Nothing further was noted about guideline 1. The general consensus of the committee was that it was an excellent guideline, required minor editorial changes and deletion of half a sentence.

Guideline 2

R Palmer spoke to Guideline 2 and called for feedback.

It was raised whether under section Consultation, paragraph 2, the wording "the decision maker is allowed to have a preferred option" might lend itself to real or perceived bias. R Palmer responded that this wording was taken from the court of appeals decision on this matter. C Eyre queried whether NAWAC should include wording affirming they are upholding the principles of natural justice. Discussion followed about what principles of natural justice mean in relation to the process of consultation. The committee agreed to put in an opening sentence stating support for the principles of natural justice with the suggested wording of *'consultation must be allowed sufficient time and a genuine effort according to principles of natural justice must be made'* in section 2.

A few editorial corrections were raised which were noted by R Palmer.

Guideline 3

P Mason spoke to guideline 3.

M Stone noted that the process detailed in section 4 is complex, and that the feedback received from MPI Legal simply reflected what is stated in the Act, whereas the guideline is intended to go beyond the facts of the Act by providing additional practical support during implementation within the broader context of Good Regulatory Practice.

s9(2)(a) commented on the following text in Guideline 3: *"Regulations recommended by NAWAC that address these requirements have the best opportunity to be made in accordance with the direct pathway indicated by section 184(2), although the decision on whether to undertake further consultation remains the Minister's."* He noted that there is no 'direct pathway' between NAWAC and the Minister for Regulations, with MPI Policy always leading. Section 184 covers consultation requirements and if the Minister determines NAWAC has completed the consultation process to a satisfactory level, they can agree that MPI does not need to do any additional consultation. However, Policy will still advise the Minister, provide a view on NAWAC's recommendation, and are required to complete the rest of the normal process for confirming a Regulation. s9(2)(a) suggested that NAWAC should note Section 184(2)(b)(ii) meaning an exception from the requirement to consult on draft Regulations only applies if the minister has not yet issued the Code; on the other hand, if the reviewed Code has been issued by the Minister, MPI (representing the Minister) must undertake consultation on draft Regulations. Given the usual processes to develop a Regulation, avoiding additional consultation through



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

application of the exception in Section 184(2)(b)(ii) could mean issue and implementation of the Code would be delayed. If NAWAC is wanting to get Codes more quickly into place, this approach to develop Regulations in parallel to Codes will undermine that objective.

s9(2)(g)(i)

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

s9(2)(g)(i)

R Palmer spoke to the final action on the memo, regarding the reformatting of Codes. After discussion, the business subcommittee determined that a reformatting of Codes is not needed, however, NAWAC should remain cognisant of the need to keep future Codes concise and usable. The committee agreed with this approach.

RESOLUTION:

R Palmer moved:

That the draft guidelines 1-3 be approved by NAWAC pending the discussed amendments by the authors and sign-off by the NAWAC Chair, and to retire those guidelines that they replace.

The committee approved the motion by consensus.

R Palmer called for feedback on the two remaining drafts guidelines by mid-December to be ready for the March meeting. She also noted that members are free to submit any comments in writing to save time discussing them in the March meeting, noting the discussion ran half an hour over in this item.

Actions:

- Guidelines 1-3 to be updated as per discussion at the November meeting and progressed for publishing.
- NAWAC to provide feedback on draft guidelines 4 and 5 by mid-December.

C 2. Dairy code of welfare

The documents [43.23A – 43.23F] were circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read.

s9(2)(g)(i)



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

s9(2)(g)(i)

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

s9(2)(ba)(i)

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

s9(2)(g)(i)

M Stone opened the floor for discussion or questions:

C Eyre acknowledged that this has been a significant piece of work and would like to abstain from the decision-making process, as she has not been part of the review process as a new member of NAWAC.

T Brown noted that she was not comfortable voting without reassurance that two points raised in the discussion and in the sub-committee would be noted when submitting to the Minister. Thereafter, T Brown elected to abstain from voting entirely, noting that changes in the dairy code would have a financial impact on her in a personal capacity.

s9(2)(a) noted that when NAWAC submits a letter of recommendation, any concerns or positions could be outlined there, and on the draft Code and report to the Minister. MPI will provide a letter of advice to the Minister outlining any concerns from a governance perspective (e.g., economic, practicality, support required for the industry, etc). The Minister can accept in full, send back to NAWAC with areas to be re-addressed / tackled, reject the Code, or with sound justification can amend based on additional advice.



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

RESOLUTION

M Stone moved:

That NAWAC accept the positions articulated in the Code of Welfare and Code report as the basis for NAWAC's recommendations, and that both should be recommended to the Minister, while passing on the concerns on noted matters by Members.

The committee approved the motion, with abstentions by T Brown and C Eyre.

(Minute Taker's Note: Information Added After the Meeting: During the meeting a Resolution in relation to recommending the reviewed Code to the Minister was moved and accepted, with two abstentions by Members with interests in dairy farming. Subsequently, MPI advised NAWAC that, in accordance with MPI's interpretation of Animal Welfare Act Schedule 1 paragraph 5(9), the two members of NAWAC with dairy farming interests should not have participated or been present for the vote. Accordingly, the vote during 7 November 2023 meeting is deemed procedurally incorrect, and will be re-visited at a subsequent NAWAC meeting).

FOR DISCUSSION

C 3. Painful husbandry procedures code memo

The document [47.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read.

M Stone introduced the memo, noting that MPI have asked for more time to consider the implications of the repeal of the PHP code and replacement with sections within each species-specific Code. M Stone noted that NAWAC may also wish to explore an opinion paper reflecting on the consideration of pain.

It was noted that a repeal of the PHP Code may cause issues in the context of other Codes currently in draft or those that have already undergone public consultation. s9(2)(a) noted that the above would need to be considered by MPI, including what a possible timeline would look like, so that MPI can feedback to NAWAC with potential strategies. It was noted that this review of the PHP code was raised initially earlier in 2023.

It was acknowledged that some parts of the PHP Code are not species-specific but are useful to retain (example of MS1 given). If the PHP code is repealed, the intention of these Minimum Standards should still be captured. The committee discussed whether the intention of these Minimum Standards could be captured in the front-matter of each Code. C Johnson suggested it would not fit particularly well and stands in support of the PHP Code and offered to draft the opinion paper.

M Stone acknowledged that he detected a good level of comfort from NAWAC for the direction signalled in the memo but noted that MPI would like to have time to explore this further before reporting back to NAWAC at the first meeting in 2024.



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

The meeting adjourned for afternoon tea at 3:38pm

MPI attendees left the meeting at 3:38pm

C 5. NAWAC In-Committee

(Minute Taker's Note: Information Added After the Meeting: NAWAC In-Committee meeting time is an opportunity for the committee to come together to have discussions without the Secretariat being present. Thus, this time was not minuted, at NAWAC's request.)

MPI attendees re-joined the meeting at 4.05pm.

C 4. Submission – draft updated dog code of welfare

The documents [44.23A – 44.23C] were circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read.

M Stone put to the committee to decide whether or not the draft dog Code in its submitted state is fit for purpose to be recommend to the Minister for public consultation, or whether NAWAC should instead accept it into their work programme for the companion animals subcommittee to review. The Code went through targeted stakeholder consultation before it was submitted to NAWAC for consideration but has not yet gone through full public consultation.

It was noted that Federated Farmers have not seen the updates to the draft Code regarding working dogs made in light of their feedback post-consultation.

The committee discussed that as it is, it is not ready for public consultation, and that the subcommittee should review it. The committee noted that the Code is long and perhaps could use further editing, however, considers most changes at this point to be editorial. It was suggested more detail may be needed around working dogs and rehoming.

M Stone proposed that NAWAC responds to the drafters and acknowledge their work to get the draft Code to where it, however, the Code is not yet fit for purpose for recommendation to the Minister, as there are a few areas within the draft where the Minimum Standards may not comply with the purposes of the Act. M stone also proposed to rename the rabbit subcommittee to the companion animal subcommittee, which could include work relating to cats, dogs, and rabbits.

The committee agreed with this approach and asked the Secretariat to draft a letter to the drafter informing them.



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

Actions:

- Secretariat to draft a response letter to the SPCA for the submission of the draft updated dog Code of Welfare.

C 7. Subcommittee updates

The document [46.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read, and subcommittee Chairs provided verbal updates.

A Dale shared that the rabbit Code had a break while there were changes in the Secretariat support, however future meetings are booked. The committee is starting at the beginning of the Code and working through systematically. C Eyre signalled interest in joining the subcommittee. Noting the Sub-Committee already has four members, M Stone asked if any existing members wanted to resign, however none did. R Palmer noted that her term on NAWAC will expire in 2024. The MPI Secretariat working on the rabbit Code was confirmed as s9(2)(a) .

P Mason provided an update on the Rodeo Code. The subcommittee is still aiming for May 2024 for public consultation and a few individual members are hoping to complete a training visit to a rodeo in February 2024, accompanied by MPI Inspectors. M Stone signalled that he would like to attend training or an event. s9(2)(a) emphasised that the budget is always a consideration in back of mind, but MPI will support the committee. The Secretariat will investigate costs and possible options for visits. It was noted by NAWAC that if the committee is not seen as credible and there are legal challenges to the Code upon issue, that is a cost concern as well.

M Stone noted that the pigs Code remains with the Minister. M Stone shared that he attended a select hearing of the Primary Productions Committee and presented on NAWAC's views on the pork industry earlier this year which was well received.

S Faulkner provided an update on the sheep and beef Code, in that the subcommittee is currently working through the differences between dairy and the sheep and beef Codes, with the intention to align the pastoral codes. NAWAC acknowledged the excellent work of s9(2)(a) . It was noted that there was a meeting with the members of the original working group that had positive feedback, and discussions about semantics and the overall impression of the draft Code were robust.

R Palmer provided an update on the business subcommittee, reminding the committee to return comments on draft guidelines 4 and 5 before the next meeting for efficiency. The NAWAC website remains on the radar but is not pressing. M Stone noted that C Eyre



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

has been added to the companion animals' subcommittee and raised whether she would like to join the business subcommittee, to which she agreed.

A Dale updated the committee on the work of the wildlife subcommittee. They are now working on the best practice guideline for the humane control of pests, which is a voluntary guideline. A Dale noted that she is eager to advance a regulation about trap testing to the Minister and does not think it would require an amendment to The Act.

s9(2)(g)(i)

The greyhound subcommittee updated that they are waiting on the new Government to form to advance any work.

M Stone noted that he has drafted a high-level plan for the poultry Codes review, with the plan to bring it to the first meeting next year. The Secretariat support is lined up for poultry, however, NAWAC will need confirmation from MPI on the resourcing available in 2024. A Dale noted that externally drafted poultry Codes may be coming to NAWAC. s
that the MPI has a draft Code for breeder chickens. 9
(

Actions:

- C Eyre to join the business subcommittee and companion animals' subcommittee.

C Johnson left the meeting at 4:34pm

C Eyre left the meeting at 4:34pm

C 6. Deer code - update on key issues

The document [45.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read.

s9(2)(g)(i)



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

s9(2)(g)(i)

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982



National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee

s9(2)(g)(i)

G McCullough left the meeting at 5.15pm.

s9(2)(g)(i)

R Palmer left the meeting at 5:17pm

s9(2)(g)(i)

T Brown left the meeting at 17:19pm.

PART 3: OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

O. 10 Work Programme update

M Stone summarised the progress of the committee noted during the guidelines discussions and subcommittee updates, and the agreed approach for progressing the review of the draft updated dog Code submitted to NAWAC when resourcing becomes available.

The deer subcommittee confirmed further revisions will occur and that they will discuss the comments from the external reviewer and the committee's discussion and will be ready for review in March by NAWAC.

The meeting was closed at 5:22pm.