

# Draft Animal Welfare (Painful Husbandry Procedures) Code of Welfare 2005

## Summary of 18 public submissions (26 August, 2005) and NAWAC's responses

### Contents

Introduction.....	1
General comments expressed in each submission .....	1
General aspects .....	4
Mulesing .....	4
Justification for undertaking procedures.....	5
Significant surgical procedures.....	5
Evidence for NAWAC's stances .....	5
Switch removal of dairy cows.....	6
High tension bands.....	6
Age limits.....	6
Specific issues.....	6

### Abbreviations

Act = Animal Welfare Act  
CF = Code Facilitator

GI = General Information  
MS = Minimum Standard  
RBP = Recommended Best Practice

### ***Introduction***

The draft *Animal Welfare (Painful Husbandry Procedures) Code of Welfare 2005* was publicly notified in July 2005 with submissions closing in mid-August. Sixteen submissions were received from a number of individuals and organizations. Most (7) indicated at least some support for the Code, while some (3) were opposed to at least some aspects of it. This report summarizes the submissions and is presented as (1) a summary of the general aspects which should be addressed by NAWAC; and (2) a summary of more specific comments. The complete submissions are included in a separate appendix.

### ***General comments expressed in each submission***

1 –

Support in general, editorial changes and minor additions, query regarding age and pain relief.

2 –

Support the intention, query regarding ages, minor suggestions.

3 –

Editorial changes and some comments.

4 –

Specific comments on castration and suggest mulesing is included in Code.

5 –

Request to address mulesing, including removing all reference to the practice since: (1) industry aims to cease surgical mulesing by 2010;  
(2) is recommending growers cease surgical mulesing by 31 December, 2005; and  
(3) the practice is adequately covered by the Sheep Code.

Would be pleased to present an oral submission.

6 –

Comment on significant surgical procedures, velvet antler removal and economic and practical considerations.

7 –

Regulation of procedures supported; opposed to many aspects of the Code.

8a –

Recommends (1) consideration is given to practical issues to ensure standards do not compromise or impact on productivity; (2) not having a six month age limit without pain relief; (3) changes from current practices are justified and supported with scientific evidence.

Other general comments included:

- some farmers still perceive potential problems with proposed minimum standards.
- MSs need to be not too high or unreasonably rigid; important that the GI and RBPs are also practical and not unnecessarily prescriptive.
- adverse effects on animal productivity and farmers' profitability must be given appropriate weighting when considering MSs, as reduced profitability can have a detrimental impact on ongoing animal welfare. The economic impact of changes should be done at an early stage to gauge the potential impact of those changes.
- MSs need to be practical and unambiguous.
- disappointed that scientific evidence or other justification has not yet been provided to support significant proposed changes.
- appreciate a response regarding areas of concern raised that are not addressed as proposed and expects an opportunity to provide further input.
- 6 and 9 month age limit is unwise since higher age limits, which fit New Zealand's farming systems, have no greater demonstrable negative effect on animals.

- particularly concerned about the 6 month restriction on procedures without pain relief since it may require veterinary supervision with its cost and practical limitations (especially given the seasonal nature of the industry and limited number of vets available).

Other specific comments listed.

Concluded by stating stock losses attributable to procedures are low, and most losses involve other contributing factors (weather, availability and experience of farm staff and dogs, condition of stock themselves which is dependent on feed, physiological status and environment etc.) which are not, and should not be covered by this Code. Prudent and humane management of painful procedures often requires arcane and intuitive knowledge that cannot be taught in a formal setting. Such knowledge and judgement is not available to those who do not have experience, not only of the practical constraints of a particular type of farming, but of the particular geographic location of an individual farm and the animals thereon. Finally, New Zealand farmers must remain economically viable and comparisons with practices in other countries are meaningless given different political environments.

8b –

Wide measure of support, some issues of clarification for completeness. Similar submission to Dairy Companies Association of New Zealand.

9 –

Opposed to unnecessary mutilations; desexing of piglets, lambs and calves should not be undertaken if slaughtered before sexual maturity; opposed to tail docking dairy cows. Would welcome opportunity for a further submission after NAWAC consideration of public submissions.

10 –

Support general principles and consider approach taken is appropriate based on experience with Pig Code.

11 –

Support for some MSs, opposed to others. MSs should be set at the level of RBPs (allowing for a transition period) since the practices are painful and none should be carried out without pain relief, the cost of pain relief is minimal, and economic justification invalid (animal performance may even be superior).

12 –

Wide measure of support, some issues of clarification for completeness. Similar submission to Fonterra Co-operative Group Ltd.

13 –

Pleased with recommended use of farming systems which reduce need for procedures, RBPs should be MSs, opposed to routine mutilations of farm

animals, any mutilations should be performed with anaesthesia/analgesia, pain of some procedures is extreme and an unreasonable burden on animals without relief.

14 –

Need to ensure practices balance the expectations of New Zealand society, and the requirements of customers, with the practicalities of farming in a productive and economically viable manner within the New Zealand farming environment. *Note that Meat & Wool NZ have requested that one section of its submission is not made public under the Official Information Act since it could have commercial implications for the sheep industry.*

15 –

Urges phasing in of mandatory use of pain relief over three years for disbudding. Supporting video included with submission.

16 –

Question whether a practice should be prevented or dealt with through procedures and best practices.

17 –

Support for the use high tension bands based on unpublished behavioural and hormone data from the US, and the view of the Australian distributor.

### ***General aspects***

While most issues raised pertained to specific parts of the Code and are summarized below, a number of more general aspects were noted. The recommendations in *italics* below are those of the Code Facilitator but reflect the submissions.

### **Mulesing**

Mulesing was not specifically addressed in the draft Code, and consequently there were some responses to its absence. On the one hand, it was acknowledged that mulesing is practiced on a proportion of the merino flock suggesting it should be included. Furthermore, consideration will have to be given to Minimum Standard 2 which would directly affect the practice (there is currently no practical means of providing pain relief). On the other hand, there was support for separate development of standards for mulesing, and not detailing them in a general code likely to have a wide audience. This position reflects the risk that the practice would have on the New Zealand farming industry as a whole. Furthermore, the merino industry consider the requirements of the draft Code to be inconsistent with their agreed strategy of moving away from mulesing (it should cease by 31<sup>st</sup> December 2005, and must cease by 2010), and are even detrimental to it. In line with this stance, all reference to

mulesing should be removed from the draft Code. The practice would remain covered by section 7.1 of the Code of Recommendations and Minimum Standards for the Welfare of Sheep.

*It is recommended that NAWAC considers how this Code will deal with mulesing.*

### **Justification for undertaking procedures**

The formidable task of balancing the welfare, economic and practical considerations relating to the procedures was acknowledged in one submission. The formidable nature of this task was evident in the range of beliefs expressed regarding what factors should be used to justify undertaking painful procedures. One stance was that only those procedures which result in clear welfare benefits for the animal could be used as justification (in other words, economic motives provide no justification). Another position was that benefits to the farming system (including human safety and profitability), and the product (thus the consumer), must also be included. This stance was further extended by the need to consider the practical and economic characteristics of New Zealand's extensive and pastoral industries in an increasing global environment.

*It is recommended that NAWAC discuss the different types of justifications for undertaking painful husbandry procedures.*

### **Significant surgical procedures**

One submission described criteria for a significant surgical procedure, namely encompassing one or more of the following:

- Significant pain;
- Entry into a body cavity;
- Invasion of the periosteum;
- Significant loss of tissue or loss of significant tissue;
- The potential, if performed inadequately, to seriously impact on an animal's welfare and/or function.

According to these criteria, castration, tail docking, dehorning and disbudding are significant surgical procedures. It was also pointed out that such procedures in other species either would be illegal, or are strictly controlled (i.e. velvet antler removal). In general, the wider use of pain relief was supported.

*It is recommended that NAWAC consider the above definition of a significant surgical procedure along with the definition in section 6 of the Act.*

### **Evidence for NAWAC's stances**

Some aspects of the draft Code represent marked changes to current practices and/or the legislation (section 201 of the Act as well as various Codes of Recommendations and Minimum Standards). There were calls for the rationale and scientific evidence for these changes to be presented so that submitters

could consider them. This was particularly with respect to age limits and high tension bands.

*It is recommended that NAWAC considers presentation of the material upon which it based this Code, and how it might deal with this issue in respect of future codes.*

In addition to the above, the following issues, addressed more appropriately in the specific aspects section, were also apparent.

### **Switch removal of dairy cows**

While there was little apparent opposition to the banning of (short) tail docking of dairy cows, the issue of switch removal (long tail docking) was more contentious. While switch removal was supported in a farmer-based submission, others opposed it. The dairy industry questioned whether the practice will be viewed internationally as being any different from full tail docking.

### **High tension bands**

It is apparent that there is a significant difference between NAWAC’s stance regarding the pain associated with using high tension bands for castration, and the stance of those using them, particularly within the beef industry, as well as information reviewed from the scientific literature.

### **Age limits**

Finally, the age limits for undertaking procedures without pain relief, and without being undertaken by a veterinarian, were addressed in several submissions. Predictably, stances ranged from reducing those limits to extending them.

### ***Specific issues***

<b>Section [Sub.]</b>	<b>Summary of submission</b>	<b>NAWAC response</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction, Purpose and Interpretation of Code</b>	
Section [9]	Contents of this Code; Preparation and Revision of the Code; Deemed Codes of Welfare and Codes of Recommendations and Minimum Standards; and Interpretation and Definitions missing.	Agreed, Code revised with additional material inadvertently deleted from the public version. Reference to Deemed Codes removed.
1.2 Leg [7]	Public would be better placed to comment on regulations and criteria if general objects and intentions of Act were quoted.	Disagree, information is covered in the Act and in Standing Order 382 (2) reproduced in <i>Guidelines for Drafting Codes of Welfare</i> .
1.3 Pro	NAWAC may recommend draft standards	Agreed, Code revised with additional

[7]	that do not meet obligations in the Act etc needs explaining.	material inadvertently deleted from the public version.
1.4 Sco [8b,12]	Support development of separate standards for mulesing. All reference to mulesing should be removed.	Agreed, mulesing is not included at this time but will be added when NAWAC's investigations are complete. In the meantime, the procedure is covered by Section 7.1 of the <i>Code of Recommendations and Minimum Standards for the Welfare of Sheep</i> .
1.4 Sco [14]	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph – “inclusion later” rather than “later inclusion”	Agreed, section substantially revised.
1.4 Sco [14]	9 <sup>th</sup> paragraph – consultation is inadequate since NAWAC has not responded with feedback or information on areas of concern raised in pre-consultation submission. Recommend dialogue and provision of supporting references within draft code.	It is not NAWAC policy, to undertake further consultation with submitters, other than for clarifying points. NAWAC has carefully considered every point raised in both pre- and public consultation phases. NAWAC is to consider making supporting material available with future draft codes.
1.5 Glo [1]	Consistency of endings.	Agreed, revised.
1.5 Glo [3]	Castration – <i>testes</i> rather than testicles. Cautery – <i>applying extreme temperature</i> (account for liquid nitrogen). General anaesthesia – <i>reduction</i> of rather than dulling of consciousness. Insecticide – delete “for the prevention of flystrike” and add <i>deter parasites</i> . Mulesing – delete comma. Tailing or tail docking – add “ <i>more than the distal portion</i> ” to differentiate from switch removal.	
1.5 Glo [14]	Cautery - covers thermal and chemical but is inconsistent with Section 7 Intro where cautery = thermal only Dehorning – remove “surgical” unless there are also “non-surgical methods.” Unclear whether this also includes tipping. Meat NZ expects to be consulted on this point. General anaesthesia – term not used thus remove.	Agreed, revised.
[7]	Opposed to whole Code as fails to include any mechanism for re-evaluation of any procedure in light of scientific findings, technological developments, or evolving societal views.	Agreed, Code revised with additional material
<b>2</b>	<b>Legal obligations</b>	
Section [7]	Purpose of this section questioned – only 3a,b,c appear relevant. 3d – appears flawed as implies significant surgical procedure may be carried out in a manner that causes unreasonable or unnecessary pain.	Agreed in part, Code revised and material added to the Scope.
Section	1a - “the owner <i>or</i> person.”	

[2]	3d – revise so as to be easily understood.	
Section [8b,12]	The term “facility” does not adequately cover most pastoral farming situations – define in glossary (buildings, farm, pasture) or use “property.”	Agreed, revised.
Section [8a]	3c – s15(1) and 18(1) of the Act details exceptions to the statement that no person may perform a significant surgical procedure unless a veterinarian. Suggest (3) <i>No person may:</i> (c) <i>perform a significant surgical procedure as defined by the Animal Welfare Act 1999 unless that person is a veterinarian or that person meets the specifications set out in Section 15(1) or 18(1) of the Act.</i>	Agreed, revised .
Section [14]	3c – s15(1) and 18(1) of the Act details exceptions to the statement that no person may perform a significant surgical procedure unless a veterinarian. Amend to reflect Act.	
Section [CF]	Suggest significant, restricted and controlled surgical procedures are defined (as in the Act) since they can be confused with the (surgical) procedures addressed in this Code.	
<b>3</b>	<b>General principles</b>	
Intro [3]	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph - replace “these include” with “inter alia.” Replace “particularly those kept” with “particularly <i>where animals are kept.</i> ” 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph – “ <i>farming systems.</i> ”	Disagreed.  Agreed, revised.  Agreed, revised.
Intro [8b,12]	2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet point – “avoiding critical periods” could be interpreted as not allowing standard practice of removing calf from dam after birth and then feeding colostrum.	Agreed, painful husbandry procedures defined in Glossary.
Intro [8a]	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph – amend “sheep may be castrated to ensure meat quality” to include <i>to stop inbreeding and out-of-season breeding</i>	Agreed, revised.
Intro [1]	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph - castration to “control” rather than “ensure” meat quality.	
Intro [8a]	3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph and elsewhere – remove references to emotional experiences, unless evidence to prove animals experience fear and emotion in a way that humans can understand.	Disagree, well accepted that animals experience emotions (e.g. fear) and that people can interpret them. Furthermore, anthropomorphism is not necessarily inappropriate in animal welfare.
Intro [14]	3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph – no currently accepted consensus supporting contention that animals undergo emotional experiences as accepted from a human perspective. Common use of the term “emotional” is anthropomorphic and has no place in the Code. Replace with “stressful experiences” or clearly define.	

Intro [1]	6 <sup>th</sup> paragraph - add “altered patterns of activity” to list of behaviours indicative of pain.	Agreed, revised.
Intro [7]	6 <sup>th</sup> paragraph - add “intense effort to get away from source of pain” to list of behaviours indicative of pain.	
Intro [3]	9 <sup>th</sup> paragraph – “ <i>Greater justification is required for more invasive procedures which are more likely to cause pain and distress.</i> ”	
Intro [7]	10 <sup>th</sup> paragraph re operator having to consider farming methods – how will this be enforced? Should be required to document and submit to NAWAC or other body for assessment.	Disagreed, introductory material, and covered by 1 <sup>st</sup> RBP.
Intro [1]	11 <sup>th</sup> paragraph - use “faster” rather than “quicker” healing.	No change.
MS1 [7]	Oppose as endorses status quo – clause (i) does not require demonstration of absence of suitable alternatives, and clauses (iii) & (iv) should be removed or supported by well-researched and supported applications to NAWAC or other appropriate regulatory body. Inconsistent with GI which states only procedures in best interests of animal should be routinely used.	Disagreed, MS sets out well supported circumstances justifying procedures.  Disagreed, information supporting RBP.
MS1v [8b,12]	New MS1 (v) results in reduced risk to human safety.	Agreed, revised.
MS1RBP [8b,12]	1 <sup>st</sup> RBP – “If required a justification in terms of MS 1 should be provided” is vague and doesn’t indicate who is able to require it.	Agreed, deleted.
MS1i&ii [3]	move “they” from end of (i) to beginning of (ii)	Disagreed.
MS1i [1]	Change to “economically viable, effective”	Agreed, revised.
MS1iii [13]	Opposed as manipulating animal to fit system.	Disagreed, these are accepted reasons for undertaking such procedures.
MS1iii,iv [9]	Delete as opposed to procedures which have no welfare benefits to the animal – unacceptable to perform them solely for the profit or farm efficiency.	
MS1iv [13]	Unacceptable justification, producers should seek other methods of improving product.	
MS1iv [1]	Delete “or quality”	Disagreed.
MS1RBP [1]	1 <sup>st</sup> RBP - delete “to farm management”	Agreed, revised.
MS1RBP [9]	1 <sup>st</sup> RBP – what criteria should be used to decide whether the benefits outweigh the discomfort, pain or distress to the animal? Does NAWAC intend publishing a profit vs. pain index? Suggest combining RBP & GI “Careful consideration should be given to the need to	Disagreed, the criteria justifying a procedure have been well described.  Disagreed, but section revised to give

	perform routine painful husbandry procedures on any animal. <i>Only those procedures which are in the best interests of the animal to prevent undesirable consequences that would otherwise occur and result in pain, distress or ill health for the animal should be routinely used.</i>	emphasis to developing systems which do not require painful husbandry procedures to be undertaken at all.
MS1Gl [3]	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph – insert “which are <i>applied</i> in the best interests” 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph – performed routinely	Agreed, revised.
MS1Gl [13]	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph – strongly agree.	Noted.
<b>4</b>	<b>Minimising the pain and distress</b>	
Intro [14]	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph – “affects <i>with</i> management”	Agreed, revised.
Intro [3]	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph – insert “associated <i>with</i> ” and “These <i>may</i> ” Separate point - “familiarising the animals with some activities may be possible” 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph – insert “resulting in a <i>smaller wound and therefore</i> better healing” 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph – indicate whether six month age limit is arbitrary or has scientific or legal basis	Agreed, revised.  Disagreed.  Agreed, revised.  Rationale dealt with in Code Report.
Intro [6]	1 <sup>st</sup> bullet point – separate sentence “In some cases, familiarisation of animals with such activities may be possible.”	Agreed, revised.
Intro [1]	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph - include “that the duration of handling procedures should be minimized”	
Intro [7]	Last bullet point – “and to farm management” implies only legitimate if management costs reduced.	
Intro [13]	2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraphs – 6 month age limit is arbitrary; different species do not develop uniformly; young animals feel pain warranting pain relief.	Disagreed, six month age limit is not related to the ability (or not) of the animal to feel pain.
Intro [2]	Clarify different age limits – 6 weeks, 6 months and 9 months and table of species (buffalo, bison, llama etc) and various age limits and RBPs for each procedure. 6 month age limit without pain relief does not apply to switch removal, does it apply to all other procedures?	Agreed, revised.
Intro [12]	Move bold NAWAC statement to RBP	Agreed in part, this material has now been revised.
MS2 [7]	Oppose – too vague to be useful, except MS2b 12 limit which is too long (c.f. people given pain relief for lesser procedures)	Agreed, part revised to ensure meaning is understood and part replaced as RBP.
MS2 [9]	6 month age limit (unless using pain relief) should be included - “Effective pain relief must be administered where painful husbandry procedures are performed on animals more than 6 months of age.”	Disagreed, 6 month age limit does not apply to all procedures.
MS2a [1]	Delete “and status (e.g. proximity to birth)”	Agreed, revised.

MS2a [6]	“Age and status” are unworkable (particularly for a MS) without guidelines	
MS2a [11]	Support. “e.g. proximity to birth” should follow age and be “i.e. proximity to birth.”	
MS2b [14]	Why is it now 12 hours (previously 24 hours)? Noted that this will require mulesed sheep to be given pain relief but this is currently impractical, provide an incentive to stop mulesing without being able to implement developing flystrike management practices (or continue mulesing without pain relief because of the risk of flystrike), and could undermine industry initiatives to deal with the practice. Recommend that NAWAC discusses with industry means of allowing farming of merinos without risk of further reducing welfare through flystrike. Mulesing may well have to continue in its present form until viable alternative practices are available.	MS has now been deleted - mulesing (the focus of this MS) addressed separately.  Mulesing is not included at this time but will be added when NAWAC's investigations are complete. In the meantime, the procedure is covered by Section 7.1 of the <i>Code of Recommendations and Minimum Standards for the Welfare of Sheep</i>
MS2b [11]	Oppose – no animal should have to bear marked pain or distress for 12 hours, should be 5 min for marked (moderate, severe) distress but could be longer for mild or minor discomfort, pain or distress.	
MS2b [9]	12 hour threshold should be 6 hours.	
MS2b [13]	12 hour limit without pain relief means significant pain, mulesed animals should have pain relief.	
MS2b [8a]	Noted that this will make mulesing without pain relief unlawful, and that NAWAC is addressing mulesing separately. Suggest that MS is reworded so as not to preclude subsequent consideration of mulesing, or impose costly and largely ineffective practices on farmers who mules in the meantime.	
MS2b [CF]	Intention of this MS was to distinguish between more routine (castration, dehorning etc) and extreme (i.e. mulesing) procedures, the latter requiring pain relief. The 12 hour limit (initially 24 hours) was based on scientific measures, some of which would not be accessible to owners and operators (and certainly not at 12 hours when that falls at night). Suggest this MS will be redundant depending on how NAWAC approaches mulesing.	
MS2cd [11]	Support.	Noted.
MS2RBP [1]	2 <sup>nd</sup> RBP delete “particular.”	Disagreed, circumstances can be specific.
MS2RBP	2 <sup>nd</sup> , 3 <sup>rd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> RBP should be MSs.	Disagreed, would be unenforceable as

[9]		MSs.
MS2RBP [13]	3 <sup>rd</sup> RBP should be a MS	
MS2RBP [8b,12]	3 <sup>rd</sup> RBP – availability of effective pain relief– could be interpreted as not needed because it was not on hand rather than not commercially available.	Agreed, revised.
MS2RBP [11]	3 <sup>rd</sup> RBP – “effective pain relief” should be recommended regardless of whether it is economically and practically viable	Disagreed, there are economic and practical constraints which currently preclude the general recommendation that pain relief is used.
MS2RBP [8a]	Delete 4 <sup>th</sup> RBP – depends on class of stock, stockmanship, environment and the risk of disturbance.	Agreed in part, material has been added to the Code.
MS2GI [1]	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph - delete “It has to be acknowledged” and new sentence at “Systems must ...”	Agreed, revised.
MS2GI [3]	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph - delete comma after “manage”	
MS2GI [8b,12]	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph – “long-term effects” adds nothing except doubt and should be removed.	Agreed, removed (long-term effects have not been adequately identified).
MS2GI [1]	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph - revise to “Long-term effects of altering sensitive tissue may possibly occur in farmed animals and this should be borne in mind.”	
<b>5</b>	<b>Castration</b>	
Intro [8a]	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph - add “and in the interests of animal welfare”	Agreed in part, revised.
Intro [2]	4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph insert “cause immediate pain <i>that may last</i> for several hours”	Agreed, revised.
Intro [3]	5 <sup>th</sup> paragraph insert – “ <i>preferred</i> practical alternative.”	
Intro [12]	5 <sup>th</sup> paragraph - move bold NAWAC statement to RBP	
Intro [8a]	5 <sup>th</sup> paragraph – emotive, speculative and requires supporting evidence, differing requirements between rubber rings and high tension bands are unjustified.	Disagreed, there is scientific evidence justifying differences between rubber rings and tight bands.
Intro [14]	5 <sup>th</sup> paragraph – NAWAC concern with high tension bands is not borne out by MAF Policy Operational Research FMA 151 “Assessment of calf castration” or by a review of the US literature. Rationale and supporting evidence should be provided. Note should be deleted.	
MS3 [7]	Oppose – little explanation of how the provisions of standard was derived, references should be listed for public scrutiny, details of early consultation, standards in other countries, process of document preparation.	Agreed, evidence is available in the Code Report, and NAWAC will consider making such information available earlier in future codes.
MS3 [1]	Query why 6 and 9 month age limits, would not pain relief mean a veterinarian would be involved anyway (i.e. between 6 and 9	Agreed, revised, 6 and 9 months now unified.

	months)?	
MS3 [4]	MS accepted but should also include the 8 month age limit for high tension bands – they pose significant risk to animal welfare despite the use of local anaesthetic	Disagreed, there is insufficient information to make this a MS.
MS3 [16]	MS appropriate and logical	Noted.
MS3a [11]	Support.	
MS3a [3]	Revise “the acute <i>as well as</i> chronic”	Agreed, revised.
MS3a [14]	As written, MS by default requires use of best practice (i.e. rubber rings) whereas various methods may be appropriate.	Agreed, RBP revised.
MS3b & RBP [2]	Clarify different age limits – 6 weeks, 6 months and 9 months	Agreed, revised, 6 and 9 months now unified.
MS3b [6]	Unaware of any scientific reasons for an age limit, thus limit is a practical one therefore suggest different age limits for sheep (4 months) and cattle (6 months)	Disagreed, age limit is based on a number of issues including less pain and distress when younger, a move towards greater pain relief, and practical aspects.
MS3b [11]	Oppose – implies pain is acceptable as long as animal is less than 6 months whereas acceptability of pain should relate to its duration and pain relief given when it is longer than a few minutes.	
MS3b [8a]	Age limits for sheep and cattle should be defined separately – a change will bring little or no benefit to animals and cost and inconvenience to producers.	Disagreed, Code applies to all species not just sheep and cattle.
MS3b [13]	Castration should not be carried out routinely. If recommended by a vet, then anaesthetic and pain relief should be used.	Disagreed, there are grounds for the procedure, consideration must be given to performing it, and there are moves towards greater pain relief.
MS3bc [6]	3 month period when pay people can castrate using pain relief – how is this workable?	Lay use of pain relief is being explored and will be reviewed by NAWAC.
MS3c [9]	9 month limit without a veterinarian should be 6 months as veterinarian should be involved, and provide incentive for procedure to be undertaken at less than 6 months.	Agreed, 6 and 9 months now unified.
MS3c [11]	Oppose as inconsistent with MS2a (conducted at an age which minimizes pain and distress. Each different type of animal should have a specific age limit.	Agreed, MS2a revised.  Disagreed, the six month limit relates to greater use of pain relief.
MS3d [8a]	While every effort is made to place rings correctly, teats can be caught unintentionally even by the most careful operators – should not be a MS as it imposes too high a burden on operator.	Disagreed, procedures must be undertaken correctly.
MS3e [8a]	Shape and texture of the testes mean they would never be included in the ring. The requirement to place the ring below the	

	testes is unnecessary since failure to do so would equate to castration. MS should be deleted.	
MS3ef [14]	5 <sup>th</sup> paragraph - move bold NAWAC statement to RBP	Agreed in part, revised.
MS3f [14]	Delete "very high tension" as only high tension bands are defined.	Agreed, revised.
MS3f [11]	Oppose – NAWAC has indicated concern regarding pain and healing, that there are alternatives, thus high tension bands should not be permitted.	Disagreed, insufficient information to not permit their use.
MS3f [8a]	MS provoked considerable concern and requires revision. The requirements for rubber rings and high tension bands should be the same and there should be no requirement for local anaesthetic at any age.	Disagreed, there is scientific evidence justifying differences between rubber rings and tight bands.
MS3RBP [1]	Add need for castration should be considered, especially in lambs destined to be slaughtered early.	Disagreed, addressed by MS1.
MS3RBP [9,11]	2 <sup>nd</sup> RBP – 6 week limit with rubber rings should be MS.	Disagreed, a MS would be deleterious and impractical in many situations.
MS3RBP [8a]	2 <sup>nd</sup> RBP does not take account of age disparities in a flock or herd where disturbance can contribute to mismothering and deaths. Age limit should be extended allowing for good sense and good stockmanship to guide.	Agreed in part, material has been added to the Code.
MS3RBP [CF]	Was the intent of this RBP to ensure rubber ring castration is done early (<6 weeks) or to ensure other methods are used in preference to rubber rings after 6 weeks? Note comment on MS3a above.	Agreed, revised.
MS3RBP [8a]	3 <sup>rd</sup> RBP is often impractical and in the interests of credibility should be amended or deleted.	Agreed in part, material has been added to the Code regarding practical constraints.
MS3RBP [9, 13]	4 <sup>th</sup> RBP should be a MS.	Disagreed, there are economic and practical constraints which currently preclude a MS.
MS4RBP [8a]	4 <sup>th</sup> RBP contradicts MS and should be deleted or amended.	Disagree, RBP are higher standards than MS.
MS3RBP [8b,12]	5 <sup>th</sup> RBP - clostridial vaccination at castration is not common in the dairy industry, because of age of animals. An age parameter should give guidance.	Agreed, revised.
MS3RBP [8a]	5 <sup>th</sup> RBP is impractical - animals seldom handled before castration; requirement depends on management system, animal vigour, breed and history; whether the disease is likely to be encountered. Unnecessary vaccination is a questionable practice for flock or herd health safety and health and related breeding programmes. May be more aligned to fiscal health of veterinary practices and should be deleted.	

MS3GI [8a]	1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraphs – differing requirements for rubber rings and high tension bands require justification. “Pain is a subjective matter which is difficult to assess even in adult humans. The statement above is emotive, speculative and cannot be confirmed with hard data”	Disagreed, there is scientific evidence justifying differences between rubber rings and tight bands.
<b>6</b>	<b>Tail-docking</b>	
Section [13]	Routine tail docking of sheep, pigs and dairy cows should be prohibited in NZ. Routine tail docking of pigs outlawed in EU, and dairy cattle in a number of countries.	Disagreed, there are justifiable grounds for undertaking tail docking.
Section [8b,12]	Concurs with industry directive to phase out tail docking of dairy cows.	Noted.
Section [16]	Right to tail dock should not be part of the Code which should only deal with best practice (guidelines) for the procedure. Properly dealt with under Dairy Code where it is accepted practice.	Agreed, revised so as to not prohibit tail docking but limit shortening to the last 2-3 vertebrae.
Section [8b,12]	Need to resolve the issue of switch removal – how will it be viewed internationally, how sustainable is it?	Disagreed, this is beyond NAWAC’s remit.
Section [11,12]	Query omission of any reference to pigs.	Covered by reference to Pig Code.
Intro [8a]	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph – add to the end of the second sentence “ <i>and thereby less likely to cause injury resulting in pain, infection, and flystrike.</i> ”	Agreed, revised.
Intro [8b,12, 13]	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph – dispute any link between taildocking and milk quality therefore delete or reword “enhancing milk hygiene” (N.B. wording in 4 <sup>th</sup> RBP is adequate)	Agreed, revised.
Intro [13]	Tail docking may cause short- and long-term pain.	Agreed, but long-term pain has not been demonstrated.
Intro [16]	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph – “dairy cows’ tails can be shortened” contradicts MS4e	Agreed, revised.
Intro [3]	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph – revise to “and to make dagging, crutching and shearing easier <i>and safer</i> to perform. <i>Docking</i> dairy cows’ tails has been used to improve comfort for milking personnel and to enhance milking hygiene, <i>but this is no longer appropriate since the introduction and widespread use of vaccination against leptospirosis.</i> ”	Agreed in part, revised.
MS4 [7]	Oppose – little explanation of how the provisions of standard was derived, references should be listed for public scrutiny, details of early consultation, standards in other countries, process of document preparation.	Disagreed, evidence is available in the Code Report, and NAWAC will consider making such information available earlier in future code development.
MS4 [1]	Query why 6 and 9 month age limits, would not pain relief mean a veterinarian would be involved anyway (i.e. between 6 and 9 months)	Agreed, six and nine month limits now unified.
MS4	Suggest age of sheep tail docking:	

[2]	- should be less than six weeks - must be less than 6 months unless by a veterinarian	
MS4 [4]	Accept	Noted.
MS4a [11]	Support justification being better welfare outcome for sheep, but oppose inclusion of cost to farm system (economics should not override the purpose of the Code, to ensure animal welfare is not compromised). Effort should be put into developing short-tailed or clean-tailed breeds.	Disagreed, these are well accepted reasons for undertaking the procedures.  Noted.
MS4b [11]	Oppose – tail docking is painful regardless of age, inconsistent with MS2a and RBP (6 weeks).	Disagreed, tail docking is necessary for a number of reasons. Age limit is based on a number of issues including less pain and distress when younger, a move towards greater pain relief, and practical aspects.
MS4b [6]	Unaware of any scientific reasons for an age limit, thus limit is a practical one. Therefore suggest 4 month age limit for taildocking sheep.	Disagreed, age limit is based on a number of issues including less pain and distress when younger, a move towards greater pain relief, and practical aspects.
MS4b &RBP [2]	Clarify different age limits – 6 weeks, 6 months and 9 months	Agreed, revised.
MS4c [11]	Oppose – inconsistent with MS2a. Code “silent” on period between 6 & 9 months.	Agreed, MS2a revised. Six and nine month limits now unified.
MS4c [9]	9 month limit without a veterinarian should be 6 months as veterinarian should be involved, and provide incentive for procedure to be undertaken at less than 6 months.	Agreed, revised.
MS4d [11]	Support.	Noted.
MS4d [8a]	May be in best interest of animal welfare to have no discernible tail as it encourages dags and flystrike and increases risk of shearing injuries. Impossible to achieve absolute consistency of tail length. Remove from MS as unrealistic and unreasonable to have this expressed in legally binding MS.	Agreed, revised.
MS4d [14]	Rewrite so as to apply only to those sheep docked after the Code comes into force.	Disagreed, regulations are not retrospective.
MS4d [14]	What is an acceptable level of compliance given 35 million lambs will potentially be tail docked each year and it is impossible to ensure every lamb is docked correctly.	Disagreed, it is not appropriate for the Code to consider levels of compliance.
MS4d [CF]	Suggest review of tail length in sheep is examined prior to setting of MS or inclusion of material as a RBP.	Agreed, MS now a RBP.
MS4e [11]	Support only for therapeutic reasons and oppose switch removal.	Disagreed, switch removal is justified.
MS4e,f	Opposed to tail docking dairy cows (many	Disagreed, switch removal brings

[9]	farmers don't tail dock) including switch removal (unless for therapeutic reasons). Suggest MS4e "Tail docking, <i>including</i> switch removal, must not" and delete MS4f	benefits at minimal cost to animal welfare.
MS4e,f [8a]	Support.	Noted.
MS4f [16]	Difficult to distinguish the difference between tail docking and switch removal. Safety concerns with the latter, and requires scientific support rather than perception.	Agreed, revised, tail shortening limited to switch removal, science inferred from tail docking research.
MS4f [11]	Oppose – switch removal should only be allowed for therapeutic reasons. Switch increases effectiveness of keeping insects away.	Disagreed, switch removal brings benefits at minimal cost to animal welfare.
MS4g [6]	Opposed to tail docking dairy cows – switch removal offers no advantage over regular trimming; cost to cow is greater than benefits; milker comfort no justification.	
MS4RBP [9]	2 <sup>nd</sup> RBP should replace MS4d.	Disagreed, insufficient science to support a MS.
MS4RBP [8a]	3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph – does not address risk of mismothering and death in flocks with a spread of lambing dates. Add "but it is recognized that this is not always practical or possible"	Agreed in part, material has been added to the Code.
MS4RBP [2]	4 <sup>th</sup> RBP obviously only applies to adult dairy cows but this has not been stated.	Agreed, inferred by RBP.
MS4RBP [8b,12]	4 <sup>th</sup> RBP – wording is adequate but replace "cowshed" with "farm dairy"	Reference now removed for other reasons.
MS4RBP [8a]	5 <sup>th</sup> RBP – requires scientific justification or removed as an unnecessary requirement. Also some confusion as to what a high tension band is.	Agreed, revised.
MS4RBP [9]	5 <sup>th</sup> RBP should be a MS.	Disagreed, insufficient science for either a MS or RBP but the material has been retained as GI.
MS4RBP [8a]	7 <sup>th</sup> RBP is impractical - animals seldom handled before castration; requirement depends on management system, animal vigour, breed and history; whether the disease is likely to be encountered. Unnecessary vaccination is a questionable practice for flock or herd health safety and health and related breeding programmes. May be more aligned to fiscal health of veterinary practices and should be deleted.	Agreed, revised.
MS4GI [3]	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph – delete "or there is significant risk to farm workers, and flies are not a serious pest for cows" Risks to farm workers could be managed by: workers wearing protective clothing; use of shields to reduce direct contact with tails; tying the tail – although there is a risk to welfare if the worker forgets to untie the tail before releasing the cow at the conclusion	Disagreed, benefits to milking efficiency are seen to outweigh the minimal costs of switch removal to animal welfare.

	of milking. Flies can be managed by: improving hygiene; and proper use of repellants provided that they are registered by the ACVM for that use in lactating dairy cows	
MS4Gl [8b,12]	2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph – dispute link between switch removal and udder health and suggest delete	Agreed, revised.
MS4Gl [3]	4th paragraph – “all” rather than “both cause”	Disagreed, rings or irons.
MS4Gl [2]	4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph “and <i>considerably</i> less”	Agreed, revised.
MS4Gl [1]	5 <sup>th</sup> paragraph - what are the signs that hot-irons are too cold or too hot?	Disagreed.
<b>7</b>	<b>Disbudding and dehorning</b>	
Section [8b]	Whole horn vs. tip dehorning not addressed.	Agreed, revised.
Section [8a]	Provoked considerable concern from farmers who considered it impracticable and unworkable.	Agreed, six month limit without pain relief extended to nine months for disbudding and dehorning.
Section [16]	Note that many dairy farmers either contract specialists or have undertaken training to disbud. Like to see proven research used to make decisions, especially regarding pain relief.  Note dairy industry provision for polled breed.	Noted.  Information available in Code report, NAWAC will consider how it makes this information available during the development of future codes. Noted.
Intro [2]	Distinguish between horns and antlers and refer to Velvet Removal regulations and guidelines.	Scope refers to velvet antler removal regulations.
Intro [14]	4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph – clarify cautery as covering thermal and caustic techniques.	Agreed, revised.
MS5 [8b]	Some confusion over use of “disbudding” and “dehorning” e.g. MS5b.	Agreed, revised.
MS5 [7]	Oppose – little explanation of how the provisions of standard was derived, references should be listed for public scrutiny, details of early consultation, standards in other countries, process of document preparation.	Disagreed, information is contained in the Code Report and NAWAC will consider presenting this information during code development in future.
MS5 [4]	Accept	Noted.
MS5a [8b,12]	MS would only allow horns on lone animals, pedigree and show animals currently retain their horns.	Agreed, MS revised.
MS5 [CF]	Need to define “horn bud” and “horn” so that disbudding and dehorning are clearly distinguishable.	Agreed, revised.
MS5 [6]	Paragraph after MS - NZVA supports phasing in of mandatory use of pain relief over three years	Noted.
MS5 [15]	Paragraph after MS - support phasing in of mandatory use of pain relief over three	Noted.

	years. Disbudding without analgesia is an unnecessary cause of pain and suffering and quite affordable to prevent. Video submitted.	
MS5 [3]	Delete “veterinary” from paragraph following MS as will be viewed as protectionism and adequately covered by other terms anyway	Agreed, revised.
MS5b [8a]	Add “and with regard to practical management”	Agreed in part, material has been added to the Code.
MS5c [11]	“As young as possible is too vague.”	Agreed in part, nine month limit now included.
MS5c [16]	No argument with earliest age possible has least effect on animal.	Noted.
MS5d [11]	MS silent on the period between 6 and 9 months.	Agreed, revised, 6 and 9 month limits now unified.
MS5d [9]	9 month limit without a veterinarian should be 6 months as veterinarian should be involved, and provide incentive for procedure to be undertaken at less than 6 months.	
MS5d,g [6]	Concern regarding the practical implications of allowing lay persons to disbud using pain relief between 6 and 9 month age limits.	
MS5new [9]	“Effective pain relief must be provided for all animals disbudded from 1 January 2009.”	Disagreed, a significant number of issues have to be resolved before pain relief is made mandatory.
MS5g [8a]	Age limit should be extended to 9 or preferably 12 months to accommodate various farming systems (buds may emerge later than 4 months, and disbudding often carried out at weaning time.	Disagreed, age limit is based on a number of issues including less pain and distress when younger, a move towards greater pain relief, and practical aspects.
MS5g [8b]	Support.	Noted.
MS5g [11]	Oppose – none of these procedures should be undertaken without pain relief, irrespective of age, and RBP (6 week limit) should be MS. Support phasing in the mandatory use of pain relief over 3y.	Disagreed, NAWAC is moving towards greater use of pain relief but acknowledges that there are significant issues still to be resolved before it could be mandatory.
MS5h [2]	Provide guidance as to ages at which the frontal sinuses invade the horn	Agree, revised to remove reference to ages since they are not well known and almost certainly vary widely.
MS5h [14]	Indicative timing of frontal sinus development should be provided for those undertaking disbudding.	
MS5h [6]	Age of frontal sinus development needs to be specified	
MS5h [8a]	Delete - operators are unable to tell when sinuses have developed. Amended age restrictions 9 or 12 months) adequately regulate procedure.	
MS5i [6]	Support	Noted.
MS5i [13]	Support and suggest it is given a more prominent position.	Agreed, revised.
MS5i [8a]	Represents a significant change which could have considerable impact. Dehorning	Agreed in part, revised. Dehorning is painful and there are means of

	should be carried out with regard to accepted and practical farming practices. Farmers report very few losses. Not a risky surgical procedure (c.f. others carried by veterinary surgeons) and pain attributed to the procedure is likely to be commensurate with that risk. Dehorning should be allowed without pain relief or veterinary supervision until 12 months of age.	reducing the pain. However, NAWAC accepts there are issues to be dealt with before pain relief is compulsory for dehorning. A nine-month limit for dehorning without pain relief is now imposed.
MS5 [8b,12]	Bold NAWAC statement is redundant, applies to whole Code.	Agreed, revised.
MS5 [8a]	Bold NAWAC statement – recommend consideration of practical, economic and social issues before any changes.	Noted, all issues being considered as part of NAWAC's strategy to move towards greater use of pain relief.
MS5 [16]	Bold NAWAC statement – trust issues will be taken into consideration.	
MS5 [14]	Bold NAWAC statement – option 2 is preferred if any change from the status quo is made.	Noted.
MS5 [13]	Bold NAWAC statement – support preference for pain relief and support option (1) phasing in over 3 years or sooner.	
MS5RBP [8b,12]	1 <sup>st</sup> RBP – support.	Noted.
MS5RBP [16]	2 <sup>nd</sup> RBP – widely supported.	Noted.
MS5RBP [9]	3 <sup>rd</sup> RBP should be a MS.	Disagreed, standards for disbudding have to be aligned with those for dehorning, revised to youngest age.
MS5RBP [8a]	3 <sup>rd</sup> RBP does not take into account that buds may emerge later than 4 months of age. Disbudding often carried out at weaning.	Agreed, revised.
MS5RBP [8b,12]	4 <sup>th</sup> RBP – “effective means of pain relief where acceptable” is ill defined.	Agreed, revised.
MS5RBP [9]	5 <sup>th</sup> RBP should be a MS.	Disagreed, there are situations where inspection is impractical and thus on balance unnecessary.
MS5RBP [8a]	5 <sup>th</sup> RBP delete or begin with “If practical” as depends on class of stock, environment, cost of disturbance. A matter of good stockmanship and not something that can be properly prescribed by codification.	Agreed, material added to the Code.
MS5RBP [8a]	6 <sup>th</sup> RBP is impractical - animals seldom handled before castration; requirement depends on management system, animal vigour, breed and history; whether the disease is likely to be encountered. Unnecessary vaccination is a questionable practice for flock or herd health safety and health and related breeding programmes. May be more aligned to fiscal health of veterinary practices and should be deleted.	Agreed, revised.
MS5RBP [3]	9 <sup>th</sup> RBP – “all” rather than “any” infected wounds	Agreed, revised.

MS5GI [CF]	May want to reconsider 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph in light of a recently published study.	Agreed, revised, noting there is less research available on chemical disbudding but that when it is done properly it appears to be a very good method.
MS5GI [1]	Does 7-10 day age apply to all species?	Applies to calves and goats at least. Noted that there is little formal information on the time of bud development.
<b>8</b>	<b>Operator training, stockmanship and facilities</b>	
Intro [3]	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph – delete “both” and add “ <i>competence, experience and</i> ”	Agreed, revised.
Intro [14]	4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph – delete “and well trained.” Suggest “Those responsible for the care of animals should be competent to do so.”	
MS6 [CF]	Heading should read “Minimum Standard 6 continued”	
MS6a [8b,12]	Discussion or clarification of the respective responsibilities and liabilities of owners and staff should be included.	Disagreed, covered in the Act and Section 2 Legal Obligations of Owners and People in Charge of Animals.
MS6a	Change to “must ensure that their personnel have either the relevant knowledge and experience, training or appropriate supervision...”	Agreed, revised.
MS6b [8a]	Amend to allow for farming family groups to participate: (b) Persons undertaking painful husbandry procedures must be – (i) experienced; or (ii) have received training, with the use of the particular technique and its variations; or (iii) be under the supervision of an experienced operator who is able to recognise early signs of significant distress, injury or ill-health so that prompt remedial action can be taken or advice sought.	
MS6d [8a]	Delete or amend to: “ <i>The best standards of cleanliness and hygiene that are achievable, having regard to the practical realities of current farming systems, should be observed at all times.</i> ”	Agreed in part, material has been added relating to practical circumstances.
MS6f [3]	Replace “sited” with “constructed”	Agreed, revised.
MS6RBP [8b,12]	1 <sup>st</sup> RBP - “experienced” needs to be defined.	Disagreed, Code strengthened by reference to “correct” application.
MS6RBP [8b,12]	1 <sup>st</sup> RBP – support concept of training for farm staff, but also recognition that “on job” training is acceptable.	Noted.
<b>Misc.</b>		

App 1 [8b,12]	Request that section on euthanasing animals, or reference to it (follows logically on from section on suffering) is included. Reference to Emergency Slaughter in App 2 could be highlighted in App 1.	Disagreed, euthanasia only one feature of treatment when anything goes wrong.
------------------	--	---