

# ATTACHMENT 1

---



**Premier & Cabinet**  
Division of Local Government

**Circular to Councils**

Circular No. 13-11  
Date 25 March 2013  
Doc ID. A319408

Contact Innovation Team  
02 4428 4100

## **CONSULTATION ON COMPANION ANIMALS TASKFORCE REPORTS**

### **Purpose**

To inform councils that two reports from the Companion Animals Taskforce have been released on the Division's website for public consultation.

### **Issue**

- The Companion Animals Taskforce was established by the Minister for Local Government and the Minister for Primary Industries to provide advice on key companion animal issues (Circular 12-11 refers).
- The Taskforce has submitted two reports providing 38 recommendations for Government consideration. The reports are:
  - NSW Companion Animals Taskforce Report
  - NSW Companion Animals Taskforce Report on the Management of Dangerous Dogs
- As the recommendations have implications for the management of cats and dogs in NSW, councils, interested stakeholder groups and the community are being encouraged to review and comment on the recommendations prior to any final decisions being made.

### **Action**

Councils are encouraged to read the reports and complete the on-line feedback form available at [www.dlg.nsw.gov.au](http://www.dlg.nsw.gov.au) by the submission closing date of **10 May 2013**.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Steve Orr', written over a light blue horizontal line.

**Steve Orr**  
**A/Chief Executive, Local Government**  
**A Division of the Department of Premier and Cabinet**

Division of Local Government  
5 O'Keefe Avenue NOWRA NSW 2541  
Locked Bag 3015 NOWRA NSW 2541  
T 02 4428 4100 F 02 4428 4199 TTY 02 4428 4209  
E [dlg@dlg.nsw.gov.au](mailto:dlg@dlg.nsw.gov.au) W [www.dlg.nsw.gov.au](http://www.dlg.nsw.gov.au) ABN 99 567 863 195

# ATTACHMENT 2

Government Companion Animals Response Feedback - Department of Local Government

Page 1 of 22



**Division of Local Government**  
Department of Premier & Cabinet

<http://www.dlg.nsw.gov.au/dlg/eventregistration/eventstaskforce/TaskForceRegister.asp?mi=25&ml=1&AreaIndex=FB2>

10/05/2013

Home Companion Animals Taskforce Government consultation on final reports

## Community Response Feedback

### Feedback Form

The final reports from the Companion Animal Taskforce have been released and you now have an opportunity to have your say on the recommendations.

Having your say allows your views and opinions to be considered by the NSW Government prior to any final decisions being made.

You can have your say by completing the online feedback form.

**Closing date:** Friday 10 May 2013.

**Note:** Please be aware that ALL submissions will be treated as being available for publication unless there are strong public interest or legal reasons against publication. Anonymous or 'confidential' submissions will not be accepted.

### YOUR DETAILS

\*indicates a required field

Name  \*

Organisation Name/Interest Group Name

*Please provide contact details (if we need to contact you - this information will be kept confidential)*

Phone Number

Email Address  \*

Interest Group: (please select the applicable box below) \*

- Animal Welfare/Rescue/Shelter Group
- Council
- State agency

bottom ↕

- Member of registered breeder body
- Other industry organisation
- Community group
- Interested individual
- Other:

If 'Other', please specify:

Your Council  \*

[Go to survey section](#)
[Dangerous Dogs](#)
[Registrations](#)
[Research Funding](#)
[Working Group](#)
[Animal Welfare](#)
[Education](#)
[Data Management](#)
[Additional Comments](#)

**QUESTIONS**

Please indicate if you agree with each Taskforce Recommendation and its level of priority. The survey also includes questions regarding policy considerations. Comments can be made at the end of this form.

Detailed information on each recommendation is included in the [Management of Dangerous Dogs Report \(DD Report\)](#) and the [Companion Animals Taskforce Report \(CA Report\)](#). Similar recommendations have been grouped below and do not appear in the same order as the reports.

The two Taskforce reports can be downloaded at:

- [Management of Dangerous Dogs Report \(DD Report\)](#).
- [Companion Animals Taskforce Report \(CA Report\)](#).

**DANGEROUS DOGS**

**Recommendation 1.1: Amend the Companions Animals Act to introduce a 'potentially dangerous' dog category for less serious dog attacks/incidents. (DD Report p.11)**

Agree:  Yes

- No
- Unsure

Priority:

- High
- Medium
- Low

**Recommendation 1.2: Introduce provisions in the Companions Animals Act for a 'dangerous' or 'potentially dangerous dog' declaration to be revoked if medical issues are resolved and behavioural training is undertaken for the dog in question and the council is satisfied that it is appropriate to do so. (DD Report p.12)**

Agree:

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Priority:

- High
- Medium
- Low

**Recommendation 1.3: Update the dog attack reporting framework to more clearly differentiate between 'dog attacks' and less serious incidents involving dogs. (DD Report p.14)**

Agree:

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Priority:

- High
- Medium
- Low

**Recommendation 1.4: Review existing powers of council officers under the Companion Animals Act relating to the seizure of dogs subject to dangerous or restricted dog declarations for the purposes of identification. (DD Report p.15)**

Agree:  
 Yes  
 No  
 Unsure

Priority:  
 High  
 Medium  
 Low

**Recommendation 1.5: Review the statute of limitations under which councils can prosecute dog attack offences to ensure that it is in-line with other relevant legislation. (DD Report p.16)**

Agree:  
 Yes  
 No  
 Unsure

Priority:  
 High  
 Medium  
 Low

**Recommendation 2.1: Introduce annual registration of cats and dogs and a breeder licensing system to improve the ability of councils to track dangerous dogs through their lifecycle. (DD Report p.18)**

Agree:  
 Yes  
 No  
 Unsure

- Priority:  
 High  
 Medium  
 Low

**Recommendation 2.2: Develop a model behavioural assessment for the use of councils and other impounding agencies. (DD Report p.19)**

- Agree:  
 Yes  
 No  
 Unsure

- Priority:  
 High  
 Medium  
 Low

**Recommendation 2.4: Improve the dissemination of information about disqualified animal owners. (DD Report p.20)**

- Agree:  
 Yes  
 No  
 Unsure

- Priority:  
 High  
 Medium  
 Low

**Recommendation 3.1: Develop a Memorandum of Understanding template for use by councils and NSW Police regarding the enforcement of the CA Act. (DD Report p.21)**

- Agree:  
 Yes

- No
- Unsure

Priority:

- High
- Medium
- Low

**Recommendation 3.2: Develop a Memorandum of Understanding between councils, animal welfare organisations and relevant State Government agencies to standardise information sharing protocols in relation to dangerous and potentially dangerous dogs. (DD Report p.22)**

Agree:

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Priority:

- High
- Medium
- Low

**Recommendation 3.3: Strengthen cross-agency delivery of educational resources on dog attack and dangerous dog issues. (DD Report p.23)**

Agree:

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Priority:

- High
- Medium
- Low

**Recommendation 3.5: Amend the CA Act to allow councils to automatically declare a dog to be dangerous or**



potentially dangerous if they receive confirmation that the dog is the subject of such a declaration in another jurisdiction. (DD Report p.25)

- Agree:
- Yes
  - No
  - Unsure

- Priority:
- High
  - Medium
  - Low

Other questions about dangerous dogs:

**A. Is there a need for further breed-specific provisions in the Companion Animals Act that restrict the ownership of particular breeds of dog?**

- Agree:
- Yes
  - No
  - Unsure

- Priority:
- High
  - Medium
  - Low

[go to index](#)

#### WORKING GROUP

**Recommendation 3.4: The Minister for Local Government and NSW Attorney General should write to the Federal Attorney General to request that a cross-jurisdictional working group be established to develop a national dog attack and dangerous dog database. (DD Report p.24)**

Agree:  
 Yes  
 No  
 Unsure

Priority:  
 High  
 Medium  
 Low

**Recommendation 3.6: Establish a working group to improve dog attack data captured by hospitals and general practitioners. (DD Report p.25)**

Agree:  
 Yes  
 No  
 Unsure

Priority:  
 High  
 Medium  
 Low

**Recommendation 22: An ongoing reference group on cat and dog management issues should be established. (CA Report p.33)**

Agree:  
 Yes  
 No  
 Unsure

Priority:  
 High  
 Medium  
 Low

[go to index](#)

#### RESEARCH FUNDING

**Recommendation 2.3: Provide funding for research into dangerous dog issues. (DD Report p.20)**

Agree:  
 Yes  
 No  
 Unsure

Priority:  
 High  
 Medium  
 Low

**Recommendation 18: Funding should be provided for research into key cat and dog issues. (CA Report p.28)**

Agree:  
 Yes  
 No  
 Unsure

Priority:  
 High  
 Medium  
 Low

[go to index](#)

#### REGISTRATION

**Recommendation 8: The Companion Animals Act should be amended to require cats and dogs to be registered**

**on an annual basis. (CA Report p.16)**

- Agree:
- Yes
  - No
  - Unsure

- Priority:
- High
  - Medium
  - Low

**Recommendation 9: Cat and dog registration fees should be reviewed and set at such a level to provide an additional incentive for owners to desex their animals. (CA Report p.18)**

- Agree:
- Yes
  - No
  - Unsure

- Priority:
- High
  - Medium
  - Low

**Recommendation 10: The Companion Animals Regulation should be amended to require a cat to be registered from the time it is 4 months of age. (CA Report p.19)**

- Agree:
- Yes
  - No
  - Unsure

- Priority:
- High
  - Medium

Low

**Recommendation 11: The Companion Animal Regulation should be amended to allow cat and dog registration fees to be indexed to the Consumer Price Index. (CA Report p.21)**

Agree:

Yes

No

Unsure

Priority:

High

Medium

Low

**Recommendation 12: A new discounted registration category 'Desexed animal - purchased from a pound or shelter' should be established to further encourage the purchase of desexed cats and dogs. (CA Report p.21)**

Agree:

Yes

No

Unsure

Priority:

High

Medium

Low

Other questions about registration:

**B. Which type of animals should continue to be lifetime registered (i.e. only once) rather than on an annual basis? (Select all that apply)**

Desexed Dogs

Undesexed Dogs

- Desexed Cats
- Undesexed Cats
- All should be registered once
- All should be registered annually

**C. Should undesexed animals attract a higher lifetime registration fee when compared to desexed animals?**

- Agree:
- Yes
  - No
  - Unsure

- Priority:
- High
  - Medium
  - Low

**D. What is an appropriate lifetime registration fee for a desexed animal (currently \$40)? (Select one)**

- Less than \$40
- \$40
- \$40-\$60
- \$60-\$80
- \$80-\$100
- More than \$100
- Fee should be annual

**E. What is an appropriate lifetime registration fee for an undesexed animal (currently \$150)? (Select one)**

- Less than \$150
- \$150
- \$150-\$200
- \$200-250
- \$250-\$300

- More than \$300
- Fee should be annual

**F. Which companion animal categories should attract a discount on registration? (Select all that apply)**

- Animal over 4 years old
- Animal over 8 years old
- Animal purchased from a pound
- Animal purchased from a shelter
- Undesexed animal from registered breeder
- Undesexed animal not held for breeding
- No discounts for any animal

**G. Should there be public access to the register, allowing individuals and groups to access details of pets they have registered, update their details, and register new animals from a private computer?**

- Agree:
- Yes
  - No
  - Unsure
- Priority:
- High
  - Medium
  - Low

[go to index](#)

**ANIMAL WELFARE**

**Recommendation 1: A breeder licensing system should be established and the Companion Animals Register should be updated to capture breeder license information for each animal record. (CA Report p.6)**

- Agree:
- Yes

- No
- Unsure

Priority:

- High
- Medium
- Low

**Recommendation 2: The Animal Welfare Code of Practice - Breeding Dogs and Cats should be revised to ensure that the existing guidelines it contains become enforceable standards. (CA Report p.8)**

Agree:

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Priority:

- High
- Medium
- Low

**Recommendation 3: Relevant animal welfare codes of practice should be amended to require the sellers of cats and dogs to display an animal's microchip number (or the license number of the breeder of an animal) in all advertisements, and at point of sale in the case of pet shops, markets and fairs. (CA Report p.9)**

Agree:

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Priority:

- High
- Medium
- Low

**Recommendation 4: The Companion Animals Regulation should be amended to remove the existing provision**



**that allows recognised breeders to sell unmicrochipped cats or dogs to pet shops. (CA Report p.11)**

Agree:  
 Yes  
 No  
 Unsure

Priority:  
 High  
 Medium  
 Low

**Recommendation 7: Relevant animal welfare codes of practice should be updated to require that at least one staff member working in a pet shop, breeding establishment, point of sale or animal shelter must hold a Certificate II - Animal Studies qualification. (CA Report p.15)**

Agree:  
 Yes  
 No  
 Unsure

Priority:  
 High  
 Medium  
 Low

**Recommendation 13: A grant funding program should be established for councils and partner organisations to deliver targeted microchipping, registration and desexing programs. (CA Report p.22)**

Agree:  
 Yes  
 No  
 Unsure

Priority:

- High
- Medium
- Low

**Recommendation 19: Better practice guidelines should be issued to councils with a view to standardising impounding practices. (CA Report p.29)**

Agree:

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Priority:

- High
- Medium
- Low

Other questions about animal welfare:

**H. If a breeder licensing system were to be established, who should be included as a breeder? (Select all that apply)**

- Member of Recognised Breeder body (eg accredited member of Dogs NSW)
- Breeder operating a breeding business that is not a member of a recognised Breeder body (non-accredited)
- Breeder (eg. Sale of a one-off litter)
- No Non-Commercial breeder should be included

[go to index](#)

#### EDUCATION

**Do you agree with following six educational recommendations?**

**Educational Recommendation**

	Do you Agree		
	Yes	No	Unsure
4.1 As part of a community-wide socially responsible pet education campaign, review and update existing dog bite prevention and dangerous dog management educational resources for the public, councils and other agencies. (DD Report p.27)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5 An information sheet should be issued in relation to the advertising and sale of cats and dogs. (CA Report p.12)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6 Mandatory standardised information on socially responsible pet ownership should be developed to be given out at point of sale. (CA Report p.13)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15 A community-wide socially responsible pet ownership education campaign should be developed. (CA Report p.25)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16 The socially responsible pet ownership school-based education program should be expanded to include the preschool age group. (CA Report p.26)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17 Comprehensive education material about the importance of confining cats to their owner's property should be developed. (CA Report p.27)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Please order the six educational recommendations displayed above in order of priority 1-6 (1 being highest, 6 being lowest)**

**Educational Recommendation**

	Order Priorities from 1 to 6					
	1 (highest)	2	3	4	5	6 (lowest)

- |  |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |                                  |
|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 4.1 As part of a community-wide socially responsible pet education campaign, review and update existing dog bite prevention and dangerous dog management educational resources for the public, councils and other agencies. (DD Report p.27) | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>            | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>            |
| 5 An information sheet should be issued in relation to the advertising and sale of cats and dogs. (CA Report p.12)   | <input type="radio"/>            | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>            |
| 6 Mandatory standardised information on socially responsible pet ownership should be developed to be given out at point of sale. (CA Report p.13)  | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>            |
| 15 A community-wide socially responsible pet ownership education campaign should be developed. (CA Report p.25)  | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>            | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>            |
| 16 The socially responsible pet ownership school-based education program should be expanded to include the preschool age group. (CA Report p.26)   | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>            | <input checked="" type="radio"/> |
| 17 Comprehensive education material about the importance of confining cats to their owner's property should be developed. (CA Report p.27)   | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>            | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>            | <input type="radio"/>            |

[go to index](#)

**DATA MANAGEMENT**

**Recommendation 14.1: Encourage breeder groups and animal welfare organisations listed in the Companion Animals Act to become 'registration agents', allowing them to process registration fees and change animal details. (CA Report p.23)**

Agree:  
 Yes  
 No

Unsure

Priority:

High

Medium

Low

**Recommendation 14.2: Establish a fee for service model for registration agents to encourage uptake of this role, whereby an amount of registration fee for each cat and do they process is remitted to them from the Companion Animals fund. (CA Report p.23)**

Agree:

Yes

No

Unsure

Priority:

High

Medium

Low

**Recommendation 14.3 Update the Register to streamline data entry processes and introduce 'self-service' data entry options for owners to update their contact details. (CA Report p.23)**

Agree:

Yes

No

Unsure

Priority:

High

Medium

Low

**Recommendation 14.4: Undertaking a campaign to increase compliance with the registration requirements of the CA Act, by targeting the owners of cats and dogs of registration age that are listed on the CA Register as not**

**registered. (CA Report p.23)**

- Agree:
- Yes
  - No
  - Unsure

- Priority:
- High
  - Medium
  - Low

**Recommendation 20: The Companion Animals Register should be updated to provide a centralised impounded animal management tool for use by all councils, relevant State agencies and animal welfare organisations. (CA Report p.31)**

- Agree:
- Yes
  - No
  - Unsure

- Priority:
- High
  - Medium
  - Low

**Additional comments**

Please provide any additional comments (responses should be limited to less than < 2000 characters)

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS – COMPANION ANIMALS TASKFORCE REPORTS**  
**DANGEROUS DOGS**  
 Recommendation 1.1: The recommendation is supported provided full discretion is able to be exercised in relation to the circumstances of the incidents.  
 Recommendation 2.1: The recommendation is not fully supported in respect annual registration of dogs and cats (see additional comments under Penetration – Recommendation 8

4-top

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Can't see image? click here  
Write the characters in the image above

Submit

**Thank you for taking the time to provide this feedback.**

4-Go to Top

Print A A

New South Wales Division of Local Government, Department of Premier and Cabinet  
5 O'Keefe Avenue, Nowra, NSW, Australia  
Locked Bag 3015, Nowra, NSW 2541 Australia  
Email:  
Tel: 61-2-4428 4100 Fax: 61-2-4428 4199

# ATTACHMENT 3



24 May 2013

Mr S Orr  
Acting Chief Executive, Local Government  
Department of Premier and Cabinet  
Locked Bag 3015  
NOWRA NSW 2541

Dear Mr Orr,

**Re: CONSULTATION ON THE COMPANION ANIMALS TASKFORCE REPORTS**

**Feedback Reference: CARESPONSE\_13005329**

I am writing in regard to Council's submission of 10 May 2013 to the on-line feedback survey to the two reports from the Companion Animals Taskforce.

The final part of the survey asked for additional comments, unfortunately however, responses were limited to less than 2000 characters. This limitation prevented Council from making adequate comment, particularly with regard to clarifying and/or elaborating our answers to the on-line survey questions.

Accordingly, attached is a copy of Council's additional comments to the Taskforce Reports which Council trusts will be given due consideration as part of our on-line submission (CARESPONSE\_13005329). An electronic copy of the attached document can be forwarded to you if required.

Should you wish to discuss the above matter further please contact Council's Acting Manager Compliance Services, Mr Michael Donachie on 4645 4614.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Jim Baldwin", written over a white background.

Jim Baldwin  
**ACTING DIRECTOR PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT DIVISION**



**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS – COMPANION ANIMALS TASKFORCE REPORTS**

**DANGEROUS DOGS**

Recommendation 1.1:	The recommendation is supported provided full discretion is able to be exercised in relation to the circumstances of the incidents.
Recommendation 2.1:	<p>The recommendation is not fully supported in respect annual registration of dogs and cats (see additional comments under Registration - Recommendation 8 below).</p> <p>The recommendation in respect of annual registration of dangerous dogs and restricted dogs is supported.</p> <p>The recommendation in respect of a breeder licensing system to improve the ability of councils to track dangerous dogs seems counterintuitive given the prohibitions on the breeding of restricted dogs under section 57C of the Companion Animals Act (CAA) and likely to be unenforceable.</p>
Recommendation 2.2:	<p>The recommendation is supported provided provision is made to enable input from all relevant stakeholders, including Councils, into the proposed model behavioural assessment standard.</p> <p>It is also suggested that if officers are to be required to be accredited in behavioural assessment then there may be a need to protect behavioural assessors (the officers) from liability in a similar way to that provided section 58E of the CAA for breed assessors and temperament assessors.</p>
Recommendation 2.4:	The recommendation is supported and it is considered essential that the proposed disqualified owner database be linked to the Companion Animals Register in such a way to enable a single entry to be made that updates the Register and database simultaneously.
Recommendation 3.1:	<p>Campbelltown City Council and Police Local Area Command have for some time now had implemented a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) regarding the enforcement of the CAA (Council's MOU is available to the Taskforce review if required).</p> <p>The MOU has been found to be most effective in defining and clarifying each agencies roles and responsibilities, particularly after hours procedures for management and welfare of companion animals. The MOU has also served to avoid duplication in procedures and subsequent legal action by each agency.</p>

	<p>more immediate and greater need and the uncertainty surrounding the scope of projects that would be funded. Additionally, care should be taken to restrict the allocation of funded research programs to objective (and not self-interest) individuals and groups that are involved in dog and cat research.</p>
<p><b>REGISTRATION</b></p>	
<p>Recommendation 8:</p>	<p>The recommendation is opposed. Council believes that the aim of the CAA changes must emphasize responsible and accessible pet ownership and to that end a registration system that encourages desexing of companion animals by way of lifetime registration incentives should continue to be supported, whilst annual registration should be implemented for those who choose not to desex their animal, as this may also encourage desexing where the need for a whole animal is not required.</p> <p>Council is also concerned that the introduction of annual registration for all companion animals may prove a disincentive to registration; may put pet ownership out of the reach of disadvantaged persons, and may result in increased euthanasia rates for abandoned animals. Additionally, an annual registration system for all cats and dogs would place an onerous administrative and compliance burden on councils that may very well outweigh any perceived benefits from the additional revenue raised by means of annual registration fees.</p>
<p>Recommendation 11:</p>	<p>The recommendation is not supported. Registration fees need to be kept as affordable as possible to encourage responsible and accessible pet ownership.</p> <p>It is also perceived that an annual registration system for all cats and dogs would at each change of fee structure mean that information resources printed or published with previous fee schedules would need to be unnecessarily disposed or altered. Any changes to fees and charges would also need to be timed so as to enable Council's to publically exhibit such changes as part of its annual review fees and charges review and before publication by the councils.</p>
<p>Additional Question G:</p>	<p>The recommendation is not supported as the security implications are considered too great.</p>
<p><b>ANIMAL WELFARE</b></p>	

Recommendation 7:	The recommendation is supported provided ample lead-in time is made available for designated staff to gain the Certificate II – Animal Studies qualification and implementation should not be to the detriment of existing staff employment arrangements.
Recommendation 19:	The recommendation is supported; however, it is suggested that a better approach would be to incorporate best practice training in impounding practices as part of the accredited training proposed under Recommendation 7.
Additional Question H:	It is suggested at recommendation 16 in the table that the education program for pre-school children also include the dangers associated with approaching or surprising unfamiliar dogs and cats.
<b>DATA MANAGEMENT</b>	
Recommendation 14.1:	The recommendation is not supported for reasons of security and as it seems counterintuitive to the confidentiality provisions under section 89 of the CAA.
Recommendation 14.3:	The recommendation is not supported for reasons of security and accuracy of information entered. A better approach it seems would be to have a link on the DLG website that owners could utilise to update ownership details online, thereby negating the need to access the register. An authorized officer could complete the change of details onto the register.
Recommendation 20:	Council is not clear on the benefits a centralised impounded animal management tool would provide as it would appear that the proposal would be a duplication of systems that many councils would already have in place.