

From: Mary-Ellen Fogarty <Mary-Ellen.Fogarty@treasury.govt.nz>  
To: 'Mark Neeson' <neesonm@maf.govt.nz>  
Date: 27/11/2000 13:22:00  
Subject: RE: Proposed FIN paper on animal welfare

54

Hi Mark,

GD/58/0/3

Our overall advice is that you do not send this paper to Cabinet. If you chose to, we will recommend that the paper be deferred in order for the Minister of Agriculture to work through the costs, benefits, legal and policy implications/risks of establishing a third animal welfare "umbrella organisation" and refer back to the Committee by 30 March 2001.

The following sets out our reasons for not endorsing the paper as it currently stands.

The paper has not clearly argued what the benefits and costs (economic, social, fiscal) of approving AWINZ are and why these benefits outweigh the costs.

We understand that the Local Government review is looking at making the Local Government Act less prescriptive which may allow them to get involved in a wider range of activities. However, this will only be possible if they have a mandate from the community and the proper accountability regimes in place. We therefore recommend waiting until such time as the review of the Act is complete.

We are unsure why the Minister is seeking Cabinet's approval for it is in his powers to do this without their endorsement. If it just for the purposes of letting them know in case there is political fall-out then this should be stated up-front.

Para 21: We think you may have missed something out as the last sentence just reads "compliance cost statement."

Para 22: We recommend that you state the fact that the application will be approved initially in principle, pending completion of establishing performance and technical standards, earlier in the paper. You may wish to expand on the reasons why you have included the International League for the Protection of Horses in para 22.

Regards  
Mary-Ellen