

Chair  
Cabinet Economic Growth and Infrastructure Committee

## **Animal Welfare Regulations – Release of Public Consultation Documents**

### **Proposal**

1. This paper seeks Cabinet approval to release public consultation documents on proposed regulations for:
  - the export of live animals;
  - the care of and conduct towards animals; and
  - the performance of surgical and painful procedures on animals.

### **Executive Summary**

2. I propose to consult on three sets of regulations:
  - Live Animal Exports regulations to bring into force amendments to Part 3 (Animal Exports) of the Animal Welfare Act 1999 (the Act) and to bring the prohibition on live animal exports for slaughter under the jurisdiction of the Act;
  - Care and Conduct regulations that will place requirements on owners and persons in charge of animals; and
  - Surgical and Painful Procedures regulations to prohibit, restrict or provide mandatory standards for the performance of particular surgical or painful procedures.
3. I intend that consultation be undertaken between April and May 2016.
4. Most of the regulatory proposals are based on current minimum standards. They should only have a limited impact on the majority of people who own or are in charge of animals.
5. A limited number of proposals may be contested. These include proposals that:
  - could increase the cost of undertaking a surgical procedure (because of requirements about pain relief or veterinary involvement),
  - restrict or prohibit certain activities (such as docking of dogs' tails for non-medical purposes),
  - could require business process changes (such as reducing the maximum period between last feed and slaughter for young calves), or
  - could incur additional infrastructure costs (such as providing adequate loading facilities for young calves).

6. Subject to feedback, I may choose to separate out the development of regulations relating to young calves and seek Cabinet approval of those regulations in July 2016. This would enable the regulations to come into force prior to the peak of the spring bobby calf season.
7. To achieve this timeline I ask the Committee to authorise the Minister for Primary Industries, the Associate Minister for Primary Industries, the Minister of Justice, and the Minister for Regulatory Reform to approve young calf regulatory policy as soon as practicable following public consultation, if appropriate.
8. I will report back to Cabinet on the remaining regulatory proposals by late-August 2016 seeking final policy approval and permission to issue drafting instructions to the Parliamentary Counsel Office (PCO). It is intended that these regulations will be made by late 2016.
9. During 2016, a number of other animal welfare matters will also be in the public domain including advice on the Animal Welfare (Pigs) Code of Welfare 2010 relating to the use of crates for sows giving birth and nursing (farrowing crates). A communications strategy is being developed so that stakeholder and media interest is well managed across all of these areas.

## **Background**

10. The Animal Welfare Amendment Act (No 2) 2015 (the Amendment Act) made changes to the Animal Welfare Act 1999 (the Act). These changes improve the enforceability, clarity and transparency of New Zealand's animal welfare regulatory system.
11. Most of the benefits of the Amendment Act will be realised through regulations. This is the first time a substantive suite of regulations has ever been made under the Act.
12. The suite of regulatory proposals are now ready for public consultation. Two separate consultation documents have been developed that set out these proposals:
  - proposed regulations for the transport of live animals from New Zealand; and
  - proposed Animal Welfare Regulations (Care & Conduct and Surgical & Painful Procedures).
13. Separating the documents makes it clear that consultation in relation to live animal exports relates predominantly to timing, and that substantive matters of policy in relation to live animal exports are not going to be re-litigated at this time.

## Live Animal Exports

### *Why regulations are needed*

14. The Amendment Act made changes to Part 3 of the Act to protect New Zealand's reputation as a responsible exporter of animals and animal products, by expanding the Director-General of the Ministry for Primary Industries' (MPI) powers and responsibilities in issuing Animal Welfare Export Certificates (AWECs).
15. The changes also enable the Director-General to require exporters to provide reports on the welfare of exported animals during their voyage and for up to 30 days after their arrival in the importing country.
16. The changes to Part 3 of the Act will either come into effect in May 2020, or can be brought into effect earlier through regulations. I want to realise the benefits of the changes made to Part 3 of the Act by bringing them into effect by the end of this calendar year.
17. In addition, the conditional prohibition on the export of livestock for slaughter is currently implemented under the Customs and Excise Act 1996 through the Customs Export Prohibition (Livestock for Slaughter) Order 2013 (CEPO).<sup>1</sup> The CEPO prevents the export of livestock for slaughter without the consent of the Director-General of MPI. This requirement has been in place since 2007 and since that time no animals have been exported from New Zealand for slaughter.
18. There are two problems with the way in which the CEPO currently operates:
  - The CEPO is time limited and must be renewed every three years. The current CEPO is due to expire on 20 December 2016.
  - The current penalty for anyone who contravenes the CEPO and exports livestock for slaughter without obtaining the consent of the Director-General will expire with the CEPO.
19. The Amendment Act provides for the provisions of the CEPO to be implemented through regulations made under the Animal Welfare Act instead. Regulations are required to ensure that the conditional prohibition on the export of livestock for slaughter is maintained post 20 December 2016.
20. Regulations also provide the opportunity to establish a regulatory penalty for failure to obtain the consent of the Director-General before exporting livestock for slaughter.

---

<sup>1</sup> The CEPO does not prohibit exports of livestock for other purposes such as breeding.

### ***How the proposals were developed***

21. All of the proposals above, except the proposal to establish a penalty for failure to obtain the consent of the Director-General before exporting livestock for slaughter, were developed as a part of the Amendment Act. They were publicly consulted on when the Amendment Act went through Select Committee, and have been accepted by Parliament when the Amendment Act was passed in May 2015.
22. The proposal to establish a new penalty for failure to obtain the consent of the Director-General before exporting livestock for slaughter will replace the penalty currently associated with the CEPO.

### ***What is proposed?***

23. There are three key proposals. Firstly, it is proposed that the changes to Part 3 of the Act be brought into effect by the end of 2016, rather than wait for these to come into force in May 2020. These changes expand the matters that the Director-General of MPI can or must consider when assessing an application for export. They also provide powers to the Director-General to impose conditions on an AWEC and the ability to refuse, revoke or amend an AWEC.
24. It is also proposed that the provisions of the CEPO to prohibit the export of livestock for slaughter be brought into regulations under the Act. The current penalty associated with a breach of the CEPO is a fine, on conviction, of up to \$5,000 in the case of an individual, and up to \$10,000 in the case of a body corporate.
25. It is proposed that this is replaced with a penalty for failing to obtain the consent of the Director-General before exporting livestock for slaughter. The maximum penalty available for a regulatory offence under the Act is proposed. This is a fine on conviction of up to \$5,000 in the case of an individual, and up to \$25,000 in the case of a body corporate.
26. The Act also provides an offence for exporting without the authority of an AWEC or breaching its conditions. The penalty is, on conviction, imprisonment not exceeding 6 months or fine of up to \$25,000 in the case of an individual, and up to \$125,000 in the case of a body corporate.

### ***Cost implications***

27. The proposed Live Animal Export regulations may impose some minor additional costs on exporters associated with the provision of reports.

### ***Proposals that may be contested***

28. None of the above proposals are expected to be contested. However, exporters may re-litigate their resistance to the policy behind the provisions in the Act enabling the Director-General to require them to report on the welfare of exported animals for up to 30 days post arrival. This provision has now been passed into law and cannot be changed except by further amendment to the Act.

## ***Stakeholder engagement***

29. Consultation with affected stakeholders is required before regulations can be made. MPI has advised the Animal Trade Advisory Council, a group of stakeholders associated with the livestock export industry, of the proposals and the intention to publicly consult on the proposals as a part of the suite of regulations currently under consideration.

## **Care and Conduct and Surgical and Painful Procedures**

### ***Why regulations are needed***

30. The Act enables me to issue codes of welfare, which set out minimum standards for the management of animals either by species (e.g. there are codes of welfare relating specifically to dairy cattle, pigs, layer hens, horses and donkeys, cats, dogs, goats, etc.); or by activity (e.g. the Painful Husbandry Procedures Code of Welfare, the Transport Code of Welfare and the Commercial Slaughter Code of Welfare).
31. Minimum standards in codes of welfare cannot be directly enforced. They do not carry offences or penalties, although they can be used as evidence in a prosecution under the general provisions of the Act. Prosecutions under the general provisions of the Act are resource intensive and generally only appropriate for serious offending. As regulations are intended to be more specific, prosecution under regulations should be more straightforward.
32. Further, the penalties associated with an Act offence are severe and not appropriate for low-to-medium offending. For example, penalties under the Act can result in up to five years' imprisonment. This is not a proportionate response to a number of areas of low-level neglect or mismanagement, such as leaving a dog in a hot car, or failing to secure a dog on a moving vehicle.
33. The Act also provides new regulatory powers and criteria to manage the performance of surgical and painful procedures on animals. The current framework for surgical and painful procedures is difficult to understand and apply as there is uncertainty about:
  - whether a procedure is a significant surgical procedure and therefore must only be undertaken by a veterinarian;
  - the circumstances in which a procedure can or should be undertaken; and
  - the appropriate method or equipment for carrying out the procedure.
34. Regulations will specify:
  - mandatory standards relating to the care of and conduct towards animals that are directly enforceable;
  - associated offences and penalties;
  - requirements for performing surgical and painful procedures on animals including who may undertake a procedure and under what conditions; and
  - exceptional circumstances where standards can be set that do not fully meet the obligations of the Act, e.g. the transition away from battery cages for layer hens.

35. Regulations will also update standards for some existing practices to reflect scientific knowledge and good practice. These include some standards for surgical and painful procedures (e.g. pain relief requirements for dehorning cattle); and some requirements for young calf management.

### ***How the proposals were developed***

36. In developing the proposals, MPI drew on the knowledge and experience of a joint working group, comprising MPI, the National Animal Welfare Advisory Committee (NAWAC), the Royal New Zealand Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and the Veterinary Council of New Zealand.
37. The joint working group reviewed over 1,200 minimum standards from all current and draft codes of welfare. In addition, some matters were identified that were not covered, or not adequately covered, by minimum standards and these were also included within the review.
38. The following criteria were used to determine which of the minimum standards and additional matters would be appropriate to consider developing into regulations:
- Effective – is there an identified problem? Is it likely that regulations will achieve the desired change in outcomes and/or update practice where necessary?
  - Efficient – they should be the minimum necessary to ensure that the purpose of the Act will be met, be practical and economically viable.
  - Equitable – the level of the offence is proportionate to the lower level penalties that are available under regulation.
  - Clear – the actions or omissions are specific and measurable. Regulations need to be clear and precise so there is no doubt when an offence is committed. This is especially so for infringement offences as they are intended to quickly and efficiently deal with minor offending. This value is lost if they are too open to challenge.
39. The 85 regulatory proposals outlined in the consultation document met the criteria above.

### ***What is proposed?***

#### *Proposals relating to care of and conduct towards animals*

40. It is proposed that some of the minimum standards set out in codes of welfare be prescribed as mandatory standards in regulation. Specifically, 50 proposals relating to care and conduct are set out in the consultation document. These relate to a wide variety of animals including: dogs, cats, eels, cattle, goats, layer hens, horses, crabs, rock lobsters, crayfish, llama, alpaca, pigs, and sheep. Eight of the proposals relate to young calves including bobby calves. The proposals will regulate a variety of activities from transporting animals to the use of blunt force trauma.

### *Proposals relating to surgical and painful procedures*

41. It is proposed that the criteria within the Act that determines whether a procedure is a significant surgical procedure should be brought into force.
42. The proposals also clarify the requirements for performing surgical and painful procedures, including whether an exception can be made to allow a non-veterinarian to undertake a significant surgical procedure. For example, tail docking a lamb is likely to fit the criteria of a significant surgical procedure. The proposed regulations would allow tail docking of lambs to be performed by a non-veterinarian.
43. Specifically, 35 proposals relating to surgical and painful procedures are set out in the consultation document. These relate to wide variety of animals including: livestock, farmed animals, companion animals, birds (including poultry), and horses. The proposed regulations would apply to a variety of procedures undertaken for activities such as farm management (e.g. castration) to aesthetics (e.g. prohibiting the cropping of a dog's ear to make it stand upright).

### ***Proposed offences and penalties***

44. Regulations will enable associated offences and penalties to be set that are appropriate for low-to-medium offending, which represents the majority of animal welfare misconduct.
45. The proposed penalty for low-to-medium offending under the regulations will be prescribed as either:
  - a prosecutable regulatory offence with a penalty on conviction of a fine of up to \$5,000 in the case of an individual, and up to \$25,000 in the case of a body corporate; or
  - an infringement offence with a set fee of either \$300 or \$500.
46. The proposed regulatory penalties are set at the maximum level able to be imposed for prosecutable regulatory offences under the Act. I consider that it is appropriate to allow fines up to the maximum level for all the proposed prosecutable offences under regulation. This is due to the variable nature of animal welfare offending and allows the court to respond appropriately to a wider range of offending.
47. The proposed infringement fees are set at a lower level than the maximum \$1,000 threshold allowed in the Act. This is to align with fines for similar levels of offending in other legislation.
48. The level of infringement fees applied to a particular offence is primarily based on whether an animal could suffer a low level of harm (\$300) or whether moderate harm could be caused to an animal as a result of the offending (\$500).
49. MPI shares responsibility for animal welfare enforcement with the RNZSPCA. The RNZSPCA is the only approved organisation under the Animal Welfare Act and has its own animal welfare inspectors that are appointed by MPI.

50. All animal welfare inspectors will receive training before the regulations are implemented. Senior MPI and RNZSPCA animal welfare inspectors will determine when it is appropriate for an infringement notice to be issued. MPI will also monitor the use of infringement notices to ensure consistency of application. This will give MPI confidence that infringement notices are used appropriately.

### ***Cost implications***

51. The proposals may result in some increased costs for people who own or are in charge of animals. However, any additional costs are likely to be limited as many of the proposals are based on existing minimum standards in codes of welfare, so they should already be current practice. Some proposals go beyond existing minimum standards and the consultation process will help to accurately identify the full costs of these proposals.

### ***Proposals that may be contested***

52. Early stakeholder engagement indicates that most of the proposals will not meet with much, if any, resistance. However, there are a few proposals where this may not be the case:
- some of the proposals around the management of young calves (including bobby calves) may incur additional costs, either through a requirement for business process changes (such as setting a 24 hour maximum period between last feed and slaughter); or for investment in new infrastructure (such as the provision of suitable loading facilities that may be required after an appropriate transitional period. The length of the transition will be informed by consultation). In addition, given the current high public profile of bobby calves, it is likely the proposals relating to young calves will be criticised by some as not going far enough and by others as going too far;
  - new mandatory requirements around the use of pain relief and veterinary involvement in some surgical and painful procedures. Some stakeholders have identified cost as a potential barrier to these proposals. Submissions will provide a valuable source of information with which to assess the overall impact of these proposals;
  - a small but vocal group of stakeholders are likely to contest the proposal to ban docking dogs' tails for non-therapeutic reasons. Docking of dogs' tails has been a long standing tradition amongst some groups. However, internationally tail docking is either banned or restricted in over 30 countries worldwide. Australia, Scotland, parts of Canada and Switzerland have banned the practice outright. England, Germany and Wales have restricted the practice to certain working dogs and the procedure can only be performed by a veterinarian; and
  - the proposal to make the provision of nesting material for pregnant sows a regulation. This may be resisted by industry on the basis that compliance with this existing minimum standard would drive additional business costs.

53. The process of public consultation will enable all interested parties to make submissions supporting their own perspective on the regulatory proposals. At this stage, no firm decisions have been made. This will be emphasised by:
- clarifying within the consultation document that one of the primary purposes of consultation is to gather information and feedback from those affected on the potential implications of the proposals; and
  - ensuring that all stakeholders have the opportunity to provide feedback to MPI on the proposals. In addition to receiving written submissions, MPI will run a series of public meetings during the latter stages of the consultation period.
54. MPI will publish a summary of all submissions received and analysed during consultation. When final regulations are developed, the option of delaying the date on which some of those regulations come in to force will also be considered, to allow changes in practice to be phased in over time.

### ***Stakeholder consultation***

55. The proposals have been tested with stakeholders through a series of pre-consultation meetings held by MPI and the Chair of NAWAC in late August to early September 2015. The pre-consultation meetings were well attended and received by participants who included farmers, industry representatives, veterinarians, companion animal groups, and animal advocacy groups.
56. Subsequently, in February 2016, MPI held two further workshops on proposed young calf regulations with a similar range of stakeholders.
57. Consultation will inform a full assessment of the impacts of the proposals, including cost and feasibility; whether any phase-in periods will be required; and whether the correct penalty is proposed for each regulation.
58. Consultation on the proposed Surgical and Painful Procedures regulations will also inform me about the matters I must have regard to when recommending regulations, including whether the procedure is likely to be a significant surgical procedure, what is good practice in relation to the procedure, and the extent to which the procedure is established in New Zealand.

### **Public consultation on all regulatory proposals**

59. The Act requires the Minister for Primary Industries to consult, to the extent that is reasonably practicable, and having regard to the particular circumstances, persons that I have reason to believe are representative of interests likely to be substantially affected by the proposed regulations.
60. It is intended that public consultation on the proposals be undertaken between April and May 2016. MPI will issue a press release and post notices on its website and on social media to advise interested and potentially affected parties of the consultation document. MPI will also be running a series of public meetings during the latter stages of the consultation period.

61. I am also required to consult with NAWAC on all new regulatory proposals and I will do this during the period of public consultation.

### **Additional animal welfare matters in the public domain**

62. I have asked NAWAC to consider whether there was any basis for a review of the Animal Welfare (Pigs) Code of Welfare 2010 (the Pigs Code), in relation to farrowing crates. Sows may be kept in farrowing crates for five weeks, from shortly before they give birth (farrow) until the piglets are weaned. Farrowing crates help to protect piglets from being crushed by the sow.
63. NAWAC has advised that there is no basis to conduct a formal review as there is no alternative farrowing system that reduces the levels of piglet mortality while meeting the welfare needs of sows. However, NAWAC has recommended that a regulation be made stipulating that for indoor farming systems a farrowing crate must be wider, taller, and longer than the sow it contains. A regulation has therefore been proposed in the attached public consultation document.
64. In addition, NAWAC found substantial industry non-compliance with an existing minimum standard requiring sows to be provided with nesting material prior to farrowing in order to meet their strong nesting instincts. A regulation has therefore been included to make this standard more enforceable.
65. NAWAC is also considering an amendment to the Animal Welfare (Dairy Cattle) Code of Welfare 2010, specifically in relation to housing of dairy cattle. NAWAC has publically consulted on the housing of dairy cattle and it is anticipated that they will provide me with advice in August 2016. NAWAC's advice will also indicate whether further public consultation is necessary.
66. In November 2015, the Regulations Review Committee (the Committee) notified MPI that it had received a complaint from Save Animals from Exploitation (SAFE) regarding the Animal Welfare (Layer Hens) Code of Welfare 2012 (the Code). The code of welfare provides for a total transition out of battery cages as a means of farming layer hens by 2022. It also provides for the ongoing use of colony cages. SAFE is opposed to the use of colony cages.
67. The Committee forwarded the complaint to MPI and requested a response to the matters raised by 26 February 2016. The Committee is yet to deliberate on the complaint and MPI's response, and timing for this is not yet known.
68. Proposed minor amendments are required to the Animal Welfare (Records and Statistics) Regulations 1999 to reflect new requirements for some animals used for research, testing or teaching to be recorded in animal use statistics. These will be publicly consulted on during November 2016.
69. NAWAC will be holding some sector meetings and pre-consultation workshops during 2016 to inform the development of a draft code of welfare for exhibition, entertainment, and encounter. This code of welfare will define, for example, minimum standards for the use of animals in zoos and circuses.

## **An overarching communications strategy**

70. Given the importance and number of animal welfare matters that will be in the public domain in 2016, MPI is developing an overarching communications strategy. The communications strategy will set out key messages and questions and answers relating to all the animal welfare matters. The strategy will outline protocols for responding to public and media enquiries and provide a schedule for media releases.

## **Timing and Process**

71. I plan to report back to Cabinet on the majority of the regulatory proposals by late-August 2016 seeking final policy approval and permission to issue drafting instructions to PCO. It is intended that these regulations will be made by late 2016.

### *Young calf proposals*

72. Given the high profile of bobby calf welfare, consideration should be given to the feasibility of making some regulations specific to young calves before the next bobby calf season. However, there is insufficient time between mid-May (when consultation will close) and July to get EGI approval, and to draft, consult, and submit the draft regulations to Cabinet before the next bobby calf season. I therefore ask the Committee to authorise the Minister for Primary Industries, the Associate Minister for Primary Industries, the Minister of Justice, and the Minister for Regulatory Reform to approve young calf regulations as soon as practicable following the public consultation, if appropriate.
73. I also seek EGI's approval to allow me to instruct PCO to draft the young calf regulations upon the approval of the policy by Ministers. I will report on any decision taken by Ministers and seek Cabinet approval to promulgate the regulations, if made, on 25 July 2016.

## **Financial Implications**

74. No financial implications will arise for the Crown from the release of the public consultation documents.

## **Legislative Implications**

75. No legislative implications will arise from the release of the public consultation documents.

## **Regulatory Impact Analysis**

76. A regulatory impact statement was prepared and submitted as part of Cabinet's consideration of the final proposals for amendments to the Animal Welfare Act 1999. Cab Min (07) 38/3 refers.

77. The consultation documents contains the key elements of the regulatory impact assessment therefore an assessment has not been provided. The consultation document seeks further information to inform the final assessment and the regulatory proposals that will be recommended to Cabinet.
78. Regulatory impact statements will be supplied for Cabinet's consideration if final policy approval for the young calf regulations is sought and when final policy approval for the care and conduct and surgical and painful procedure regulations is sought.
79. A regulatory impact statement is not required for the live animal export proposals as they reflect policy contained in current legislation (CEPO) and provide for the commencement of existing legislative provisions.

### **Consultation with other Government agencies**

80. The following departments have been consulted in the preparation of this paper: New Zealand Customs Service, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment, Ministry for the Environment, Ministry of Transport, Te Puni Kokiri, Environmental Protection Authority, WorkSafe NZ, New Zealand Police, Department of Conversation, Department of Internal Affairs, Parliamentary Counsel Office and the Treasury. The Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet has been informed. The officials' committee for the Cabinet Economic Growth and Infrastructure Committee was consulted on the draft of this paper.
81. Departmental comments have been incorporated into this paper and there are no substantive issues outstanding.

## Recommendations

82. The Minister for Primary Industries recommends that the Committee:
1. **note** that the attached consultation paper, “Proposed Animal Welfare Regulations: Care and Conduct and Surgical and Painful Procedures”:
    - a) makes proposals relating to specific care and conduct and surgical and painful procedures regulations that, if approved, would be made by late 2016; and
    - b) proposes that the regulations will be enforced through either:
      - prosecutable offences, with individual fines of up to \$5,000 for individuals or up to \$25,000 for body corporates; or
      - infringement offences, with fees of \$300 or \$500 depending on the level of harm to the animal as a result of the offending.
    - c) requests feedback on the proposals, particularly on the practicality and costs of the proposals.
  2. **note** that the attached consultation paper, “Proposed Regulations for the Transport of Live Animals from New Zealand”:
    - a) proposes that amendments to Part 3 (Animal exports) of the Animal Welfare Act 1999 made by the Animal Welfare Amendment Act (No 2) 2015 are brought into force by Order in Council in late 2016 rather than waiting for them to automatically commence in May 2020;
    - b) proposes that regulations be made to implement the current conditional export prohibition for livestock exports for slaughter under the Animal Welfare Act 1999 in late 2016; and
    - c) proposes that the regulation that conditionally prohibits the export of livestock for slaughter be enforced through a prosecutable offence, with fines up to \$5,000 for individuals or up to \$25,000 for body corporates.
  3. **agree** that the Ministry for Primary Industries release the consultation papers, “Proposed Animal Welfare Regulations: Care and Conduct and Surgical and Painful Procedures” and “Proposed Regulations for the Transport of Live Animals from New Zealand ” for public consultation.
  4. **agree** that the Minister for Primary Industries be authorised to make minor and inconsequential edits to the “Proposed Animal Welfare Regulations: Care and Conduct and Surgical and Painful Procedures” and “Proposed Regulations for the Transport of Live Animals from New Zealand ” public consultation documents.
  5. **note** that following public consultation it may be feasible to bring specific regulations relating to young calves into force prior to the peak of the 2016 spring bobby calf season, which is in August and September.

6. **note** that to have young calf regulations in place during the 2016 bobby calf season it will not be possible to follow the standard regulatory development process.
7. **agree** to authorise, following public consultation if appropriate, the Minister for Primary Industries, the Associate Minister for Primary Industries, the Minister of Justice, and the Minister for Regulatory Reform to approve young calf regulatory policy.
8. **invite** the Minister for Primary Industries to issue drafting instructions to the Parliamentary Counsel Office upon the approval of the Ministers authorised to approve young calf regulatory policy.
9. **invite** the Minister for Primary Industries to report back to Cabinet with final policy proposals and drafted young calf regulations by July 2016.
10. **invite** the Minister for Primary Industries to report back to Cabinet with final policy proposals for care and conduct and surgical and painful, and procedures, and live animal exports regulations by late-August 2016.
11. **note** that a number of animal welfare matters will be in the public domain in 2016, and that the Ministry for Primary Industries is developing a communications strategy to manage publicity and enquires.

Hon Nathan Guy  
Minister for Primary Industries  
/ /2016