

Tom Didovich

From: Neil Wells[SMTP:newells@cybernet.co.nz]
Sent: Monday, 31 August 1998 15:47 PM
To: David Bayvel
Subject: WAITAKERE CITY

David

This is an unofficial outline and draft. I would appreciate your advice on the best way to proceed.

PART 1

The Waitakere City programme has been operating now for 2 ½ years, first, under a 6 month pilot and then under an extended "interregnum".

In that time MAF Compliance Group has conducted a number of audits and another is scheduled for November. All audits have come through with favourable reports, some with recommendations for improvements all of which have been adopted. two

Ten officers of Waitakere City Animal Welfare Services were originally warranted. Two resigned before warrants were issued and one did not apply for a warrant due to ill health. The remaining seven have held warrants, first for a 6-month term, and then for 12-month terms. The warrants will expire in December 1998 and, presumably, they will be renewed for a further 12-month term if policy has not been determined, or for a 3-year term if a long term policy arrangement is in place by then.

Waitakere Animal Welfare Services is a stable work environment and all 7 officers warranted 2 ½ years ago are still employed. One additional officer has been employed but a warrant has not been issued. There has been an assumption that additional/replacement officers would be able to be trained and warranted (if suitable) under the existing system. But it has not been economical to put one person through a training course.

Waitakere City has been successful in winning a tender to provide animal care and control services to North Shore City. This will require Waitakere Animal Services to expand their team by 4 or more officers. Existing and new officers will rotate between Waitakere and North Shore. In other words, Waitakere City AWS will cover the two cities as one combined territory.

Waitakere City AWS now wishes to train 5-8 officers under the current standards to enable warrants to be issued to them. It is economical to train that number.

At this stage all that is being requested is that additional personnel be warranted (subject to the suitability) under the existing training and quality system.

It would seem that this should be possible without any major policy initiative.

In parallel to this development, UNITEC has been accredited to teach the National Certificate

in Compliance and Regulatory Control (Animal Welfare) (NCCRC(AW)). It is not viable for UNITEC to teach the certificate unless there is a minimum of 15 but preferably 25 persons enrolled.

There is an opportunity now to extend their accreditation to teach the NCCRC (Animal Control) which LGITO expects to be registered within a month or two. A majority of the unit standards are common to both national certificates.

Naturally, UNITEC is taking up the opportunity to submit for the PSTO tender, and I am meeting with Judith Nicholson, Dean of Health and Science, tomorrow to further that.

In the meantime, if we go ahead with training the 5-8 new Waitakere officers I could do that through UNITEC and use that as a basis for launching the teaching of the full National Certificate from say March next year. The alternative is that I contract to Waitakere to provide the training as I did last time.

What we would propose is that the Waitakere training standard is adapted to meet appropriate unit standards so that trainees would have a number of unit standards to their credit. We would need to identify the unit standards that would meet the training standard.

The following might be appropriate:

- 5181 First aid companion animals (8 credits)
- 14232 Animal welfare legislation (4 credits)
- 4223 Describe powers (4 credits)
- 4235 Plan and prepare investigation (4 credits)
- 4236 Conduct an investigation (4 credits)
- 4237 Search premises (4 credits)
- 4238 Seize property (4 credits)

This amounts to 32 credits out of a total of 83 required for the national certificate.

It occurs to me that this is as far as we really need to go at this stage. That is, simply advise MAF Reg that Waitakere City wishes to train 5-8 officers under the existing programme and seek advice from MAF Reg as to the most appropriate unit standards to equate to the qualifications framework approved 2 ½ years ago.

PART 2

Anticipating that the policy in the Bill will allow for the "Option 2" concept, it would seem inappropriate for territorial authorities as corporate bodies to be able to go directly to MAF Reg to be compliance bodies (or whatever term will be used in the government Bill).

That being the case there are a small number of territorial authorities (as I have indicated earlier) that will be interested in participating in an extended trial (if that is the right term).

The Waitakere pilot was relatively simple in that there was one corporate body (Waitakere City Council) and it was easy to establish a memorandum of understanding between MAF Reg and Waitakere City. If suitable persons for appointment as Inspectors were to be considered

outside of Waitakere City, the MOU (MAF Reg – WCC) would be inappropriate. (This would not apply in the case of North Shore City as Waitakere City will be providing the service for both territories and all the officers will be employed by Waitakere City.

If we go back to the "Barry O'Neil Training and Accrediting Body" concept and bring it up to 1998 we would have something like this.

MAF Reg does not wish to deal with a multitude of corporate bodies whether they be branches of SPCA, local offices of MQM Food, or similar bodies. Therefore under this principle it would be inappropriate for individual Territorial Authorities to operate directly with MAF Reg.

The current models are:

- a. RNZSPCA is an umbrella organisation that deals with MAF Reg and the national body is responsible for establishing quality standards, auditing compliance with those standards, and ensuring that training standards are met.
- b. It is presumed that MQM Food will operate in a similar manner. The head office of MQM Food would be responsible for an MOU or contract with MAF Reg and branches of MQM Food would operate under the umbrella of the MQM Food compliance contract with MAF Reg.

Following these models then, (as we have discussed before) would it not be appropriate for a national body to be formed to fulfil the function of training and quality assurance body (excluding functions for MQM Food and RNZSPCA). For this exercise let's assume that there will be a new charitable trust formed, independent of Waitakere City, to be known as the Animal Welfare Institute of New Zealand (AWINZ). AWINZ could be that national body and would be responsible to MAF Reg through a memorandum of understanding or contract. The quality assurance system and procedures currently operating the Waitakere scheme would become the training standards and quality assurance system of AWINZ. MAF Compliance would audit AWINZ on an annual basis and at random would audit work places of inspectors.

Suitable officers would be trained to agreed standards (NCCRC (AW)) and would contract individually to AWINZ for performance. Those officers might be predominantly from territorial authorities but not exclusively. As part of the contract with AWINZ the officer would need to have an MOU with his/her employer allowing the performance of animal welfare compliance duties as part of his/her employment.

This model would allow for AWINZ to establish links with officers employed by animal control in territorial authorities but leaves the boundaries open (in discussion with MAF Reg) for inspectors following other occupations to be considered as suitable for appointment. For example, power company meter readers, perhaps farm consultants (non MAF Food), pest control officers, real estate agents, park rangers, etc.

In the current SPCA model the primary occupation of an Inspector is not a factor for assessing suitability, in fact, there are a few animal control officers who hold warrants as SPCA Inspectors. It follows then that the question of suitability under the present Act is determined by the qualities of the individual, not the nature of the individual's employer.

It is possibly premature to propose Part 2 at this stage as there needs to be a little more

certainty in terms of what is in the Bill, when will AWINZ be up and running, what transitional procedures can be used for Waitakere City.

Do you think I should restrict formal advice to simply advising MAF Reg that Waitakere City wishes to train a further 5 to 8 officers under the current programme and seek advice from MAF Reg on the most appropriate unit standards to use as an interim training programme.

I know you are pressed for time this week. Waitakere City is anxious to get some certainty for the training of the additional officers as they take over North Shore within 2 months.

If need be I am prepared to fly to Wellington on Friday if you think there is some advantage in meeting with you and Barry before you leave for Europe.

Regards

Neil

++++
Neil Wells
N E Wells & Associates
P O Box 60-208, Titirangi, Auckland 1230, New Zealand
Tel: +64 9 811 8020
Fax: +64 9 811 8010
e-mail: newells@cybernet.co.nz
++++