

Page 40 Legislative Council

Please. Could you also take on notice how does an inspector—as to the Chair's questioning earlier—without any formal training, who's sent out by themselves, decide what an appropriate jurisdiction is? AMANDA GRAY: Yes, I can take that on notice.

Our inspectors can always reach out to the Chief Inspector, Inspector manager and other experienced inspectors for guidance about our jurisdictions and powers.

When inspectors are commencing their induction period, they begin by researching POCTAA- relevant laws and regulations regarding animal welfare legislation at a state level. Understanding the legal framework helps in determining the appropriate jurisdiction. Trainees also shadow experienced inspectors in the field so they can learn to assess and prioritise what elements constitute a POCTA issue versus a council (Companion Animals Act) issue.

In cases where there's ambiguity or confusion regarding jurisdiction, it is first essential for the inspector to prioritize the welfare of the animals involved and take appropriate action to ensure their safety and well-being. Then we can decide in what jurisdiction the issue resides.

Do you suggest, then, that there's no lack of clarity on jurisdictional responsibilities between those many agencies that are involved? STEPHEN ALBIN: There can be. The Hon. PETER PRIMROSE: Are there, or are there not? STEPHEN ALBIN: Yes, there are. The Hon. PETER PRIMROSE: Can you elaborate on that? - STEPHEN ALBIN: Yes. You've got the Companion Animals Act and you've got POCTAA. Just those two Acts alone create confusion in terms of regulation and who does what, when. I think we spoke about that earlier— The Hon. PETER PRIMROSE: Yes. STEPHEN ALBIN: —with regards to the rangers and the inspectorate. Areas like that do cause confusion. Do you have any other examples, Amanda? AMANDA GRAY: That's the only example I can use for now, but I can take it on notice.

As with the CAA and POCTAA crossover example above, another example I've experienced in terms of confusion around regulations and jurisdictional responsibilities is when Police enact their powers under POCTAA. Where a person has been arrested and is in prison, animals are often seized by police. If there are cruelty issues present, police will contact Inspectors and ask about next steps in how to charge the individual. If evidence has not been collected and the correct process has not been followed, cruelty charges can be dismissed. In sensitive cases such as bestiality, police officers will often contact us as to who is prosecuting. While we will care for the animal and provide the veterinary treatment and the relevant documentation with the custody of that animal, police must charge the Person of Interest under the Crimes Act and we often need to advise them of that.

Page 41

The last question I want to ask is something you actually said in response to one of my questions. Of course, it was hypothetical, but I was talking about a horse that was shot in a

national park and you said that you haven't been consulted on the brumbies. Had it been the circumstance that instead of the RSPCA being consulted around the SOPs for aerial culling, and let's assume it was the Animal Welfare League that might have been tasked with reviewing the SOPs, what circumstances do you think you might have insisted on, or employed, or in fact would you have at all approved or given feedback on concerning those SOPs? AMANDA GRAY: I'd have to take it on notice because I'm not an expert in the field of the culling of wild animals, so I would have to take that on notice and get back to you about that.

I am not aware of what was within the SOPs so it's difficult to comment with specific regard to these documents.

However, I would communicate our expectation that any organisation dealing with animals upholds the humane treatment of those animals within the boundaries of POCTAA regulations.

I would request the organisation to conduct and assess feasibility and effectiveness of alternatives for ongoing population management (contraceptives/sterilization).

As a welfare organisation with an inspectorate attached to it, we often must euthanise animals for behavioural and medical reasons. Inspectors will assist to alleviate suffering of animals, especially in natural disasters where we will often need to humanely destroy wild animals or livestock who are suffering and beyond veterinary treatment.

It is not our role to decide on whether animals should be culled for reasons such as environmental damage – in fact our governing regulations do not provide allowances for such situations.

In this instance, if it has been confirmed by the correct governing bodies that indeed the brumbies needed to be killed and population could not be controlled by other methods then our responsibility as an animal welfare organisation is to ensure that humane conditions are clearly outlined and upheld. It MUST meet the conditions of 1) as humane as possible (with death being instantaneous) 2) confirmation of humane death by veterinarians. 3) Recording of each animal culled.

We are not experts in the aerial culling of wild animals – it is a very particular and technical situation that would have intricacies that would need to be guided by experts. Hence, for me to be satisfied that SOPs would achieve the conditions of humane killing as set out above I would need to see attached to those SOPs confirmation from relevant experts in the field of aerial shooting/culling, stating that the SOPs represent the best way of meeting the mentioned conditions within the various possible scenarios that may arise. Again, it is our role as an animal welfare organisation to ensure that standards of humane treatment are clear and upheld, and it is the role of the requesting organisation to go to every effort to ENSURE they are certain they can meet those conditions.