

mailto:/C%7C/Program%2...cybernet.co.nz&number=0

mailto:/C%7C/Program%20Files/Netsc...939F61.3B54@cybernet.co.nz&number=

**Subject:** INSPECTOR TRAINING  
**Date:** Tue, 03 Jun 1997 17:36:49 +1300  
**From:** Neil Wells <newells@cybernet.co.nz>  
**Organization:** N E Wells & Associates  
**To:** David Bayvel <bayveld@ra.maf.govt.nz>  
**CC:** Catherine Smith <2smiths@wave.co.nz>

No Contact  
SPCA vs IA  
RE  
Vulner  
Trust

David

Thanks for spending the time with me on Friday morning discussing the territorial authority programme.

I have had the weekend to think things through I have come up with these rambling thoughts.

The solution has to be a win-win for all concerned. I include in this MAFRA, MQM, RNZSPCA, TAs and NZVA (and me). I don't think the NZVA can be excluded as there is an NZVA interest in non-government veterinarians becoming warranted in a range of fields including animal welfare.

The situation as I see it is that there was originally opposition to the programme by MQM (as indicated when we saw Lockwood Smith prior to the election) and at that stage that was the only impediment. The Catherine Petrey factor post-dates the Ministerial meeting although it was always in the background.

MQM has got together with Waitakere City and, as I understand it, are now satisfied that the TA programme does not represent any threat.

There was also a problem with Bob Kerridge, but he too has conceded that there is no problem with the Waitakere programme but he would not like to see it extended. This last comment is probably no more than a feeble last ditch stand.

I don't really know what RNZSPCA's position is and where Peg is coming from but I understand there was some perception that it would be a threat to their manor. They may still have this perception but as far as I am aware they have been unable to come up with anything that would substantiate this.

I do know that Peg is fiercely defending Andy Waters ability to train Inspectors. This is probably not fair to Andy as he does not have the skills that Peg purports that he has. To get to the reality of this just survey SPCA Inspectors and find out what they think.

Andy is still using material that I wrote 1978-1980. While it served the purpose then it is totally inadequate in 1997. A case in point is that one of the 8 assignments deals with wild cat strikes at freezing works. That was topical in the 1980s. It is irrelevant today. There is nothing in the RNZSPCA training about the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act or the Dog Control Act.

Andy

NS

mailto:/C%7C/Program%2...cybernet.co.nz&amp;number=0

mailto:/C%7C/Program%20Files/Netsc...939F61.3B54@cybernet.co.nz&amp;number=

Catherine's comments about the standard of inspectors attending the Hamilton workshop I think reflects the low standard of training. The PSTO unit standards will address this but there still needs to be a means of delivering the training. MQM might be able to do it - I don't know --- but I think there would be some resistance in the local SPCAs if the training leaned heavily into a livestock officer's work.

It's not for me to blow my own horn -- but I think my qualifications, prosecuting experience and skills in teaching speak for themselves. I have skills that could benefit RNZSPCA, MQM, TAs and even the NZVA.

The way I see it is that each branch, i.e. RNZSPCA, MQM, NZVA and TAs, should be seen as synergistic. Each has a role to play and there is not, nor should there be, any sense of competition or threat to each other's territory.

As I indicated to you I don't know why MQM should see me was competition but they obviously still have this perception (hence their pre-emptive letter to Councils offering training).

My interest in this whole area is a desire to see animal welfare enforcement carried out in an efficient and cost-effective manner but in such a way that one agency does not tread on the toes of another.

The Waitakere programme I think has shown that there is a need for animal welfare enforcement to play a role in local animal control and welfare without there being any clash with other agencies. In other words it is enhancing animal welfare awareness.

My skills are in training and setting up the systems. I do not want to set up an organisation myself that would need to be accredited by NZQA - it is just too onerous. That's why I took the idea to UNITEC. I think once RNZSPCA realise the implications of NZQA accreditation they too will see it as arduous.

I can't compete with MQM and I do not have the stomach for a fight but there doesn't need to be one.

The animal welfare compliance field is too small for there to be three competing agencies wanting to do the training. Here I am referring to MQM, RNZSPCA and UNITEC.

What I am coming to is that the training could all be unified under UNITEC by pulling in MQM, RNZSPCA and my skills and achieving a cost effective training programme that meets the needs of all 3 organisations. It was always UNITEC's intention to establish an on-site and workplace training course first, and then develop a long distance package (correspondence). That could serve the needs of all.

The UNITEC course might have been cost effective if it catered to TAs only but it would have been marginal. If RNZSPCA tries to set itself up as a private training provider it might find it is not cost effective.

mailto:/C:/Program%2...cybernet.co.nz&amp;number=0

mailto:/C:/Program%20Files/Netac...939F61.3B54@cybernet.co.nz&amp;number=

They will have their hands full setting up a workplace assessment scheme just to bring their existing Inspectors up to standard without setting up a PTE as well. Peter Blomkamp is the first to say they do not have the resources or the people that can do it.

It was UNITEC's intention to engage me as the course co-ordinator but there would still need to be a range of tutors (veterinarians, senior SPCA Inspectors, and even MQM livestock officers) as well as me.

About one-third of the training will be in animal care and handling. RNZSPCA will not be able to deliver that training internally and possibly MQM might not be able to either, unless they use their own vets who are not trained teachers.

It might well be found that the most cost-effective means of delivering training to the National Certificate is to unite under UNITEC which is their core business.

I think the remedy might be in mediation. You, I think, are in the best position to mediate.

Some Kissinger strategies might be called for and/or a summit meeting between all.

As an aside I received this message today from Judy Nicholson, who is the Head of Department at UNITEC.

"Dear Neil,

Let's think positively and go ahead - just so long as you understand that we may have to 'pull the plug' at the last minute if there are not enough enrolments.

Diane has done a great job and I am sure that there is the potential there. Now we just need to be optimistic.

I have office space identified for you. Now I just need to find a computer.

Judy"

I have not replied but obviously I need to be honest and tell her soon that without the TA policy it is pointless in trying to launch anything this year. Any thoughts on how this should be approached?

I warned you that these thoughts are rambling and they live up to that prediction.

I have copied this to Catherine as I would appreciate her input as well.

I will be working from home tomorrow.