



Systems Audit Team

FINAL REPORT

Audit Report

Annual audit of RNZSPCA

National Office and Selected Regional Centres

April - May 2017

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Summary

Under the Animal Welfare Act 1999 (the Act), Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI) must carry out audits of RNZSPCA (SPCA) as an approved organisation for the purpose of this Act. The Director General sets terms of reference for audits of approved organisations in order to assess; the organisation's compliance with animal welfare law; compliance with any memorandum of understanding established between the Ministry and the organisation; compliance by an organisation and its Inspectors and auxiliary officers with any relevant performance and technical standards for inspectors and auxiliary officers, and the inspectors and auxiliary officers exercising of any power, and the carrying out of any functions or duties.

This audit focused on the RNZSPCA National Office in Auckland (the National Office) and five Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals centres (SPCA Centres).

The main finding of this audit is that within the terms of reference the RNZSPCA remains in substantial compliance with requirements of the Act, Memorandum of Understanding between the RNZSPCA and MAF 2010 (MoU), and the Performance and Technical Standards for Inspectors and Auxiliary Officers (PTS). The auditor has raised one MPI Issue for failing to provide feedback on the progress of investigation of complaints transferred from SPCA. This is non-compliant with the MoU, Section 72.

The National Office and regional SPCA Centres effectively implemented the majority of the recommendations made by SAT auditors in the last two years. The National Office and MPI postponed the implementation of two recommendations; to review the MoU and PTS due to a planned restructure of the RNZSPCA in 2017. The National Office has not yet implemented the recommendation to establish an internal audit but has a strategy to implement it once the new structure is in place. The National Office has reviewed its complaints process against inspectors and auxiliary officers but the audit showed that two Centres' staff were still discontented with the process. There is no noticeable improvement in MPI communicating with the SPCA on animal welfare complaints transferred to MPI, which was previously recommended by SAT.

Since the 2016 audit, the National Office has launched a number of initiatives aimed at developing resources to assist Centres in a number of areas. It has expanded its documented procedures for selection, training and appointment of inspectors and auxiliary officers. The office has continued improving its communication with, and the support to, regional centres. Reporting to MPI appears to be well maintained.

The number of trained auxiliary officers (AO) has increased but the recruitment of new inspectors is limited in some remote locations. Similarly, the provision of post warranting training is more difficult in small centres due to unavailability of experienced inspectors. The National Office provides many opportunities for ongoing, refresher training for inspectors but only limited refresher training for auxiliary officers.

There has been a significant increase in the uptake of the electronic administration tool, "Shelterbuddy" by the Animal Shelters in comparison with the last year.

All Centres' staff demonstrated their full engagement, dedication and often a passion for animals they care for. The same must be said about volunteers who appear to be an essential workforce of the SPCA. The Inspectors knowledge of welfare priorities and relevant animal welfare and administrative requirements were acceptable. Similarly, AOs were conversant with their statutory powers and actions in regards to dealing with animal welfare complaints.

Recently, one of the Centres has been heavily involved in managing a crisis situation due to a severe flooding in Whakatane region. This event killed and threatened lives of hundreds of domestic and farm animals. That situation was managed alongside the MPI response team.



The audit was able to achieve its goals however the auditor(s) raised one MPI issue and identified several areas for improvement. Eight recommendations have been made; four of these being carried over from the last year and four are new ones.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Important Note

This report may discuss Topics, i.e. subjects of particular interest. The discussion can include positive and negative elements. In some cases, the negative elements are such that Non-compliances result.

All deficiencies discussed as Non-compliances are expected to be resolved by auditee or the auditee's organisation, whether or not they are described as Serious Non-compliances. Serious Non-compliances constitute a system failure. They have a profile such that the effectiveness of the corrective actions will be measured in subsequent Systems Audit Team audits. Inadequate resolution can lead to failure of the subsequent audit.

Recommendations may appear in the report. These are non-binding, and do not affect subsequent audits. Their implementation may provide efficiencies for both the auditee and MPI. The presence of recommendations to change existing specifications does not excuse the absolute requirement to conform to the existing specifications. Changes to specifications that may result from these recommendations will be promulgated officially.

The Auditee is reminded that audit reports are subject to the *Official Information Act 1982*. The Auditee may highlight any information considered confidential during the course of the audit however the Auditor cannot provide any assurance to the Auditee that the information considered confidential will not be disclosed as a result of an enquiry under the Official Information Act.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Terms of Reference

Goal(s)

To assess the effectiveness of Royal New Zealand Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Incorporated (RNZSPCA) national procedures to ensure that obligations and requirements of the *Animal Welfare Act 1999* (AWA) are being met by RNZSPCA/SPCA branches and member societies (centres).

To evaluate how the systems and procedures implemented by the RNZSPCA are meeting the requirements outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the RNZSPCA and the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI).

To assess the effectiveness of the RNZSPCA/SPCA branches in managing the requirements of the AWA and MOU for appointments, training and monitoring of Inspectors and Auxiliary Officers.

To assess corrective actions undertaken by the RNZSPCA national body and/or RNZSPCA centres in response to the previous MPI systems audit findings, and if appropriate to recommend further improvements to ensure requirements of the AWA are met.

To make recommendations to MPI for improvements to the MOU, and AWA ancillary notices and specifications and guidance as required.

Scope

Shall include interviews with the RNZSPCA national and regional offices staff and a review of methods used for the assessment and recommendation to MPI for appointment of their Inspectors and Auxiliary Officers.

Shall include an examination of reports submitted by the RNZSPCA national office to MPI, and if the reporting satisfies requirements of the MOU.

Shall include an examination of the follow-up actions taken by the RNZSPCA in response to the findings of 2016 round of audits.

A sample of locations included in this audit shall consist of the national RNZSPCA office and five regional centre offices and facilities.

Standards / Legislation

1. *Animal Welfare Act 1999*
2. Memorandum of Understanding between the RNZSPCA and MAF, 2010
3. RNZSPCA Performance and Technical Standards for Inspectors of RNZSPCA, 2012
4. Performance and Technical Standards for Auxiliary Officers of RNZSPCA, 2012.

Initiator

s 9(2)(a), Manager Animal Welfare, Regulation and Assurance, MPI

Specialist / Observers

The auditor may call upon the services of other parties as deemed appropriate to facilitate the audit. The Initiator or representatives nominated by the Initiator may attend audits in this domain as Specialists / Observers.

Response to Critical Situation

If a critical situation is identified, the provisions of the MPI Systems Audit Team (SAT)



procedure for management of critical situations (SAAM-SAT-004-PRO) shall be implemented. The Initiator shall be contacted immediately and any actions will be determined in consultation with the Initiator and/or Manager, Systems Audit.

A Critical situation is defined as follows: "Any situation which, in the professional judgement of the auditor, Initiator or Manager Systems Audit places food safety, market access, official assurances, animal welfare or MPI Directors' credibility at risk. A critical situation may result from information received from a number of sources as well as SAT audit findings."

Other Terms of Reference

The audit will be conducted according to SAT operating procedures (SAAM-SAT-002-PRO).

Non-conformance Management

The mechanism for resolving any identified serious non-compliances will be recorded in the Serious Non-Compliances, Corrective Action Requirements section of this audit report. Closure of any non-compliances raised will be as agreed with, and to the satisfaction of, the Initiator.

MPI Issues

Issues identified and raised during the audit that require MPI attention will be specified in the final audit report. The Initiator must identify the relevant accountable persons to manage any required follow-up.

Reporting Considerations

The auditee may receive Location Finding or a site report. Upon completion of the audit the lead auditor will submit a draft audit report to the Initiator and to the Manager Systems Audit for comment. The draft may also be submitted to the RNZSPCA for comments, at the Initiator's discretion.

The final report shall be distributed to:

Allan Kinsella - Director Systems Audit, Assurance and Monitoring
s 9(2)(a) - Manager Systems Audit, Regulation and Assurance
s 9(2)(a) - Manager Animal Welfare, Regulation and Assurance
s 9(2)(a) - Manager Animal Welfare Compliance, Operations

Further distribution of the final report will be at the discretion of the Initiator.

Other

All travel costs associated with this audit and undertaken by the allocated auditor(s) are approved by the Manager Systems Audit on approval of these Terms of Reference.

The auditor will notify auditees of the impending audit and provide them with a copy of these Terms of Reference prior to the audit date.



Audit Date (Last Day)

31 May 2017

Audit Number

4495

Location(s)

Royal New Zealand Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals t/a: RNZSPCA, 3047 Great North Road, PO Box 15349, Auckland
SPCA North Taranaki t/a: SPCA North Taranaki, 75 Colson Road, New Plymouth
SPCA Canterbury t/a: SPCA Canterbury
Whakatane SPCA t/a: Whakatane SPCA, 15 Gateway Crescent, Whakatane
Hastings and District SPCA t/a: Hastings and District SPCA, 8 Heathcote Rd, RD5, Hastings
Gisborne SPCA t/a: Gisborne SPCA, 14 Nursery Rd., Gisborne

Lead Auditor

s 9(2)(a), MPI Systems Audit Team, Systems Auditor

Auditor(s)

s 9(2)(a), MPI Systems Audit Team, Systems Auditor

Auditee(s)

s 9(2)(a), RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support
s 9(2)(a), RNZSPCA, Animal Welfare Coordinator
s 9(2)(a), RNZSPCA, Regional Manager
s 9(2)(a), SPCA North Taranaki, Area/Centre Manager
s 9(2)(a), SPCA North Taranaki, Centre Coordinator, Inspector
s 9(2)(a), SPCA North Taranaki, Senior Inspector
s 9(2)(a), SPCA Canterbury, Chief Inspector
s 9(2)(a), SPCA Canterbury, Operation Manager
s 9(2)(a), Whakatane SPCA, Centre Manager
s 9(2)(a), Whakatane SPCA, Senior Inspector
s 9(2)(a), Whakatane SPCA, trainee Auxiliary Officer
s 9(2)(a), Hastings and District SPCA, Centre Manager
s 9(2)(a), Hastings and District SPCA, Inspector
s 9(2)(a), Hastings and District SPCA, Centre Committee Chair
s 9(2)(a), Gisborne SPCA, Centre Manager
s 9(2)(a), Gisborne SPCA, Auxiliary Officer
s 9(2)(a), Gisborne SPCA, Inspector

Audit Type

Allocated Audit



Background

Introduction

The audit took place between 26 April and 9 June 2017 and included the SPCA National Office in Auckland and the following five SPCA centres: North Taranaki, Canterbury, Whakatane, Hastings & Districts and Gisborne.

Two SAT auditors, s 9(2)(a) and s 9(2)(a) visited the first two locations, Auckland and New Plymouth, after which s 9(2)(a) visited the remaining four locations, in Christchurch, Whakatane, Hastings and Gisborne. s 9(2)(a), the RNZSPCA Regional Manager was an observer during the audit at those last four locations.

The SPCA National Manager selected and recommended to MPI the centres, taking into considerations the length of time since the last audit and the size of the centres. The recommended centres represented those that had not been audited previously or for many years and were of various sizes, from small to large, both rural and urban.

All individuals that were spoken with during the course of the audit are shown in the Auditees list. s 9(2)(a), the Gisborne SPCA Inspector was not present during the audit but provided written answers to questions that the auditor prepared for her prior to the audit.

Location findings were created at each centre and they are appended to the report.

Requirements

The MoU between the SPCA and MPI stipulates requirements for selection, appointment, training of SPCA inspectors and auxiliary officers, enforcement of the Act, management of animal welfare complaints and complaints against inspectors or auxiliary officers, records keeping, and management and accountabilities of the SPCA as an MPI approved organisation.

The MoU requires annual audits of Branches and Member Societies (MS). Branches or Member Societies are selected for audit with the agreement of, and input from, the National Office. The audits have been carried out by the Systems Audit Team (SAT) or its predecessors.

Historically, the MPI annual audits included three locations proposed by the SPCA National Office and agreed to by MPI. Following the SAT recommendation from the 2015 audit the scope had been expanded and five locations were selected for the audit in 2016. Similarly, the scope of this year audit included six locations - the SPCA National Office, and five branches (Centres).

The SAT audit includes assessment of corrective actions and changes undertaken by the SPCA national body and regional centres in response to the previous MPI audit, and if appropriate, recommends further improvements.

The PTS for Inspectors and AOs detail the requirements noted in the first paragraph of this topic. These standards were reviewed in 2012 and signed by both parties (MPI and SPCA) in February 2013, but are referred to as versions 2012 of the PTS.

SPCA

At the time of the audit the SPCA had 40 Branches and 6 Member Societies (MSs) operating in New Zealand. Branches and Member Societies are referred to as "Centres" by the National Office and this terminology is adopted by the auditor in this report. The Centres are overseen on a regional basis by four SPCA Regional Managers. The Branches and Member Societies (Centres) cover all geographical areas of NZ and currently there are no gaps between them.



SPCA Branches operate under SPCA constitution and funding, and MSs have their own constitution and independent funding. Each SPCA Centre has a chief executive or manager as well as a management board (Centre committee). The Centres are supported by local communities, volunteers, and their own fundraising.

The SPCA National Executive Committee is a part of the National Board that runs on a day-to-day basis its National Support Office in Auckland (National Office). The accountability for management of the National Office stays with the CEO, who reports to the National Board and manages the National Office. The National Office is run according to Board and Executive Directives. The National Manager, Inspectorate & Centre Support works closely with a Chief Scientific Officer (CSO) who sets animal welfare policies and manages the integration with MPI. There are two Animal Welfare Coordinators based in the National Office who liaise with the Centres and provide them with technical and operational support. A bi-monthly newsletter is published by the Marketing and Fundraising team that is distributed to all Centres and includes a variety of information from general news to events and national updates including information relevant to Inspectors and Auxiliary Officers.

Currently, there are 79 warranted Inspectors and 5 trainee Inspectors, and 81 warranted Auxiliary Officers plus 14 trainee Auxiliary Officers (AOs). The number of Inspectors and AOs employed by the visited Centres vary, from one Inspector and one AO in Whakatane to seven Inspectors and 10 AOs in Christchurch. There are between 25 and 150 volunteers affiliated with each of those Centres. The Gisborne Centre came out of RNZSPCA administration in April 2014, just over 3 years ago.

SPCA restructure

The SPCA restructure has been on the agenda for several years with a number of workshops and consultation meetings being held between the National Office and Centres. During the AGM meeting in June 2017 delegates from all Centres have voted for the proposed new constitution and new rules governing the SPCA. According to the passed resolution the “new” SPCA is to commence its operation from 1 Nov 2017.

Under new rules all Centres will cease to exist as independent entities and a new organisation, RNZSPCA (or similar name) with its new Centres will be created. The country will be divided into 3 regions, and 11 areas within the regions. There will be one CEO, 3 regional general managers and 11 area managers. There is an intention that the Centre managers should be the current managers of existing Centres.

There may be some Centres that will choose not to join, and those areas will lose the legal SPCA status and will become separate entities with names other than SPCA. The biggest change for the National Inspectorate will be the one employer for all inspectors (rather than the Inspectors being employed by each separate Centre).

Abbreviations

AO - Auxiliary Officer
AWA - Animal Welfare Act 1999, the Act
CEO - Chief Executive Officer
CSO - Chief Scientific Officer
IoA - Instrument of Appointment
MAF - Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
MoU - Memorandum of Understanding
MS - Member Societies
MPI - Ministry for Primary Industries
PTS - Performance and Technical Standards
RNZSPCA - Royal New Zealand Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
SAT - Systems Audit Team
SPCA - Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals



Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Topics

1.0 Follow up to Previous Audits

There were seven recommendations made to SPCA and MPI during the audit in 2016. The auditors also looked at two recommendations made by the SAT auditor in 2015.

1.1 Expanding the scope of the audit (2015 audit)

The scope of the annual audit had been expanded and there were five SPCA Branches and Member Societies audited in 2016 and six centres audited during this 2017 round of audits. The day-to-day supervision of Inspectors, and working relationship between the Centres and National Office, have been included in the scope of the audits since.

1.2 Internal Audit (2015 audit)

A specific internal audit programme has not yet been established. While the auditees agree overall with that recommendation, the implementation of such a programme in the current environment is limited by various factors. Additional funds and training of SPCA auditors continue to be the main limitations. The National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support has indicated that RNZSPCA does not have sufficient experience in internal auditing and that MPI assistance with training of SPCA internal auditors would be very valuable.

Under the current structure where SPCA Centres run their own operating model imposing an internal audit process was difficult. Under the proposed changes all independent Centres will fall under one umbrella of the SPCA and the National Office has a strategy to build an internal audit process into that new structure.

Nonetheless, since the 2016 audit, the National Office has launched a number of initiatives aimed at developing resources to assist Centres in a number of areas. One of them is a Centre Checklist; a tool that can assist Centres in measuring their performance against wide set of animal welfare parameters, identifying areas of success and areas for development. In addition, the National Manager and Centre Support sends all Centres the summary of findings and recommendations from the MPI annual audit to ensure those issues have been addressed on the regional level, where applicable.

All Centres had used the Centre Checklist and they all confirmed substantial compliance with the checklist. Three of five Centres were familiar with the findings from the previous MPI audit. In one case, a newly appointed manager was not aware of the findings and in another case, the Centre committee most likely failed to pass that information on to the manager.

Recommendation - 1. To Manager, Animal Welfare Team – Assistance in training of SPCA auditors

It is recommended to the Manager, Animal Welfare Team that MPI considers providing assistance to SPCA with training of the internal auditors.

Training of internal auditors has been identified by SPCA as one of the main limitations in implementing their internal audit programme. The National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support has indicated that SPCA does not have sufficient experience in internal auditing and that MPI assistance with training of SPCA internal auditors would be very valuable.

MPI has a great deal of expertise in auditing animal welfare related fields and in the auditor's opinion these could be utilised in assisting SPCA in training their own resources. Having effective internal audit programme would facilitate SPCA in effective delivery of their national programme and provide MPI with confidence the SPCA as an approved organisation meets their duties and obligations in relation to the Act.



1.3 Review of the MoU (2016 audit)

During a pre-2017 audit meeting with the Initiator, s 9(2)(a), s 9(2)(b) advised the SAT auditor that the review of the MoU was to be further delayed until SPCA decides on the new structure.

Recommendation - 2. To National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support, RNZSPCA and Manager Animal Welfare, MPI - Review of the MoU

This recommendation is carried over from the previous 2016 audit.

It is recommended to the RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support and the Initiator, the Manager Animal Welfare, MPI that review of the MoU is carried out to ensure the proposed changes of SPCA structure are incorporated into that agreement. As previously recommended, that review should be done within one year of the restructure. Depending on the outcome, the ongoing review period could be extended to a period determined at MPI discretion.

1.4 Review of the PTS (2016 audit)

This recommendation is linked to the review of MoU and it has also been delayed until the proposed SPCA restructure is implemented.

Recommendation - 3. To National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support, RNZSPCA and Manager Animal Welfare, MPI - Review of the PTS

This recommendation is carried over from the previous audit.

It is recommended to the RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support and the Initiator, the Manager Animal Welfare, MPI that review of PTS documents is carried out.

Part A: It is recommended that the SPCA reviews the PTS documents, to ensure they accurately describe how the Centres, Inspectors, AOs, and the National Office interact to meet the MoU and AWA. A review of the reporting to and communication with MPI should be included.

Part B: It is recommended that MPI reviews the proposed changes and determine if they are appropriate and manageable prior to the documents being finalised. Further changes and communications may be required before the documents can be signed e.g. differences between the Complaints Bylaw and the PTSs for managing complaints against Inspectors and AOs should be aligned.

1.5 Training and Mentoring of New Inspectors (2016 audit)

The National Office has reviewed the training programme for inspectors and the overall SPCA Inspectorate framework. As a result, a National Inspector Competency Training Programme for inspectors has been developed. That programme has been already trialled at three main centres; Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch.

Due to small numbers of staff at many remote locations, the problem of monitoring and training of new Inspectors in small centres is ongoing. However, to improve the support for inspectors the National Office developed and provided all Centres with a suite of technical and operational procedures and templates, as guidance. All these documents are available on the SPCA website as part of the Inspectorate web resource.

1.6 Auxiliary Officer Approval (2016 audit)

It was recommended that MPI and RNZSPCA review the frequency of AO training in order to increase the number of AOs.



The National Office runs two intakes of trainee AOs per year and training is carried out in May and October. If the trainees fail the first online assessment they have one further opportunity to re-sit the assessment. In total there are 4 assessments for AOs per year – 2 regular assessments and 2 repeat assessments if required. Taking into consideration the amount of work and time that is needed for carrying out police checks, filling out the SPCA and MPI application forms and sending them to MPI it is logistically difficult to organise more training sessions for AOs.

The number of trainee AOs has increased from approximately 20 in 2016 to 30 in 2017. Currently, there are 81 AOs and 14 trainees for the next course. The number of AOs has doubled from 40 trained AOs in 2015.

1.7 Review of the Complaints Process (Complaints against Inspectors and AOs) (2016 audit)

It was recommended that the review of the MoU and PTS documents include the procedures for managing complaints against Inspectors and AOs in a timely and appropriate manner, taking into consideration any potential employment issues.

As advised by the National Manager, there are variations in the way complaints against Inspectors and AOs are handled as there are differences between the Complaints Bylaw and the PTSs for managing complaints. When the PTSs are reviewed then these should be aligned. The National Office has now drafted a new procedure that blends those two documents. An example of a recent, closed complaint against an Inspector demonstrated that procedure was correctly followed.

However, the staff at two Centres reported they had been dissatisfied with the National Office managing the complaints. An Inspector in one Centre felt the National Office staff's enquiry was inadequate and the conclusion prejudiced. An AO in another Centre felt strongly that the support provided by the National Office for the AO to handle the complaint was inadequate.

Recommendation - 4. To National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support, RNZSPCA – Review of the Complaints Process

This is an extension of the recommendation made in the previous audit.

It is recommended to the RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support that SPCA revisits their complaints process to ensure the enquiries are full, and objective and their own staff is treated fairly and supported throughout the process.

Due to comments made by the key personnel at two Centres the auditor is in the opinion that SPCA should be more considerate when handling complaints against inspectors and AOs in order to avoid alienating their own staff.

1.8 Review of PTS (Animal Welfare Complaints) (2016 audit)

It was recommended that: a) the review of the PTS includes consideration of the grading of complaints b) the implementation of "Shelterbuddy" is included in the review c) the implementation of "Shelterbuddy" is monitored and reviewed.

The "Shelterbuddy" system (electronic animal register and complaint database) has been already adopted and used by 32 of 46 Centres (in comparison with only 5 of 46 centres a year ago). The grading of cases used by the "Shelterbuddy" system is based on the PTS. The National Office developed a Dispatch Shelterbuddy Manual; a guidance document which includes a summary on the types of questions that should be asked in order to obtain the right information for the complaint's risk assessment and grading. The manual was distributed to all Centres that took up the "Shelterbuddy" system. The guidance documents pertaining to the



essential animal welfare complaint questions, as in the manual, has been distributed to all Centres regardless of whether or not they use "Shelterbuddy". In addition, all Centres have been provided with a Dispatch Request form; a two page sheet that summarises and classifies the received calls including grading of cases. The National Office can view most of the Centres' "Shelterbuddy" systems online.

Three of the visited regional Centres have adopted the "Shelterbuddy" system and were familiar with the Dispatch Shelterbuddy Manual. The remaining two Centres use a combination of paper and electronic records and registers (e.g. electronic "AWSOM" system).

In the majority of Centres the grading of animal welfare complaints is done directly by Inspectors or under the supervision and guidance of Inspectors. In some Centres the initial grading is done by receptionists/dispatchers; some being warranted AOs themselves, and reviewed by the Inspectors when they are available. Personal experience is the main determinant by which the grading of complaints is done by the non-warranted administration staff. During interviewing the non-warranted staff they all demonstrated the grading of animal welfare cases follows, to a large extent, that of the PTS.

1.9 Communication Improvements between MPI and SPCA (2016 audit)

It has been recommended that the communication channels for complaints formally transferred to MPI be reviewed and that the requesting SPCA Centre be kept informed of the progress and outcome of cases transferred via National Office.

Since approx. 2012 MPI has not been providing SPCA (National Office or Centres) with information relating to complaints that were transferred to MPI. In earlier discussions MPI has advised the SPCA that it was prepared to share investigation outcomes only (e.g. Closed, Verbal Advice Given, Written Warning issued etc.). For all MPI-SPCA transfers, the SPCA provides MPI a report summary of the full investigation and would appreciate a reciprocal arrangement. According to the SPCA a brief summary or investigation overview on all transfers would benefit individual Inspectors and Centres involved and would assist in managing complainants (e.g. advise them if MPI is still conducting its investigation or if it has been concluded). According to the National Manager, that matter has been discussed with MPI but so far there has been no change in the MPI approach.

During the 2016 SPCA audit SAT made recommendation to the MPI to review its policy and provide the SPCA with information on the progress and outcome of cases handed over.

MPI Issue - 1 - Transfer Policy

According to the MoU, Section 72 MPI, as the agency accepting the transfer of complaints is obliged to provide feedback to the SPCA, the transferring agency, on the progress of the investigation of the complaints. MPI has advised the SPCA that it was prepared to share investigation outcomes only with no further details.

During the 2016 SPCA audit SAT made recommendation to the MPI to review its policy and provide the SPCA with information on the progress and outcome of cases handed over. No information on the progress of transferred cases is provided.

A brief summary or investigation overview on all transfers would fulfil the collaborative partnership agreement between SPCA and MPI and would benefit individual Inspectors and Centres and assist in managing complainants.

2.0 Policies and Procedures

The National Office has standardized a number of policies and procedures that apply to functions carried out by the office as well as regional centres. These include key procedures such as euthanasia and animal welfare investigation but also policies related to: safe system of



work, effective communication, training etc. The resources and templates that National Office developed are available on the SPCA website for the centres to use.

Section 290 of the PTS (Inspectors) and Section 189 of the PTS (Auxiliary Officers) requires all SPCA Centres to have up-to-date Policy and Procedure Manuals kept at the premises and complied with by all staff and volunteers.

The Centres have adopted the SPCA national policies and procedures and adjusted these to local circumstances however, these differ significantly between the Centres. In one Centre the Policy and Procedure Manual was very comprehensive and covered almost every area of the Centre activity and potential risks the Centre may face. In another Centre the policies and procedures were minimal and not providing adequate information. Similarly, in some Centres the policies and procedures were regularly updated, discussed and acknowledged by the staff. In other Centres the procedures were outdated and there was no evidence the staff and volunteers had discussed/acknowledged the changes.

The lack of updated policies and procedures made it difficult to ascertain if correct ones were complied with by all staff including volunteers.

Section 220 of the PTS (Inspectors) requires every SPCA Centre to have its own policy regarding euthanasia that follows the SPCA National Euthanasia Policy. The majority of the sites had documented their own euthanasia policy but in one Centre the policy was a copy and paste of the SPCA national euthanasia policy without specifying the roles or names of the people making euthanasia decisions (euthanasia panel).

The auditor has made a recommendation in the Location Findings to those Centres where policies and procedures were identified as deficient (see Appendixes E and F) but is also making here a similar recommendation to the National Office to ensure the implementation is consistent across the centres.

Recommendation - 5. To National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support – Policy and Procedure Manual

It is recommended to the RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support that the SPCA National Office ensures up-to-date policy and procedure manuals are maintained at each centre. Consideration should be given to a minimum list of policies and procedures that should be kept by each centre.

3.0 Memorandum of Understanding, MoU

The MoU requires the National Chief Inspector to maintain and ensure all Centres, Inspectors and AOs comply with various provisions of the Act, the MoU and PTS. While the SPCA can ensure the majority of these provisions are complied with some policies are out of the SPCA control. The National Office develops policies and procedures but their uptake is up to individual centres (as reported above). More meaningful control over these provisions will be in place once the restructure of the SPCA takes place and the National Office has a line of control over the branches (internal audit).

4.0 Selection, Training and Appointment

One of the Animal Welfare Coordinators (SPCA National Inspectorate) looks after the Centres for training, appointing and warranting Inspectors and AOs. Inspectors must attend mandatory training each year to maintain their warrants.

4.1 Selection

Criteria used by all the Centres when selecting candidates for training as Inspector or AOs generally follow those listed in the PTSs. Some Centres reported they do not have a luxury of



having a group of people interested in applying for the positions and all candidates are carefully considered.

Generally, the candidates are selected from amongst the existing staff that have been known to the Centres and that have been working in the Centres in various capacities for some time. While this is true for most, one Centre employed a person that was not known to the staff prior but spent a month at the Centre during her training before applying for the job as an Inspector.

The criminal history, NZ citizenship and residency status of the candidates are checked by the National Office upon receiving recommendations for training from the regional centres. The National Manager explained his, and delegated person's role, in the interviewing of selected candidates for training.

One of the Centres even organises monthly induction sessions for people interested in volunteering at the Centre.

4.2 Training

Training policies and procedures are established for different types of applicants for inspectors e.g. those that are new to the industry with no qualifications, those that are new to the industry with previous qualifications, those that are returning graduates of Unitec etc. In order to facilitate training and appointment processes the National Office developed extensive check lists, separate for initial training, first appointment and renewal appointment.

All trainee inspectors undergo training that is delivered by UNITEC Auckland. The Centre Inspectors spoken with during the audit were all complimentary about the UNITEC training programme.

As reported under the Follow up to Previous Audits section, the National Office has developed a National Inspector Competency Training Programme for inspectors. The programme has been already trialled at three main Centres (Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch) and is to be implemented in other Centres once the new structure is in place. For other Centres the National Office developed a suite of technical and operational procedures and templates, as guidance. All these documents are available on the RNZSPCA website as part of the Inspectorate web resource.

Some Centres have organised, of their own initiative, other forms of training e.g. Canine Temperament Testing at Hastings and District SPCA.

There is a high level of support for newly appointed Inspectors in larger centres that employ many Inspectors, and in locations where at least one experienced Inspector is available. Inspectors at three Centres confirmed they had received satisfactory support in the first year of the appointment. In one small Centre, an Inspector was placed on the job straight away after completing her training programme with no opportunity to work alongside any experienced Inspector. That Inspector was employed part-time only, one day a week, and that limited her exposure to the Centre's daily activities and handling of animal welfare complaints. Although such a situation arose from the lack of availability of an experienced inspector in the region, in the auditor's opinion the National Office and the Centre should have arranged for practical training with an experienced inspector at a different location.

The training programme for auxiliary officers is based on online modules that have been prepared by the National Office, and which the AO candidates have to complete within a required time. While the Centre AOs assessment of this type of training was positive, two of them commented that feedback from the National Inspectorate on their performance would be appreciated.



Recommendation - 6. To National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support, RNZSPCA – Support for Inspectors during the post-warranting period

It is recommended to the RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support that the National Office and Centres provide the newly appointed inspectors with support and access to an experienced inspector, during the post-warranting period. At present this is not happening at all locations esp. in small centres where the availability of experienced inspectors for training is limited.

4.3 Appointment and Reappointment

The National Office manages the recommendations for appointments and renewal of appointments of inspectors and AOs, as per Sections 22 and 23 of the MoU.

The SPCA Animal Welfare Coordinator maintains a reminder list of expiry dates of appointments for all Inspectors and AOs and sends e-mail notifications, with attached renewal application forms, to Centres 3 months prior to the expiry date. All Centre managers also monitor the due dates for renewal of appointments of their Inspectors and AOs, and in one Centre, Canterbury SPCA, a computer "VAULT" program is used as a tool for identification and notification of incoming renewal of appointments for Inspectors and AOs.

All SPCA inspectors' appointments are valid anywhere within New Zealand' as per PTS Section 124 (3) (b) (ii). When an inspector changes the area of jurisdiction he/she works in, the National Office notifies MPI of the transfer. MPI records and acknowledges such transfers but no longer replaces the existing Instrument of Appointment, as described in MoU, Section 45. Validity of that requirement should be also included in the recommended review of the MoU.

One Inspector, from Whakatane SPCA is also contracted as an Inspector by Kawerau SPCA and at times she operates outside the Whakatane SPCA area of jurisdiction. However, that is done with permission from both Centres.

The National Office is generally successful in retrieving Certificates of Appointment from Inspectors and AOs that cease to work for, volunteer at or otherwise be affiliated in that capacity to the RNZSPCA or their Centres.

During the audit the auditor viewed Instruments of Appointment (IoA) of selected Inspectors and AOs, and all presented IoAs were valid.

The National Office and all Centres demonstrated compliance with appointment and reappointment processes for Inspectors and AOs and the Centres' managers were overall complimentary about the National Office running these processes.

4.4 Ongoing Training

The SPCA National Office organises refresher training workshops for appointed Inspectors. This training focuses on various areas of interest and is run in different locations, sometimes more than once per year to ensure all inspectors attend. There are four training sessions scheduled for the period between June and October 2017.

Last year, the SPCA organised an 'Emerging Leaders' course for selected inspectors at the Edmund Hillary outdoor activity centre at Tongariro. The main purpose of this course was to train future leaders in dealing with large scale crisis situations. The same type of course is scheduled for September this year for current senior inspectors in leadership positions.

The National Office sends reminders to inspectors that didn't attend annual training sessions and places their names on the list for the next year's training. As a rule, the Inspector may skip the attendance at the annual training session, if justified, but repetitive absences may result in the National Office not recommending the Inspector for renewal of appointment.



All Inspectors from the audited Centres are on the list to attend the scheduled refresher training workshops this year. Generally, all Centre managers and all but one Centre committee appeared to be supportive of the ongoing training for inspectors. One Centre manager reported that the Centre committee was dissatisfied with the Inspector's absence during training and additional costs involved.

While the National Office manages the ongoing training for inspectors well the same cannot be said about refresher training for AOs. Four AOs from three Centres advised the auditor they had not attended any refresher training since their appointment, although one of them has been in the role of AO for less than a year. The Canterbury SPCA organises refresher trainings for their AOs as part of ongoing training. The Gisborne SPCA AO attended a Centre Management course run by the National Office which included some specific units for AOs.

Lack of ongoing training for AOs is not in line with PTS for AOs Section 93 that requires AOs to attend training workshops at least once in every 3-year period.

Recommendation - 7. To National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support, RNZSPCA - Ongoing Training for Auxiliary Officers

It is recommended to the RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support that the National Office provides all AOs with the opportunity to attend training workshops as defined in the PTS for Auxiliary Officers. At present AOs from several Centres have not participated in any ongoing training workshops.

4.5 Day-to-day Supervision of Inspectors and Evaluation of Inspectors' Performance

Day-to-day supervision of Inspectors' activities is simple in small Centres where direct contact with the manager is frequent during a day. Communication with the use of mobile phones between Inspectors and Centre managers is common. In the Canterbury SPCA the managers also use the Navman tracking system to monitor the geographical location of the Centre's fleet cars. All their Inspectors have a "Find Me" app in their smart phones that's similar to a panic button, to ensure health and safety for each individual.

Evaluation of inspectors' performance and their ongoing suitability for the role is done differently by the Centres and ranges from informal meetings and discussions with the Centre manager to more structured, regular one-on-one meetings and/or annual performance reviews. The inspectors' evaluation is also done during their attendance at the refresher training sessions.

As reported by all Centres' managers there have been no cases recently where their Inspectors or AOs failed to comply with their Terms of Appointment, PTS, MOU, or cases of a serious misconduct.

5.0 Complaints against Inspectors/Auxiliary Officers

The National Office has recently issued new national procedures for complaints. The new procedures separate complaints against Inspectors and AOs from complaints against SPCA Centres and personnel. A separate part of those procedures is Complaint Management Process, an administrative guidance for the National Office on categorising and maintaining, and managing the complaints database. The majority of complaints against inspectors or AOs are minor in nature and dealt with successfully by regional centres without notifying the National Office. Serious complaints are notified to, and dealt by the National Office with notifications to MPI. There have been no complaints of serious misconduct by inspectors or AOs and only one minor complaint notified to National Office in the last 12 months or so.

All Centres have adopted the SPCA national procedure for dealing with complaints against inspectors and AOs.



Two of the five audited Centres received no formal complaints against their Inspectors or AOs. Remaining three Centres received one complaint each:

- in one Centre a member of the public has made a complaint against the Inspector and that was dealt with by the Centre and SPCA Regional Manager. That complaint was resolved to the satisfaction of the complainant and the Inspector,
- in one Centre a volunteer has made a formal complaint against the Centre AO/ Centre Manager directly to the National Office. Despite the National Office following the newly issued procedure, the Centre Manager felt strongly that the support she had received was inadequate and the final outcome reached by the National Office made her feel victimised. - in one Centre a complaint has been made against an Inspector of which the National Office was notified. The Inspector assessed the National Office staff's enquiry as inadequate and their conclusion prejudiced.

The auditor has made a recommendation in relation to the complaints process, see Recommendation 4 – Review of the Complaints Process.

6.0 Animal Welfare Complaints

All complaints investigated by the SPCA follow the procedures as outlined in the PTS for Inspectors and AOs. Detailed information on receiving, grading and managing of complaints is provided in the Dispatch Shelterbuddy Manual. A Dispatch Request form summarises and classifies the received calls including grading of cases.

The National Office is currently reviewing the "Shelterbuddy" system training. In order to ensure proper classification of animal welfare complaints and appropriate and timely corrective actions, a guidance document, Cruelty Complaint Dispatch Code - Welfare Issues has been developed and issued to all Centres.

In addition, the National Office developed and issued workflow sheets for assisting Inspectors in their decision making process. These sheets specify legislative powers the Inspectors can use under the Animal Welfare Act 1999 and Search and Surveillance Act 2012.

Centres' policies and procedures that relate to receiving and managing animal welfare complaints are developed to a various degree and range; from comprehensive in some Centres to minimal procedures in other Centres. The auditor has made recommendations in relation to documented policies and procedures in Location Findings for those Centres where deficiencies were identified (see Appendixes E and F).

Three of five visited Centres have adopted the "Shelterbuddy" system and were familiar with the Dispatch Shelterbuddy Manual. The remaining two Centres use a combination of paper and electronic records and registers (e.g. electronic "AWSOM" system). In the majority of Centres the grading of animal welfare complaints is done by Inspectors or under the supervision and guidance of Inspectors. In some Centres the initial grading is done by receptionists/dispatchers, some being warranted AOs themselves, and reviewed by Inspectors when they are available. Personal experience is the main determinant by which the grading of complaints is done by the non-warranted administration staff. During interviewing the non-warranted staff demonstrated their familiarity with receiving complaints procedures and their grading of animal welfare complaints was in line with the PTS.

Animal welfare complaints that relate to animals being exported, animals in zoos and animals used in research, testing or teaching would be referred to the National Office and then further, on to MPI. However, none of the audited Centres have received these.

For complaints where the Inspectors know or believe the case is being investigated by MPI the Inspectors follow the Centre transfer policy (transfer forms completed and sent to the National Office).



All interviewed Inspectors demonstrated satisfactory knowledge of welfare priorities as specified in PTS for Inspectors, Sections 203-212 and relevant requirements of the AWA. Similarly, all interviewed AOs were conversant with their statutory powers as AOs and actions in regards to dealing with animal welfare complaints.

In all Centres the inspectors and managers reported that they had access to equipment necessary to do the day-to-day work, but one Centre was seeking to obtain the Global Positioning System as they serve remote locations. The recent Edgcombe flood revealed deficiencies in protective clothing (safety and weather proof gear) in Whakatane SPCA and they are in the process of replenishing the used equipment. SPCA Regional Manager and observer of this audit, § 9(2)(a) informed the auditors the National Office has been surveying the regional centres on their provision of basic equipment for handling animal welfare complaints.

6.1 Euthanasia

All but one Centre have the documented euthanasia policy that include names or roles of persons that are on the euthanasia panel. One Centre has a copy of the SPCA national euthanasia policy but does not have a local policy nor description of who is on the euthanasia panel.

The auditor has made a relevant recommendation in one Location Finding (see Appendix F).

One Centre reported that the number of animals that were put down by the Inspector outside the shelter e.g. on the owner's property, or where the Inspector instructed the owner to put down the animal on his/her property are not included in the statistics. Although Section 142 of AWA1999 requires that records of animals destroyed must be kept, it applies to situation where the SPCA obtains the custody of an animal, as per Section 141 of the AWA. During further discussion with the SPCA Regional Manager (observer) he explained that all euthanized animals should be recorded and reported to the National Office and that had to be reiterated to all Centres.

6.2 Search Warrants

All visited Centres confirmed they routinely contact or would contact the National Office before applying for and executing a search warrant, to enable the office to check in the search warrant database for any previous search warrant applications at that property. The National Office also checks with MPI if the property to be searched has livestock and if there has been any search warrant already executed on that property by MPI.

Only one of the Centres audited has executed several search warrants in recent years.

6.3 On Farm Inspections

The SPCA may request assistance from MPI Compliance Animal Welfare investigators at two levels, one – for transfer of animal welfare investigations from SPCA to MPI (commercial livestock properties, large scale investigation), and two – for direct support of SPCA personnel by MPI investigators. The National Office developed a procedure, Complaint Transfer Process and corresponding flowchart for managing cases transferred from SPCA to MPI. The office staff also developed a template transfer form for all Centres to use.

Only a couple of Centres deal routinely with complaints that relate to farm animals while the remaining three Centres do not see such complaints frequently. All Centres were familiar with the SPCA national transfer procedure and some have used the transfer form template. Transfer of complaints is also recorded in "Shelterbuddy" at Centres that use it.

The recent Edgcombe flood that killed and threatened lives of hundreds of domestic and farm animals was an example of a situation that could not be handled by the Whakatane Centre itself and where assistance from other agencies, including MPI was requested.



There have been occasions where MPI requested help from the Centres and these usually were related to single production animals (cattle, goat).

6.4 Prosecution

The RNZSPCA and Ben Vanderkolk and Associates signed a MoU in 2013 to provide legal representation for SPCAs throughout New Zealand. Currently 29 out of 46 SPCAs have signed up to the scheme. The remaining 17 SPCAs are responsible for their own prosecution cases but they must provide a prosecution detail report to national office at the completion of sentencing.

Four of the Centres audited have adopted the national SPCA prosecution scheme and would liaise with the National Inspectorate or Regional Manager for assistance before any case is recommended for prosecution. One Centre uses their own Crown prosecutor and is responsible for managing their own prosecution cases. That Centre provides the prosecution details to the National Office at the completion of the prosecution.

The National Office keeps a register of all SPCA prosecution cases. There are approx. 30-60 prosecutions per year. If a file fails to meet the prosecution threshold a formal warning letter may be issued to resolve investigation.

Three of the Centres reported no cases were referred for prosecution in recent years. In one Centre the staff commented that there could have been cases referred for prosecution however due to limited time and resources available for processing of each case other solutions such as issuing a notice of direction under the Section 130 of the AWA, were used. That Centre was hoping that the planned restructure of SPCA would result in the head office directing more funds and human resources (trained Inspectors) to the Centre.

6.5 Records and Reporting

As per Section 142 of the AWA all Centres keep records of all animals handled. Some Centres use the new electronic register, "Shelterbuddy", some others use its predecessor "AWSOM", and some keep paper registers.

These registers are kept for various lengths of time by different Centres, from 2 years to 7 years. Nevertheless, they all keep it for longer than the minimum required time of 1 year. Each Centre provides the National Office with annual statistics on the number of complaints received, number of cases investigated and referred to another agency, number of prosecutions and number of person charged with or proceeded against. The SPCA National Office collates each Centre's annual statistics report and provides MPI with national statistics, as per Section 89 of the MoU and Section 268 of PTS.

There were 14,809 animal welfare complaints made to SPCA in 2016.

SPCA New Zealand receives funding from MPI to assist with costs incurred by SPCA centres and inspectors while attending rural animal welfare complaints. As part of the SPCA's funding agreement with MPI, the SPCA is obligated to provide detailed quarterly reports. Examples of the reports have been demonstrated to the auditors. The reports showed a breakdown of the complaints into regions, type of problems, commercial vs. non-commercial premises, outcomes of complaints, types (class) of animals involved.

One Centre kept hard copies of records related to animal welfare complaints unsecured. That creates a potential risk that other staff may access confidential information stored there. The auditor has made a recommendation to eliminate that risk in the Location Findings for that Centre (see Appendix E).



7.0 Premises, equipment, services

Overall, shelter facilities at all visited Centres were presented fit for purpose and in an acceptable state of repair and maintenance, and cleanliness. There were different type of facilities present at the visited Centres and these included: reception, hospital, adoption, quarantine/recovery, isolation, exercise etc.

There was adequate separation between facilities of different disease status and adequate prevention of disease spread. In some Centres there was a strict separation between personnel working with healthy and diseased animals.

There was a different type and level of enrichment in cages for dogs and cats and overall the standard of facilities and cages ranged from acceptable to good. However, in one Centre the cat adoption facility was not adequately protected from cold temperatures and there was no proper dog isolation area. In another Centre, the dog adoption facilities were not adequately protected from wind. The auditor has made relevant comments in Location Findings for those two Centres.

One Centre had so called amnesty facilities for dogs and cats. These are an outdoor kennel for dogs and a box for cats where people can place unwanted, abandoned or stray dogs and cats without being asked questions. These facilities seem to provide a convenient option for persons that do not want or cannot care for their animals but also for the community to look after animals that are abandoned. In addition, the Centre provide a de-sexing voucher for the people that drop the animals in to use the free option of de-sexing their other animal(s) rather than continuing breeding their pets and adding unwanted offspring.

Three of the visited Centres have plans for improvements of their shelters and these range from modifications and additions in two Centres to building an entire new Centre, in the third.

It is worth mentioning here a successful initiative by Whakatane SPCA whose staff brought together local communities from local low socio-economic areas in order to help them understand and deal with issues related to animal husbandry and welfare. The Centre has organised an event, called a "Big Day Out" in which they involved SPCA staff and various animal health professionals such as veterinarians, horse dentists and farriers. They all gathered in one place in Ruatoki and provided the community with a range of professional advice, demonstrated and conducted minor veterinary procedures and offered free animal feed and other items. After the event the Centre received a positive feedback that the initiative had been very well received and valued by the community, especially as the attendees were provided with help and advice without being judged or asked questions. Following the event, the number of animal welfare complaints from those traditionally problem areas dropped but the number of enquiries about animals' needs and future initiatives increased.

8.0 MPI/ SPCA Liaison

Most of the Centres maintain close relationships with local MPI Animal Welfare Compliance Investigators and they contact MPI when required. There is no MPI Animal Welfare Compliance person available in Whakatane.

Section 85 of the MoU refers to minimum two formal discussions a year between RNZSPCA National Executive and MPI. According to the SPCA National Manager there is one, at best, meeting per year. SPCA values those meetings especially the operational aspects and would welcome more meetings per year.

According to Section 86 of MoU, each organisation should invite and attend the other organisation's conferences and training workshops. On the local level the SPCA invites representatives from MPI Animal Welfare team to attend their annual conference (AGM) and the MPI representative usually attends. Six SPCA inspectors have attended 2 combined trainings in



recent years at Burnham and at Taratahi, and the SPCA National Manager also presented at an MPI AWI course in Napier a couple of years ago. There have been no reciprocal invitations to SPCA to attend MPI conferences or training workshops recently. This may be because the MPI Animal Welfare team has not held any conferences or workshops.

Recommendation - 8. To Manager Animal Welfare, MPI - MPI/ SPCA Liaison

It is recommended to the Manager Animal Welfare, MPI that a meaningful liaison between MPI Animal Welfare and SPCA Inspectorate is reinstated.

Section 85 of MoU refers to minimum two formal discussions a year between RNZSPCA National Executive and MPI. According to the SPCA National Manager there is one, at best, meeting per year.

Section 86 of MoU, each organisation should invite and attend the other organisation's conferences and training workshops. While the SPCA invites representatives from MPI's Animal Welfare team to attend its annual conference there have been limited reciprocal invitations to the SPCA to attend MPI conferences or workshops.

Effective liaison and appropriate feedback will assist with maintaining a close relationship between MPI and the SPCA. This liaison should include Representatives from both MPI's Animal Welfare Team and Compliance Directorate.

9.0 Annual auditing of RNZSPCA activities

In 2015 the SPCA developed and published an SPCA MPI Audits procedure/form that facilitates resolving any non-compliances that are identified in the annual SAT audit reports. In addition to the non-compliances, the procedure also includes MPI recommendations that are made to the SPCA in the final report. The progress of the proposed resolution for each finding is being rated on a quarterly basis.

10.0 Conclusions

Findings from the audit sample (selected sites) can be considered as generally representative of all SPCA centres nationally.

Addressing the Terms of Reference:

Goal 1- To assess the effectiveness of RNZSPCA national procedures to ensure that obligations and requirements of the AWA are being met by RNZSPCA/SPCA branches and member societies (centres).

Since the last audit there has been a significant improvement in the SPCA National Office standardizing its policies and procedures and enabling centres with access to these and various other resources. The communication between the National Office and Regional Manager, and the Centres has been improving. The National Office, via its Regional Managers, aims to have contact with each Centre at least three times a year. The National Office publishes and distributes to all Centres a bi-monthly newsletter that includes a variety of information from general news to information relevant to inspectors and auxiliary officers.

The Centres' staff acknowledge the positive changes and stressed that National Inspectorate staff and Regional Managers are always available for assistance.

The requirements of the AWA are being substantially met. There was no evidence to suggest that animal welfare is being compromised. That goal would not have been achieved without the Centres' staff engagement and dedication. That equally applies to volunteers who, although not being the scope of this audit, appear to be an essential workforce at the Centres.



The auditor has made a recommendation to the SPCA in regards to internal audits and to MPI in regards to assistance in training SPCA internal auditors.

Goal 2 - To evaluate how the systems and procedures implemented by the RNZSPCA are meeting the requirements outlined in the MOU between the RNZSPCA and MPI.

The requirements of the MOU are being substantially met but there are some deficiencies and inconsistencies in administering these policies and procedures between Centres. The majority of visited Centres developed and effectively implemented policies and procedures. In one Centre the policies and procedures were outdated and some procedures were lacking. One Centre had no evidence the updated policies and procedures were discussed and acknowledged by the staff.

The auditor has made recommendations to those Centres where deficiencies were identified but has also made a similar recommendation to the National Office to ensure the up-to-date Policy and Procedure Manual is maintained at each centre with consideration to be given to a minimum list of policies and procedures required.

Goal 3 - To assess the effectiveness of the RNZSPCA/SPCA branches in managing the requirements of the AWA and MOU for appointments, training and monitoring of Inspectors and AOs.

The findings of this audit indicate the processes of selection, training, appointment and monitoring generally meet the requirements of the AWA and MOU however the auditor identified areas for improvement. In one Centre, the newly appointed Inspector was placed on the job straight away after completing her training with no opportunity to work alongside any experienced Inspector. The auditor is making a recommendation to the National Office and the Centres to ensure the appropriate level of support from an experienced Inspector is available during the post-warranting period. Several Auxiliary Officers have not attended any refresher training since their appointment more than 3 years ago. Although details of ongoing training for AOs do not constitute part of AWA or MoU these requirements are documented in PTS for AOs Section 93, which requires AOs to attend training workshops at least once in every 3-year period. The auditor is making a recommendation to the SPCA to that effect.

Goal 4 - To assess corrective actions undertaken by the RNZSPCA national body and/or RNZSPCA centres in response to the previous MPI systems audit findings, and if appropriate to recommend further improvements to ensure requirements of the AWA are met.

The majority of recommendations that SAT has made during the last two audits were addressed by SPCA. Great progress has been made in the process of training and mentoring new Inspectors and securing the number of applicants for AOs positions. Similarly, the uptake of the administration tool, "Shelterbuddy" by the Centres has increased six fold. Due to the lengthy debate on the restructure of the SPCA the reviews of the MoU and PTS have been postponed and the auditor renewed those recommendations. The internal audit programme has not been implemented yet but some internal audit processes were put in place. The SPCA has a strategy to implement the internal audit programme once the new structure is in place. The auditor is making a recommendation that the SPCA is more considerate when handling complaints against inspectors and AOs to avoid alienating its own staff.

Goal 5 - To make recommendations to MPI for improvements to the MOU, and AWA ancillary notices and specifications and guidance as required.

Due to the planned SPCA restructure MPI has not reviewed the MoU and PTSs as recommended the previous year, and these recommendations are carried over.

One recommendation is made to MPI to reinstate a meaningful liaison between MPI Animal Welfare and SPCA Inspectorate. I suggest that the inspectors should be meeting with MPI



Compliance while the National Office deals with MPI AW team.

The auditor raised one MPI issue due to a lack of an adequate feedback to the SPCA on the progress of the investigation of the complaints.

In order to facilitate the SPCA implementing its own internal audit programme MPI should consider providing SPCA with assistance in training internal auditors.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982



Recommendations

Recommendation - 1. To Manager, Animal Welfare Team – Assistance in training of SPCA auditors

It is recommended to the Manager, Animal Welfare Team that MPI considers providing assistance to SPCA with training of the internal auditors.

Training of internal auditors has been identified by SPCA as one of the main limitations in implementing their internal audit programme. The National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support has indicated that SPCA does not have sufficient experience in internal auditing and that MPI assistance with training of SPCA internal auditors would be very valuable.

MPI has a great deal of expertise in auditing animal welfare related fields and in the auditor's opinion these could be utilised in assisting SPCA in training their own resources. Having an effective internal audit programme would facilitate SPCA in effective delivery of their national programme and provide MPI with confidence the SPCA as an approved organisation meets their duties and obligations in relation to the Act.

Recommendation - 2. To National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support, RNZSPCA and Manager Animal Welfare, MPI - Review of the MoU

This recommendation is carried over from the previous 2016 audit.

It is recommended to the RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support and the Initiator, the Manager Animal Welfare, MPI that review of the MoU is carried out to ensure the proposed changes of SPCA structure are incorporated into that agreement. As previously recommended, that review should be done within one year of the restructure. Depending on the outcome, the ongoing review period could be extended to a period determined at MPI discretion.

Recommendation - 3. To National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support, RNZSPCA and Manager Animal Welfare, MPI - Review of the PTS

This recommendation is carried over from the previous audit.

It is recommended to the RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support and the Initiator, the Manager Animal Welfare, MPI that review of PTS documents is carried out.

Part A: It is recommended that the SPCA reviews the PTS documents, to ensure they accurately describe how the Centres, Inspectors, AOs, and the National Office interact to meet the MoU and AWA. A review of the reporting to and communication with MPI should be included.

Part B: It is recommended that MPI reviews the proposed changes and determine if they are appropriate and manageable prior to the documents being finalised. Further changes and communications may be required before the documents can be signed e.g. differences between the Complaints Bylaw and the PTSs for managing complaints against Inspectors and AOs should be aligned.

Recommendation - 4. To National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support, RNZSPCA – Review of the Complaints Process

This is an extension of the recommendation made in the previous audit.

It is recommended to the RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support that SPCA revisits their complaints process to ensure the enquiries are full, and objective and their own staff is treated fairly and supported throughout the process.

Due to comments made by the key personnel at two Centres the auditor is in the opinion that SPCA should be more considerate when handling complaints against inspectors and AOs in



Recommendations

order to avoid alienating their own staff.

Recommendation - 5. To National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support – Policy and Procedure Manual

It is recommended to the RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support that the SPCA National Office ensures up-to-date policy and procedure manuals are maintained at each centre. Consideration should be given to a minimum list of policies and procedures that should be kept by each centre.

Recommendation - 6. To National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support, RNZSPCA – Support for Inspectors during the post-warranting period

It is recommended to the RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support that the National Office and Centres provide the newly appointed inspectors with support and access to an experienced inspector, during the post-warranting period. At present this is not happening at all locations esp. in small centres where the availability of experienced inspectors for training is limited.

Recommendation - 7. To National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support, RNZSPCA - Ongoing Training for Auxiliary Officers

It is recommended to the RNZSPCA, National Manager, Inspectorate and Centre Support that the National Office provides all AOs with the opportunity to attend training workshops as defined in the PTS for Auxiliary Officers. At present AOs from several Centres have not participated in any ongoing training workshops.

Recommendation - 8. To Manager Animal Welfare, MPI - MPI/ SPCA Liaison

It is recommended to the Manager Animal Welfare, MPI that a meaningful liaison between MPI Animal Welfare and SPCA Inspectorate is reinstated.

Section 85 of MoU refers to minimum two formal discussions a year between RNZSPCA National Executive and MPI. According to the SPCA National Manager there is one, at best, meeting per year.

Section 86 of MoU, each organisation should invite and attend the other organisation's conferences and training workshops. While the SPCA invites representatives from MPI's Animal Welfare team to attend its annual conference there have been limited reciprocal invitations to the SPCA to attend MPI conferences or workshops.

Effective liaison and appropriate feedback will assist with maintaining a close relationship between MPI and the SPCA. This liaison should include Representatives from both MPI's Animal Welfare Team and Compliance Directorate.

MPI Issues

MPI Issue - 1 - Transfer Policy

According to the MoU, Section 72 MPI, as the agency accepting the transfer of complaints is obliged to provide feedback to the SPCA, the transferring agency, on the progress of the investigation of the complaints. MPI has advised the SPCA that it was prepared to share investigation outcomes only with no further details.

During the 2016 SPCA audit SAT made recommendation to the MPI to review its policy and provide the SPCA with information on the progress and outcome of cases handed over. No information on the progress of transferred cases is provided.

A brief summary or investigation overview on all transfers would fulfil the collaborative partnership agreement between SPCA and MPI and would benefit individual Inspectors and Centres and assist in managing complainants.



Appendices

Appendix A - Location Findings for RNZSPCA National Office, Auckland - for MPI use only

Appendix B - Location Findings for SPCA Canterbury - for MPI use only

Appendix C - Location Findings for SPCA North Taranaki - for MPI use only

Appendix D - Location Findings for Whakatane SPCA - for MPI use only

Appendix E - Location Findings for Hastings and District SPCA - for MPI use only

Appendix F - Location Findings for SPCA Gisborne - for MPI use only

Appendix G - Final Report - draft - feedback from the Initiator - for MPI use only

Distribution

s 9(2)(a), Manager Animal Welfare, MPI Regulation and Assurance

s 9(2)(a), Manager Systems Audit, MPI Regulation and Assurance

Allan Kinsella, Director Systems Audit, Assurance and Monitoring, MPI Regulation and Assurance

s 9(2)(a), Manager Animal Welfare Compliance, MPI Operations

s 9(2)(a)
Systems Auditor

MPI Systems Audit Team

s 9(2)(a)
Systems Auditor

MPI Systems Audit Team

Electronically Signed by s 9(2)(a) *Auditor on the 20 Oct 2017 9:57 am*