

Response to questions taken on notice and supplementary questions from the Select Committee’s public hearing on 28 May 2021

Questions taken on notice during public hearing on 28 May 2021	Commission’s response dated 30 June 2021
<p><u>Cobalt – transcript pages 21 and 22</u>  <b>The CHAIR:</b> No, I am not asking you to prove it. I am asking, have you got any scientific papers to back up what you are talking about? You are saying you are using Greyhounds Australasia’s levels. Do they have, or do you have, anything from a scientific point of view that at least argues a proper case, that they are performance enhancing at the levels that you are currently using? Is there such a thing from Greyhounds Australasia?  <b>Dr LEDGER:</b> You are asking about whether Greyhounds Australasia has papers that support the introduction of a threshold?  <b>The Hon. MARK PEARSON:</b> No, what is the science that you are basing this on?  <b>The CHAIR:</b> What is the science?  <b>The Hon. MARK PEARSON:</b> Can you provide that science?  <b>The CHAIR:</b> If there is science hopefully behind all of this, can you access it for us and give it to us, please?  <b>Dr LEDGER:</b> Absolutely, yes.</p>	<p>In 2017, Greyhound Racing Victoria and Greyhounds Australasia (GA) commissioned Professor Brynn Hibbert to conduct a study of cobalt and arsenic levels with a view to setting appropriate threshold levels (or tolerances) for these naturally occurring substances. The study led to the introduction of nationwide greyhound racing rules which imposed a threshold level for each substance. As the Commission does not hold rights to the paper, an access request should be directed to GA.</p>
<p><u>Interim suspensions – transcript page 22</u>  <b>Ms ABIGAIL BOYD:</b> Could I ask you to provide on notice a list of some data—we do not need names—on how many interim suspensions have been issued and what the issue was? You say that it is in serious cases only. It is just so that we can see whether the data supports that. That would be very useful.  <b>Dr LEDGER:</b> Yes, we can do that.</p>	<p>Under the disciplinary scheme in Part 6 of the <i>Greyhound Racing Act 2017</i>, the Commission can take a range of disciplinary actions – including suspending the registration of a greyhound racing industry participant. This can also include the suspension of a participant for an interim period. This is known as an ‘interim suspension’. An interim suspension may be imposed where the alleged breach presents a serious or imminent risk to animal welfare, to racing and betting integrity, or to the reputation of the greyhound racing industry and where the risk may be mitigated by an interim suspension.</p> <p>Typical situations where an interim suspension may be imposed include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Laboratory confirmation of a Permanently Banned Prohibited Substance in a greyhound owned or trained by the participant</li> <li>• A conviction, charge or investigation relating to a serious criminal offence (including animal welfare offences)</li> <li>• Evidence of serious misconduct such as abuse of a steward.</li> </ul> <p>Interim suspensions in response to the foregoing circumstances were utilised by GRNSW when it was the controlling body prior to the establishment of the Commission. Interim suspensions are used by other greyhound racing jurisdictions, and in other codes of racing.</p> <p>Since 1 July 2018, the Commission has imposed 49 interim suspensions<sup>9</sup> against registered greyhound racing industry participants. As at 30 June 2021, 8 interim suspensions were in force.</p> <p>See <a href="#">GWIC website</a> for a synopsis of each current interim suspension. See Annexure A for a synopsis of all interim suspensions.</p>

Response to questions taken on notice and supplementary questions from the Select Committee’s public hearing on 28 May 2021

Questions taken on notice during public hearing on 28 May 2021	Commission’s response dated 30 June 2021
<p><u>Greyhound euthanasia – transcript pages 22 and 23</u>  <b>The Hon. MARK LATHAM:</b> Just on that topic, can I take you to page 35 of your submission, where it lists in 2019-20 greyhound deaths reported not at racetracks? Under the category, "After a private veterinarian certified that the greyhound was behaviourally unsuitable for rehoming (typically aggressive)", it states 59 dogs were put down in that circumstance. How many of those 59 dog owners were charged with breaking a GWIC policy in that action of putting the dog down because it was aggressive and might have bitten a kid, for example? ...  <b>The Hon. MARK LATHAM:</b> This is a 2019-20 figure. So what is the figure for this financial year if it is not 59?  <b>Mr BROWN:</b> I will turn those up for you, if you like.  <b>The Hon. MARK LATHAM:</b> How many of the 59 were charged?  <b>The Hon. MARK PEARSON:</b> You can take that on notice.  <b>Mr BROWN:</b> I will take that on notice.</p>	<p>In 2019-20, 59 greyhounds were euthanased because they were behaviourally unsuitable for rehoming. Of these greyhounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 48 were euthanased prior to 30 November 2019 when it was permissible for a registered veterinarian to certify that a greyhound was unsuitable for rehoming due to untreatable behavioural problems</li> <li>• 11 were euthanased after 1 December 2019 when the Commission strengthened its Greyhound Rehoming Policy by requiring additional efforts to rehome a greyhound.</li> </ul> <p>Of the 11 instances, five resulted in the issue of a warning letter or a formal reprimand, one resulted in disciplinary action, four were assessed as requiring no further action, and one remains under investigation.</p>
<p><u>Commissioner Wheeler – professional association – transcript page 24</u>  <b>The Hon. MARK LATHAM:</b> Let me just say that in your organisation there is a belief that Commissioner Wheeler clearly has a conflict of interest in that he receives money—and you admitted it is fee for service from Centium—which is used by GWIC when there are other alternative organisations providing the same service that could be used. That is a clear conflict of interest that has lowered staff morale. They look at it thinking it is part of the favouritism, the insider deals and arrangements in this organisation and they are wondering why GWIC has such a tolerance of very clear conflicts of interest.  <b>Mr BROWN:</b> That matter was raised to Mr Wheeler and, as I recall, he gave a very satisfactory answer to it. There was no conflict in our view. But I am more than happy to take that on notice and provide a detailed answer to you.</p>	<p>Mr Wheeler was appointed as a part-time Commissioner in October 2019. In accordance with the Commission’s Code of Ethics and Conduct, Mr Wheeler declared a potential conflict of interest before accepting an engagement with Centium as a specialist adviser in March 2020.</p> <p>The Commissioners considered Mr Wheeler’s disclosure and, in order to effectively manage any potential conflict of interest, the following strategies were agreed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr Wheeler would have no involvement in any Centium investigations that are requested by the Commission</li> <li>• Mr Wheeler would have no involvement in the choice of consultants where Centium is a candidate or possible candidate for the professional services sought by the Commission</li> <li>• Mr Wheeler would not be informed about any dealings that the Commission may have with Centium.</li> </ul> <p>The Commission, Mr Wheeler and Centium have fully complied with these arrangements at all times.</p> <p>Mr Wheeler had and continues to have no involvement in the Commission’s choice of consultants to perform professional services for the Commission from time to time.</p> <p>Moreover, the selection and engagement of firms to undertake fact-finding investigations for the Commission are operational matters managed by the Commission’s executive.</p>

Response to questions taken on notice and supplementary questions from the Select Committee’s public hearing on 28 May 2021

Supplementary questions received 9 June 2021		Response dated 30 June 2021
Questions directed to the Commission		
1	<p>Inspectorate program</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. How does the inspectorate program work?</li> <li>b. How many inspections have been undertaken by GWIC since its inception, by financial year?</li> <li>c. How many inspections have been undertaken that were prompted by GWIC concerns about the welfare of greyhounds and/or the conditions in which they were kept?</li> <li>d. How many inspectors would be needed to check every one of the 20K+ estimated greyhounds owned by industry participants in New South Wales at least once a year?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Commission inspectors attend kennels and conduct kennel inspections as part of their functions under the <i>Greyhound Racing Act 2017</i>, the Greyhound Racing Rules and the NSW Greyhound Welfare Code of Practice. In conducting kennel inspections, inspectors assess compliance with the standards contained in the Code of Practice which focus on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nutrition and Hydration</li> <li>• Health and Wellbeing</li> <li>• Greyhound Breeding</li> <li>• Housing and Environment</li> <li>• Transporting Greyhounds</li> <li>• Exercise, Socialisation and Enrichment</li> <li>• Training, Trialling and Racing</li> <li>• Rehoming Greyhounds as Companion Animals.</li> </ul> <p>In addition to kennelling and greyhound housing areas, an inspection will examine food preparation and storage areas; veterinary treatment records; and any medications, supplements and other substances present.</p> </li> <li>b. Since 1 July 2018, the Commission has completed 1,396 individual kennel inspections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2018-19 – 780 inspections (747 premises and 33 follow-up inspections)</li> <li>• 2019-20 – 309 inspections (261 premises and 48 follow-up inspections) *</li> <li>• 2020-21 – 307 inspections (257 premises and 50 follow-up inspections) *.</li> </ul> <p><i>*COVID-19 Impacted</i></p> </li> <li>c. In recording kennel inspection statistics, the Commission does not specifically differentiate those kennels inspected due to welfare concerns for greyhounds and/or the conditions under which they are kept. These inspections have historically been captured as targeted or intelligence-led inspections, and can include inspections initiated for the investigation of integrity and conduct matters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2018-19 – 126 targeted inspections (114 premises and 12 revisits)</li> <li>• 2019-20 – 86 targeted inspections (64 premises and 22 revisits)</li> <li>• 2020-21 – 90 targeted inspections (62 premises and 28 revisits).</li> </ul> </li> <li>d. The Commission estimates that, using existing methods and technology, a validation check of every greyhound at least once a year would require a workforce of 30 inspectors, which is three times the current workforce. The introduction of e-Tracking will accelerate the current rate of greyhound inspections, through systematic checks at racetracks and kennels as part of an annual audit program which can be undertaken within current staffing levels.</li> </ol>

Response to questions taken on notice and supplementary questions from the Select Committee’s public hearing on 28 May 2021

Supplementary questions received 9 June 2021		Response dated 30 June 2021
2	<p>Evidence for disciplinary action</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Please provide an outline of evidence and documentation required for a warning or disciplinary action to be taken by GWIC against an industry participant.</li> <li>b. Please provide a de-identified example of evidence gathered and documentation required for a disciplinary action which has been taken.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Section 58 (1) of the <i>Greyhound Racing Act 2017</i> provides that the Commission may take disciplinary action against or in respect of a relevant person if the Commission is of the opinion that the person has contravened a provision of the Act, the Greyhound Racing Regulation 2019, the Code of Practice or the Greyhound Racing Rules. The Commission has developed rigorous procedures to ensure that relevant evidence is collected in relation to any proposed disciplinary action and that procedural fairness is afforded to the relevant participant(s) in the decision-making process. These are explained in the Commission’s <a href="#">Compliance &amp; Enforcement Explanatory Guide</a> and <a href="#">Disciplinary Action Guide</a>. While the relevance of evidence is dependent on the circumstances surrounding each particular case, in all cases a brief of evidence is prepared for consideration by the Commission’s decision-maker(s). In matters relating to prohibited substances, the evidence will include laboratory samples confirming the presence of a prohibited substance(s) in a greyhound. With the exception of fines under \$200, decisions resulting in disciplinary action against a participant are appealable under <i>the Racing Appeals Tribunal Act 1983</i>. In most situations, an internal review of a decision is also available under section 91 of the <i>Greyhound Racing Act 2017</i>.</li> <li>b. For the Committee’s assistance, a de-identified brief of evidence is attached at Annexure B.</li> </ol>
3	<p>Please table all records you hold in relation to the death of Coniglio at The Gardens on 15 May 2020.</p>	<p>Attached at Annexure C are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicable veterinary examination form from the Greyhound Examination Database (GED)</li> <li>• Independent veterinary opinion into the incident</li> <li>• The post-mortem report</li> <li>• Findings of an internal investigation into Coniglio’s treatment</li> <li>• Terms of reference for an expert panel to review the internal guidelines for the treatment of serious injuries in racing greyhounds</li> <li>• Development and <a href="#">publication</a> of principles in the treatment of serious injuries and euthanasia of racing greyhounds.</li> </ul>
4	<p>Autopsies</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Are autopsies conducted on deceased greyhounds in any circumstance? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. If yes, which circumstances warrant an autopsy?</li> <li>ii. If yes, is documentation from these autopsies made available to the public?</li> <li>iii. If yes, please table all autopsy reports since GWIC’s inception.</li> <li>iv. If no, why not?</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Yes. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. All sudden deaths occurring at a racetrack and, on a case-by-case basis, when investigations are conducted into the suspicious death of a greyhound or if greyhound remains are discovered</li> <li>ii. No – as veterinary records, autopsy documentation is governed by the <a href="#">Veterinary Practitioners Code of Professional Conduct</a>.</li> <li>iii. Not applicable – see response above</li> <li>iv. Not applicable – see response above.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
5	<p>Reduction in catastrophic injuries</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. During the hearing at which GWIC appeared, information was provided about a reduction in catastrophic injuries. Are injuries where an owner is directed to</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. No. Injuries that occur as the result of racing are reported in the Commission’s quarterly <a href="#">Analysis of Greyhound Racing Injuries</a> in the injury category that is applicable at the time the greyhound is examined by the Commission’s On-Track Veterinarian (OTV). Where the Commission is notified that a greyhound has been euthanased by a private veterinarian</li> </ol>

Response to questions taken on notice and supplementary questions from the Select Committee's public hearing on 28 May 2021

Supplementary questions received 9 June 2021		Response dated 30 June 2021
	<p>visit a non-track vet following a race and the greyhound is subsequently euthanised at that visit recorded as 'Catastrophic' injuries in your data?</p> <p>b. If the answer to the above is no, please provide data on major 1 and major 2 injuries where participants are directed to see a non-track vet after a race injury, and that greyhound is subsequently euthanised at the subsequent visit to a vet.</p>	<p>following a Major II racing injury, this is noted as an off-track euthanasia in the quarterly <a href="#">Analysis of Greyhound Racing Injuries reports</a> published by the Commission.</p> <p>b. In calendar year 2020, the Commission was notified of 27 greyhounds having been euthanased by a private veterinarian following complications associated with a Major 2 racing injury or due to the poor prognosis for full recovery; and four greyhounds euthanased following complications associated with a Major 1 racing injury or due to the poor prognosis for full recovery.</p>
6	<p>Greyhounds euthanised at owner's request</p> <p>a. According to your 2019-2020 annual report, 6% of all greyhounds euthanised (not including those at racetracks) are euthanised at their owner's request after rehoming attempts failed, despite no illness, injury, or emergency, and despite not being assessed as unsuitable for rehoming. Taking into consideration 2020-2021 data to date, has this rate increased or decreased since GWIC's inception and by how much?</p> <p>b. What steps are being taken to further reduce the number of greyhounds euthanised in these circumstances?</p>	<p>a. The proportion of greyhound euthanasias following failure of rehoming efforts has declined from 6% in 2018-19 (the Commission's first year of operation) to 5.4% in 2019-20, and to 4.5% in the first three quarters of 2020-21. The Commission does not have custody of corresponding data before 2018-19.</p> <p>b. The Commission continues to educate participants about the requirements of the Greyhound Rehoming Policy and their obligation to seek to rehome any greyhounds that they do not wish to retain.</p> <p>The Commission actively monitors <i>Notifications of Intent to Euthanase</i> a greyhound and seeks to verify the information provided by participants. Where the information cannot be verified, the Notification is not approved.</p> <p>The Notification of Intent process also provides the Commission with an opportunity to contact the greyhound owner, remind them of their obligations under the Greyhound Rehoming Policy, and seek alternatives to euthanasia.</p>
7	<p>Greyhound death not at racetracks: injury or accidental causes</p> <p>a. According to GWIC's 2019-2020 annual report, 37% of all greyhounds which died without medical assistance (not including those at racetracks) died due to injury or accidental causes. In what circumstances would deaths which fall into this category be investigated by GWIC?</p> <p>b. Please provide examples of circumstances which lead to deaths due to injury or accidental causes not including those at racetracks.</p>	<p>a. Circumstances under which a greyhound death at a participant's property may be escalated for investigation include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multiple deaths occurring at the same premises or under the care of the same participant (e.g. snake bites)</li> <li>• Greyhounds euthanased for behavioural reasons or aggression and/or at odds with the Greyhound Rehoming Policy</li> <li>• Infectious causes (e.g. parvovirus or canine coronavirus)</li> <li>• Anything unusual or suspicious (e.g. following a race, recently arrived or travelled).</li> </ul> <p>b. See 7a above.</p>
8	<p>Greyhound death not at racetracks: illness, age or natural causes</p> <p>a. According to GWIC's 2019-2020 annual report, 136 greyhounds died due to illness, age, or natural causes. Is GWIC provided further and/or more specific information by industry participants and/or private vets on the cause of death of greyhounds in this category?</p> <p>i. If yes, please provide further breakdown of this figure by cause of death.</p> <p>ii. If no, why not?</p>	<p>a. Some death notifications include additional information, particularly where a greyhound has had a previously diagnosed condition such as cancer, where a veterinarian has been consulted after death, or where symptoms of some conditions are evident.</p> <p>i. In a sample of 149 greyhounds where death was attributed to illness, age or natural causes and additional information was provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 21 greyhounds were over the age of 10</li> <li>• 28 greyhounds were noted as showing signs of gastric volvulus, bowel torsion or obstruction</li> </ul>

Response to questions taken on notice and supplementary questions from the Select Committee's public hearing on 28 May 2021

Supplementary questions received 9 June 2021		Response dated 30 June 2021
	<p>b. In what circumstances would deaths which fall into this category be investigated by GWIC?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9 greyhounds were reported to have canine corona virus, canine herpes or parvo virus</li> <li>• 6 greyhounds had been diagnosed with cancer before death</li> <li>• 11 deaths were attributed to heart attack or heart failure</li> <li>• 55 greyhounds were reported as having been found dead with no cause presumed</li> <li>• 7 greyhounds collapsed and died suddenly</li> <li>• 2 pups were reported to have fading puppy syndrome</li> <li>• 4 died after a medical procedure performed by a veterinarian.</li> </ul> <p>Death of the remaining greyhounds was attributed to a variety of causes such as pancreatitis, aneurism, blood clot, embolism, gastroenteritis, pneumonia, renal failure, stroke or neurological condition.</p> <p>ii. Not applicable – see response above.</p> <p>b. See 7a above.</p>
9	<p>Interstate transfers</p> <p>a. Data provided by GWIC to the Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds suggests that 2,102 greyhounds from the 2015/2016 and 2017/2018 cohorts were transferred outside of NSW by the end of the 2019/2020 financial year. Please advise the name, date of transfer, and recorded transfer destination for each greyhound transferred out of NSW since the inception of GWIC.</p> <p>b. Under the new e-tracking system, will greyhounds transferred interstate be able to be removed from the GWIC register before being added to equivalent interstate records?</p> <p>i. If yes, does GWIC have confidence in the continued welfare of greyhounds transferred interstate?</p>	<p>a. See Annexure D.</p> <p>b. This will be dependent upon whether the ownership of the greyhound is being transferred to a registered owner in another jurisdiction or merely for short-term training in another jurisdiction. If ownership is being transferred, then the greyhound will be archived from the Commission's register following receipt of confirmation from the controlling body in the other jurisdiction that the greyhound is now on its register. If the greyhound is being transferred to a trainer in another jurisdiction, it will remain on the Commission's register.</p> <p>i. Yes, the Commission has confidence that the responsible inter-jurisdictional body will continue to monitor greyhounds transferred onto its respective greyhound register.</p>
10	<p>Potentially unaccounted for greyhounds</p> <p>a. Data provided by GWIC to the Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds suggests that 190 greyhounds whelped in NSW are 'potentially unaccounted for'. Why are these greyhounds considered unaccounted for?</p> <p>b. What steps are being taken to account for these greyhounds?</p> <p>c. What steps have been taken to discipline industry participants whose greyhounds are considered potentially unaccounted for?</p> <p>d. If no disciplinary action has been taken, why not?</p>	<p>a. The figure of 190 is an estimate of the number of greyhounds whelped in 2015-16 and 2017-18 that could not be accounted for in other categories (e.g. died, transferred interstate, registered for breeding, still racing, retired). The figure was arrived at by calculation, to demonstrate to the Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds that the claim of "2,338 missing greyhounds" was erroneous because it failed to take into account life events such as death, transfer interstate, breeding, long racing careers and retirement to participants. The figure of 190 is 2.3% of the 8,200 whelped in 2015-16 and 2017-18, before the Commission was operational.</p> <p>b. Not applicable as the figure of 190 is a calculated estimate, not a count of individuals.</p> <p>c. See 10b above</p> <p>d. See 10b above.</p>
11	<p>Minimum standards for racetracks</p>	<p>a. The Commission understands that GRNSW, as the body responsible for the minimum standards, is giving consideration to publishing the documentation.</p> <p>b. See 11a above.</p>

Response to questions taken on notice and supplementary questions from the Select Committee's public hearing on 28 May 2021

Supplementary questions received 9 June 2021		Response dated 30 June 2021
	<p>a. We understand minimum standards for racetracks were adopted by GWIC &amp; GRNSW in June 2020. When will these minimum standards be made available to the public?</p> <p>b. Please table a copy of the minimum standards.</p> <p>c. Which organisations or specialist advisers were consulted in relation to the minimum standards?</p> <p>d. What was GWIC's role in the review of the draft track safety standards, given that GWIC is independently tasked with the responsibility of overseeing animal welfare in the industry?</p> <p>e. Were there any recommendations or requested changes put forward by GWIC which were not incorporated into the draft standards? If so, what were these recommendations?</p> <p>f. What is the justification for the standards being based on "minimum" standards, rather than "maximum" standards?</p> <p>g. Has the Minister reviewed or signed off on these standards?</p>	<p>c. See 11a above.</p> <p>d. Under section 26(6) of the <i>Greyhound Racing Act 2017</i>, the minimum standards have no effect unless approved by the Commission. On 29 June 2020, the Commission approved of minimum standards for racecourse design and construction, racecourse facilities and amenities, and greyhound training facilities. Approval followed incorporation of enhancements suggested by the Commission.</p> <p>e. No.</p> <p>f. See section 26 of the <i>Greyhound Racing Act 2017</i> and recommendation 104 in the Greyhound Industry Reform Panel's report.</p> <p>g. Under the <i>Greyhound Racing Act 2017</i>, there is no role for the Minister for Better Regulation and Innovation to review or endorse the minimum standards.</p>
12	<p>Straight tracks</p> <p>a. Phase I of the UTS study into greyhound track design strongly recommended that the greyhound racing industry consider building purpose-built straight tracks to prevent injuries associated with bent tracks. Why has a phase-out of bent tracks not been mandated in GWIC rules and policies?</p> <p>b. Now that a straight track has been constructed at Richmond, why is racing continuing to occur on the adjacent oval track?</p> <p>c. Phase I of the UTS study into greyhound track design strongly recommended that races be limited to 6 greyhounds to reduce congestion and associated injuries. Why has this not been mandated in GWIC rules and policies?</p>	<p>a. This is a matter largely for GRNSW. However, the Commission supports research into and development of straight tracks. Straight tracks are not mandated under the minimum standards referred to in Question 11.</p> <p>b. See answer to 12a.</p> <p>c. The racing program – including field size – is determined by GRNSW. The Commission considers that there is currently insufficient evidence to support a requirement to limit field sizes to six greyhounds.</p>
13	<p>Greyhound Racing Industry Reform Panel recommendations</p> <p>a. In 2017, GWIC accepted 121 recommendations from the Greyhound Racing Industry Reform Panel. How many of these recommendations have been implemented to date?</p> <p>b. Please provide an update on progress of all recommendations not fully implemented.</p>	<p>a. In the Commission's assessment, 108 of the 121 recommendations were fully implemented and two were part-implemented as at 30 June 2021.</p> <p>b. The Commission was responsible for implementing 39 recommendations. Of these, 36 were implemented by 30 June 2021. The three recommendations not yet implemented, and the reasons therefor, are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendation 64 [Additional options for breeding controls and other total lifecycle management initiatives, including a target date for achieving zero unnecessary euthanasia, should be considered in two years informed by more robust data] – contingent on GRNSW's implementation of recommendation 63</li> <li>• Recommendation 84 [Owners should be required to pay a modest upfront bond to the integrity commission no later than four months after whelping, that is transferable with ownership. This should be paid by the breeder if they still own the greyhound at four months. This should be supplemented with annual payments, made by the person responsible for the greyhound, while the greyhound is registered with the integrity</li> </ul>

Response to questions taken on notice and supplementary questions from the Select Committee's public hearing on 28 May 2021

Supplementary questions received 9 June 2021		Response dated 30 June 2021
		<p>commission. Industry may develop a scheme to fund these payments) – the Commission has informed the Government that it (the Commission) it is not in a position to introduce a fit-for-purpose bond as the available data was not adequate to make confident policy and regulatory decisions about the rate of breeding needed to support the industry; and that the Commission is concerned that a bond would discourage industry participation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendation 85 [The bond and annual payments should be recoverable by the last person who has the care and control of the greyhound before it is rehomed or has been retired as a pet of an industry participant] – see remarks re recommendation 84.</li> </ul>
14	<p>Greyhound register</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why has the greyhound register not been made available to the public?</li> <li>When will it be made publicly available?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As a NSW public sector agency, the Commission is subject to the <i>Privacy &amp; Personal Information Protection Act 1998</i> (PPIPA). The PPIPA restricts the information that the Commission can lawfully release, if the information contains the personal information of individuals, without the prior consent of the individual. As the Commission does not have the consent of greyhound owners, the Commission cannot release details of greyhounds and their owners as recorded on the greyhound register. Additionally, while clause 19 of the <i>Greyhound Racing Regulation 2019</i> requires the Commission to maintain a register of greyhounds, clause 20 only permits the sharing of information from the greyhound register with those bodies set out within clause 20.</li> <li>Not applicable – see answer to 14a.</li> </ol>
15	<p>Injured greyhounds removed from tracks and euthanised</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>According to GWIC's quarterly reports (Analysis of Greyhound Racing Injuries), in 2020 a total of 29 greyhounds were categorised by On Track Vets as having sustained a 'Major II Injury', removed from tracks, and subsequently euthanised. These are not included in the reported statistics for catastrophic injuries. Please provide the names of these 29 greyhounds.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The figure of 29 greyhounds reported in the 2020 injury reports has been revised down to 27 after further investigation indicated that the death of two greyhounds was not as a result of complications associated with a Major II racing injury or due to a poor prognosis for full recovery. This list includes 18 greyhounds where formal notification of euthanasia has been received; and nine where informal notification has been received and formal notification is pending. The greyhounds are: Argent Gambler, Awesome Shae, Canya Chase, Changer's Chance, Dana Mousey, Double Dream, Flash High Ball, Flash Sling Shot, Flying Shadow, Go Do More, Hey Arthur, Hillbilly Fusion, Jet Twist, Kingsbrae Jess, Kingsbrae Millie, Lightning Ally, Like Billyo, Mack Cool, Merciless Ming, Palisades Park, Revhead Sloy, Rushforth Des, Scar Cargo, Spookie Magic, Tweed General, Uryan Bale, Zipping Ryder.</li> </ol>
16	<p>90-day incapacitation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research by Coalition for the Protection of Greyhounds and Animal Liberation shows that in 2020, 51 greyhounds were given a 90-day incapacitation and subsequently never raced again. Can you provide information as to what happened to each of these greyhounds?</li> <li>If not, why?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Annexure E for this information. Note that, as five greyhounds that continue to be registered for racing are registered in Victoria and Queensland, the Commission may not hold the most up-to-date information about their status at this time.</li> <li>See answer to 16a.</li> </ol>
17	<p>Online marketplaces</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RSPCA has spoken out against the selling and giving away of greyhounds on internet marketplaces such as Gumtree due to risks to greyhounds and potential adoptees, particularly because the transition of a racing greyhound</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Greyhound Rehoming Policy is intended to promote rehoming of retired greyhounds and prevent unnecessary euthanasia. The Policy requires greyhound owners to attempt to rehome any greyhound that they do not wish to retain. It does not prescribe where greyhound owners may advertise. The Commission regularly monitors greyhound advertisements to ensure compliance with the Greyhound Rehoming Policy and section 23A</li> </ol>



Response to questions taken on notice and supplementary questions from the Select Committee's public hearing on 28 May 2021

Supplementary questions received 9 June 2021		Response dated 30 June 2021
	<p>to a companion animal is difficult and requires expert support. Does GWIC support the selling or giving away of greyhounds on internet marketplaces?</p> <p>b. Will GWIC consider including a statement on the GWIC website which indicates their position on this matter?</p>	<p>of the <i>Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1979</i>. In addition, the Commission must be notified whenever there is a change in the ownership of a greyhound. Moreover, when a greyhound is transferred to an owner outside the greyhound racing industry, the Commission ensures the new owner has access to information on how to care for their new companion animal.</p> <p>b. Yes.</p>
18	<p>Non-racing puppies</p> <p>a. According to GWIC's Annual Report FY 19/20, 26% of puppies born in NSW in 2017 and 2018 did not race by October 2020. Does GWIC track the whereabouts of puppies who do not race, once they are determined not suitable or able to race?</p> <p>i. If yes, please provide this information.</p> <p>ii. If no, why not?</p>	<p>a. While the Commission does not specifically track each registered greyhound, which has not been nominated to race, inspectors during kennel inspections will scan and identify all greyhounds present, including yet-to-race and retired greyhounds. In addition, inspectors will inquire about any greyhound expected to be present at a kennel premises, if it is not present. Commencing in 2021-22, the Commission's forthcoming eTracking system will ensure that every greyhound is scanned each year as part of an annual audit program.</p> <p>i. See answer to 18a.</p> <p>ii. See answer to 18a.</p>
19	<p>Track safety</p> <p>a. Since GWIC's inception, how many verbal or written concerns or complaints has GWIC received from GRNSW participants, vets, or stewards, raising concerns or complaints about the safety of NSW tracks?</p> <p>b. How many of these complaints were referred to GRNSW?</p> <p>c. Can you provide information as to the outcome of each of these complaints?</p> <p>d. Since its inception, how many applications for compensation has GWIC received from industry participants, where a greyhound has suffered injury or death as a result of an unsafe track?</p> <p>e. Can you provide information as to the outcome of each of these applications?</p>	<p>a. While the Commission does not record complaints specifically in relation to track safety, the Commission has established procedures for responding to concerns regarding track safety. This includes relying on the Greyhound Examination Database (GED) as the Commission's main source of data relating to track injuries, accompanied by referral of serious and catastrophic injuries while racing for consideration by the Race Injury Review Panel.</p> <p>b. In accordance with the Commission's <a href="#">Protocol for track inspections and race abandonments</a>, the Commission's stewards routinely inspect each track before a race meeting to ensure that it is safe for racing. Where a track is determined to be unsafe and remedial action cannot be completed before a meeting is scheduled to commence, the stewards may direct that a meeting be abandoned. This is done in consultation with GRNSW, as the body primarily responsible for track safety. In addition, any safety concerns identified or received by stewards are communicated to GRNSW and to racing club management for resolution.</p> <p>c. The Panel examines every serious and catastrophic injury suffered by a greyhound while racing in order to better understand the underlying causes of racing injuries and to develop and implement preventative measures that will reduce the rate and severity of injuries to racing greyhounds. The Panel's quarterly reports are published on the Commission's <a href="#">website</a>.</p> <p>d. The Commission does not provide compensation to industry participants in the event of greyhound death or injury. The Race Injury Rebate Scheme, which subsidises the cost of treating greyhounds injured during a race, is funded and managed by GRNSW.</p> <p>e. As the Commission does not manage the Race Injury Rebate Scheme, this question should be directed to GRNSW.</p>

Response to questions taken on notice and supplementary questions from the Select Committee's public hearing on 28 May 2021

Supplementary questions received 9 June 2021		Response dated 30 June 2021
20	<p>Parliamentary Friends of Greyhound Racing</p> <p>a. In March 2021, GRNSW instigated the formation of the Parliamentary Friends of Greyhound Racing group at NSW Parliament. Is GWIC involved in this group?</p>	<p>a. No.</p>
21	<p>GWIC Industry Participants Advisory Council (GIPAC)</p> <p>a. Can you provide an overview of the recently instigated Industry Participants Advisory Council (GIPAC)?</p> <p>b. What have been the outcomes from the 5 meetings to date?</p>	<p>a. An overview of GIPAC together with meeting minutes are published on the Commission's <a href="#">website</a>.</p> <p>b. See answer to 21a.</p>
22	<p>Whistleblower policy</p> <p>a. When a whistleblower comes forward to GRNSW with a matter involving allegations relating to animal cruelty, suffering, or neglect, is the issue referred to and dealt with by GWIC?</p> <p>b. Current GRNSW whistleblower policy does not include reporting of matters to the agencies authorised under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, such as RSPCA, AWL, or the NSW police. Why is this not included in the policy?</p>	<p>a. This question should be directed to GRNSW.</p> <p>b. This question should be directed to GRNSW.</p>
23	<p>GRNSW operating licence</p> <p>a. Did GWIC provide any feedback regarding the GRNSW Operating Licence?</p>	<p>a. The Commission had not been established when the Operating Licence was issued to GRNSW on 3 July 2017. During 2020, as part of the statutory review of the <i>Greyhound Racing Act 2017</i>, the Department of Customer Service sought views on the appropriateness of the terms of the Operating Licence. The Commission's response to the review submitted that the licence requires revision to remove duplication of provisions between the Act and the licence; to remove anomalies and drafting inconsistencies; and to strengthen feedback loops in relation to the achievement of licence requirements.</p>
24	<p>Greyhound Racing Act Statutory Review</p> <p>a. Was GWIC invited to provide any feedback regarding the recent statutory review of the Greyhound Racing Act 2017?</p> <p>b. If so, will this be made public?</p>	<p>a. Yes.</p> <p>b. Report on the Statutory Review can be found <a href="#">here</a>.</p>
25	<p>Swabbing and prohibited substances</p> <p>a. The Committee has received a number of submissions from industry participants which argue that GWIC's response to positive swabs is 'heavy-handed' and that no discretion is exercised before punitive action is taken against participants. It has been argued that participants have suffered reputationally and financially in circumstances where they are eventually cleared of wrong-doing. Is GWIC restricted by legislation or other rules from changing its approach to responding to low-level positive swab results - for example, by issuing warnings or by instituting an intermediate investigation before action is taken against the participant?</p> <p>i. If yes, please detail the reasons why.</p> <p>ii. If no, is GWIC considering changing its approach?</p>	<p>a. The Greyhound Racing Rules stipulate that a greyhound must be free of any prohibited substance when presented for racing. For that purpose, the Rules define what constitutes a Prohibited Substance and what constitutes a Permanently Banned Prohibited Substance. Such offences are absolute liability offences – this means that, if a prohibited substance is detected (or is detected above the specified threshold level), the participant is guilty of a 'presentation' offence. This approach is consistent with the regulation of prohibited substances in other greyhound racing jurisdictions, and other codes of racing. Following relevant decisions by the Racing Appeals Tribunal, the Commission's approach to penalties for prohibited substance offences is informed by precedents established by the Tribunal itself and by GRNSW when it was responsible for this function. In 2020, the Commission determined that no charges would be issued against a participant in the absence of both a positive "A" sample and a confirmatory "B" sample. While not required under the Greyhound Racing Rules, this practice affords participants greater protection against the risk</p>

Response to questions taken on notice and supplementary questions from the Select Committee’s public hearing on 28 May 2021

Supplementary questions received 9 June 2021		Response dated 30 June 2021
	<p>b. Has GWIC had any involvement in the process of setting prohibited substances and associated thresholds by Greyhounds Australasia? If not, why not?</p>	<p>of anomalous test results or laboratory error. In addition, the Commission has adopted the practice of issuing a warning notice to a participant whenever a test sample contains a substance that is nearing the threshold.</p> <p>i. See above.</p> <p>ii. The Commission is working towards publishing a penalty guideline which is designed to provide participants with an understanding of the penalty likely to be applied to their circumstances. In the meantime, the Commission and the Tribunal continue to rely on the penalty guideline published by GRNSW in October 2012.</p> <p>b. With the exception of minor amendments in November 2018, the Commission was not involved in the development of the current Greyhounds Australasia (GA) Rules of Racing. These Rules were adopted by GRNSW before the establishment of the Commission. The Commission is represented in the current review of the GA Rules. Specified thresholds for prohibited substances are being considered as part of this review.</p>
<p><b>Questions directed to Mr Alan Brown, Chief Commissioner</b></p>		
1	<p>In announcing on Friday the new policy for putting down greyhounds that are vicious and have bitten children, what checking of local government staff has GWIC undertaken to ensure every Council in NSW has someone qualified to make these judgements?</p>	<p>The Commission has not introduced a “new policy for putting down greyhounds that are vicious and have bitten children”. The Commission’s current Greyhound Rehoming Policy has been in place since 1 December 2019, and the previous Greyhound Rehoming Policy was in place from July 2018.</p>
2	<p>On what basis has GWIC decided that qualified vets in the community can no longer undertake the functions in (1) above?</p>	<p>Not applicable – see 1 above.</p>
3	<p>When Mr Brown said that GWIC was finding it hard to employ vets, is part of the reason the slur Mr Brown has placed on them by telling our Inquiry that that ‘family vets’ in the community are collaborating with greyhound trainers and owners to put down dogs unnecessarily, dogs that aren’t really vicious?</p>	<p>The Chief Commissioner rejects the premise of the question. As context for the Chief Commissioner’s evidence, mainstream media has highlighted a shortage in veterinary practitioners nationwide and some of the difficulties in retaining veterinarians within veterinary practice settings, including the codes of racing.</p>
4	<p>When was the new policy in (1) above decided on and when was it communicated to vets and industry participants in NSW?</p>	<p>Not applicable – see 1 above.</p>
5	<p>Is Mr Brown aware that GWIC staff morale and confidence has plummeted due to the Steve Griffin/Michelle Ledger relationship, giving rise to widespread concerns about favouritism and conflicts of interest? When did Mr Brown first become aware of this problem? What is he doing to resolve it?</p>	<p>The Chief Commissioner rejects the premise of the question. Mr Griffin and Dr Ledger strongly reject any suggestion that there is anything but a functional and professionally appropriate working relationship between them. In addition, no reports have been made to Mr Brown or to the Commission itself about concerns of alleged favouritism and conflicts of interest.</p>
6	<p>Since its formation, according to GWIC travel and accommodation records, which greyhound race meetings and trials have been visited and on which dates by a) Steve Griffin, b) Michelle Ledger and c) Alan Brown?</p>	<p>See Annexure F.</p>
7	<p>Following the experience in employing _____, does GWIC now have a policy of not employing staff who have publicly declared their belief that the greyhound industry should be closed down?</p>	<p>The Committee can be assured that the Commission employs staff in accordance with NSW public sector employment laws and guidelines.</p>

Response to questions taken on notice and supplementary questions from the Select Committee’s public hearing on 28 May 2021

Supplementary questions received 9 June 2021		Response dated 30 June 2021
8	Does Mr Brown believe that Steve Griffin and Michelle Ledger behaved appropriately at the GWIC 2019 Christmas party? What action has he taken with regard to this night?	Mr Brown is unaware of any behavioural concerns at a staff function in December 2019.
9	Can Mr Brown please supply the Committee with the _____ email he referred to in his evidence?	See Annexure G.
10	What internal investigation did GWIC undertake in relation to the matters raised by _____ in (9) above? What involvement did Steve Griffin have in this and what paid leave from GWIC did Griffin take after the internal process began?	The matters raised by _____ in his email of 29 August 2020 were investigated by the Commission which found there was insufficient evidence to support the suspicions expressed by _____. For the sake of clarity, _____ confirmed to the Commission that, by his email, he was not suggesting that any of the Commission’s stewards were involved in any manipulation or “rotting” of races. Mr Griffin assisted in obtaining explanations and clarification from _____ in respect to the matters raised in his email. Mr Griffin took scheduled paid leave from 7 September 2020 to 18 September 2020, the timing of which was unrelated to the investigation of the matters raised by _____ in his email.
11	Does Mr Brown believe that Steve Griffin acted appropriately in Orange on 25 February 2021 in drinking late into the night with an industry participant whose partner is under investigation by GWIC? What staff policy has GWIC implemented in relation to such incidents? What disciplinary measures have been taken against Mr Griffin?	Mr Griffin attended a meeting of executives from peak greyhound racing industry bodies. Mr Griffin made an appropriate record of his attendance at that meeting. Mr Griffin had and continues to have no involvement in any disciplinary action being considered against persons at that meeting or their associates.
12	When did Mr Brown and GWIC first ‘look at an enterprise agreement’ with staff, and why wasn’t the agreement ever progressed?	When the Commission was being established, Mr Brown was advised that As the Commission is a NSW public sector agency, its staff are to be employed under the <i>Government Sector Employment Act 2013</i> and the <i>Crown Employees (Public Service Conditions of Employment) Reviewed Award 2009</i> and related awards which are accessible <a href="#">here</a> .
13	Given low staff morale, multiple conflicts of interest, allegations of nepotism and favouritism, internal dysfunction and GWIC’s reputation for targeting and persecuting outspoken industry participants, does Mr Brown now concede it was a mistake to employ senior staff without greyhound experience, especially a policeman like Mr Griffin and an animal rights activist like Ms Ledger?	The Commission does not accept the imputations in the question. In all other respects, no.
14	What role has Mr Brown taken in overcoming the clear conflict of interest by which the CEO’s son has been shortlisted for casual stewards employment, even though he has no greyhound experience and was previously rejected by the organisation?	Mr Steve Griffin voluntarily declared a conflict of interest after he became aware that his son Mr _____ Griffin applied for appointment as a casual steward with the Commission. That declaration was immediately added to the Commission’s Conflict of Interests Register. The Register records steps that were put in place to mitigate the conflict – these included Mr Griffin senior not being involved in the recruitment process at any stage and, were Mr _____ Griffin to be selected for the role, he not directly reporting to Mr Griffin senior. Before interviews were held as part of the selection process, Mr _____ Griffin withdrew his application.
15	When _____ Griffin previously applied for stewards employment at GWIC in 2020 and was rejected, who ordered a review of that decision and why? What was the outcome of the review and when was it finalised? Can Mr Brown please supply the relevant documents to the inquiry?	No review was undertaken, or required to be undertaken, of that recruitment process.

**Response to questions taken on notice and supplementary questions from the Select Committee's public hearing on 28 May 2021**

Supplementary questions received 9 June 2021		Response dated 30 June 2021
16	Given that Mr Brown acts as the spokesperson for GWIC, clearly involves himself in operational matters and presented to the Committee as a de facto CEO, why is Mr Griffin being employed on \$350,000 pa? Is Mr Griffin's true role that of an assistant to Mr Brown?	The Chief Commissioner rejects the premise of the question. Moreover, this amount is not Mr Griffin's annual remuneration. Under section 7 of the <i>Greyhound Racing Act 2017</i> , Mr Griffin as the Chief Executive Officer is responsible for the day to day management of the affairs of the Commission and for the implementation of the decisions of the Commissioners.
17	On page 35 of the GWIC submission, how many of the owners/trainers/vets who put down the 59 vicious dogs (unsuitable for rehoming) in 2019/20 were charged by GWIC for what they did? If the answer is zero, why then has Mr Ken Burnett been charged for the same process involving vet certification?	At 30 June 2021, one industry participant had been charged for breaching the Greyhound Rehoming Policy insofar as it related to those greyhounds, and one matter remained under active investigation.
18	In (18) above, isn't the charging of Ken Burnett another example of an outspoken industry participant being targeted and persecuted by GWIC, at enormous personal and legal cost to Mr Burnett and his family?	No.
19	Since its inception, how many interim suspensions has GWIC issued before the second swab finding? What are the details?	One. Details are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On 10 December 2019, the Commission imposed an interim suspension on a participant following detection of EPO in the "A" sample taken from the participant's greyhound.</li> <li>Under the Greyhound Racing Rules, EPO is a Permanently Banned Prohibited Substance.</li> <li>The Commission's action was in accordance with the <i>Greyhound Racing Act 2017</i> and the Greyhound Racing Rules.</li> <li>On 10 January 2020, the Commission received the independent laboratory's test results on the "B" sample.</li> <li>As these results could not confirm the presence of EPO, the interim suspension was immediately lifted.</li> </ul>
20	You said a rule of racing is that if a person transfers a dog from an industry participant to a non-participant knowing or having reasonable grounds to believe that that dog will end up being euthanised, then that is an offence and you will take action accordingly. Has this rule and its related follow-up procedures ever resulted in an industry participant being proven to have given a dog away to be euthanised, and if so, how was it successfully proven?	To date, the Commission has not had reason to take disciplinary action against any participant in respect of a breach of clause 8 of the Greyhound Rehoming Policy or Standard 9.4 of the NSW Greyhound Welfare Code of Practice.
<b>Questions directed to Mr Steve Griffin, Chief Executive Officer</b>		
1	Leaving aside that fact that Griffin is your son, how has someone with no greyhound experience and previously rejected by GWIC been shortlisted for a stewards job? What are the qualifications and job specification required for such employment?	Mr Griffin met the requirements of the role and, although offered an interview, he withdrew his application before interviews were held. The fact that he was rejected in 2020 for a temporary steward role with the Commission had no bearing on this latest recruitment action. Under NSW public sector recruitment processes, each applicant is assessed on their merits at the time of application and interview, and in direct comparison with other candidates. <p>Essential requirements for the role (from which Mr Griffin junior withdrew) were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Certificate III in Racing Services (Steward) or willingness to obtain this qualification</li> <li>Demonstrated experience as a racing official, or relevant regulatory experience</li> <li>Disclosure of any conflicts of interest</li> </ul>

Response to questions taken on notice and supplementary questions from the Select Committee's public hearing on 28 May 2021

Supplementary questions received 9 June 2021		Response dated 30 June 2021
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current NSW Class C Driver Licence</li> <li>• Willingness to travel and work rosters outside normal business hours.</li> </ul>
<i>Based on GWIC's annual reports and disclosure logs</i>		
2	In Table 3 on page 30 of GWIC's 2019-2020 annual report, 7744 or 51.2% of greyhounds are categorised as "sold, rehomed, exported or died before 1 July 2018". When broken down into sub-categories, how many dogs belong to each (sold, rehomed, exported, or died), and what causes of death does "died" constitute?	<p>After the publication of the Commission's 2019-20 annual report, the Commission continued work to update the location and status of registered greyhounds. As a result, the figure of 7,744 greyhounds sold, rehomed, exported or died before 1 July 2018 cited in the annual report was updated to 7,518. Of these 7,518 greyhounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2,412 were reported to have died prior to 1 July 2018</li> <li>• 270 were reported as exported prior to 1 July 2018</li> <li>• 4,836 were reported as sold or rehomed prior to 1 July 2018.</li> </ul>
3	In Table 3 on page 30 of GWIC's 2019-2020 annual report, 698 or 4.6% of greyhounds are categorised as "sold, rehomed, exported or died after 30 June 2018". When broken down into sub-categories, how many dogs belong to each (sold, rehomed, exported, or died), and what causes of death does "died" constitute?	<p>After the publication of the Commission's 2019-20 annual report, the Commission continued work to update the location and status of registered greyhounds. As a result, the figure of 698 greyhounds sold, rehomed, exported or died after 20 June 2018 cited in the annual report was updated to 681. Of these 681 greyhounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 250 were reported to have died after 30 June 2018</li> <li>• 431 were reported to have been sold or rehomed after 30 June 2018</li> <li>• None were reported to have been exported after 30 June 2018.</li> </ul>
4	In Table 3 on page 30 of GWIC's 2019-2020 annual report, 3028 or 20% of dogs are listed as "incorrect or no contact details on file, did not respond to repeated requests for information, or had died". When broken down into sub categories, how many dogs fall into each category, and what further efforts have been made to relocate the untraceable dogs?	<p>After the publication of the Commission's 2019-20 annual report, the Commission continued work to update the location and status of registered greyhounds. As a result, the figure of 3,028 greyhounds – where incorrect or no contact details for owners were on file, owners did not respond to repeated requests for information, or owners had died – cited in the annual report was updated to 2,306. Of these 2,306 greyhounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 647 greyhounds had a recorded owner with incorrect or no contact details on file</li> <li>• 1,403 greyhounds had a recorded owner who did not respond to repeated requests for information</li> <li>• 256 greyhounds had a recorded owner who had died.</li> </ul>
5	In Table 3 on page 30 of GWIC's 2019-2020 annual report, an "estimate" of 15,118 is given for the number of greyhounds in the industry, yet in Figure 11, section 41, page 43, the estimated industry greyhound population is listed as 20,168. What accounts for the discrepancy of 5050 dogs?	<p>Table 3 on page 30 of the Commission's 2019-20 annual report does not give an estimate of the number of greyhounds in the industry. As explained on page 29 of the annual report, the figure of 15,118 is the number of greyhounds which were less than 10 years old and which had not appeared in a participant's interactions with the Commission since 1 July 2018. The custodians of these 15,118 greyhounds were contacted as part of the Greyhound Register Reconciliation Program described on page 29, in order to determine each greyhound's status. Only those greyhounds in the custody of a registered greyhound participant were included in the population estimate of 20,168.</p>
6	In Figure 11, section 41, page 43 of GWIC's 2019-2020 annual report, 5986 dogs are listed as being "post-racing". Where are these 5986 dogs today?	<p>The post-racing greyhounds referred to in Figure 11 were in the custody of registered industry participants as at 18 October 2020 and will remain in the greyhound industry unless rehomed outside the industry, transferred interstate or overseas, or are deceased.</p>

Response to questions taken on notice and supplementary questions from the Select Committee's public hearing on 28 May 2021

Supplementary questions received 9 June 2021		Response dated 30 June 2021
7	In Table 8, section 45, page 47 of GWIC's 2019-2020 annual report, 27% of retired dogs are reported as going to a rescue organisation, with just 18% being rehomed through GWIC's Greyhounds as Pets program. What is the reason more dogs aren't rehomed by Greyhounds as Pets?	The Greyhounds As Pets (GAP) program is managed by GRNSW which, under the <i>Greyhound Racing Act 2017</i> , has functional responsibility for management of greyhound adoption programs. Questions regarding the GAP Program should therefore be directed to GRNSW.
8	In Table 9, section 46, page 47 of GWIC's 2019-2020 annual report, 685 dogs are recorded as dying off the racetracks during 2019-2020. How many dogs died on the racetrack and how does this compare to the 97 that were euthanised or died suddenly due to racing injuries in 2018-2019 (Table 7, section 40, page 43 of GWIC's 2018-2019 annual report)?	As stated in Table 7, section 44, page 46 of the Commission's 2019-20 annual report, 52 greyhounds were euthanised after a catastrophic injury or died suddenly at racetracks in 2019-20. This was 45 fewer than in 2018-19.
9	In Table 9, section 46, page 47 of GWIC's 2019-2020 annual report, 685 dogs are recorded as dying off the racetracks during 2019-2020, with 32% dying without medical assistance. What factors cause this to occur and what is GWIC doing to ensure every dog gets medical assistance when required?	Under clause 10 of the <i>Greyhound Racing Regulation 2019</i> , each greyhound death must be reported to the Commission within two days. For example, participants will notify the Commission of greyhounds found deceased in their kennels. The reasons may include illness (suspected twisted bowel or suspected gastric torsion), old age, heart failure/sudden death; snakebite or other envenomation; or accidents or misadventure resulting in loss of life (e.g. fractured neck from running into to a fence post).  The NSW Greyhound Code of Practice Standard 3.3 makes veterinary care mandatory, where necessary. To that end, the Commission has published an Industry Practice Guide (IPG 3 – When to Take your Greyhound to The Vet?) which provides additional guidance for participants as to when veterinary care should be sought. In addition, the Commission publishes fact sheets from time to time.
10	Why do GWIC's Disclosure Logs use a different time frame to its annual reports (July to March (disclosure log for the period of 1 July 2018 to 19 March 2019 published on 16 April 2019; 20 disclosure log for the period of 20 March 2019 to 31 July 2019 published on 14 October 2019; annual reports use conventional Financial Year time frame), and given these documents contain information about the number of dogs that were retired, rehomed or euthanised, why don't they cover the same time-frames to ensure the documents can be cross-checked for consistency and transparency?	These publications have different purposes. The purpose of the Disclosure Log is to provide a public record of the Commission's response to requests for information received under the <i>Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009</i> (GIPA), whereas the purpose of the Commission's annual report is to report on the Commission's activities in accordance with the <i>Annual Reports (Departments) Act 1985</i> . The information published in the Disclosure Log was produced in response to specific questions received via GIPA requests, and reflects the timeframes referred to in the relevant request.
11	Why does GWIC's 2017-2018 annual report not cover injuries and deaths of greyhounds on or off the track?	Injury reporting before 1 July 2018, when the Commission commenced operations, was the responsibility of GRNSW.
12	Why has GWIC not published its 20 December 2018 Disclosure Log, and can GWIC provide a copy to the committee?	The 20 December 2018 Disclosure Log contained information that may identify individual participants, and publication was therefore inappropriate. See Annexure H for a redacted version of this document.
13	GWIC's whole-of-life eTracking program will be implemented in the second half of 2021 with annual sighting, scanning and accounting for greyhounds. Will the reporting on this annual tracking be made public and if not, why?	Yes, the results of the Commission's annual reconciliation of greyhounds on its register will be published.
14	GWIC's arsenic threshold is 800ng/ml, with samples taken of dogs at race days and at kennels. Given 77 positive results were returned last year (Figure 2, 2019-2020 annual	77 swabbing results tested positive for prohibited substances in 2019-20. Of these, arsenic was present at a level above 800 ng/ml in 4 swabs. Disciplinary action was taken against the

Response to questions taken on notice and supplementary questions from the Select Committee's public hearing on 28 May 2021

Supplementary questions received 9 June 2021		Response dated 30 June 2021
	report, page 9), why was no further information provided about the health of these dogs and the disciplinary action faced by the relevant owner/ trainer?	participant in each case. Full details of all disciplinary decisions are published on the Commission's <a href="#">website</a> .
<i>Based on GWIC's submission to the inquiry</i>		
15	On page 8 of your submission you say your Swabbing Policy is a "key welfare and integrity strategy". Beyond publishing the number of drug infringements detected, do you publish the anonymised details and results of your swabbing activities – such as what substances are found and the disciplinary action that followed – and if not, why not?	At a summary level, the Commission outlines outcomes of the swabbing program in its annual reports, which are available on the Commission's website. Information relating to positive swab samples that confirm the presence of a prohibited substance is published as part of relevant <a href="#">disciplinary action decisions</a> (this includes the level of the relevant prohibited substance detected).
16	On page 9 of your submission, you state that the Commission "places importance on people who are knowledgeable about the greyhound racing industry". In her hearing, former GWIC Chief Steward stated that she was the "the only one with greyhound experience" in the Bathurst office. When hiring for positions within GWIC, how important has it been to GWIC that staff have greyhound experience, and do you think the Bathurst office was ever incompetent when it came to an understanding of greyhound behaviour and wellbeing, and why/why not?	Mr Griffin rejects the claim by Ms Thorsby, who resided in northern NSW, that she was located "in the Bathurst office". Moreover, from its inception in July 2018, the Commission employed or otherwise engaged stewards and veterinary practitioners who previously worked for GRNSW and therefore brought with them valuable knowledge and experience about greyhound racing.
17	On page 10 of your submission you state the Commission conducts "programmed visits to kennels maintained by greyhound participants". Are kennel operators always aware of an upcoming inspection and if so, how much notice are they given, and do you feel it would increase industry transparency if visits were not pre-announced?	Kennel inspections may be either announced or unannounced depending on the nature and purpose of the inspection. It is customary for the Commission to announce an inspection if the purpose is a routine examination of kennels, associated with a registration-related application, the construction of new kennels. In these situations, an inspector will contact the industry participant 24 to 48 hours prior to the proposed inspection and arrange to visit at a mutually convenient date and time. Targeted, intelligence-led inspections and inspections arising from a positive swab and out-of-competition swab testing, are usually unannounced. Whilst unannounced inspections do occur in certain situations there are also efficiencies in pre-announcing or scheduling low-risk inspections in advance so that the attendance of the participant can be assured, and the inspection can progress.
18	On page 23 of your submission, you state that in 2019-2020 \$2.5 million was spent on compliance and enforcement, including inspections, investigations, disciplinary and life cycle tracking. Can you specify how many inspectors GWIC employed in 2019-2020 and how many FTE (hours) were spent on compliance and enforcement, and what percentage of this was made up by the 1,008 initial inspections conducted in this time period?	The Commission employed eight inspectors, three investigators and one intelligence analyst in 2019-20. There were approximately 20,500 FTE hours spent on compliance and enforcement functions in 2019-20. Approximately 65% of these FTE hours relate to those staff associated with kennel inspections. The volume of inspections in 2019-20 was heavily impacted by COVID-19 restrictions, with only 261 initial inspections being completed. The 1,008 initial inspections referred to in the question appears to comprise the 747 initial inspections undertaken in 2018-19 plus the 261 inspections undertaken in 2019-20.
19	On page 25 of your submission, you state that the whole-of-life tracking begins in the pre-race training phase when pups are between 12-18 months of age, with statistics about whelped pups and raced pups following on pages 26-29. If pups are not tracked via whole-of-life tracking until they reach 12 months of each, can you explain where and how GWIC confirms the number of pups whelped (page 28)?	Under clause 10 of the <i>Greyhound Racing Regulation 2019</i> , every participant who owns or keeps a greyhound must provide information to the Commission for whole-of-life tracking purposes. Specified events include when a greyhound is serviced, when a greyhound is whelped, when a greyhound changes ownership, and when a greyhound dies.



Response to questions taken on notice and supplementary questions from the Select Committee's public hearing on 28 May 2021

Supplementary questions received 9 June 2021		Response dated 30 June 2021
		<p>The Commission monitors notified services and, after the 63-day gestation period, checks to ensure that the requisite whelping notice is received. If not received (including if no pups are whelped), the Commission undertakes follow-up action with the participant responsible. Under Rule 137(2) of the Greyhound Racing Rules, a litter cannot be moved unless approved by the Commission. Between week 6 and week 8, each pup in the litter must be vaccinated and again vaccinated between week 10 and week 16.</p> <p>By week 12, each pup must be registered with the Commission and recorded on the Greyhound Register. Between the two vaccinations, Commission staff attend the kennelling property and complete earmarking and microchipping of each pup. Each pup is physically inspected and the physical markings, with the new identifiers, are recorded and added to the Register. Any gaps in the 'chain of custody' are identified and followed-up.</p> <p>From this point, all pups have unique identifiers and can be monitored as they are transferred from participant to participant within the industry.</p>
20	On pages 27-29 of your submission, you state 3,935 pups were whelped in NSW and that 74% of these pups went on to race. Can you confirm the whereabouts of the remaining 1,023 pups (26% of pups whelped) that did not race, and how they were tracked given they were presumably too young to enter the whole-of-life tracking program?	<p>The Commission was notified of the whelping of 3,935 pups in 2019-20 but the figure of 74% does not apply to those pups. Some of the pups whelped in the 2019-20 financial year are too young to race at this time, and a figure on how many have raced at this time does not indicate how many will go on to race in the future.</p> <p>The figure of 74% in the Commission's submission applies to pups born in the 2016-17 and 2017-18 financial years. As this was prior to the commencement of the Commission, the Commission's whole-of-life tracking program could not be applied to those pups.</p>
21	On page 30 of your submission, you state that our race injury numbers do not include those injuries which require no stand down period from racing. To your best estimate, how many dogs (rate per starts) are injured when racing but do not require a stand down period?	<p>In the five years of data available to the Commission, the quarterly rate of injuries requiring no stand-down period has ranged from 2.1 per 1,000 starts to 6.7 per 1,000 starts, with an average over 21 quarters of 4 per 1,000 starts.</p>
22	On page 35 of your submission, you state that 6% of euthanised dogs in the 2019-2020 period were euthanised at the owner's request after rehoming attempts failed. What is your policy in situations such as these – is GWIC obligated to find a new home for greyhounds when the owner wants to euthanise them, and at which point does GWIC concede to euthanise?	<p>On 1 December 2019, the Commission released a strengthened Greyhound Rehoming Policy which outlines the responsibility of greyhound owners in relation to the rehoming of greyhounds at the end of their racing careers.</p> <p>Where a greyhound is to be rehomed, an owner must make genuine attempts to rehome the greyhound that the owner does not wish to retain. The owner must seek the greyhound's admission to the Greyhounds As Pets (GAP) program. If the greyhound is not admitted to the GAP program, the owner must then seek to rehome the greyhound through at least one other pet rescue or rehoming organisation; or seek the greyhound's admission to the GAP program a second time.</p> <p>If the greyhound is not successfully admitted to rehoming programs, the owner, after complying with the requirements of the Policy, may have the greyhound euthanased. If this action is to be taken, the owner must submit a Notice of Intent to Euthanase at least 10 business days prior to</p>

Response to questions taken on notice and supplementary questions from the Select Committee's public hearing on 28 May 2021

Supplementary questions received 9 June 2021		Response dated 30 June 2021
		<p>this action being taken. Commission staff assess these notifications as a priority and intervene if the Policy has not been adhered to.</p> <p>Any non-compliance with the Policy is escalated for an intervention. Where necessary, Commission staff will contact the veterinarian and owner to advise that the proposed action is not approved.</p> <p>While there is no obligation for the Commission to find a new home for greyhounds when they have not been admitted by rehoming organisations, the Commission strongly encourages an owner to explore all feasible rehoming options.</p> <p>If all requirements of the Greyhound Rehoming Policy have been met and the Notice of Intent to Euthanase has been completed correctly, then the Commission will make a record of the outcome and update the greyhound register.</p>
23	<p>On page 35 of your submission, you state that 13% of euthanised dogs in the 2019-2020 period were euthanised after a private veterinarian certified that the greyhound was behaviourally unsuitable for rehoming (typically aggressive). Are these certifications by private vets written and recorded? What circumstances are the dogs typically displaying unsuitable behaviour when assessed by a vet? What is your policy in situations such as these – is the “unsuitable” dog required to go into temporary care away from their track-life for a particular amount of time before assessment and a final call on euthanasia is made, or can the dog be assessed at any time, including while they are still engaged in the industry, and at which point does GWIC concede to euthanise?</p>	<p>Prior to the introduction of the Greyhound Rehoming Policy on 1 December 2019, the Euthanasia of a Greyhound notification form required a veterinarian to provide information that a greyhound was humanely euthanased at the owner's request and provide the reason for the action. The veterinarian would then provide the date of euthanasia, the date of certification of the reason for euthanasia and sign the form. Of the 59 reported in 2019-20, 48 were prior to the Policy that took effect on 1 December 2019. Aggressive behaviour was the typical behaviour identified by the vets and this included aggressive actions towards other animals and attacks on owners. The Policy now in force requires a 30-day wind down period from the last day of racing before making attempts to rehome a greyhound.</p>
Questions directed to Dr Michelle Ledger, Director Animal Welfare (and Chief Veterinary Officer)		
1	<p>In a teleconference organised by GWIC, did Ms Ledger recommend that there was no need to vet every dog that fell in a race? Was this opposed by stewards? What is the GWIC policy today?</p>	<p>Dr Ledger has always maintained that falls occurring during a race require a mandatory veterinary examination. This approach is supported and practised by the Commission's stewards.</p>
2	<p>You spoke about the need for veterinarians employed by GWIC to have specialist greyhound knowledge, and agreed it is incumbent on GWIC to provide this training to vets. You later said a new two-module course will be launched by GWIC in the near future.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When did it become apparent to GWIC that your vets need more specialist greyhound knowledge?</li> <li>When did GWIC make the decision to develop this course?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Commission has always provided comprehensive training material for OTVs, including annual continuing professional development opportunities i.e. attendance the annual conference for greyhound veterinarians which is conducted by the Australian Veterinary Association (AVA); and specialist courses in sporting and working dog rehabilitation and treatment.</li> <li>A practical course was developed in collaboration with GRV and was planned for a March 2020 attendance in Melbourne. COVID lockdown interrupted that course on the day OTVs were due to attend. All of the Commission's OTVs attended the AVA Greyhound Vets conference in October 2020 instead and the course was postponed. Further, the OTV's attended a training day in prohibited substance detection and expert evidence in December 2020. GRV has in the meantime recorded those courses and planned release of an online course. In addition, the Commission in November 2020 engaged experienced greyhound</li> </ol>

Response to questions taken on notice and supplementary questions from the Select Committee’s public hearing on 28 May 2021

Supplementary questions received 9 June 2021		Response dated 30 June 2021
		veterinarian Dr John Newell to run a NSW practical training course in November 2020. The Commission agreed on a course framework with Dr Newell in December 2020. Ethics approval for the use of animals in teaching was granted in May 2021 for a two-year period. It is currently proposed that this course be delivered in August 2021.
3	With regard to the dog severed in half at The Gardens, can you clarify what a webbing injury is?	Dr Ledger rejects the premise in the first part of the question. In relation to the second part of the question, a webbing injury is a laceration to the webbing between the paw pads and individual toes of a greyhound (i.e. webbed feet). This injury can range from minor to severe (requiring surgery). More information can be found <a href="#">here</a> .
4	With regard to the dog severed in half at The Gardens, you said the vet mistakenly made the decision to suture the wound at the trainer’s request. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Would you say this was a case of a vet being pressured by a trainer to conduct post-accident treatment in a particular way?</li> <li>b. Are you aware of any other incidents where vets have been influenced by trainers or other industry stakeholders how they treat sick or injured greyhounds?</li> </ul>	Dr Ledger rejects the premise at the start of the question. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. No. The OTV attended the greyhound immediately via the emergency response vehicle provided. The greyhound was bleeding from severe lacerations sustained when the greyhound contacted the lure cable at a turn. The OTV could not at that point confirm whether the greyhound had sustained a spinal injury. He decided not to immediately move the greyhound to the veterinary facility on track, as is usual procedure, without pain relief and sedation. He returned to the veterinary room to get his bag of medications and bandages, and promptly returned to attend to the greyhound. The trainer did not discuss euthanasia or treatment with the OTV at that point but was reported as being eager to see his very promising greyhound provided every chance of recovery.</li> <li>b. One only, regarding the suture of a webbing injury at Richmond. In this instance, the OTV at Richmond was asked by a trainer to treat a split webbing without pain relief or sedation. This was against her better judgment, and she acknowledged her error in hindsight. She is no longer employed by the Commission. The Commission’s published principles in the treatment of serious injuries and euthanasia outline the <a href="#">decision-making process</a> which OTVs undertake when considering on-track injuries.</li> </ul>
5	You stated that catastrophic injuries have dropped from 7 per cent of all injuries in 2018 down now to about 2 per cent, and cited a major contributing factor being that funds are now available to industry participants to pay for veterinary services, leading to fewer cases of euthanasia. Then is it the case that many of the injuries that were called catastrophic injuries weren’t in the true meaning of the word ‘catastrophic’ because now there are funds or an incentive to treat the animal, and therefore euthanasia was previously over-prescribed?	The Commission developed guidelines for the treatment of serious injuries and euthanasia in 2019 to assist OTVs in their decisions and improve consistency in decision-making when treating injuries at the track, which included improving the rehabilitation prospects of injured greyhounds. OTVs began declining euthanasia and insisting on referral for x-ray and further treatment, unless greyhounds were severely injured and fell within the guidelines for immediate euthanasia. The NSW Greyhound Welfare Code of Practice mandates that directions of veterinarians, to seek further treatment or diagnostics, must be followed by industry participants (Standard 3.4).  GRNSW’s Injury Rebate Scheme allows for participants to cover veterinary costs associated with additional diagnostics and pursuit of treatment options for seriously injured greyhounds.

Response to questions taken on notice and supplementary questions from the Select Committee’s public hearing on 28 May 2021

Additional supplementary question received 18 June 2021		Response due 9 July 2021
1	Since the inception of GWIC what work/projects has Mr Peter Davis completed for GWIC, how much was paid for each project and how was each project instigated?	In February 2020, the Commission entered into a Consultancy Services Contract with Mr Davis to provide advisory services to the Commission. This included providing briefings to the Commission’s staff to rapidly upskill the knowledge base on the broad operation of the greyhound industry and assist in agreed policy development projects, by assessing likely impacts of proposed policy positions and contributing to the development of industry change management strategies. As at 30 June 2021, Mr Davis had completed eight projects for the Commission under this contract for which he was paid fees totalling _____ (inclusive of GST).

GW20/162/2; GWDOC21/101273