

**Animal Welfare
(Dairy Cattle)
Code of Welfare**

Summary of Public Submissions

Forty-three submissions on the draft of the Animal Welfare Code pertaining to dairy cattle were received. The majority of submissions welcomed the opportunity to take part in the consultation process. However, many made suggestions for improvement of the Code and highlighted areas of concern. Two submissions (4, 6) stated that they would not take part in the consultation process, as they believed that the industry would be allowed to make the final decision on the Code of Welfare and that therefore the consultation process was farcical. Fifteen of the submissions were form letters, which were all of the same type (9, 10, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42). Submissions 12 and 14, although independent, had some statements in common. Submission 43 fully endorsed the content of submission 26 as well as listing some extra issues of concern.

The majority of submissions were concerned for the animals' welfare and the requests/suggestions for changes in the various sections of the Code reflect this. The submissions received from the industry seemed generally supportive of the Code as written. However, concern regarding the practicality of some farming practices as set by the Code (e.g. calf feeding before transport) as well as the short time allowed for public consultation and the enforcement of poorly qualified minimum standards has been expressed.

Dairy Cattle Code of Welfare

Summary of submissions received on the public draft

SUBMISSION AND NAWAC RESPONSE			
CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
General comments	1	<p>Those who produced the draft clearly have given it a lot of thought and are to be congratulated.</p> <p>Concerned about extremely cursory attention given to bobby calves. If there is to be a separate code this needs to be stated.</p> <p>Two comments:</p> <p>The ‘first days of life’ are after conception NOT birth and hence the phrase ‘days after birth’ is more strictly correct than ‘days of life’.</p> <p>The mother ‘suckles’, the baby ‘sucks’. Suckle means ‘to give suck’.</p> <p>There are a number of places where the Minimum Standard refers to avoidance of distress. NAWAC may consider it worthwhile to consider how ‘distress’ would be demonstrated in the circumstances of the Minimum Standard.</p> <p>Previously compromise to ‘health and welfare’ was a phraseology NAWAC thought was demonstrable.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Bobby calves are covered as all calves are by this code.</p> <p>Disagree – in this context.</p> <p>Agree – change made.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
	3	<p>Has long been concerned about the cruel treatment of dairy cattle.</p> <p>Primary concern is premature abortion and treatment of bobby calves.</p> <p>Worried about docking of mature cows’ tails.</p> <p>Animal welfare is a ‘bit of a joke’, as the industry has a big input into the final decisions hence not addressing the welfare of the animals. Compassionate dialogue is needed based on animal welfare and not financial gain. The public wants all codes of animal welfare to be changed and put into law for a much-needed improvement on farm animal care and treatment.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Inductions and bobby calves are covered in this code. Tail docking is covered in the Painful Husbandry Procedures Code.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
	4	<p>Declines to be part of the public consultation process on this Code of Welfare as considers consultation process a waste of time and public money.</p> <p>NAWAC and the government consistently ignore public opinion, scientific evidence, the Animal Welfare Act and even Parliamentary Select Committees and simply do whatever the industry demands of them.</p> <p>Suggests that, since the government allows industry to have the final say in</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		animal welfare matters, the government should repeal the Animal Welfare Act so that industry always makes the final decision on Codes of Welfare. Although this would be unacceptable to the submitter, it would show a degree of honesty lacking in the Code of Welfare process so far and the money saved could be better spend elsewhere.	
	5	Comfortable with the Code in its present form as it relates to transport of dairy cattle.	Noted.
	6	<p>Will not take part in the public consultation process of the Code of Welfare for Dairy Cattle.</p> <p>Does not want to be associated with the consultation process as it is farcical. Previous codes have shown that NAWAC is unable to write Codes of Welfare in line with principles of the Animal Welfare Act.</p>	Noted.
	8	<p>Minimum Standards in this draft code do not meet the objectives of the Animal Welfare Act (1999) as they do not meet the behavioural or physiological needs of cows, as demonstrated by scientific evidence and good practice.</p> <p>Code is written in a disjoint, incomplete way, thereby failing to deliver sufficient quality information or guidelines to help farmers achieve good standards of welfare.</p> <p>If adopted in its current form Code would create risk to export markets for all pastoral products.</p> <p>Concerns:</p> <p>Cows without shelter in winter and without shade in summer</p> <p>Cows on sodden paddocks with nowhere dry to rest</p> <p>Shade and shelter are disappearing rapidly from the New Zealand rural landscape as large dairy operations convert vast areas, not only affecting farm animal welfare, but also the aesthetic value of the countryside, biodiversity and soil conservation. Total land clearing for dairy production should be actively discouraged, rather than encouraged by adopting low welfare standards that best suit the large scale operators.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Shelter and stand-off areas are covered in this code.</p>
	11	Agrees with most aspects of the draft code.	Noted.
	12	Generally support all aspects of the draft code, but have some recommendations	Noted.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		<p>for amendments and additional information.</p> <p>There are no aspects of the Code that submitter is opposed to.</p> <p>Code has limited comment on matters such as transport and humane slaughter. While the submitters realise that these areas are covered in separate Animal Welfare Codes, they believe that these are areas that pose significant welfare concerns for dairy cattle. Dairy farmers will need to be familiar with multiple codes rather than a single complete Dairy Code addressing all dairy issues. Hence, reference to "complementary" codes should be prominently highlighted in appropriate sections of this Code (examples: 6.14 Pre-slaughter; 7.4 Emergency slaughter).</p>	
	13	<p>Pleased with the changes made to the Code since the initial draft in June 2006.</p> <p>Would like to see a separate document for the Minimum Standards and the Recommended Best Practice to take away any confusion between the two areas. If they are intended to be together, would like to see a statement defining both the Minimum Standards and Recommended Best Practice to take away any confusion, as dairy farmers have to work with and be judged by this document.</p>	Noted.
	14	<p>Welcomes opportunity to comment on the public consultation of the draft code. Code is comprehensive and thorough.</p> <p>Layout: Code should be written to capture all the welfare elements that pertain to a particular farm task (i.e. "Care of calves not feeding from their mothers" is not at all arranged under a heading pertaining to calf rearing). Such changes would make it easier to reproduce for extension and training purposes and to be copied into farm calf rearing operating procedures, hence increasing the educational value of the Code (sections concerned: Calf rearing, Downer cows and Lamé cows).</p> <p>Although the submitters are aware of NAWAC's desire not to duplicate information, they are also aware that issues such as transport and humane slaughter pose significant welfare concerns for dairy cattle. Dairy farmers will need to be familiar with multiple codes rather than a single complete Dairy Code addressing all dairy issues, hence creating a weakness in the provision of information. Hence, reference to "complementary" codes should be prominently highlighted in appropriate sections of this Code (examples: 6.14 Pre-slaughter; 7.4 Emergency slaughter)</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Disagree – NAWAC believes that it is important all dairy cattle, including calves, are considered within all sections of code.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
	15	<p>Most of the Minimum Standards are not defined on their own, but can only be judged when interpreted using the Recommended Best Practices which support each Minimum Standard (example “Feeding newborn calves: Newborn calves must receive adequate colostrum or good quality commercial substitute”). This cannot in itself be a legal requirement as there is no definition unless taken with Recommended Best Practice.</p> <p>The terminology of the Minimum Standards is subjective and open to judgement and interpretation, which will be based on good practice and not the minimum requirement; good practice not necessarily reflecting welfare requirements, but requirements for good dairy productivity (which are not the same) - (example given in submission). No issue with the recommendations made for good dairy practice, but is concerned that good management practice is taken as a requirement for welfare. Those in the position of judging whether minimum requirements have been met for a prosecution can only do so based on the outlined recommended good practice putting them in a very difficult position.</p> <p>The document in its current form is dangerous to the industry and difficult to implement, as Minimum Standards are not defined.</p>	Noted – NAWAC believes the minimum standards and recommended best practices to be appropriate as written.
	16	<p>Grateful for opportunity to comment on draft code.</p> <p>Code needs to be forward looking i.e. consideration should be given to how ‘future proof’ it is (how well it will anticipate developments over the next decade).</p> <p>Code needs to be easily understood by those affected if it is to be adopted and championed by farmers. Believe that it would be in NAWAC’s interest to submit the Code to a ‘Plain English’ organisation, such as Writemark, for review of its readability. Code should be professionally reviewed regarding spelling, grammar and punctuation before it is issued to the Minister in order to avoid potentially embarrassing implications for those involved in the code development process.</p>	Noted.
	17	<p>Code is comprehensive and well-considered document</p> <p>Suggests insertions regarding obligations to health and safety of the handlers relating to Health and Safety in Employment Act (1992) and Health and Safety in Employment Regulations (1995). Realises that code is primarily concerned with animal welfare, but believes that if the person handling the cattle is safe,</p>	Noted. NAWAC believes this code should focus on animal welfare not human safety.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		that this can only be beneficial for the cattle and their efficient management.	
	18	<p>Fully supports the draft code and the intent to improve welfare standards for dairy cattle.</p> <p>Excellent pasture management skills do not translate into excellent cow management skills, unfortunately, so the bulk of our dairy cows remain undergrown, underfed and under performing. Unfortunately, the level of underfeeding, and hence poorly grown, under conditioned cows in many NZ herds means that a significant and often costly investment needs to be made in terms of feed, along with better management skills, initially, before one sees a significant improvement in profitability. Too many people in NZ dairy farming have been brain washed into believing that feeding cows properly (better) cannot be profitable, or that it means buying/ using expensive feeds other than pasture – neither is true. For most, there is however, a lag phase, of investment, in feed, in cow condition, and most importantly in knowledge before there is a financial return.</p>	Noted.
	19	<p>Serious concerns with the draft in its current form and believes the draft in general requires further refinement before being recommended to the Minister. Draft does not meet high standards of animal welfare that society expects.</p> <p>Large-scale dairy operations create a loss of landscape mosaic which is detrimental not only to aesthetic value of countryside, but also to ecosystem services, biodiversity and farm animal welfare. Appreciates that majority of New Zealand farmers have genuine regard for their animals and environment and that the wealth of information provided by dairy industry is tremendous and to be applauded. However, believes that there will always be a percentage of farmers who will fail to meet standards expected of them and that these farmers, who could most benefit from the information made available, will not use it.</p> <p>Due to the growing awareness of animal welfare issues in New Zealand and overseas, sights such as animals standing in thick mud without dry ground to rest on or shelter from wind and rain, may be detrimental to future export markets.</p> <p>Draft is disjointed in how it deals with the issue of calf care/management. The submitter would like to see one complete section devoted to calf care/management that includes all aspects of calf management.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NAWAC believes that it is important all dairy cattle, including calves, are considered within all sections of code.</p>

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
	20	<p>Supports the Minimum Standards as written.</p> <p>Is content that Minimum Standards represent realistic and practical interpretations of commonly accepted farming management practices necessary to ensure the welfare of dairy cattle in New Zealand. While some argue that some Minimum Standards, as written, are not readily measurable, more detailed and specific statements are unlikely able to be developed.</p>	Noted.
	21	<p>It is essential that New Zealand has in place animal welfare systems and outcomes that are recognised as appropriate worldwide.</p> <p>Supports development of code (standards for animal welfare) for dairy cattle.</p> <p>Final draft for public consultation much improved compared to earlier versions regarding allocation between Minimum Standards and Recommended Best Practice.</p> <p>The code contains instances where a Minimum Standard is duplicated in the Recommended Best Practice for that standard area. Actions should either be a Minimum Standard or best practice to avoid confusion, given that Best Practice Recommendations are “shoulds” and Minimum Standards are “musts”.</p>	Noted.
	22	<p>Supportive of the concept of a code pertaining to dairy cattle.</p> <p>Many Minimum Standards have inadequate quantifiable outcomes specified making them difficult to use or enforce. The guidelines in Recommended Best Practices frequently have better quantifiable outcomes described.</p>	Noted.
	24	<p>Generally supportive of the Code and believe that most of the Minimum Standards are practical and reasonable to farmers.</p> <p>Adverse effects on animal productivity and farmer’s profitability must be given appropriate weighting when considering Minimum Standards, as reduced profitability can have detrimental impact on ongoing animal welfare.</p> <p>Too much information in the Code; duplication and general information should be minimised thereby assisting readers to comply with the Minimum Standards. Drafters should be conscious of length of introduction and general information sections, general information could be included in appendices rather than main text, introductory material should be kept to a minimum as Minimum Standards are self-explanatory.</p>	Noted.
	25	Code falls short of an adequate means of protecting the welfare of dairy cattle	Noted.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		<p>required by the Animal Welfare Act (1999).</p> <p>New Zealand prides itself on having high standards of animal welfare and this is a major point in the marketing of its agricultural products. Until now the pastoral industries have done little to support this image. Livestock can all too easily be observed suffering on sunny days without shade, wintry days without shelter, and standing miserably in muddy or wet paddocks instead of lying down to rest. With these images we risk our export markets. The Code does nothing to discourage the clearing of trees and shrubs as land is converted to dairy pasture.</p> <p>Wording of Minimums Standards:</p> <p>Minimum Standards are so loosely written they will be of little use. Vague terms, such as ‘adequate’, ‘sufficiently’, ‘appropriate’, ‘unnecessary’, etc, are used in most of the standards instead of specific guidelines this document is supposed to provide to protect animal welfare. How can they be used in a way that stands up in court? Information from research carried out with dairy cattle can provide specific guidelines that protect welfare. In many cases the Recommended Best Practice sections contain guidelines, which should be used as Minimum Standards.</p>	<p>Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standards and recommended best practices to be appropriate as written.</p> <p>Noted – appropriate references to science will be included in the report to the Minister which accompanies the draft code.</p>
	26	<p>Opportune time for the New Zealand dairy industry to become more accountable in the eyes of the public, tourists and international customers.</p> <p>The single most important deficiency is the widespread destruction of shelterbelts of trees, particularly in Canterbury and Otago, which increases wind velocity and chill factor for cattle exposed to southerly and westerly storms as no replacement shelter has been provided.</p> <p>Concerned over the way in which minimum codes of practice are and will be enforced, as MAF are presently under-resourced in all areas (especially human resource is of great concern) and assistance is difficult to get. Hence, it is suggested that attention be given to recruit new MAF inspectors to cope with the present and ever increasing workload across New Zealand.</p> <p>Concerned over large dairy herds grazing pasture that had recently been spray irrigated with diluted effluent for the dairy shed (low pressure ‘low line’). It is well known that diluted effluent sprayed on herbage contaminates by way of both smell and taste. Hence, cattle grazing such pasture are under extra stress to forage further and are more selective in their grazing pattern. They are required</p>	Noted.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		<p>to walk further and possibly take in less pasture for digestion adding a further stress factor. A recommendation should be that pasture treated this way must be further irrigated with clean water or grazed following meaningful rainfall.</p> <p>Concern over the ‘place of animal welfare’ in the emerging ‘large dairy herd farming scene’. Numbers of lactating cows, replacement cattle and calves are increasing at an unheard of rate and there seems to be conflict between these new farming arrangements and the concern and place for welfare of the animals. They are concerned that within this structure, responsibility for animal health and welfare falls short of what could be termed “Best Practice”. It is time that the Dairy Industry, RNZSPCA/MAF and Federated Farmers came together and form some type of Dairy Farm Practice Audit (see submission for suggested duties of such an Audit).</p>	
	27	<p>Generally very comfortable with the latest draft code</p> <p>Suggest the use of Dexcel data as a single source for all tables and data relating to cow body condition and needs.</p> <p>Support Minimum Standards, as they are reasonable and reflect the current management practices in use on dairy farms.</p>	Noted.
	28	<p>Welcomes the opportunity to make a submission on the draft code.</p> <p>Encouraged that comments on a previous draft by Meat and Wool NZ have largely been incorporated.</p> <p>Comments of the submission are focussed on Minimum Standards that may have implications for the beef cattle sector and upcoming beef cattle code of welfare. There is inconsistency in the draft code with the use of the term ‘dairy cattle’ and ‘cattle’. They would like the term ‘dairy cattle’ to be used rather than ‘cattle’ to avoid confusion and misinterpretation (for example MS 1 and MS 2(a)).</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree – ‘dairy cattle’ used throughout.</p>
	43	<p>The SPCA welcomes the opportunity to make a submission and would welcome the opportunity to make further submission on NAWAC’s revised draft of the code following consideration of public submissions should NAWAC choose to undertake targeted industry consultation.</p> <p>They acknowledge the excellent submission made by the Otago SPCA (submission #26) and fully support all points made in that submission. Hence, the submission by the Otago SPCA can therefore be taken to represent the</p>	Noted.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		<p>national SPCA viewpoint.</p> <p>They point out that several recommended best practices be changed to Minimum Standards (legal minimum requirements for producers) where the Otago SPCA submission indicates changing the wording to ‘must’ instead of ‘should’.</p>	
	44	I suggest where the words "adequate, appropriate or sufficient" are used in individual minimum standards they should come with a definition.	Noted – NAWAC has reviewed the use of these words in all minimum standards and recommended best practices.
	9,10,30 31,32,33 34,35,36 37,38,39 40,41,42	<p>Time allowed for submissions is too short for a complex document such as the present Code, inadequate for practical farmers to be able to properly consider the code, discuss it with their peers and brief their representatives.</p> <p>Mixing minimum requirements with best code of practice is inappropriate and may lead to farmers being judged as poor farmers because they have not followed Recommended Best Practice. Concerned that this may lead to farmers being prosecuted for failing to follow prescriptive best practice recommendations,</p> <p>Code appears to be contrary to the provisions of the Animal Welfare Act in that it contains requirements and recommendations that are not based on proven scientific fact or normal farming practice (e.g. calving cows at condition score 5 – there is no evidence that this is good farming practice, let alone necessary for dairy cow welfare). The minimum water recommendations are not based on scientific recommendations.</p> <p>The proposed code would appear to prevent innovative farmers from developing new techniques of animal husbandry, as new techniques by definition are not established farm practice.</p> <p>The code contains standards that are not measurable. Who is to judge if a farm worker has appropriate ability, knowledge and competence? Who judges what is sufficient personnel.</p> <p>There is no allowance for different requirements for different individuals (e.g. water requirements).</p> <p>Before setting themselves up as judges of standards MAF should provide leadership and training. Should poorly qualified inspectors (SPCA and MAF) be in a position where they can authoritatively contradict veterinary advice?</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standards and recommended best practices to be appropriate as written.</p> <p>Noted – appropriate references to science will be included in the report to the Minister which accompanies the draft code.</p>
1.2 Scope, page	16	Paragraph 3: Bolden the following sentence: Under the Act the “owner” of an	Disagree - However Introduction section now

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
3		animal ... obligations for animal welfare. Paragraph 6: Bolden the following sentence: Responsibility for meeting minimum standards ... carrying out that particular task.	changed.
1.5 Contents of this code, page 6	8, 19	The present code claims to provide for the physical, health and behavioural needs of dairy cattle, including adequate shelter. Earlier welfare codes and the newly developed Deer Code read 'appropriate comfort and shelter' rather than 'adequate shelter'. This is a step backwards and must be changed in the Code to "appropriate comfort and shelter".	Disagree – this is the wording in the Animal Welfare Act.
1.5, page 6	19	'Adequate shelter' must be replaced by "appropriate comfort and shelter" if the Code is to achieve reasonable standards of welfare.	Disagree – this is the wording in the Animal Welfare Act.
1.8 Glossary	16	The term 'bovine' is used extensively in the glossary. It should be checked for grammatical correctness in this context. Consider including a definition for 'Automatic Milking System' (AMS). Such systems, although yet uncommon, may gain popularity during the life of the code (e.g. AMS = An electronically controlled system for milking animals without human intervention.) The definition of 'Body Condition Score (BCS)' is awkward. Consider revising the second constituent of the sentence to "based on the amount of fat and/or muscle cover which is present". Hip clamps definition should read: 'A mechanical device that attaches to the hips of an animal to assist them being raised into a standing position.'	Noted. Disagree – term not used in code. Disagree – wording is consistent with other codes, although it has been reworded to "based on the assessed amount of fat and/or muscle covering they have (see Appendix I, "Body Condition Scoring", to this code)." Agree – changed to "...assist in raising them...".
2 Legal obligations, page 13	16	(1) typo, should read 'The owner or person in charge of dairy cattle must:'	Agree – change made.
2, page 13	18	Section 1: sp/typo 'or not of' Section 1 (b): When should treatment be sought? The 'leave it and see' method is becoming too common. Increasingly herd managers are under pressure from owners to reduce animal health costs and vet bills, hence increasing numbers of animals are being left for too long.	Agree – change made. Disagree – this is the wording in the Animal Welfare Act
3 Stockmanship	16	Paragraph 1 ("Personnel should undergo training, either formally or 'on the	Disagree – the suggested additions provide

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
Introduction Page 15		job'..."): It is possible that farm/managers have a legal obligation to provide appropriate training under New Zealand's occupational safety and health (OSH) regulations, in which case this statement should be revised and strengthened. See www.dol.govt.nz for more information. Paragraph 2 should be bold: 'The owner or person in charge ... from their responsibility.'	significant detail of a nature which NAWAC believes should not be included in the code. Disagree
3 Introduction Page 15	17	After the first paragraph on that page ending with the words 'relevant activity' it could be stated: "Training and /or supervision of staff is also a requirement of the Health and Safety in Employment Act 1992 to ensure the safety of employees. Those people in charge of cattle also have a duty under the Act for their own safety."	Disagree – NAWAC believes this code should focus on animal welfare not human safety.
3 Introduction Page 15	18	How is the competency of those responsible for care of dairy cattle assessed? Who does the assessment? In the submitter's experience, general stockmanship skills are poor in New Zealand and the bulk of New Zealand dairy farmers (and many veterinarians) do not know what a normal healthy cow looks like or how she behaves.	Noted.
MS 1 Page 15	13	Accepted.	Noted.
MS 1 Page 15	20	Is supported as written.	Noted.
MS 1 Page 15	21	Remove 'a sufficient number' as otherwise need to define sufficient. As long as the health and welfare of animals are maintained in accordance with the code then the number of personnel is not relevant.	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard as written adequately covers this issue.
MS 1 Page 15	28	They would like the term 'dairy cattle' to be used rather than 'cattle' to avoid confusion and misinterpretation (for example MS 1).	Agree – change made.
MS 1 Page 15	9,10,30, 31,32,33 34,35,36 37,38,39 40,41,42	The code contains standards that are not measurable. Who is to judge if a farm worker has appropriate ability, knowledge and competence? Who judges what is sufficient personnel.	Noted.
RBP Page 15	22	(a) Are you saying that quality assurance programmes are a Recommended Best Practice? This is unclear. Make consistent with Section 8.	Disagree – this recommends that training be part of a QA programme.
4 Feed and	8	The point should be made that low quality bulk feeds may not allow sufficient	Disagree – quality of feed listed as a factor to be

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
Water General comments		<p>intake for cows to maintain homeothermy and/or desired levels or productivity in cold conditions.</p> <p>Stockpeople would gain a better appreciation of the needs of young calves if given information on the normal behaviour of the calf. Information should include feeding frequency, hiding, resting and following, and would demonstrate that young calves are not well equipped to cope with infrequent feeds, mustering or transport.</p> <p>Body condition scoring information should be provided as it is in other Codes.</p>	<p>considered.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree – Appendix I amended.</p>
4 Introduction Page 17	14	<p>First bullet point – It has been suggested that examples (e.g. lactation, pregnancy) be given to clarify ‘physiological state’ (it is noted that in the Draft Code of Welfare for Slaughter ‘physiological state’ is included in the glossary).</p> <p>Paragraph 2: Suggest replace with “Factors to be considered when determining the amount of food and nutrients by animals include:”</p> <p>Paragraph 3: Suggest re-wording of first sentence to “Given the many factors to be considered and the natural variation in the needs of individual animals, it is not appropriate to specify the complete range of quantities and nutrients required. Rather than simply following regimes of feeding pre-determined levels of feed, additional information to allow feeding levels to be adjusted according to need can be obtained by monitoring body condition score or by weighing at regular intervals. Refer to section 4.2, 4.4 and Appendix IV for guidelines.”</p>	<p>Disagree – NAWAC believes the wording should be consistent with other species codes.</p> <p>Disagree – NAWAC believes the wording should be consistent with other species codes.</p> <p>Agree – change made.</p>
4 Introduction Page 17	16	<p>Add bullet point after ‘physiological state’ reading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of production <p>Paragraph 3: Add comma after therefore ‘Therefore, it is not appropriate to specify a complete range of the ... as minimum standard.’</p>	<p>Agree – both changes made.</p>
4 Introduction Page 17	18	<p>“Proper rumen function” should be added to the list of factors to be considered when feeding dairy cattle.</p>	<p>Disagree – this is highlighted in the appropriate “newborn calves” section.</p>
4.1 The importance of planning feed supply	16	<p>Paragraph 1: (‘...it is her function to graze pasture and turn it into milk’.): This statement is inaccurate, in that it does not account for the use of non-pasture feedstuffs, such as maize or palm kernel extract, or the fact that future feeding systems in NZ may not be predominantly pasture based. The following wording</p>	<p>Agree – all changes made.</p>

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
Introduction Page 18		is suggested: “... it is her function to turn food into milk”. Paragraph 2: Change ‘must’ to ‘should’ ‘The herd manager should remain alert ...and plan accordingly.’ Paragraph 3: Add commas ‘It is, therefore, not possible ... may be different.’	
4.1 Introduction Page 18	18	Paragraph 4: The dangers of certain feeds should include the “improper management of feeds”. In many cases, it is not the feed that causes the problems, but the improper management of that feed.	Disagree.
MS 2 Page 19	28	Would like the term ‘dairy cattle’ to be used rather than ‘cattle’ to avoid confusion and misinterpretation (for MS 2 (a)).	Agree – change made.
MS 2 Page 19	8	(b) Should be more specific and should be worded as follows: “If any cow shows signs of emaciation, or if the body condition score of any cow falls below (x), immediate remedial action through veterinary attention, improved nutrition or husbandry practice must be taken to prevent further deterioration and any risk to animal health or welfare.” (x) in the above should be greater than 3 as a dissection study showed that cows with a BCS of 3 were emaciated (Gregory et al. 1998).	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written. Refer to the report to the Minister that accompanies the draft code for a full explanation of NAWAC’s view on fatness levels and BCS.
MS 2 Page 19	13	Accepted (a-d).	Noted.
MS 2 Page 19	15	The terminology of the Minimum Standards is subjective and open to judgement and interpretation, which will be based on good practice and not the minimum requirement; good practice not necessarily reflecting welfare requirements, but requirements for good dairy productivity (which are not the same).	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.
MS 2 Page 19	16	(b) Possible that the wording (‘...body condition score...falls below 3...’) may not protect animals which never reach condition score 3, i.e. the current onus of the standard is on moving below a particular level, rather than maintaining a minimum level. Suggest to amend wording to reflect maintenance standpoint and that it apply only to adult animals. Calves and young growing animals should be protected with a separate clause around the provision of food, based on the standard growth curves given in Appendix IV of the code. Minimum Standard fails to address the issues (metabolic and physical) of	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written. This BCS is appropriate for calves and growing animals too. Disagree – is covered by MS(a) providing for

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		overfeeding, which, although rare on commercial farms, may be an issue on smaller farms. RBP (b) should be MS.	maintenance of good health
MS 2 Page 19	18	<p>(b) The submitter strongly endorses all minimum body condition score targets. While there will be individual cows at below condition score 3 even in the best fed, best managed herds at times, these animals will have a good reason for the decline in condition. Cows in condition score 3 are not healthy and are not performing efficiently. We have a big problem with those herds where the average condition score is only 3 or approaching 3. The reality is that New Zealand dairy cows are never in optimum condition, either at calving or during lactation. Well-conditioned cows not only have better reproductive performance, but feed conversion efficiency is maximised. These cows have the ability to buffer adverse climate or feed quality events without needing to use feed inputs for anything but production. Cows at condition score 3 are unacceptable and the submitter strongly supports the presence of section (b).</p> <p>(c) All feeding systems must be monitored every day (including drinking water), not just automated systems.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Disagree.</p>
MS 2 Page 19	20	Is supported as written	Noted.
MS 2 Page 19	22	(b) Why are thresholds for other nutritional disorders not described in more detail? Given the lack of scientific information to support a threshold body condition score of 3, and that overarching standards are specified in subsection (a), suggest that subsection (b) is deleted.	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written. Note appropriate references to science are included in the report to the Minister which accompanies the draft code.
MS 2 Page 19	25	Suggested Minimum Standard: “The food and water provided to dairy cows must be palatable to them.”	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.
MS 2 Page 19	26, 43	Strong support for section (b) relating to body scoring.	Noted.
MS 2 (b)	44	Min Standard 2b is critical to me with regard husbandry of dairy cows (actually states dairy cattle) and rather than say appropriate remedial action should say something like "a lactating dairy cow should be dried off if its CS reaches less than 3" or something similar and very prescriptive.	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.
MS 2 Page 19	14	(d) This is a bit vague. Standing alone section (d) does not really give much specific guidance about what it is about. Should be expanded to “resulting in ill	Agree – change made.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		health as a consequence of the feedstuff or feeding methods are minimised”.	
RBP Page 19	15	RBP CS 5 at calving. This is not a welfare issue but a management issue. CS of less than 5 at calving will impact on future productive performance not welfare.	Disagree – NAWAC believes low BCS to be a welfare issue.
RBP Page 19	16	(b) Should be included in MS 2 to address problem of overfeeding.	Disagree – this is about BCS at calving not overfeeding.
RBP Page 19	18	<p>(b) Body condition score at calving should be 5 or better. There is no need for heifers to be at a higher condition score, provided they are fully grown. There should not be an upper limit. The submitter has clients who calve cows with herd condition scores averaging in excess of 6, to 7 plus with no calving or metabolic problems. These are management issues, not unavoidable sequelae of high body condition.</p> <p>(c) As gut fill is not part of body condition score, it has no influence on the scoring, unless the scorer is incompetent. Condition scoring should be able to be done accurately at any time of the day – it is after all an estimation of cover between skin and bone not an estimation of rumen score.</p> <p>(d) The proper introduction of feed changes and new feeds, and the time needed, requires an understanding of rumen function and the fermentation rates generally lacking in New Zealand. Some feeds will require longer than 10 days, especially if high intakes are being targeted.</p>	<p>Disagree – heifers going into their first lactation should start at a higher BCS. The recommended best practice as worded allows for BCS 6–7.</p> <p>Disagree.</p> <p>Noted – the 7–10 day period is only provided as an example.</p>
RBP Page 19	26, 43	<p>Strong support for section (b) relating to body scoring.</p> <p>Best practice should include a laminated copy of the Body Score in every shed and shed office</p>	Noted.
RBP Page 19	9,10,30, 31,32,33 34,35,36 37,38,39 40,41,42	(b) recommendations that are not based on proven scientific fact or normal farming practice. E.g. a group of farm advisers recently reported that less than 20% farmers calve their cows close to condition score 5, and there is no evidence that this is even good farming practice, let alone necessary for dairy cow welfare.	Disagree – NAWAC believes low BCS to be a welfare issue. RBPs establish best practice not current practice.
MS 3 Page 20	8	<p>Fails to provide sufficient guidance to protect welfare (although information is available to do this). Suitable wording for this Minimum Standard could be:</p> <p>“Every calf must receive at least two litres of good quality colostrum within the first six hours of life.”</p> <p>“Every day during the first week of life calves must be fed colostrum, milk or</p>	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		milk replacer at a minimum rate of 10% of bodyweight per day, divided into no less than two feeds.”	
MS 3 Page 20	13	Accepted.	Noted.
MS 3 Page 20	15	“Feeding newborn calves: Newborn calves must receive adequate colostrum or good quality commercial substitute”. This cannot in itself be a legal requirement as there is no definition unless taken with Recommended Best Practice.	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.
MS 3 Page 20	16	Suggest a definition of ‘adequate colostrum’, especially as a guideline is given as a Recommended Best Practice. Code needs to emphasise that calves need to receive colostrum, even if destined for slaughter after birth. There may be farmers who withhold colostrum from bobby calves, choosing instead to on-sell it for profit. It is suggested to develop a proposal to introduce random testing for colostrum intake at slaughter plants using GGT test (Thompson and Pauli 1981).	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard and RBP provide for the desired welfare outcomes as written. However ‘adequate’ has been replaced by “sufficient”.
MS 3 Page 20	18	Newborn calves must receive adequate colostrum or a good quality commercial colostrum substitute within 10 hours of birth to ensure their welfare. (Some farmers think within the first few days is adequate!)	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.
MS 3 Page 20	19	This is inadequate especially when compared to the Code of Recommendations and Minimum Standards for the Welfare of Dairy Cattle MS 9. Suggestions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Define ‘adequate’ colostrum (i.e. “Newborn calves must receive at least two litres within the first 6 hours of birth.”). 2) Recommended Best Practice (c) to be additional Minimum Standard (i.e. “During the first week of life calves must be fed colostrum, milk or milk replacer at a minimum rate of 10-12% of bodyweight per day, divided into not less than two feeds.”). 	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.
MS 3 Page 20	20	As written is unlikely to be achieved on many farms, as there is no definition of adequate colostrum in the Minimum Standard. As most calves are removed from their mothers within 24 hours, and those that remain on their mothers are very likely to suckle satisfactorily within a 24-hour period, a Minimum Standard along the line of “All calves removed from their mothers within 24 hours of birth must receive a minimum of 2 litres of fresh colostrum or colostrum substitute at the time of removal.” is suggested.	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written. This issue is fully covered in NAWAC’s report to the Minister, which accompanies the draft code.
MS 3 Page 20	22	Suggest making definition of ‘adequate’ more quantifiable.	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard and RBP provide for the desired welfare

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
			outcomes as written. However 'adequate' has been replaced by "sufficient".
MS 3 Page 20	26, 43	Should include reference to the Bobby Calf Code (8) which refers to special welfare needs and specifies calves require feeding before transport	Disagree – this code sets welfare standards for all calves not just bobby calves. Their requirements are the same as other calves.
RBP Page 20	1	(a) '...within the first six hours of life.' to read "...within the first six hours."	Agree – change made.
4.2 General Information Page 20	16	Exchange 'warranted' with 'needed' to read: 'Dried whole colostrum is commercially available and can be used if needed - ...'	Agree – change made.
4.3 Hand rearing calves Introduction Page 21	1	Third paragraph should read: '...i.e. for at least four weeks.'	Agree – change made.
4.3 Introduction Page 21	16	Paragraph 1: Change sentence 2 to the following: "Consequently they require special attention to ensure they are healthy and to allow their individual needs to be assessed."	Agree – change made.
MS 4 Page 21	8	It is well established and acknowledged in the Code that calves cannot cope with a solid diet until they are at least 4 weeks old. The Minimum Standard should be specific, e.g.: "Calves must receive sufficient liquid feeds to meet their nutrient requirements until at least four weeks of age." "Calves must not be weaned off liquid feed until the rumen has developed sufficiently to enable them to meet their total requirements from solids." "Rapid changes in the type of feed must be avoided."	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.
MS 4 Page 21	13	Accepted.	Noted.
MS 4 Page 21	16	Suggest that rather than using a definition based on rumen function, which may be hard to measure accurately, a definition based on target liveweight is used instead. Table 1, page 22 of the Code gives suggested target liveweights for weaning. A suitably conservative target could provide certainty for farmers, while minimising the risk of welfare issues for calves.	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written. Liveweights will vary considerably depending on breed, year, location and farm.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
MS 4 Page 21	19	<p>It is acknowledged in the Code that animals need liquid feed until at least four weeks. Suggest the standard to be rewritten to give specific requirements (i.e. “A calf must be given liquid feeds to meet their total nutrient requirements until at least four weeks of age.”).</p> <p>The following 2 Minimum Standards to be included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Calves must not be weaned off liquid feed until the rumen has developed sufficiently to enable them to meet their feed requirements from solids. b) Rapid changes of diet must be avoided. 	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written
MS 4 Page 21	20	Is supported as written	Noted.
RBP Page 21	18	<p>Contradiction in (a) and (c) regarding length of time liquid milk should be fed.</p> <p>Milk being fed too cold is also a problem (d).</p>	<p>Disagree – (a) is total nutrient requirements; (c) is maintaining some milk as part of the diet as calves are weaned.</p> <p>Agree – change made.</p>
RBP Page 21	22	Suggest that Recommended Best Practice (a) becomes part of MS 3.	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written
RBP Page 21	26, 43	(b) The word appropriate should be inserted before ‘concentrates’.	Agree – change made.
RBP Page 22	44	Insert the following "(h) Calves should have access to clean potable fresh water at all times to meet their requirements for good health and welfare."	Disagree – Minimum standard 5 covers all dairy cattle, including calves.
4.4 Growing cattle RBP Page 22	14	Table 1: The heading in the 5 th column should be more descriptive – maybe “immediately before first calving” or “immediately before calving as a two-year-old”. Those weights would certainly not apply for mature cows immediately before calving.	Agree – change made.
RBP Page 22	18	The liveweights given are an absolute minimum for animals of New Zealand genetics, and grossly inadequate for animals with a high portion of Northern Hemisphere genetics (example given in submission). Failure to grow heifers adequately is the number one underlying reason for low production, poor reproduction and poor cow condition, exacerbated by inadequate feeding of milking cows.	Agree – Added to General Information section.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
RBP Page 22	27	LIC suggests that Table 1, extracted from Dairy Statistics 2004-5, LIC, should be replaced by data published by Dexcel (http://www.dexcel.co.nz) in Farm Fact 5.19 (Feed demand information covering the entire range of Friesian-Jersey crosses). LIC suggests providing a reference to the Dexcel website so that readers can access detailed and updated information.	Agree – change made to http://www.dairynz.co.nz .
4.5 - Water General comments	8	The desirability of water being palatable should already appear in the General Information section and not just in the Recommended Best Practices in relation to troughs.	Agree – change made to RBP.
4.5 Introduction Page 22	16	Paragraph 1: Add comma to read ‘Different classes of dairy cattle ... during the year, which, if not adequately fulfilled ...’ Statement in the second paragraph concerning water consumption does not read well. It needs to be re-written to convey the message that although water may freeze in the winter, this is undesirable and should be avoided.	Agree – both changes made.
4.5 Introduction Page 22	18	Access to water is as critical as flow rate. Herd hierarchy and social interaction can limit access of individual cows to drinking water where large mobs have only one water trough.	Agree – amended.
MS 5 Page 23	13	Accepted (a-c).	Noted.
MS 5 Page 23	16	(a) Suggest to revise this section to acknowledge the differing water requirements of lactating and non-lactating cows. While all lactating cattle must have access to an adequate daily supply of drinking water that is not harmful to health, non-lactating cattle may not require daily access to water, although they should be offered it. Evidence from Canada suggests that during winter cows are able to satisfy their water requirements from snow. Issues only arise when temperatures drop below minus 40°C. With regard to water from feedstuffs, so long as dry feeds (including silage) are not given, there should be no issues regarding thirst (calculations provided in submission). Where dry feeds, including silage, are given, water must be provided for all animals. This is especially true for periods of hot weather. (b) Could have significant economic implications for farmers if they have to install new water mains to meet demand. This is likely the case on big farms, or dairy conversions involving the amalgamation of many small units into a single,	Disagree – NAWAC believes all dairy cattle must have access to a daily supply of drinking water. This does not preclude the differing requirements of stock. Noted.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		<p>large operation. On the positive side, improved access to water can increase milk production and the provision of more drinking troughs can help reduce bullying, also improving production. It is recommended that these points will be considered by NAWAC and noted in their report on the code.</p> <p>This section is concerned only with mains water and says nothing about animals which may have access to other water sources, be it deliberate or accidental. This needs to be addressed in terms of potential contamination, disease risk and consistency of access/quality of such non-potable water sources.</p>	Disagree – Minimum standard applies to all water sources and states that they ‘must not be harmful to health’.
MS 5 Page 23	20	Seems to be repetitive. Section (a) will only be achieved if section (b) and (c) are implemented.	Disagree – (a) is for all water sources not just mains water.
MS 5 Page 23	22	Suggest rewording for clarity: “All dairy cattle must have access to an adequate supply of potable drinking water to meet daily requirements.”	Disagree – NAWAC believes the wording should be consistent with other species codes.
MS 5 Page 23	9,10,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42	<p>The minimum water recommendations are not based on scientific recommendations.</p> <p>There is no allowance for different requirements for different individuals. For instance the water requirements for cows producing 2 kgs ms per day are quite different than for cows producing 0.6 per day.</p>	Disagree – appropriate references to science will be included in the report to the Minister which accompanies the draft code. NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written and does not specify minimum water requirements for exactly the reasons given in the submission.
RBP Page 23	22	(a) is ‘palatable’ meant to be ‘potable’?	Disagree – NAWAC believes the wording should be consistent with other species codes.
RBP Page 23	44	Insert the following “(c) Water quality should equal or exceed the New Zealand Meat Circulars Industry Standard 3.”	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written. Potable or human drinking water standards are unnecessary for good animal welfare.
5.1 Shade and shelter Introduction Page 24	8	The draft Code claims that dairy cattle in New Zealand pastoral conditions tolerate the weather variations well provided they are well fed and not very young. Tolerance in this sense seems to be based on the incidence of hypo- and hyperthermia. However, this does not take into account the underlying level of suffering and does not take into account that suffering may occur before the stage of hypo- and hyperthermia. The submitter provides evidence that cow welfare is frequently poor due to weather conditions experienced at pasture	Noted – appropriate references to science will be included in the report to the Minister which accompanies the draft code.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		<p>(Mellor & Stafford, 2004; Young, 1981; Bergen et al., 2001; Kennedy et al., 2005; Young 1975, Tucker et al., 2006; Webster et al., 2006; Pollard & Orr, 2002; Gregory et al., 1998; Verkerk et al., 2006; Malechek & Smith, 1976; Young, 1981; Adams et al., 1986; Webster, 1971; Collier et al., 1982; Holmes & Sykes, 1984; Webster, 1970; 1976; 1996; Gatenby, 1977; Gregory, 1995; Holmes et al. 1978; Holmes & McLean, 1975; Bluett et al. 2000). Issues include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Zealand weather is highly variable. While stock exposed to continuous cold or hot conditions acclimatise through hormonal, metabolic and physical changes, these adjustments do not occur in response to intermittent exposure to such climate. • Body condition is a major factor influencing vulnerability of cows to cold stress, especially in cull cows, which tend to be in poor condition. • Cows fed bulky, low quality food in winter may struggle to ingest sufficient to generate heat to keep warm (cull cows may even be losing weight as their food ration is likely to be minimal). • Lactating dairy cows have an extremely high productive output compared to other livestock, making them particularly susceptible to overheating. • Weather factors do not operate in isolation. Hence, cattle in muddy conditions in poor weather, for example, have many avenues of heat loss and they will have a poor ability to counteract this if fed low energy food. • Cattle with facial eczema become extremely photosensitive and will suffer severe discomfort if exposed to direct sunshine. • Thermal discomfort is considered to be an important cause of stress to livestock, especially when shade and shelter are not provided. • There is a wealth of information, which shows the negative effects of cold (Bond et al., 1970; Thompson, 1976; Holmes et al., 1978; Young, 1981; Christopherson, 1985; Bergen & Young, 1993) and heat (Kadzere et al. 2002; Jordan 2003) on productivity of dairy cows. Other studies have shown the beneficial effect of shade and shelter on productivity. <p>In the introduction of the draft Code, seeking shade and shelter are not even</p>	

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		<p>mentioned as responses to heat and cold. These responses must be represented and discussed as vitally important behavioural mechanisms, which allow cows to maintain a normal temperature, along with the fact that when cows have to use alternative means of thermoregulating, there is a negative impact on productivity.</p> <p>Suggested Addition to Introduction: “Seeking shade in hot weather and shelter in cold weather are natural behavioural responses that cows use to maintain a normal body temperature. When cows are unable to maintain a comfortable temperature they use physiological means (such as shivering and sweating) to gain or lose heat, and this uses energy and resources that would otherwise be used productively. Cows are most productive, healthy and comfortable when they can readily maintain a normal temperature.</p> <p>Heat from solar radiation is a major contributor to a cow’s heat load and this is very effectively reduced by shade. Providing shade to cows also reduces their demand for drinking water.</p> <p>Wind causes convective heat loss due to evaporative cooling of the skin and flattening the coat, which then loses some of its insulative value. Artificial rain shelter or overhanging trees will also protect cows from radiative heat losses to the open sky.</p> <p>Cows with facial eczema become extremely photosensitive and suffer when they are exposed to direct sun. Therefore affected stock need access to shade.”</p> <p>Behavioural signs of cold stress also include standing with the back hunched facing away from the wind, in addition to shivering and huddling.</p>	<p>Agree – Shade and shelter ‘seeking’ has been included in the Introduction.</p> <p>Agree – information included in General Information section.</p> <p>Disagree – additional information not necessary to achieve desired welfare outcomes.</p> <p>Disagree – already a recommended best practice.</p> <p>Agree – information added to Introduction.</p>
5.1 Introduction Page 24	16	<p>Paragraph 3: Add ‘s’ to indicate ‘Such depression and listlessness indicates the need for urgent remedial action.</p>	<p>Agree – change made.</p>
5.1 Introduction Page 24	19	<p>Introduction seems to be centred on the adult animal with little mention of calves, but the first Minimum Standard (MS 6) relates specifically to calves.</p> <p>This section does not seem to have been given the consideration it deserves or that is set out in Section 5.5 of the Guidelines for Drafting Codes of Welfare – MAF Information Paper 36. There is much more information that could be included here to improve the physical environment in which dairy cows presently live.</p>	<p>Disagree – Second sentence stipulates “the young” as an exception to tolerating NZ weather conditions well.</p> <p>Agree in part – Additional information has been added throughout this section.</p>

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
5.1 Introduction Page 24	26, 43	Concern is expressed that during summer animals are exposed to extended periods of sun and humidity. Facial eczema is common and heat stress also a problem. During winter dairy cows are exposed to long periods of cold southerly winds and wet footing.	Noted.
5.1 Introduction Page 24	14	Paragraph 3: Suggest “standing back to wind with back hunched” to be included along with ‘shivering and huddling together’.	Agree – change made.
MS 6 Page 24	8	The following should be added: “‘All classes of dairy cattle must have access to shelter to minimise the effects of cold stress.’” “‘All classes of dairy cattle must have access to shade to minimise the effects of heat stress.’” “‘Where conditions are likely to lead to clinical hypothermia immediate remedial action must be taken.’” “‘Shelter must be provided to protect cows and calves from wind and rain during the calving period.’” “‘Cows with facial eczema must have access to shade.’”	Agree in part – new minimum standard added “‘All classes of dairy cattle must be provided with the means to minimise the effects of adverse weather.’” Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.
MS 6 Page 24	13	Accepted (a-c).	Noted.
MS 6 Page 24	14	(a) The reference is to ‘newborn’, but the definition of ‘newborn’ is ‘first 24 hours of life’. It should perhaps be “‘Recently born calves up to 7 days of age that have been...’”. While there could be a debate about the 7 days, confining it to just 24 hours is definitely not enough. (b) It is suggested that “‘heat’” should be included along with ‘wind, rain and snow’.	Disagree – older calves are covered by minimum standard (c). Agree – reworded to “‘adverse weather’”.
MS 6 Page 24	16	Recommend that Minimum Standard clarify the position around use of calf/cow covers. Do covers count as legitimate form of shelter?	Disagree – information is provided in General Information section.
MS 6 Page 24	19	(a) Does not come near what is stated in the Code of Recommendations and Minimum Standards for the Welfare of Dairy Cattle MS 9 (Shelter should be provided for calves for at least the first 3 weeks of life.). In fact, there is no mention of this anywhere in the draft (appears to be weakening animal welfare standards). (c) Seems to imply that an animal must actually become sick from the weather	Disagree – calves are covered by minimum standard (c). Agree in part – minimum standard reworded to

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		<p>conditions before it becomes necessary to take remedial actions. If the Code is providing for the physical, health and behavioural needs for dairy cattle and giving them ‘adequate shelter’ as it states it is, one would hope they would not ‘develop health problems associated with exposure to weather conditions’. There is much evidence (Verkerk et al 2006) that the welfare of dairy cattle is at times compromised by the environmental conditions they are exposed to at pasture and scientific studies have shown that seeking shelter in cold weather and shade in hot weather are natural behavioural responses of cattle.</p> <p>The importance of shade and shelter for cows’ health and well-being should be emphasised and a Minimum Standard should be added similar to that in the Deer Code of Welfare i.e. “Shelter and shade must be available for all classes of animal to provide protection from extreme weather elements.”</p>	<p>“Where animals develop health problems associated with exposure to adverse weather conditions, priority must be given to remedial action that will minimise the consequences of such exposure.” Appropriate references to science will be included in the report to the Minister which accompanies the draft code.</p> <p>Agree – new minimum standard added “All classes of dairy cattle must be provided with the means to minimise the effects of adverse weather.”.</p>
MS 6 Page 24	20	Section (a) and (b) seem to be the same statement in respect of calves.	Disagree – (a) newborn calves must have shelter (b) older calves must be protected from adverse weather.
MS 6 Page 24	22	<p>(a) It is not clear why this standard does not apply to all calves (i.e. those with and without their dams), as all require shelter. Suggest delete the phrase “that have been removed from their mothers”.</p> <p>(b) It is not clear why this is not already covered under subsection (a).</p>	<p>Disagree – cows can provide and/or seek shelter for them and their calves.</p> <p>Disagree – (a) newborn calves must have shelter (b) older calves must be protected from adverse weather.</p>
MS 6 Page 24	23	<p>No Minimum Standard has been set regarding the shade needs of dairy cattle in conditions of significant heat. While there are Recommended Best Practices for shade needs during hot weather, this is insufficient to ensure the reduction of animal stress in these conditions, because it has no legal effect. An additional Minimum Standard item is needed to provide legal obligation.</p> <p>Current Standard 6(c) is so vague and without definition so as to make it unenforceable in law.</p>	<p>Agree – new minimum standard added “All classes of dairy cattle must be provided with the means to minimise the effects of adverse weather”.</p> <p>Disagree – however minimum standard reworded to “Where animals develop health problems associated with exposure to adverse weather conditions, priority must be given to remedial action that will minimise the consequences of such exposure”.</p>
MS 6 Page 24	25	Using shade and shelter and finding somewhere comfortable and dry to rest are normal behaviours of all cattle, which allow them some control over their	Noted.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		<p>environment to avoid discomfort and physiological stress. Therefore the Code must contain Minimum Standards which require farmers to meet these needs at all times for all of their stock. Providing these needs cannot be considered impractical or uneconomic (i.e. provisions under Section 73 of the Act do not apply) because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) there are artificial structures and natural features available and in use by many farmers 2) meeting behavioural and physiological needs reduces physiological stress and energy demand, making stock more productive and healthy. <p>(‘Exceptional circumstances’ under Section 73 should refer to just that. Circumstances which are “exceptional” are those that will lead to a large section of the industry being forced out of business if they were out in place. They are not supposed to apply to general improvements in animal welfare because such improvements will often initially cost something. Neither can making provisions for these needs be considered “new” forms of farming, because good stockmanship has traditionally aimed to allow animals the means to make themselves comfortable – in fact this is the essence of good stockmanship which is based on empathy and returned with good individual animal productivity.)</p> <p>Accommodating and growing trees and shrubs and controlling mud and faeces provide many environmental advantages which help to counteract the negative impacts of farming (such as methane emissions, reduced biodiversity, soil loss and waterway damage), and should be regarded as necessary actions for meeting environmental sustainability as well as animal welfare needs.’</p> <p>Minimum Standard should include: “All classes of dairy cattle must have access to shade, shelter and dry, comfortable resting surfaces at all times.”</p>	<p>Noted – Section 73 has not been used in the code.</p> <p>Agree in part – new minimum standard added “All classes of dairy cattle must be provided with the means to minimise the effects of adverse weather”.</p>
MS 6 Page 24	26, 43	<p>Considerable concern in the South Island where established shelter belts are being demolished for the extensive irrigation and grazing for cattle. The South Island is also susceptible to prolonged periods of driving wind and rain. Appropriate shelter must be provided for all classes of cattle under such conditions to avoid extended stress.</p>	<p>Agree – new minimum standard added “All classes of dairy cattle must be provided with the means to minimise the effects of adverse weather.”</p>
RBP Page 25	14	<p>It is suggested that at least section (b) and section (c), and section (a) for cows close to calving and those in poor conditions, should be Minimum Standards.</p>	<p>Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written. However, RBP (b) has been deleted as it is covered by minimum standard (d).</p>

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
RBP Page 25	22	<p>(a) How is 'severe' to be interpreted?</p> <p>(b) What conditions are likely to lead to fatal hypothermia? Conditions 'likely to lead to fatal hypothermia' seems a very harsh threshold for determining action.</p> <p>(c) Why is this not mandatory for cases of extreme photosensitivity e.g. with use of sun screen. Also, suggest adding 'direct' before 'sunlight'.</p> <p>(d) What is 'hot weather'? There is considerable research to suggest temperature/humidity/solar radiation thresholds leading to significant heat challenge. Specify behavioural signs for action and include in a Minimum Standard.</p>	<p>Noted – change made to “adverse weather”.</p> <p>Agree – RBP (b) has been deleted as it is covered by minimum standard (d).</p> <p>Disagree –these cases are covered by minimum standard (d).</p> <p>Agree – change made.</p> <p>Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written. Information is provided in both the Introduction and General Information sections.</p>
RBP Page 25	26, 43	(c) And in respect to Facial Eczema, at the time 'spore counts' are reported as dangerous.	Disagree – this does not provide a “means of reducing the heat loading”.
5.1 General Information Page 25	1	Paragraph 2: Should read: 'Newborn, wet or sick calves,...'	Agree – change made.
5.1 General Information Page 25	8	<p>Information on suitable ways of retaining existing trees for shade and shelter and incorporating them into farm design should be provided. The advantage of trees over artificial shelter could be described (e.g. durability in wind and sun, aesthetic appeal, forage, etc). References to information sources for farm tree types, design and management should be given.</p> <p>Information on the photosensitising information of facial eczema should be given.</p> <p>It should be noted that farm layout ideally minimises the distance between paddocks and the milking shed, to minimise activity required in hot weather and exposure to rain and wind on cold days (as well as energy expenditure and wear on feet).</p> <p>Covers are not a realistic method for providing shelter on a long-term or herd-wide basis and this should be made clear (as should be problems associated with covers such as ectoparasites, chafing, probable discomfort when weather conditions improve and fear relating to the covers) (Holmes et al., 1993; McDonald & Penno, 1996) .</p>	Disagree – additional information not necessary to achieve the desired welfare outcomes.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
5.1 General Information Page 25	16	Paragraph 4: Should read: ‘A substantial increase in body temperature occurs during walking on hot days, ...’.	Agree – change made.
5.2 Floods, storms and droughts Introduction Page 26	25	Why is it considered not reasonable to put plans in place to deal with every potential problem regarding floods, storms and droughts? These are recurring events, and they should not take farmers completely by surprise every year. Suggested Minimum Standard: “Dairy farmers must be able to demonstrate that they have contingency plans for any extreme weather events (including floods, snow storms and droughts) which may affect their region.”	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.
5.2 Introduction Page 26	26, 43	This aspect of welfare results in more ‘complaints’, particularly from tourists, than any other. The sight of ‘caked’ mud often dry on legs of cattle is quite unsightly.	Noted.
5.3 Farm Facilities General comments	8	The desirability of having the milking shed in a central location to minimise walking distance should be pointed out here. Walking distance to the milking shed (Tucker et al., 2005) increases with herd size so this is a particularly important welfare concern for large herds. Information on suitable and unsuitable materials for races, to minimise foot discomfort and wear, should be given. A Minimum Standard could provide maximum daily walking distances. It should be mentioned that slippery surfaces should be avoided in all cow facilities to minimise risk of injury.	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.
5.3 Introduction Page 26	17	The introductory paragraph lists the reasons for having proper handling facilities. One of the reasons should also be “for the safety of the handlers”.	Disagree – NAWAC believes this code should focus on animal welfare not human safety.
MS 7 Page 27	13	Accepted	Noted.
MS 7 Page 27	14	It is suggested that the Recommended Best Practices (p. 27) should all be Minimum Standards.	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.
MS 7 Page 27	16	Support this Minimum Standard and associated section as it stands.	Noted.
MS 7 Page 27	17	‘Farm facilities must be...injury to animals’. Suggest the words “and their handlers” to be added to the end of this sentence.	Disagree – NAWAC believes this code should focus on animal welfare not human safety.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		<p>advantages of comfortable dry surfaces with sufficient space, need to be presented rationally. Suggest the following wording:</p> <p>“Cows are likely to suffer significant discomfort if the surface type and area per cow are not appropriate for the frequency of use. Discomfort occurs when surfaces are hard, wet, and/or unhygienic and/or there is insufficient space to lie down (when there is insufficient space, aggression occurs and lying time is reduced).</p> <p>In addition to the physical discomfort of lying on hard and wet, cold surfaces, other problems include tiredness, coldness due to conduction of heat into the lying surface, reduced eating and associated hunger and coldness, lameness from abrasive/wet/unhygienic surfaces and mastitis from wet/unhygienic surfaces.</p> <p>Cows are more productive and healthy when provided with comfortable, dry lying surfaces and sufficient space for all cows to lie down at one time.”</p>	
5.4 Introduction Page 27	16	Paragraph 1: Change to ‘It is common practice during winter to use either stand-off areas, ...’.	Agree – change made.
MS 8 Page 28	8	<p>This Minimum Standard is so non-specific that it contains nothing which can be enforced and therefore is not really a standard at all.</p> <p>There is sufficient information for useful standards to be developed to protect cow welfare. Suggested standards:</p> <p>“(a) All classes of cattle must have access to dry, comfortable resting areas for a minimum of 10 hours per day, to allow normal resting behaviour to occur.</p> <p>(b) There must be sufficient dry, comfortable resting area for all stock in an enclosure to be able to rest at one time.</p> <p>(c) Cows must have access to dry, comfortable, clean areas in which to calve.”</p>	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.
MS 8 Page 28	13	Accepted.	Noted.
MS 8 Page 28	14	It is suggested that the words “each day” be added between ‘sufficient periods’ and ‘to minimise distress’.	Disagree.
MS 8 Page 28	16	While the section on stand-off areas and feed pads is acceptable from a NZ perspective, it may not be from the perspective of some market partners, especially with regard to animals lying on concrete. The UK Welfare of Livestock Regulations 1994 state that, when in a building, lactating dairy cows or cows which are calving ‘shall have access at all times to a well-drained and	Noted.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		bedded lying area'. Statements such as this have particular ramifications for the use of 'Herd Homes', which are becoming increasingly popular in NZ. These are a new technology and need robust science behind them to demonstrate that they meet, or exceed, domestic welfare expectations. It is suggested that NAWAC consider the need for future research into the lying behaviour of cows on concrete pads and in 'Herd Homes'.	
MS 8 Page 28	18	What is 'sufficient period' to lie down? If possible, cows prefer to lie down for at least 10 hours a day. Does the sufficient period apply within any particular time limit?	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.
MS 8 Page 28	19	This Minimum Standard is general and vague, offering no clear action. Dexcel has produced some excellent information on stand-off pads looking at the issue of surface types, space requirement per cow, health issues associated with stand-off pads, lying time, design and management. There has also been some work done on winter management systems in New Zealand.	Noted.
MS 8 Page 28	20	Is supported as written.	Noted.
MS 8 Page 28	21	It is essential to make clear that notwithstanding the requirements contained here, farmers are able to use other situations for standing animals off in exceptional one-off circumstances.	Disagree – emergency care is separate from stand-off area requirements.
MS 8 Page 28	22	Reword for clarity: "Cattle must lie down and rest..."	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.
MS 8 Page 28	24	Minimum Standard recommended to only refer to stand-off pads. A stand-off area is designed to allow animals to lie down and rest, however, a feed pad does not necessarily serve this purpose. Feed pads usually serve a specific feeding purpose, and animals are often discouraged from lying down on a feed pad surface, as they are generally concentrated and far from ideal for cows to rest on.	Disagree – however minimum standard has been reworded "...to meet their behavioural needs."
MS 8 Page 28	25	How can MS be enforced? How is distress to be measured in a way that can stand up in court?	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.
MS 8 Page 28	26, 43	Add after the words 'lie down' the words "on a preferred area".	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
RBP Page 28	8	Suggests: “(a) Well-drained areas covered with woodchips, bark or post-peeling surfaces can be used to create dry, comfortable resting areas.”	Disagree – however recommended best practice has been reworded.
RBP Page 28	22	(a) Add “normally require 8-10h rest per day” (Jensen, M.B., Pedersen, L.J., Munksgaard, L., 2005). An outcome measure (e.g. resting behaviour) rather than a provision of a resource is required.	Disagree – however recommended best practice has been reworded.
RBP Page 28	26, 43	Add to the end of the sentence the words “as a preferred area”.	Disagree – however recommended best practice has been reworded.
5.4 General Information Page 28	8	The claim that ‘Research shows that cows prefer to lie down for between 8 hours and 11hours/ day’ is incorrect. Lying times for dairy cows on comfortable (woodchip or pasture) surfaces are 10-12 hours per day, reducing to 7 hours or less on uncomfortable surfaces (Fisher et al. 2003; Verkerk et al., 2006).	Disagree – however range changed to “...between 8 and 13 hours each day...”.
5.4 General Information Page 28	14	Last paragraph: Suggest “Where harder surfaces such as concrete or raceways are used for periods of 12 hours or more each day for consecutive days, welfare will be compromised. Lameness, stiffness, agitated behaviour and weight loss are likely to occur. It is recommended that this practice is limited to periods of no more than three days after which the animals should be given at least one day on a surface on which they can lie comfortably.”	Disagree.
5.4 General Information Page 28	16	Paragraph 1: Write out number ‘Research shows that cows prefer to lie down for between eight hours and 11 hours/day...’.	Disagree.
5.5 Housing of dairy cattle Introduction Page 29	8	The space requirements per cow should be given.	Disagree.
5.5 Introduction Page 29	16	Paragraph 1: First sentence to read ‘In New Zealand, few adult dairy cattle are housed, but...’ NAWAC’s position on what constitutes ‘housing’ should be outlined here to provide clarity to farmers. To arrive at a robust position concerning space allowances it is suggested that NAWAC consider the existing debate around spacing allowances for dairy cattle under housed conditions overseas. Current EU regulations state that 80% of	Agree –change made. Agree – definition added to Glossary Disagree – however statement added “The important factor is allowing enough area per cow to ensure they achieve adequate lying time i.e. at

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		animals must be able to lie down at the same time, while US regulations favour spacing which allows 110% of animals to lie at the same time. While an outcome-based standard is to be applauded, acknowledgement of these issues is desirable, in case the standard is challenged in future by domestic and overseas markets.	least eight hours each day”.
5.5 Introduction Page 29	17	In the second paragraph the highlighted words in the following text could be added: ‘The design and construction of cattle housing needs to be carried out with the well-being of the animals and the safety of stock handlers in mind.’	Disagree – NAWAC believes this code should focus on animal welfare not human safety.
MS 9 Page 29	8	There should be a minimum requirement to inspect housed cows daily (as with housed deer in the new Deer Code).	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standards in this code provide for the desired welfare outcomes as written.
MS 9 Page 29	12	(a) Is identical to MS 8. Suggest to remove this section.	Disagree – NAWAC believes it is important that this key welfare aspect is covered in both situations. However. “...each day...” has been added to this minimum standard.
MS 9 Page 29	13	Accepted (a-e).	Noted.
MS 9 Page 29	22	(a) Reword for clarity “Cattle must lie down and rest...”	Disagree.
MS 9 Page 29	14	(a) This is identical to MS 8. Suggest section (b) and (e) are combined and replaced with a Minimum Standard such as MS 7 i.e. “Farm facilities in which animals are housed must be constructed, maintained and operated in a manner that minimises the likelihood of distress or injury to animals.”	Disagree – NAWAC believes it is important that this key welfare aspect is covered in both situations. However. “...each day...” has been added to this minimum standard. Disagree – (b) covers construction and (e) repairs.
MS 9 Page 29	17	The words “and people” could be added at the end of section (b). These words could also be inserted into section (e) after the words ‘injury to cattle’.	Disagree – NAWAC believes this code should focus on animal welfare not human safety.
MS 9 Page 29	20	Section (b) and (e) appear to be similar standards as do sections (c) and (d) and hence could be amalgamated.	Disagree – (b) covers construction and (e) repairs; (c) covers adequate ventilation and (d) when action must be taken to reduce ammonia levels.
MS 9 Page 29	16	(c) There are potential issues around ammonia levels in semi-open houses under wet or foggy conditions, i.e. damp conditions, with little or no air movement. Suggest that NAWAC consider the available research in order to form an opinion on whether there is likely to be a problem in existing or future housing systems. Should information not be available, it is recommended this become a	Noted.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		future research priority, given the increasing popularity of housing systems in NZ.	
MS 9 Page 29	24	(d) It is recommended that a practical indicator is included here to give guidance for farmers. Although it is appreciated that it is important to have quantitative measures, it is unreasonable to expect farmers to accurately ascertain ammonia levels at any given time. This clause should be amended to reflect a more outcome-based and practical approach. For example, “ammonia levels causing eye and nasal irritation in people” as described in the general information section.	Disagree – NAWAC believes the wording should be consistent with other species codes.
MS 9 Page 29	25	Full housing of cows should be discouraged because this is factory farming as carried out in the Northern Hemisphere and New Zealand’s agricultural marketing image is based on pastoral farming. If full housing is to be allowed then it should only be carried out with welfare standards that demonstrably surpass those of overseas countries (e.g. Minimum Standards should include allowing daily exercise and disallowing tethering). How can MS be enforced? How is distress measured in a way that can stand up in court?	Noted.
RBP Page 29	14	(a) Suggest that the words “and spread of disease e.g. mastitis” be included after ‘avoid animal discomfort’. Quality of bedding in housed situations is a major contributor to mastitis.	Disagree – NAWAC believes this code should focus on animal welfare.
RBP Page 29 and 30	22	(b) Why are ammonia levels not specified as a Minimum Standard? (c) Specify minimum lux levels as a Minimum Standard. Not clear what discomfort is referring to as worded – inspector or cow – reword. Discomfort is poorly defined.	Disagree – ammonia levels are given in minimum standard the RBP states lower levels. Disagree – NAWAC believes the wording should be consistent with other species codes.
RBP Page 29	1	(c) Delete space between ‘20-’and ‘50 lux’ to read “20-50 lux”.	Agree – change made.
6. Husbandry practices General comments	25	Regard should be given to the management of dairy bulls and possible welfare issues arising with artificial reproduction techniques used on cows and bulls. Information on these topics must be presented.	Agree – however additional information not necessary to achieve desired welfare outcomes as the whole code applies to dairy bulls.
6.1 Behaviour and stock	8	The excessive use of force when twisting the tail of cattle to induce them to move forward can cause painful injuries and break tails. This should be noted in	Agree – information and recommended best practice added.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
handling Introduction Page 31		the text and the use of force that is likely to cause injury should be prohibited.	
6.1 Introduction Page 31	16	Should read: ‘Good facilities reduce pressure on animals so distress and risk to both the animals and their handlers are decreased.’	Disagree.
MS 10 Page 31	17	At the end of section (a) the words “and their handlers” could be added.	Disagree – NAWAC believes this code should focus on animal welfare not human safety.
MS 10 Page 31	20	(b) Could potentially pose problems in interpretation. For example, one is not to poke cattle in the nose, but use of nose grips as a method of restraint is acceptable. The statement in section (a) covers the specific statements included in part (b). The statement regarding minimal force in section (c) appears to be another ‘activity’ captured by the outcome-based statement of section (a).	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written
MS 10 Page 31	1	(c) Replace ‘minimum’ with ‘minimal’.	Disagree.
MS 10 Page 31	2	Add the following: “Cows tails must not be physically manhandled or twisted as a means of propelling a dairy animal forwards. This may result in broken tail bones and cause unnecessary pain and distress to the animal.” Historically this has been a problem of such significant importance, especially when first year milkers are bring trained to enter a herringbone shed or rotary platform, that the use of cows’ tails in this manner should appear as a Minimum Standard here.	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written. However a recommended best practice has been added.
MS 10 Page 31	8	The Recommended Best Practice points regarding the use of electric goads should be included as Minimum Standards because this instrument undoubtedly causes distress. Suggest the following: “Electric goads must not be used to move animals other than stubborn or recalcitrant cattle.” “Electric goads must not be used for more than one second at a time, or more than four times on the same animal.”	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.
MS 10 Page 31	13	Accepted (a-c).	Noted.
MS 10 Page 31	14	Disappointed that reference to the lifting or twisting of tails as a means of getting animals to move has been omitted from this version of the Code. It is strongly recommended that both “Electric goads should not be applied to any	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written. However a recommended

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		animal for more than once second at a time”, and “Undue force lifting or twisting an animal’s tail (i.e. force sufficient to dislocate or break the tail) should not be used” should be Minimum Standards.	best practice has been added.
RBP Page 31	14	<p>It should be a Recommended Best Practice that the tail should not be used as a means of getting animals to move.</p> <p>(a) -to lead into ‘shadowy areas’ seems unmanageable – e.g. show cows are always led from outside into inside areas which are ‘shadowy’ – this should be deleted.</p> <p>There should also be some rewording to put the reason first, then the ‘should not’ second, consistently i.e.:</p> <p>“...handling cattle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They have poor vision for distance and detail so they should not be subjected to sudden movements. • Their hearing is similar to humans so they should not be subjected to loud noises. • Their instinct to herd is strong so they should not be isolated unnecessarily.” <p>(g) There needs to be further information on the application of backing gates, probably best included in the General Introduction section. It is suggested that the Chesterton Golden Rules are incorporated here (Chesterton, 2006).</p>	<p>Agree – change made.</p> <p>Disagree – the recommended best practice suggests that these factors should be taken into account when handling animals.</p> <p>Agree – change made.</p> <p>Agree – added as recommended best practice to section 6.2 lameness.</p>
RBP Page 31	16	<p>(a) Recommend to insert a brief statement describing the differing front and rearward visual acuity of dairy cows. There should be practical mention of the lowest light conditions that cows can safely be handled in, to protect both animal and handler.</p> <p>(d) Recommend that NAWAC consider the prohibition of weapons, or objects that could be used as weapons e.g. sharpened sticks, to move stock. If it is not appropriate to address this in the code (i.e. may be covered somewhere else such as the Animal Welfare Act 1999) this needs to be stated in the code report.</p>	<p>Disagree – NAWAC believes the recommended best practice provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
RBP Page 31	26, 43	Add a section to exclude the use of tails as a means of ‘moving or forcing cattle’. Excessive leverage will cause the tails to break and be stressful for the breast.	Agree – change made.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
6.2 Droving General comments	16	Suggest that this section is strengthened by some consideration of the modern dairy cow with regard to walking long distances. Although anecdotal, there is a risk that droving modern dairy cows can cause damage to the udder tendons.	Noted.
MS 11 Page 32	13	Accepted (a-c).	Noted.
MS 11 Page 32	20	Is supported as written.	Noted.
RBP Page 32	16	(c) Need to clarify statement on droving distances. It is unclear whether the statement includes routine movement of stock on farm (e.g. to and from milking). If so, it could have a negative impact on stock movement, especially on large or hilly country properties.	Agree – definition of droving included in Glossary.
RBP Page 32	22	(a) For clarity change ‘driven’ to “walked”. (c) Sentence beginning ‘If the cattle have to...’ is redundant as its provisions are covered by the details in the first sentence.	Disagree. Agree in part – Reworded to “If this travel includes any hills, then the distance should be less than 6 – 8 km/day.”
6.2. General Information Page 33	16	Paragraph 2: Replace ‘can’ with ‘should’ to read ‘Signage indicating stock are on the road ... drovers should wear visibility clothing.’	Agree – change made.
MS 12 Page 34	13	Accepted (a-d).	Noted.
MS 12 Page 34	16	Support this standard and associated section as it stands.	Noted.
MS 12 Page 34	20	Is supported as written.	Noted.
RBP Page 34	14	(b) This is the only reference to ‘tethered’ cattle – this practice needs to be expanded upon as it raises potential welfare issues that the NZVA feels are not adequately covered. The instances of tethering of which we are aware include calves for calf club and cattle at shows (and on farm during training and pre-paragraphation for showing), cattle in some research institutions (e.g. metabolism stalls or when being held for specific manipulations in which case they are all covered by the SOP relating to the manipulation, some bulls at AB centres, sometimes bulls on farms, the occasional house cow on a lifestyle block, and occasional calf rearing systems) – all situations in which they should regularly be checked. We would suggest that every 8 hours would actually fit with current practice, with more frequent checking during any period of training	Agree – changed to a minimum standard and information added to General Information section.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		for such restraint.	
6.5 Identification General comments	16	No mention is made in this section of Automatic Milking Systems (AMS). These systems should be considered in light of the need to ‘future proof’ the code.	Disagree – NAWAC believes amendments can be made at such a time as any new practices are deemed to not be adequately covered by the Code.
6.5 Introduction Page 34	28	The statement given in the introduction is correct at present. However, there is a national identification and traceability scheme being developed, which will be mandatory for all cattle. The introductory statement might be best altered to merely say that permanent identification is mandated.	Agree – change made.
RBP Page 34	1	(b) To read: "... ridges and major blood vessels."	Agree – change made.
RBP Page 34/35	26, 43	Excessive number of ear tags not to be used and distort the natural position of the ear.	Disagree – NAWAC believes the recommended best practice provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.
RBP Page 35	18	(e) Hot branding without anaesthetic should be illegal.	Agree - minimum standard added "Hot branding must not be used without pain relief."
RBP Page 34/35	43	Recommended Best Practice (e) should become a Minimum Standard to read: "Hot branding must not be used".	Agree - minimum standard added "Hot branding must not be used without pain relief."
6.6 Milking Introduction Page 35	16	Insert comma to read: 'The milking process...; this will ensure that a complete milk ejection reflex occurs in the cow prior to, or during milking.	Agree – change made.
MS 13 Page 35	8	(a) Is too non-specific to be useful. Therefore recommend that Recommended Best Practice point (a) be included here as part of the Minimum Standard, i.e.: "All lactating cows must be milked or suckled by calves at least once every 24 hours (unless sickness or good management practices dictate otherwise)."	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written as it allows for different milking management throughout lactation.
MS 13 Page 35	13	Accepted (a-b).	Noted.
MS 13 Page 35	14	(a) Suggest that Recommended Best Practice (a) is incorporated by adding "and at least every 24 hours except when cows are being dried off" at the end of this Minimum Standard.	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written as it allows for different milking management throughout lactation.
MS Page 35	16	(a) Suggest NAWAC consider the implications of this clause in light of research by Dexcel, suggesting that cows can go up to seven days without being milked	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		<p>before production is adversely affected (Dalley and Davis, 2006). While this finding does not account for the welfare status of the cows during this period, it should at least be investigated or discussed further.</p> <p>(b) Recommend this clause to be changed to: “Milking equipment must be installed and operated to the relevant local standard(s), to minimise the risk of damage and infection of the teats and udder.”</p> <p>This would require the clause to be linked to a specific relevant standard e.g. ISO, NZ/AS or International Dairy Federation (IDF) rules. The proposed change would also cover the operation and use of other automated milking components (e.g. cup removers). When coupled with increasing herd size and decreasing human contact, the improper use of such components could lead to welfare issues not experienced in the current system. Hence it would be wise to have protection in place. In addition, if an AMS is not set up correctly, it could lead to animals not being milked often enough to meet requirements of clause (a) of the Minimum Standard.</p>	<p>outcomes as written.</p> <p>Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.</p>
MS 13 Page 35	20	Is supported as written.	Noted.
RBP Page 35	22	(a) Would appear to be unnecessary, as its provisions seem to be covered by MS 13.	Disagree – the RBP suggests a maximum time limit which promotes higher welfare standards than the minimum standard.
RBP Page 35	16	<p>(b) Remove comma after ‘properly’ to read: ‘To minimise ... the pulsation system should function properly and cows should not be over or under-milked.’</p> <p>(c) Should read: ‘Milking machines should be tested at least once a year and more frequently if the milking process is compromised as indicated by milking speed, teat damage and/or cow behaviour. All faults should be corrected immediately.’</p> <p>(d) Should read: ‘The risk of teat and udder infections should be minimised by practising good hygiene during milking and disinfecting teats of every cow after removal of teat-cups at every milking.’</p>	<p>Disagree – however this is now formatted as a list.</p> <p>Agree – change made.</p> <p>Disagree – NAWAC believes the recommended best practice provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.</p>
RBP Page 35	27	(d) LIC recommend ending the recommendations after the words “...practising good hygiene during milking” as the additional comment is implicit in the opening statement	Disagree – NAWAC believes the recommended best practice provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written..
RBP Page 36	1	(g) Surely this should be a Minimum Standard.	Agree – change made.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
RBP Page 36	14	(g) Suggest this should be a Minimum Standard.	Agree – change made.
6.6 General Information Page 36	16	Paragraph 1: Exchange ‘with a good milking machine’ with “operating conditions”. Regarding the paragraph on once-a-day (OAD) milking, there is no scientific justification for these statements and recent research exists, which demonstrates that the incidence of mastitis is not increased with OAD milking and that there is no difference in udder pressure at peak when cows are milked either OAD or TAD (twice-a-day) (Lacy-Hulbert et al 2005; Tucker et al 2007). Recommend this statement is either justified, revised or removed. Paragraph 3: Add comma after ‘therefore’ to read: ‘Therefore, cows need to be selected and managed carefully for once-a-day milking.’	Disagree. Agree – statement revised. Agree – however sentence no longer in code.
6.6 General Information Page 36	18	Signs of discomfort during milking can also indicate poor shed design, inadequate space per cow, poor stockmanship skills, etc, as well as voltages.	Agree – however the information given provides specific information for milking.
6.6 General Information Page 36	27	Submitter opposed to the reference to once-a-day milking. The paragraph related to once-a-day milking should be taken out, as there is no scientific support for this statement. If the Committee feels once-a-day milking has to be mentioned, peer-reviewed publications from Dexcel scientists would give the correct information as to how Once a Day milking is influencing the welfare of dairy cattle. (Lacy-Hulbert et al 2005; Tucker et al 2007)	Agree – statement revised.
6.7 Calving Introduction Page 36	16	Paragraph 2: First sentence to read ‘Induced calving for management purposes should only be used as a last resort because it has the potential to affect animal welfare adversely.’	Disagree – however new paragraph included.
6.7 Introduction Page 36	18	Well-managed inductions may be preferable to the high rate of metabolic and calving problems seen in late calving cows that are often inappropriately managed or simply neglected.	Disagree.
MS 14 Page 37	8	To avoid possible distress due to calving problems this should read: “Cows close to calving must be inspected at least twice every 24 hours.”	Agree – change made.
MS 14 Page 37	26, 43	(a) Must be inspected twice daily. Add section requiring a dry place for cows to calve onto. Often drop calves into	Agree – change made. Disagree – however section on shelter from adverse weather included.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		water. Suggest calving paddocks with dry ground and also improved shelter.	
MS 14 Page 37	28	(a) Uncomfortable with this section as currently written as the requirement might be used to argue that it should be consistent across all cattle systems. Beef cattle are not and cannot be inspected with such frequency due to extensive farming systems. Also, the majority of beef cows are not used to daily contact with people and there may hence be welfare implications associated with disturbing cows at regular intervals during calving.	Agree – changed to ‘dairy cow’ and issue included in the report to the Minister which accompanies the draft code.
MS 14 Page 37	14	(a) Suggest this should be twice every 24 hours. (c) It has been suggested that excessive traction can be produced by other means than a moving vehicle, with the recommendation that this Minimum Standard read: “Excessive traction, such as provided by a moving vehicle, must not be used to assist calving.”	Agree – change made. Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written as it defines a moving vehicle as ‘excessive traction’.
MS 14 Page 37	16	(a) Recommend NAWAC change the inspection interval to once every 12 hours, i.e. twice daily. A single daily inspection does not provide enough vigilance to take effective action if things go wrong during calving. (b) Suggest that this clause is re-worded to improve its clarity. For example: “If during inspection, a cow or heifer observed with vigorous and regular abdominal straining, has not given birth within a further two hours, it must be examined and appropriate remedial action taken.” There is also a need to consider this clause in relation to heifers, who may take longer than 2 hours to calve for the first time, often without incident. (c) Fully support this clause.	Agree – change made. Agree in part – minimum standard reworded Noted.
MS 14 Page 37	11	(c) This covers quad bikes, which are invaluable in the field (centrifugal clutch or automatic gearbox) providing far more controlled assistance to pull the calf out than any stationary block and tackle used by veterinarians. Furthermore it prevents back injury to farmers thereby reducing the risk of a career ending injury. Any tractor or large vehicle used to pull a calf is an absolute no, but the quad bike is invaluable.	Disagree.
MS 14 Page 37	12	(c) Statement in previous draft (i.e. ‘Excessive traction...’) is more practical as excessive traction can be applied through other means than a moving vehicle. Hence, suggest to add a reference that would prohibit use of excessive traction by other means than moving vehicles.	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written as it defines a moving vehicle as ‘excessive traction’.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
MS 14 Page 37	13	Accepted (a/b/d). (c) To be re-worded: “All assisted calving must be done in a humane manner.” Sometimes the only way to get traction to pull a calf is to anchor against a vehicle (vehicle not used to pull, but as an anchor). If the farmer were to pull a calf by himself in wet conditions he would be more likely to pull the cow as well as the calf.	Noted. Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written as it allows for a stationary vehicle to be used as an anchor.
MS 14 Page 37	20	Is supported as written.	Noted.
MS 14 Page 37	21	(c) Is the same as Recommended Best Practice (g).	Disagree – a moving vehicle is stipulated in the minimum standard and any vehicle for traction in the recommended best practice.
MS 14 Page 37	22	(d) The information in the ACVM Code must be publicly available (state source).	Disagree – however (d) reworded “All inductions must be conducted under the direct supervision of a veterinarian.”
RBP Page 37	14	(a) Should change ‘parturition’ to “calving” – technical term (d) It is suggested that provision of areas free of mud is an important requirement for calving paddocks – perhaps even a Minimum Standard. It is not acceptable to have calves born into mud and it is also a very significant factor in the incidence of post-calving strep mastitis especially in heifers. (e) Rewording – suggest: “Those inexperienced in stock management should obtain immediate...”. (g) Is this Recommended Best Practice not rendered redundant by MS 14 (c)?	Agree – change made. Agree – change made. Agree – change made. Disagree – a moving vehicle is stipulated in the minimum standard and any vehicle for traction in the recommended best practice.
RBP Page 37	18	(a) Easy calving sires may not be known or available. Mating heifers to genetically smaller sires may be more practical.	Disagree – smaller size is just one aspect of easier calving.
RBP Page 37	20	The statement regarding motor vehicles and traction is unnecessary since it is included in the Minimum Standards.	Disagree – a moving vehicle is stipulated in the minimum standard and any vehicle for traction in the recommended best practice.
RBP Page 37	22	(f) Define ‘controlled traction’ in Glossary.	Disagree.
RBP Page 37	26, 43	(b) ‘should not’ to read must not (c) ‘should’ should read must (g) ‘should’ be changed to must	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
6.7 General Information Page 38	18	Assessment of the cow is equally important as assessment of the size, state and position of the calf. Metabolic problems, especially hypocalcaemia, should be treated immediately.	Agree –change made.
6.8 Managing cows that are unable to stand General comments	14	Section 6.8 should include some mention/discussion of the methods for flotation of down cows and possibly some Minimum Standard or Recommended Best Practice in relation to that practice which is becoming increasingly common (and which also is providing much better outcomes for cows).	Agree – RBP added.
6.8 Introduction Page 38	16	Delete ‘causing any’ from second sentence.	Agree – change made.
MS 15 Page 38	16	(a) Add a comma after water. (b) An appropriate time limit should be given for the use of hip clamps here as has been done in clause (d). Suggest a further clause to be added, requiring slings and hip clamps to be used in accordance with manufacturer’s instructions.	Agree – change made. Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.
MS 15 Page 38	13	Accepted (a/b/d). (c) When downer cows try to stand they often end up in a place where they need to be shifted from (i.e. gully or drain). Using hip-lifters is often the only way to move them to safe position where they can be left to regain full coordination.	Noted. Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.
MS 15 Page 38	20	Is supported as written.	Noted.
MS 15	44	Min Standard 15 should also clearly state that a PIC/owner "must obtain veterinary advice/treatment should a cow remain down after (say) 72 hrs. Also to cover our types of scenario movement of a downed cow from the site of its injury should be the minimum required to ensure it is moved to a dry and sheltered place, any further movement should only be on veterinary advice.	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.
RBP Page 38/39	26, 43	(a) Delete 48 hours and replace with “24 hours”. 48 hours is far too long to leave a recumbent cow without seeking veterinary advice or destroying! (c) 4 th point: This statement requires a time limit and we would suggest 15° is inserted after ‘discontinued’ and to read ‘...discontinued after 15° and if...’.	Disagree – NAWAC believes the recommended best practice provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
RBP Page 39	14	(c) The first bullet point should include an example, e.g. broken or dislocated hip.	Disagree – NAWAC believes the recommended best practice provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written.
RBP Page 39	16	(d) Second bullet point should read ‘two suspending sequences’ not ‘2 suspending sequences’.	Agree – change made.
RBP Page 38/39	18	Hip clamps should be padded. Analgesics and anti-inflammatories should get more priority. Too often cows remain recumbent because inadequate calcium and/or energy are available to the cow, i.e. the initial problems have not been corrected.	Noted – this is already stated in (d). Agree in part – this will be dealt with by the veterinary advice as recommended in the RBP.
6.8 General Information Page 39	22	Paragraph 1: Last sentence (begins ‘careful diagnosis’) needs rewording for clarity in lay language.	Disagree.
6.9 Calf management General comments	8	Calf removal is distressing for cows and calves and yet there is no mention of how to minimise this distress. There should be Minimum Standards, Recommended Best Practice guidelines (e.g. ensure the separated animals have company, keep them out of sight and hearing of each other) and information on this topic.	Agree – recommended best practice added.
6.9 General comments	25	Regard should be given to the distress suffered by cows and calves when they are separated from each other. It is a normal pattern of behaviour for mothers and calves to stay together for many months with close contact and frequent sucking. Ways of minimising the distress of separation, as writing in existing scientific literature as well as identified by experienced stockpeople and veterinarians as good practice, must be presented and used to provide Minimum Standards. For example: “Newly weaned calves and cows must be kept out of visual, aural and olfactory contact with each other” and/or “Newly weaned calves and cows must not be held in isolation from other cattle”. Future research should be directed at systems where the calf can stay with its mother (such systems may well yield greater overall productivity through reduced stress, reduced input into calf rearing and fewer health problems).	Agree – recommended best practice added.
6.9 General comments	26, 43	This section should include the requirement to minimise weaning stress on the cow and the calf (e.g. Weaned calves should be taken out of sight and sound of the cow and the cow should not be left in a paddock on its own, but provided	Agree – recommended best practice added.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		with companions.)	
6.9 Introduction Page 40	1	Insert 'a' between 'only' and 'few' to read: 'Many are destined to have only a few days...'	Agree – change made.
6.9 Introduction Page 40	14	Suggest some mention of the need to minimise weaning stress on both calf and cow, e.g. calf should be taken out of sight and sound of the cow, and the cow should be given companions.	Agree – recommended best practice added.
MS 16 Page 40	13	Accepted (a-b).	Noted.
MS 16 Page 40	16	Support this Minimum Standard and associated section as it stands.	Noted.
MS 16 Page 40	20	Is supported as written.	Noted.
6.10 Mothering calves onto cows General comments	1	Title should read: 'Mothering calves onto cows'.	Agree – change made.
6.11 The selection of bulls for mating General comments	43	A new Minimum Standard should be added to read: "The Blockey Test or similar must not be used to test the serving capacity of bulls".	Disagree.
RBP Page 41	1	(a) Point 2: Delete 'potential' to read "...offspring relative to their dams"	Agree – change made.
6.13 Painful husbandry procedures Introduction Page 41	14	This section requires some re-wording (combine the last 2 sentences).	Agree – change made.
6.14 Pre-transport selection Introduction Page 41	12, 14	This section should have greater comment to emphasise its importance. The transport of cull dairy cows, particularly to slaughter, is a significant area for potential adverse welfare situations. An expansion of the introduction emphasising this above comment is recommended. It should also be emphasised that there are responsibilities detailed in the Animal	Agree – change made.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		Welfare (Transport in NZ) Code, and Animal Welfare (Commercial Slaughter) Code that owners do need to be aware of when selecting animals for transport. These Codes need to be prominently highlighted.	
MS 17 Page 42	16	<p>(a) The phrase ‘off the farm’ is potentially limiting to the intent of the standard. While the clause is suitable for animals going to sale or slaughter, it offers no protection for animals being transported to the farm, e.g. from run-off. If this issue is to be covered as part of the ‘transport code’, then suggest that the title of this Minimum Standard be changed to ‘transport off the farm’. If the issue will not be covered by the ‘transport code’, suggest that the phrase ‘off the farm’ be removed from clause (a) and (d) of the standard.</p> <p>(a) There is a need to provide clarification around who the ‘persons in charge’ are during the pre-transport selection period (could be included as general information.</p> <p>(b) This clause is acceptable for the majority of animals. However, the question of transporting compromised animals to a place of care should be considered, especially if they cannot be driven by foot. Is there a system, e.g. veterinary certification, which can be used to meet the special welfare needs of these individuals?</p> <p>(d) The two-hour limit is impractical and should be revised or removed. While it may be desirable that calves be fed colostrum as close to transport as possible, the control of stock trucks is ultimately beyond the farmers’ control. In addition, withholding colostrum to meet requirements of this clause, say for a morning pick-up which does not arrive in time, is also likely to compromise calf welfare.</p>	<p>Agree – change made.</p> <p>Disagree – responsibilities are stated in Section 1 of this code.</p> <p>Disagree.</p> <p>Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired calf welfare outcomes as written. This issue is fully covered in NAWAC’s report to the Minister, which accompanies the draft code.</p>
MS 17 Page 42	8	(b) The fact that young calves may not be able to stand throughout the journey, and that older calves may trample younger ones, should be taken into account.	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired calf welfare outcomes as written. This issue is fully covered in NAWAC’s report to the Minister, which accompanies the draft code.
MS 17 Page 42	12, 14	(c) Is too broad and gives too much leeway in deciding on the likelihood of calving. Cows in the last 3 weeks of pregnancy are likely to give birth if exposed to various stressors including transport. Usually the owners and/or farm managers know the expected calving date and the age of the pregnancy should be taken into consideration while selecting the pregnant animals for transport.	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written. This issue is fully covered in NAWAC’s report to the Minister, which accompanies the draft code.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		<p>Although prescriptive, this approach is more meaningful than the proposed interpretation of the likelihood of calving. As there is a significant financial incentive from sold foetal blood for meat premises as well as farmers, the proposed individual assessment of the suitability of pregnant animals for transport will create a risk of such a broad interpretation being abused.</p> <p>It is recommended that the wording from the previous draft be added – “Pregnant cattle must not be transported, even for short distances, within 4 weeks of expected calving date”. The current statement “Any animal likely to give birth during transport must not be selected” should also be used, but in the context that is irrespective of the pregnancy age.</p>	
MS 17 Page 42	13	<p>Accepted (a-c).</p> <p>(d) To be re-worded: “Calves receive their normal daily feed before penning before transportation”. This is to be discussed further and should be subject to the Bobby Calf Code. Pick-up times for bobby calves by transport operators often vary, depending on sale days or other work. Maybe for long distance transport the minimum of two hours before travel is more appropriate.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired calf welfare outcomes as written. This issue is fully covered in NAWAC’s report to the Minister, which accompanies the draft code.</p>
MS 17 Page 42	20	<p>Section (d) is too restrictive. Many bobby calves adequately fed following morning milking may not be picked up within two hours. Is it realistic to expect that these animals be re-fed prior to collection?</p>	<p>Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired calf welfare outcomes as written. This issue is fully covered in NAWAC’s report to the Minister, which accompanies the draft code.</p>
MS 17 Page 42	24	<p>(d) It is recommended that this clause be reworded to allow a more practical outcome-based approach. As calves are usually fed at approximately 12-hour intervals, re-feeding at a 2-hour interval if transportation has not occurred or is delayed is not appropriate as it can induce scouring due to gut overload. This may have a negative effect on animal welfare.</p>	<p>Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired calf welfare outcomes as written. This issue is fully covered in NAWAC’s report to the Minister, which accompanies the draft code.</p>
MS 17 Page 42	1	<p>(e) The other key Minimum Standards of the Bobby Calf Code should be included here, especially in relation the minimum postnatal age before transport.</p>	<p>Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes for all dairy calves as written. This issue is fully covered in NAWAC’s report to the Minister, which accompanies the draft code.</p>
RBP Page 42	16	<p>(b) Is there a potential OSH issue with the lifting of particularly heavy calves? Suggest reference be made to correct lifting technique here.</p>	<p>Disagree – NAWAC believes this code should focus on animal welfare not human safety.</p>

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
RBP Page 42	22	(b) Reword for clarity by changing to “lifted using the handlers arms to support the calves’ whole body”. (c) Must become a Minimum Standard and reworded to read “Electric prodders must not be used to drive calves”.	Agree –change made. Agree – change made.
RBP Page 42	8	(c) Should be a Minimum Standard.	Agree – change made.
RBP Page 42	14	(c) Should be a Minimum Standard.	Agree – change made.
RBP Page 42	26, 43	(c) ‘should’ be changed to must	Agree – change made.
RBP	44	Insert the following "Animals that are sick, clinically diseased, injured or weak and/or where there is a likelihood the animals may go down in the truck during transport, should not be transported. Where any doubt exists as to their suitability for the intended journey the owner of person in charge should seek a veterinary examination and approval to transport." "Where ever possible cull dairy cows should be transported to the nearest slaughter plant for processing."	Disagree – NAWAC believes minimum standard (a) provides for this desired welfare outcome as written. Agree – RBP added “Every effort should be made to ensure calves, pregnant, peak lactation and cull dairy cows are transported for the shortest possible time.”
7. Health General comments	16	This section does not discuss the management/reporting of infectious diseases. Although this may be discussed elsewhere, consideration should be given to include a statement about this important topic, even if only as reference to another document. If not included, discussion of this should be included in the code report.	Disagree – NAWAC believes this code should focus on animal welfare not disease management.
7. General comments	22	Why is only lameness (and not other common diseases) accorded a section on its own in section 7?	Disagree – lameness is a painful condition that can be prevented by appropriate management, which often has other welfare benefits.
7. General comments	25	There are ever-increasing distances cows have to walk to the dairy, as the size of farms increases. There should be a maximum distance specified to protect cows from foot problems, exhaustion, overheating in summer and exposure to wind and rain in winter. Suggested Minimum Standard: “Dairy cows must not walk more than x m each day to visit and return from the milking shed.” (x in the above standard should be based on scientific knowledge and good practice, e.g. veterinary experience with problems associated with long journeys to the milking shed)	Disagree – NAWAC believes the minimum standard provides for the desired welfare outcomes as written. This issue is fully covered in NAWAC’s report to the Minister, which accompanies the draft code.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
MS 18 Page 43	13	Accepted (a-c).	Noted
MS 18 Page 43	12, 14	<p>(a) This is a Minimum Standard and the word ‘must’ is rightly used. However, further down in Section 7.1 Inspection and Treatment the Recommended Best Practice says that ‘any injured or ailing animal should be treated and veterinary advice sought when...there is serious injury, severe haemorrhage, deep wounds, bone fractures.’ The words ‘serious, severe, deep and fracture’ are usually used to describe very painful and grave situations. Also, in Section 7.2 Lameness is described as a very painful condition that warrants immediate and effective treatment. Yet, the Recommended Best Practice only says ‘... appropriate treatment should be instituted immediately.’ From the legal point of view in cases of severe lameness or injury the phrase ‘treatment must be instituted’ is more appropriate.</p> <p>Recommend that such cases should be classified as Minimum Standard rather than Recommended Best Practice. Otherwise the text of Recommended Best Practice is in conflict with Section 2 of the Animal Welfare Act – ill treat – causing an animal to suffer, by any act or omission, pain or distress..., and Legal Obligation of Owners or Persons in Charge which says: ‘the owner of dairy cattle must:...where practicable, ensure that an animal that is ill or injured receives treatment that will alleviate any unreasonable pain or distress or that is killed humanely.</p>	Agree in part – minimum standard reworded to “Professional advice must be sought where there is any significant injury or disease or a problem persists” and additional information included in the General Information section.
MS 18 Page 43	16	(b) Poses a number of potential issues with regard to the use of unlicensed products and homeopathic/alternative remedies for the treatment of animal health problems. The current clause only recognises conventional animal remedies, yet poor welfare and unnecessary suffering can result from use of alternatives. Suggest clause to be re-worded in favour of remedies with ‘proven efficacy’. However, this proposal needs to be considered in the light of recent moves by the ACVM group, not to require efficacy information as part of the registration process.	Noted.
MS 18 Page 43	20	Is supported as written.	Noted.
MS 18 Page 43	28	(c) It is suggested that more guidance be given on this requirement. There are a number of diseases that may affect a number of animals in the herd that can be satisfactorily handled by the farmer and where professional advice is not warranted (i.e. worms, facial eczema, ryegrass staggers).	Agree in part – minimum standard reworded to “Professional advice must be sought where there is any significant injury or disease or a problem persists”.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
MS 18	44	Min Standard 18 c refers to advice when disease "persists" I think this leaves it wide open to a PIC and should be more aligned to the wording of Sec 4 e of the AWA.	Agree in part – minimum standard reworded to “Professional advice must be sought where there is any significant injury or disease or a problem persists”.
7. General Information Page 43	18	Signs of illness also include changes in behaviour and demeanour, changes in appetite and eating behaviour, lack of or excessive chewing, lack of gut fill, etc.	Agree – change made.
7. General Information Page 43	21	DCANZ considers that it is not necessary to include this statement regarding organics. The Code and Minimum Standards apply irrespective of the style of farming and this is made clear in the Scope of Document.	Agree – however providing additional information in GI raises awareness of a particular welfare risk.
7. General Information Page 43	22	It is not clear why the sentence beginning ‘Organic dairy...’ is included as the Code is relevant to all dairy cattle, and there are no specific guidelines provided for organic systems.	Agree – however providing additional information in GI raises awareness of a particular welfare risk.
7.1 Inspection and treatment Introduction Page 44	18	Inspection is also important where natural hazards are present, e.g. drains, cliffs.	Agree – change made.
RBP Page 44	16	(b) Second bullet point to read: ‘there is serious injury, purulent infections, severe haemorrhage, deep wounds, bone fractures, damage to the eye and surrounding structures, and when first aid does not result in satisfactory resolution of the problem’	Agree – However this bullet point no longer included.
7.2 Lameness General comment	26, 43	This section should include reference to the fact that ‘lameness’ could be a symptom of a serious exotic disease.	Disagree – NAWAC believes this code should focus on animal welfare not disease management.
RBP Page 45	8	It is claimed that lameness is a very painful condition and warrants immediate and effective treatment. Hence, Recommended Best Practice (b) should be a Minimum Standard, i.e. “When an animal is found to be lame, the affected foot must be examined and appropriate treatment instituted immediately.”	Disagree
RBP Page 45	26, 43	(a) Add “...by ensuring that the walking trails are covered with a suitable surface material. The distance walked each day is kept to a minimum”. The location of ‘new’ milking sheds to be in the centre of the property to minimise the daily time spent by lactating cows moving to and from the dairy	Disagree – note however additional recommended best practices have been added.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		shed.	
7.3 Animal health plan General Information Page 45	16	First sentence should read: ‘Computer-based recording systems for dairy herds can produce useful diagnostic outputs from simple input records.’	Agree – change made.
7.4 Emergency humane destruction Introduction Page 45	14	While the NZVA understands that too much overlap between codes is undesirable, we do feel, given the importance of appropriately applied humane destruction methods to the welfare of the animals, it is important in this case to have the information located within this code, thus avoiding the need to cross-reference to other codes.	Agree – minimum standard, recommended best practice and general information added.
	12, 14	Hence, it is recommended that the Introduction be expanded and that an attempt be made to define in simple terms ‘Humane slaughter’. As an example only – “Humane slaughter depends on rapidly inducing failure of brain function. This can be achieved by causing sufficient brain damage to render the animal unconscious, and then cutting the major blood vessels of the neck to cause heart failure and death.”	Agree – change made.
	12, 14	Paragraph 2 (‘the blood supply to the brain...’): Does not clearly state what was intended and should be re-worded i.e. “killing any cattle by cutting the throat may not produce rapid death and therefore is less humane, compared to first rendering that animal unconscious.”	Agree – change made.
	14	Repeated from previous submission: ‘Some veterinarians have expressed concern about the hammer blow, saying it is not always easy to affect a humane stun. Is there scientific evidence and/or auditing records to demonstrate that this is indeed a humane slaughter method?’	Noted.
7.4 Introduction Page 45	24	Emergency humane destruction of animals will eventually be covered under a code of welfare for emergency slaughter. The preferable approach to code development is to include a cross-reference to material in other relevant codes, rather than including overlapping material in several codes. However, it is important that farmers have clear guidelines on what is acceptable practice for emergency humane destruction. It is hence recommended that a section for humane destruction be included in the Dairy Code of Welfare, which can then be removed from the dairy code once the emergency humane destruction code is	Agree – minimum standard, recommended best practice and general information added.

CODE SECTION, MS or RBP	SUB REF	SUBMISSION	NAWAC RESPONSE
		developed.	
8. Quality management General comment	21	There is no introduction to this section – inconsistent with the rest of the Code. An introduction could add clarity.	Agree – change made.
RBP Page 47	16	(a) Should read: ‘To ensure that standards of animal welfare and husbandry are maintained, each farm should have a quality assurance system that provides documented procedures.’	Agree – change made.
Appendices General comment	21	There is no reference in the document to the Induction Code of Practice that has been developed for use by Dairy Industry veterinarians. It would be appropriate for this code to be referenced here: ‘New Zealand Veterinary Association Code of Practice May 2005: Use of long-acting Dexamethasone esters for routine induction of parturition in cattle’.	Disagree – referenced in section 6.7.
Appendix II Page 51	16	Add ‘s’ to Circular in title of second paragraph to read: ‘List of Regulations and Circulars...’	Disagree – however section no longer included.
Appendix III Page 53	14	A number of members have suggested that a code of welfare should, at the very least, have a table of diagrams of the range of condition scores. While the Dexcel publication is excellent and obviously should be referred to, it is felt that a failure to include any diagrammatic description of scores will detract from the value of the code.	Agree – change made.