

POINT OF ENTRY BUSINESS CASE.

Project initiation date: 2 October 2023
Project title: **Isolation Management Facility – Animal Pound**
Hapū/iwi active partnership consideration: Active partnership does not apply
Note: your consideration for active partnership must take into account [Tupua te Kawa](#) – a set of indigenous values at law.

Business case prepared by: Jason Shailer – Operations Manager – Regulatory and Planning

Business owner: General Manager Community & Customer Experience

[\[Link\] to guidelines "The PoE template explained..."](#)

PROBLEM / OPPORTUNITY STATEMENT

The Animal Pound on Airport road has been in operation for about 2.5 years. During that time we have made improvements to ensure it complies with the Animal Welfare Act 1999 - specifically in relation to the housing, shelter and exercise of dogs.

Under the Code of Welfare for Temporary Housing of Companion Animals 2018 (the code), there are listed some basic requirements to ensure the safe housing of animals by temporary shelters (pounds).

One of these requirements is a provision of a Quarantine/Isolation facility.

Undertaking some minor alterations to the current infrastructure within the existing footprint will enable us to have an isolation facility that complies with the code and will not require construction of a stand-alone facility.

While the code states: 'ideally an isolation should be a separate building located away from the main accommodation buildings' we are fortunate that our facility has been constructed in a way that, with some modifications, a standalone facility will not be required. Animals requiring to be isolated or quarantined can be isolated from others using the existing solid wall construction, and as each kennel has its own water supply, ventilation and drainage and transfer of disease from a known infected animal will be restricted.

Pound facilities are highly susceptible to imported infection such as parvovirus which affects dogs causing a fast agonising death. Currently we are at risk because we do not know vaccine status of the majority of dogs that are impounded. Animal Management Officers work on the assumption that all dogs are unvaccinated therefore pose a higher risk than the general dog population.

When a high risk dog (under 18 months and elderly) is impounded and found to be infected, they can be 'shedding' the virus wherever they go, which can result in the virus unknowingly being transferred by staff and equipment, infecting other animals as they come into contact.

The code recommends that 10% of our capacity should be used as isolation facility. In there are 48 kennels. We are proposing to set aside five kennels for isolation purposes.

BENEFITS STATEMENT

There are a number of benefits.

- Trust and Confidence in the Council will improve if infection incidents are minimised as much as possible.
- Reduction of unknown infected animals released back to owners.

- Reduction in risk and incidents for animals in the pound.
- The construction of a facility will give staff more tools to deal with infection threats and actual infections.
- Improving health and safety for staff by preventing Zoonosis which is the spreading of virus, bacteria or parasites between animals and humans.
- The construction of a facility will improve the health and safety of pound staff, we have had minor infections to staff in the past from animals so this will reduce incidents both minor and serious.
- Infections cause a dramatic increase in workload for staff trying to get it under control.
- Financial costs for staff time required to manage infection and cost of equipment.

Social Benefits:

- Improving the quality of the existing animal pound

Economic Benefits:

- Construction of new isolation area will result in new economic activity for that period time
- Repurposing existing facility to ensure it remains fit for purpose and compliant for new use provides an economic use of assets

STRATEGIC CASE

Ensuring there is a suitable isolation facility in the Animal Pound will ensure that we are compliant with the Animal Welfare Act 1999 and related welfare codes.

FINANCIAL CASE

An estimate of Capex would be 30K funded from rates.

I anticipate that the rollout would of the programme would be: design, build and delivery in year 1.

Year of LTP for delivery:	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6	Y7	Y8	Y9	Y10
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
	24/25	25/26	26/27	27/28	28/29	29/30	30/31	31/32	32/33	33/34

External funding contributions: Not an option

Capex \$	Opex \$	Funded by
\$30,000.00	No increase to existing Opex	Rate funded

*Note: providing explanation via free text is also acceptable in the above boxes.

RISK EVALUATION

Item	Potential Risk Event	Likelihood	Consequence
1	Publicity regarding lack of Isolation Facility (reputation)	Almost certain	Moderate
2	Death of animal in care	Almost certain	Major
3	Legal action from owner of sick/dead animal	Possible	Moderate
4	Regulatory body action ie; intervention from MPI	Possible	Moderate

OPTIONS APPRAISAL

Option 1: Construct a stand-alone isolation facility – This option will attract significant cost and may require further consenting, there is unlikely to be sufficient space within the current footprint to construct a stand-alone facility. This would provide a purpose built facility that will be fit for purpose for the life of the facility.

Option 2: Construct a facility within the existing footprint – this is the cost effective option that will ensure we have mitigated the risk of spreading disease..

Do Nothing / Status quo The risk of animal death and illness, staff safety (zoonosis), reputational damage to the council remains.

STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS

Stakeholder	Influences	Key interests & issues
Animal management Staff	High power/highly interested (Manage closely)	Users of the facility
Animal Owners	Low power/interested (Monitor)	Informed via media
Choose an item.		

Animal management staff understand the need to have an isolation facility and support this being undertaken to enable them to provide better care to sick animals.

KEY CONSTRAINTS, DEPENDENCIES AND ASSUMPTIONS

The key constraints from a design perspective will be whether the addition of infrastructure to the existing footprint would be practical in that environment.

NEXT STAGE

Obtain Quotes

Please contact the PMO (interim Stuart White: stuart.white@whanganui.govt.nz or 021738273) for any inquiries relating to this form or the business case process.

Team Leader/Project Manager Self-Review		Strategic Panel FINAL score	
Strategic Fit	3	Strategic Fit	3
Benefits	3	Benefits	3
Economic Impact	2	Economic Impact	2
Level of Service Improvements	4	Level of Service Improvements	5
Risk of doing nothing	4	Risk of doing nothing	4

*Note a copy of the anchored scoring matrix is available at the end of this document.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT OFFICE TO COMPLETE

Communications team level of involvement: Choose an item. (PMO to liaise with the Communications team)

ELT REVIEW

Date: Click or tap to enter a date.

ELT Minutes Reference: Click or tap here to enter text.

Agreed next steps:

Click or tap here to enter text.

If this project is **approved for a detailed business case**, then –

Name and job title of **Project Sponsor**

Click or tap here to enter text.