



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: Room 1.04, Charles Ferguson Building,
Wellington

Rā: 1st August 2023

Tāima: 09:00 – 16:30

MENETI | MINUTES

Komiti / Committee: Matthew Stone (Kairuruku/Chair), Arnja Dale, Peter Mason, Grant McCullough, Tracy Brown (virtual), Mhairi Sutherland, Ruth Palmer, Natalie Waran, Sandra Faulkner

Nuinga / Attendees: s9(2)(a)

[Redacted Attendee List]

Tūmatanui tangata I tae atu / Public Attendees: No public attendees

Matangaro / Apologies: Craig Johnson

Any Other Business (Open to the Public):

Any Other Business (Public Excluded):

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

PART 1: OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

GENERAL

O 1. Welcomes and Farewell

M Stone opened the meeting with a karakia at 09.06am. C Johnson was noted as an apology. No public attendees, or absentees were noted. N Waran communicated a late arrival.

M Stone addressed an article from the Institute of Directors, detailing that the process of moving and seconding is not widely used anymore and does not technically have a legal basis. M Stone put to the committee to make decisions based on consensus without recording who requested the motion and who seconded it. The committee agreed with this approach, and it was decided that going forward, motions will be carried based on consensus without requesting a seconder.

An update was provided on the appointments progress for two new NAWAC members. M Stone noted that G McCullough's term will be ending soon and thanked him for his service to the committee.

O 2. Confirmation of previous minutes

The minutes from the previous general meeting held on the 2nd and 3rd of May 2023 [21.23] were circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. The committee reviewed and discussed the minutes. Some minor amendments were made via email prior to the meeting but no main points were discussed. M Stone thanked the Secretariat for the detail contained within the minutes.

RESOLUTION:

M Stone moved:

That the minutes be approved as a true and accurate record of the NAWAC General Meeting held on the 2-3 May 2023

The committee approved the minutes by consensus.

The motion was put: carried.

O 3. Status of actions arising from previous meetings

The actions list [22.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. The committee reviewed completed and in-progress actions.

The committee noted the paper on sheep washing requested from Verification Services was circulated for this meeting.

A Dale provided an update that the action regarding halal stunning is in progress and that it would be useful for either the poultry subcommittee (SC) or the wider committee to hear from VS on reversible stunning and its associated regulatory framework, either as a written update or in-person briefing. It was noted that a contact within VS has already been secured for this and can be followed up.

N Waran arrived at 09.16am.

Regarding action five, the committee noted two different funding packages that were made available for cyclone Gabrielle recovery, which were focused primarily on providing business support. M Stone noted an initiative within MPI involving support for vets to provide animal health and welfare planning support to farmers.

Regarding action six, s9(2)(a) spoke to the review of cabinet circular on committee fees. She confirmed that NAWAC is categorised as Group 4. She shared that a survey on the cabinet fees framework is scheduled which MPI will have input into, and there may be movement in this space on its own accord. s9(2)(a) confirmed that the Secretariat will update NAWAC when they know more. M Stone queried the criteria under the scoring framework for categorisation and fees alignment, and whether a record of the evaluation of NAWAC against that framework exists.

The committee noted that action seven was completed.

It was noted that s9(2)(a) agreed to re-join the wildlife SC as an ex-officio member. It was shared that the status of the snare prohibition is in progress.

Regarding action twelve on the NAWAC opinion piece on sentience, the committee discussed that there is information on the NAWAC website about sentience already, and that there was a joint NAEAC/NAWAC sentience workshop took place in 2022. M Stone would like to see this material brought together into an opinion piece, which could propose criteria for considering an animal species as sentient along the lines of the review of evidence for sentience in cephalopod molluscs and decapod crustaceans undertaken by the London School of Economics and Political Science in 2021.

Regarding action thirteen, the committee discussed that the NAWAC website refresh is in progress, overseen by the NAWAC business SC and administrated by the Secretariat.

The committee noted that action 14 and 15 are in progress.

No further points were raised.

Actions:

- **Secretary to follow up scheduling a VS speaker on halal poultry stunning for the committee.**
- **Secretariat to follow up the record of evaluation of NAWAC against the cabinet fees framework.**

O 4. NAWAC correspondence

The correspondence log [23.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and is taken as read. The log was reviewed by the committee. The committee noted that the link on the document to the ACVM response could not be accessed.

Actions:

- **Secretary to circulate the response from NZFS, ACVM regarding NAWAC's 2021 submission on the brodifacoum consultation, along with their summary of submissions and associated responses.**

O 5. MPI update and discussion

The MPI update documents [24.23a, 24.23b] were circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read.

§9(2)(a) provided an MPI Animal Welfare Science team update and talked through the recent movements within the team. M Stone talked to the information on the Farm to Processor Animal Welfare Forum (FTPWF) and the good summary of operational research. S Faulkner requested an update on what MPI Sector Liaison are hearing at events regarding pastoral Codes and regulations in the next MPI update.

N Waran expressed an interest in MPI Animal Welfare Emergency Management (AWEM), and any reviews occurring on cyclone Gabrielle recovery. §9(2)(a) shared that there was no intention at this point for any reviews, but this can be discussed. §9(2)(a) noted that the AWEM team will be contributing to a response covering all of primary industries. M Stone noted that NAWAC have previously requested for AWEM to be part of the series of updates requested from MPI, and that if there are any reviews happening, S Faulkner should be invited as a NAWAC representative. §9(2)(a) confirmed for the committee that the manager of AWEM is pencilled in to present at the NAWAC November meeting. It was discussed how NAWAC should be progressively integrating chapters within Codes on contingency plans, how they relate to existing national plans and the specific issues that sit within contingency planning for different species, including permanent identification.

M Stone shared with the committee that he has a meeting scheduled on 16th August with Minister Luxton regarding NAWAC and their work programme. Additionally, NAWAC received an invitation for 17th August to speak to the Primary Productions Committee regarding the pigs Code.

M Stone asked §9(2)(a) to provide update on the pig Code. §9(2)(a) noted that NZPork have submitted information as part of the public consultation process, and that there is a meeting with Ministers O'Conner and Luxton scheduled for this week. M Stone

noted that Animal Policy International secured a funding grant with a pitch related to animal welfare for international trade purposes, which feeds into NZPork's position regarding market protections. The committee noted that Jo Luxton was the Chair of the Primary Productions Committee (PPC) previously, and queried who the current Chair is, which was confirmed as Steph Lewis. s9(2)(a) confirmed that Policy had not received any request directly from the PPC.

The committee moved on to discussing the sheep washing report provided by VS, noting it was an interesting read. The main point discussed was that sheep washing is an industry-adopted practice that does not seem to have sound food safety justification, however, comes with increased animal welfare compromise risk. With support of food safety team, NAWAC want to use the VS report to produce clearer recommendations, potentially in light of the review of the slaughter/post-farm gate Code.

N Waran spoke to the statement on water supply within the report, in that the environmental cost of disposing of wash water, and how this relates to sustainability, could be a powerful argument for processors to end this practice. M Stone confirmed that reasons relating to food safety, cost economics, sustainability, and animal welfare seem to collectively present a strong argument against sheep washing. S Faulkner noted to the committee on (physiological) pH rising during sheep washing, compromising meat quality. s9(2)(a) recommended that NAWAC check in with NZFS on what their position is.

The committee discussed a proposed action plan of:

1. checking with NZFS on their position regarding food safety rational for sheep washing.
2. raising the issue at an upcoming FTPAW forum, including seeking permission from VS to share report.
3. taking the views and information from the VS update into the post-farm gate Code review.

The committee discussed that there is a difference between visual and microbiological contamination, and that whilst sheep washing reduces visual contamination, there is increased microbiological contamination.

T Brown asked whether NAWAC should discuss their concerns with Nathan Guy (Chair, Meat Industry Association) before going to the wider FTPAWF, to give a heads-up regarding concerns and understand what the industry is doing. The committee discussed whether this contact should be formally or informally undertaken, and T Brown noted that she can action this as she has a connection.

s9(2)(a) noted a technical paper that NZFS published in 2021 which covers washing of sheep and microbiological contamination impacts. She also noted the issue that some premises use recycled water for sheep washing. The committee requested this paper to be circulated for background information, which A Dale did during the meeting.

Actions:

- **Secretariat to organise an update from MPI Sector Liaison on feedback received during public events regarding pastoral Codes in the next MPI update**
- **NAWAC Action plan for sheep washing;**
 - a. **Check with NZFS on their position regarding food safety rational for sheep washing**
 - b. **Draft letter to Nathan Guy to formally state position and discuss the issue**
 - c. **Raise the issue at an upcoming FTPAW forum, including seeking permission from VS to share report.**

O 6. Issues register

The issues register [25.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. The committee reviewed the items currently listed on the issues register.

Main points discussed included the ongoing issue of larval fish. It was noted that the main issue is that larval fish are not defined as animals under the Animal Welfare Act, and therefore research involving their use is not subject to review by an animal ethics committee (AEC), even though evidence shows that they are sentient and capable of feeling pain. N Waran noted that there is a need for consultation with groups using larval zebrafish in research, testing, and teaching (RTT) to understand how such a change may impact research in New Zealand.

s9(2)(a) discussed that demonstration of the sentience of larval fish would be needed. The committee questioned when the next opportunity to make a recommendation for an Act amendment might be, given the ongoing discussion between NAWAC and NAEAC. s9(2) noted that he can discuss this internally, but it would be a significant undertaking rather than a minor technical amendment, and they would need to adequately consider the consequences. A Dale reminded the committee that there was work on this matter conducted with Policy historically, and that there will be documentation recorded within MPI Policy. N Waran acknowledged that timing would need to be right for such a change and that it would be a difficult undertaking but affirmed that New Zealand is out of step internationally on this, so it needs to be progressed.

The committee touched on insect sentience. M Stone referenced the London School of Economics and Political Science 2021 report detailing criteria needed to determine sentience in relation to cephalopod molluscs and decapods. When NAWAC drafts the sentience opinion piece, the need to adopt a framework that provides scientific clarity on criteria for determining sentience should be included, along with a clear message that definitions will continue to change as we know more.

S Faulkner spoke to emerging technologies in agriculture, and that there is drive within industry relating to identification and traceability. She spoke to issues on virtual fencing for beef cattle, and that collars used for beef cattle are often heavier than those used for dairy cattle. The committee discussed how NAWAC are positioned to encourage lighter/better technologies for the companies developing these. The committee discussed whether this should be something to be proactively progressed by NAWAC to prevent tech coming on the market that has the potential to compromise animal welfare. It was suggested that a concise opinion piece on Animal Welfare Issues with Emerging Agritech could address this, including wearable devices, internal devices, drones, and robotics as the key areas of tech. The committee noted that there is an absence of legal requirement for prior consideration of safety, efficacy, and animal welfare, but that developers should be providing evidence of absence/reduction of animal welfare risks before launching to market. The committee would like to frame the opinion piece around this. s9(2)(a) noted that in theory, animal-based research during development of Agritech involves the use of animals for RTT and thus needs consideration by an AEC. AECs may therefore need to be encouraged to question developers heavily when applications come through. There is also likely a need for increasing awareness that developers of Agritech need to discuss if approval is required with an AEC.

The committee adjourned for morning tea at 10:38am

The committee reconvened at 11.02am

Actions:

- s9(2)(a) check in with MPI Policy and legal regarding larval fish and provide NAWAC with an update.
- M Stone to draft Animal Welfare Issues with Emerging Agritech NAWAC opinion piece
- A Dale and N Waran to draft Animal Sentience NAWAC opinion piece

FOR DISCUSSION

O 7. Business Subcommittee Review of NAWAC Guidelines

The draft guidelines [26.23a, 26.23b, 26.23c] were circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. M Stone introduced the draft guidelines, and the business SC's proposed approach for reviewing the remaining guidelines. There are currently 15 guidelines on the NAWAC website. The set has grown, is not coherent and requires review and updating. NAWAC made the decision to update the guideline set and the SC have created draft guidelines for the first three. M Stone affirmed that NAWAC are not looking to approve today, as MPI will need to review the drafts as well. The business SC will review the remaining guidelines still online to determine which should be retired, and which should be reviewed. It likely will result in a smaller set of guidelines. The three draft

guidelines already replace eight existing guidelines. The members of the business subcommittee introduced each guideline in turn that they developed.

Draft guideline 1: M Stone talked to this and introduced the structure and decision-process for the content. He noted the appendices – the earlier guideline already had a template for the Terms of Reference of the SC, and this was kept as was with some minor editing. A summary of what NAWAC should view as good regulatory practice as a committee is included in annex 2 but could also be its own guideline if needed. A Dale suggested to condense all updated guidelines into one guideline document rather than separate. N Waran spoke to the challenge of how minimum standards are developed, how to describe this process, and how to define broadly what a minimum standard is to ensure that stakeholders have a sufficient understanding. M Stone suggested that NAWAC lay out the process of Code of Welfare development, and that operationally this is how minimum standards come about. R Palmer agreed that it is a synthesis of information and evidence that the committee decides on, which informs the minimum standard. N Waran suggested that although it may start as evidenced-based it becomes a judgment from experts. M Stone noted to perhaps include a sentence touching on this, where the information comes from and that this feeds into a judgment.

s9(2)(a) noted work from Policy on the animal welfare system health check and looking at definitions such as minimum standards. They are working with Legal and will update NAWAC on this. M Stone suggested that when policy review the draft guidelines, if they see something they want to react to, that would be the opportunity to raise any issues. The committee also noted the same issue with the definition on best practice, and that there is a need to ensure there is consistency within NAWAC and MPI.

Draft guideline 2: R Palmer talked to this and provided an overview. She introduced that the draft guideline had been stripped back to fundamentals of consultation to replace a number of pages with a concise two-page guideline capturing key points only. There was agreement within the committee on the quality of the draft.

Draft guideline 3: P Mason talked to this and provided an overview. He noted that it will likely require legal review and input from MPI. He introduced that the first part reflects what was presented in the last NAWAC meeting from s9(2)(a) on the regulations process, and that it gets more complex in the later sections regarding transition processes.

Many problems arise when a Code is developed alongside a parallel recommendation for a regulation, which requires amendment to the minimum standard in the Code, as well as the issue of managing non-compliant practices. When a transition period for non-compliant practices is over, a determination needs to have been made as to whether a new minimum standard or regulation takes effect. M Stone provided clarification on the term non-compliant practices. A minimum standard may be recommended by NAWAC, however there may be a recommendation for a transition period to this minimum standard due to numerous factors. In the meantime, an additional minimum standard that is technically non-compliant with the Act may be issued, which will expire after the transition period. Any minimum standard that is non-compliant within the Act needs to

be supported by a regulation under s183A(2). If NAWAC's recommendation to the Minister is that standard X should be a minimum standard in the meantime due to transition considerations, a regulation also needs to be passed, and standard Y should be the minimum standard implemented after the transition period. NAWAC can recommend a transition period of up to 10 years, but ultimately the Minister decides.

s9(2)(a) acknowledged the complexity of the process and affirmed that Policy are happy to support as appropriate. M Stone clarified that NAWAC are attempting to navigate the Act and express their obligations for this process and would value Policy's opinion. M Stone expressed that NAWAC need to be clear when Codes and regulations interact during processes of being promulgated, and when a regulation is promulgated that results in an amendment to the Code.

T Brown noted if industry organisations or assurance schemes should be included within the last page of guideline three. There are a wide number of assurance schemes, and it would be challenging to determine which ones would be considered. It was suggested for the business SC to deliberate on whether sector leaders in charge of animals should be considered within the guideline.

Actions:

- **NAWAC members to provide business SC feedback on the draft guidelines by 10th October, to be confirmed at the November meeting**

O 8. NAWAC Annual report 2022

The draft Annual Report [27.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and is taken as read. M Stone pressed to get the report finished earlier going forward and that there are still outstanding contributions needed for SC brief reports. The committee discussed that the timeline in the workplan table was not correct for December 2022.

A Dale questioned the tone of the report, when it needs to be released, and suggested a change of tense within the meeting summaries. The meeting summaries have to accurately summarise what was discussed in the meetings. The committee agreed to delete the fish SC report as nothing was actioned in 2022.

The committee discussed whether there is harm in providing an indication on how work has progressed since 31st Dec 2022 within the report, and that if not, it would need to be consistent across SC reports. The committee also discussed their obligation under the Act

to produce the annual report, with regards to timing. NAWAC noted that the February meeting was cancelled which delayed the production of the annual report.

Actions:

- s9(2)(a) [REDACTED] **to update workplan and annual report in line with comments made and send to Mat for review**

The committee adjourned for lunch at 12.09

The committee reconvened at 1.00pm.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

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. Codes of Welfare: format

C 2. Code of Recommendations and Minimum Standards for the Welfare of Ostrich and Emu

C 3. Draft Code of welfare – cats

C 4. Codes of Welfare: updates – also move to transfer discussion previously on Codes updates to this section of the Minutes.

C 5. Roles and responsibilities of NAWAC and MPI in Codes reviews

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
<i>C 1. Codes of Welfare: format C 2. Code of Recommendations and Minimum Standards for the Welfare of Ostrich and Emu C 3. Draft Code of welfare – cats and; C 4. Codes of Welfare: updates</i>	<i>To enable the local authority to deliberate in private on decisions or recommendations where it is required to make a recommendation by any enactment.</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 48(2)(a)(ii) of the OIA.</i>
<i>C 5. Roles and responsibilities of NAWAC and MPI in Codes reviews</i>	<i>To maintain the effective conduct of public affairs through —</i>	<i>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>

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.

Moved: M Stone – committee consensus

Motion put: carried

PART 2: PUBLIC EXCLUDED AGENDA

FOR DISCUSSION

C 1. Codes of Welfare: Format

The memo [28.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. s9(2)(a) introduced the issue addressed in the memo. Feedback has been received regarding the length of Codes, in particular by way of the dairy Code and policy and legal reviews. There has also been discussion at the previous NAWAC meeting about Code structure. The memo contains information from surveys that have taken place and includes options for a proposed updated structure. s9(2)(h), s9(2)(g)(i)

s9(2)(g)(i), s9(2)(h)

It was noted that the majority of people who read these Codes read them online, and a written document is for those without internet access. If they are online, they could be structured with various layers to guide the reader.

s9(2)(ba)(i), s9(2)(g)(i)

M Stone talked to option three which may be the easiest to implement, i.e., creating an additional document that draws out minimum standard and recommended best practice and references to regulation as the most important and legally relevant elements. There is some overlap between options.

A Dale queried how representative the stakeholder feedback is, and what the scope of the issue is. The committee discussed that the document needs to be user-friendly but

also mindful of related cost to any reformats, and that we cannot rely on people having internet access.

The committee discussed the Code format suggestion submitted by s9(2)(ba)(i) which included a tabular layout for recommended best practice, minimum standards, and example indicators. This would require substantive editorial work to rewrite, which could likely result in a loss of text. s9(2)(a) noted that once a Code is issued, it is no longer a NAWAC document in terms of editorial control. s9(2)(a) suggested it is likely that Sector Liaison would be doing work around implementation of the Code, and that there may be an opportunity to work closely with them.

The committee discussed that in general, Codes are becoming longer, and it is important to be mindful that the document, whilst they are legislative instruments still need to be useful for the target audience. There may be a need to review the general information sections, and the level of detail included.

s9(2)(ba)(i), s9(2)(g)(i)

Actions:

- **Secretariat to develop two examples using the rabbit Code aligned with option four listed on the memo, and the s9(2)(ba)(i) table example.**

C 2. Code of Recommendations and Minimum Standards – Ostrich and Emu

The memo [29.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. s9(2)(a) introduced the issue detailed in the memo. Before the Animal Welfare Act 1999, there were Codes of Recommendation and Minimum Standards (CRMS). Ostriches and emus seen as a growth industry and a CRMS was developed. The ostriches and emu CRMS has not been transferred into a CoW and is still online however it does not have any legal force.

A Dale shared that the SPCA refer to information within this document, and some information contained within it still has relevance. N Waran questioned whether other

countries that farm ostrich will have more updated information, and NAWAC may not be providing the best guidance if linking to an outdated document. The committee discussed that other countries, including Australia and South Africa have more up-to-date guidance documents. It was discussed whether NAWAC would like someone with expertise to review the document, or for someone to do a comparison with other existing documents to ensure it does not contain problematic advice. A Dale volunteered.

s9(2)(ba)(i), s9(2)(g)(i), s9(2)(h)

Actions:

- **Policy to initiate adding a disclaimer to the Ostrich and emu CRMS on the MPI website.**
- **A Dale to cross-check advice provided within the Ostrich and emu CRMS with other existing guidance documents**

C 3. Draft Code of Welfare - Cats

The documents [30.23a, 30.23b, 30.23c] were circulated prior to the meeting and taken as read. M Stone introduced the submitted documents to the committee and clarified that the reason for circulation was for the committee to review them and determine whether they are fit-for-purpose in their current state, and if not, how much work would be needed prepare the Code draft and Code report for NAWAC to recommend them to the Minister. M Stone acknowledged the substantial amount of work the SPCA put into the documents, noting the introduction and general information sections. It was noted that the Code may not comply with the Plain Language Act 2022. M Stone requested the committee to be mindful of Secretariat capacity and the current prioritised NAWAC work programme in their review.

A Dale reaffirmed that NAWAC was notified two years ago that a draft cat Code would be submitted to NAWAC for consideration, which was included on NAWAC's workplan.

s9(2)(a) clarified the process of reviewing a submitted draft Code of welfare, as outlined within Section 71 of the Act. If NAWAC determine that the draft Code as submitted by the SPCA satisfies criteria under Section 71 of the Act, NAWAC can agree to immediately recommend the draft Code for public consultation to the Minister. If NAWAC determine that criteria under Section 71 are not met in the submitted Code, NAWAC are required under the Act to formally decline immediately recommending the Code to the Minister for public consultation. After this has occurred, NAWAC can choose to accept the draft Code into their own work programme and use the submitted draft Code from SPCA as a

basis for reviewing the Code. s9(2)(a) stressed the need for NAWAC to ensure they follow the process as outlined in Section 71.

s9(2)(ba)(i), s9(2)(g)(i)

s9(2)(a) provided further clarification on Section 71 within the Act. If the decision of NAWAC is that the draft Code requires further work to ensure it is fit-for-purpose, then NAWAC will need to notify the submitter as outlined within the Act that the Code will not be recommended to the Minister for public consultation in its current state. The committee discussed the process of submission to NAWAC and clarified expectations of the SPCA when submitting the draft Code to NAWAC. A Dale noted that SPCA did not expect that the draft Code would immediately be recommended to the Minister for public consultation, but rather that it would be accepted within NAWAC's work programme, and reviewed and edited by a NAWAC subcommittee, before being reviewed by the wider committee. s9(2)(a) confirmed that submission of the draft Code has been formally acknowledged to the SPCA.

R Palmer acknowledged the draft Code as a great document, and suggested NAWAC accept it onto its work programme and discuss prioritisation. T Brown also noted the amount of work conducted by the SPCA, and that the draft gives NAWAC a good grounding for progressing future work. The committee reviewed Section 70 and 71 of the Act for clarification on wording and notification of the draft Code to the submitter.

The conversation moved to the anticipated submission of the Dog Code of Welfare. M Stone updated the committee that he had received correspondence from Federated

Farmers on the draft Codes, and that they felt underrepresented in the initial working group of the Code. A Dale confirmed that Federated Farmers were included as a stakeholder and received the draft dog Code. S Faulkner and T Brown acknowledged that a working dog's representative may have needed to be included in initial working group.

The committee discussed resourcing for reviewing the Code, and whether companion animal Codes should be bundled together as all have been submitted by the same group.

Actions:

- **Secretariat to reply to the SPCA, acknowledging the work that has gone into the draft and notifying them that NAWAC have considered the draft Code and will proceed by taking the Code and draft report into its work programme.**

C 4. Codes of Welfare: Updates

The Codes of welfare update [31.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and is taken as read.


R Palmer noted nothing to report.

A Dale provided an update on the rabbit Code. Work is progressing after a long pause, with a SC meeting scheduled second week of August.

M Stone provided an update on the poultry Code. It is currently still in the scoping and analysis phase. M Stone had to withdraw presenting at the Australasian Poultry Vet Association meeting due to other commitments and will confirm if they would like another NAWAC member to present.

A Dale provided an update on the wildlife SC progress. They are currently finishing off a guideline and will then circle back to snares and toxin guidelines.

s9(2)(ba)(i), s9(2)(g)(i)



M Stone called for any member reports of recent activity.

A Dale shared that she will be presenting at the ANZCCART conference in August, as well as Chairing sessions.

S Faulkner shared that she will be away for two weeks after 12th August and is currently busy with ongoing cyclone recovery.

s9(2)(ba)(i), s9(2)(g)(i)

P Mason shared that he is currently busy with ongoing greyhound SC work.

G McCullough shared that the NZVA recently held their centennial conference.

T Brown shared that DairyNZ are providing animal welfare early response training to field persons who provide consultancy roles. She is in the midst of calving at the moment. She queried operational research shared within the MPI update, and whether she can get further information on the calf welfare project.

N Waran shared that she is still heavily involved in post-cyclone relief for the equine community in Hawke's Bay. CANZ are currently running a community initiative to run three days of microchipping for horses to encourage permanent identification. CANZ have also been working on a project regarding a Good Life for Animal Centre, with updates to come. N Waran also shared that she is Chairing a commission on equine ethics and wellbeing with The International Federation for Equestrian Sports and is drafting a final report. N Waran also won a grant from the Hong Kong Jockey Club for a three-year study on horses, working on robust indicators on positive welfare and indicators of positive emotions. She is going to Malaysia to speak and run master classes on animal welfare in livestock. With regards to her position as Chair on NAEAC, they are progressing their ongoing work to promote the 3Rs, including on asking for reporting on the 3Rs from those using animals in research, testing, and teaching. NAEAC are hosting an AEC Chair meeting 27th October to discuss this topic.

M Stone shared that he attended the Thoroughbred Welfare Association meeting on 30th May in Cambridge, and the Euro Farm Animal Welfare council meeting on 6th June. He also attended a meeting with MPI VS AW coordinators and gave a presentation on NAWAC. At the NZVA conference he spoke three times. Upcoming is a presentation on social license for Animal Welfare Network Aotearoa on 18th Oct.

Actions:

- **Secretariat to connect T Brown with Sector Liaison regarding Operational Research on calf welfare**

The committee adjourned for afternoon tea at 3.11pm.

s9(2)(a) left the meeting at 3.11pm

The committee reconvened at 3.23pm

C 5. Roles and Responsibilities of NAWAC and MPI in Code Reviews

The memo [32.23] was circulated prior to the meeting and was taken as read. M Stone clarified that this is a continuation of the discussion series where NAWAC has identified topics of interest and invite Secretariat to inform and lead discussion.

s9(2)(ba)(i), s9(2)(g)(i)

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

s9(2)(ba)(i), s9(2)(g)(i)

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

s9(2)(ba)(i), s9(2)(g)(i)

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982

PART 3: OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

O. 10 Work Programme update

The committee reviewed any new updates to the work programme, with the main points discussed including:

- Finalising the 2022 Annual Report as priority.
- Poultry and post-farm-gate Codes are soon to be in the early scoping and analysis phase.
- Painful husbandry procedures and cats are in the planning and prioritisation stage. Next steps are to reply to the SPCA regarding the cat Code and prioritise the review.
- The drafting of two opinion pieces have been discussed. N Waran and A Dale volunteered for the sentience piece, and M Stone volunteered to draft the piece on emerging Agritech.
- In-Committee meetings within general meetings are supported by MPI and will be positioned directly after the afternoon tea break. These sessions provide an opportunity for NAWAC to discuss any matters arising and come together. To be built into the agenda moving forward.

No other business was noted.

The next meeting is scheduled for November 7th.

The committee closed the meeting at 4.28pm

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982