|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Draft IO Report  | Final IO Report  | IO Summary |
| **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY** |  | **VOYAGE SUMMARY** |
| There were cattle shipped that should have been rejected under ASEL eg SEALS cow with lumpy jaw, LSS heifer with an infected swollen hind fetlock on account of a missing claw hoof that resulted in non-weight bearing lameness and bulls from SEALS with bleeding horn buds due to horns being cut too short | The section about cattle not being fit to load under ASEL was removed from the executive summary and moved to Section 8f | “The causes of these mortalities were not considered to be linked to any systemic failure by the exporter” – VALE COMMENT – loading cattle that are unfit to load and significant stockperson competency issues are directly the responsibility of the exporter **HEALTH AND WELFARE**“The observer noted that three cattle showed signs consistent with ASEL rejection criteria. Considering available information, an assessment of suitability of these animals was inconclusive.” VALE COMMENT: there was 1 cow with lumpy jaw (non ASEL compliant), 1 cow with non weight-bearing lameness and a missing claw and bulls (plural) with bleeding horn buds (non ASEL compliant). There were also concerns raised about unsuitability of cull cows. The DAWR statement is absolutely incorrect and misleading as there are >3 cattle and the cattle described have ASEL reject criteria.“These cattle had no observable negative health or welfare implications and were discharged in Jakarta”VALE COMMENT: non weight-bearing lameness is not fit to load in Australia and is clear negative health and welfare situation. DAWR chose to a) mislead and b) make a comment that is contrary to what the IO said |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Draft IO Report | Final IO Report | IO Summary |
| **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY** |  | **PEN CONDITIONS** |
| Areas became flooded with heavy effluent during discharge in Jakarta Port – challenging for crew and cattle standing in some pens with liquid eluent, fetlock deep for over 30 hours | Comment added that heat stress may have been a result of excess moisture from the effluent | Re the effluent on Decks 6 and 7: “No negative health or welfare implications were observed upon the cattle due to these pad conditions with affected animals discharging at this portVALE COMMENT: this is not what the IO said. The IO said that “Heat stress may have been a result of excess moisture from the effluent” |
| Cattle in some pens showed heat stress in Indonesian Ports |  | Heat stress is detailed under Ventilation consistent with this comment |
| Manure pads in some pens not washed and became heavy and sloppy | Comment added that these conditions did not appear to cause heat stress | “pad conditions in the main pens and hospital pens were managed acceptably throughout the voyage”VALE COMMENT: an incorrect representation of the IO comments. |
| Most cattle had acceptable space, feed and water | Most cattle deleted and changed to “A general observation was” | “stocking density was within ASEL requirements”VALE COMMENT: the IO did not make this comment |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Draft IO Report | Final IO Report | IO Summary |
| **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY** | **EXEC SUMM** | **HEALTH AND WELFARE** |
| 14 cattle died; The [redaction] were appropriately euthanised due to traumatic injuries. The [redaction] cattle died due to suspected stress related illnesses, all of which were SEALS cattle. [Redaction – likely a number] of 325 older cull cows died (ie [redaction] %) from the same SEALS consignment suggesting they were not fit to transport | The word “appropriately” was deletedChanged to “what the stockman suspected as being respiratory…”Deleted “suggesting they were not fit to transport” | No mention that redacted % of a consignment of older cull cows died. VALE COMMENT: why were older cull cows even included for feeder/slaughter? |
| Issues were also identified with the management of sick and injured cattle by one of the SEALS stockmen. “This included insufficient supply of saw dust bedding in hospital pens, lack of care to downer cattle, incomplete and inaccurate record keeping on voyage reports, and delayed or insufficient euthanasia of cattle showing signs of pain and suffering and imminent death.” | Similar | No mention of insufficient bedding or lack of care to downer cattle.No mention in IO summary of the inaccurate record keeping or issues with S4 drugs.VALE COMMENT: Government summary excluded concerning information recorded by the IO. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Draft IO Report | Final IO Report | IO Summary |
| **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY** | **EXEC SUMM** | **HEALTH AND WELFARE** |
| Furthermore no records were made of veterinary medications used, despite evidence that Flunixil and Trisoprim used. At least two heifers administered with Schedule 4 veterinary drugs were not identified to show that a withholding period of 28 days should pass before slaughter. This is contrary to section 5.8 and 5.9 of ASEL and relevant to guidelines for responsible use of Schedule 4 veterinary drugs. | Similar | No mention in IO summary of the inaccurate record keeping or issues with S4 drugs.VALE COMMENT: Government summary excluded concerning information recorded by the IO. |
| Further concerns for animal welfare include the discharge of two severely lame heifers that had non-weight bearing hind foot lameness injuries (one LSS and one SEALS) that were infected and had a poor prognosis for recovery. | Similar | No mention that one of the animals not fit to load was lame (with only one claw) thus should not have been loaded in Australia or discharged in Jakarta.No comment about the animal welfare implications that another animal that also had non-weight bearing lameness was discharged in Jakarta. |
| Empty drug containers cast on the ground remaining until in deck washing | Similar | No mention in IO summary |
| In Jakarta port, the medical room containing all veterinary drugs was left unlocked during discharge | Similar  | No mention in IO summary |
| Smoking also occurred throughout the livestock decks by many persons during discharge where cigarette butts were left in sawdusted areas | Similar | No mention in IO summary despite this being an extreme risk for animal welfare and on a vessel that had undergone a full investigation after a major fire in Fremantle Port. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Draft IO Report | Final IO Report | IO Summary |
| **THE CONSIGNMENT** | **CONSIGNMENT** |  |
| 146 Friesian heifers transported | Similar | No mention of dairy heifers.VALE COMMENT: one assumes only *Bos indicus* for feeder/slaughter from northern ports so this omission is noteworthy.  |
| **THE VOYAGE** |  | **PEN CONDITIONS** |
| The forward section on deck 5 was not washed due to increasing daily cattle mortality and morbidity levels on that deck prior to washing. Wash down did not occur on decks 7,8, or 9 because they were the first to be discharged in Jakarta and the manure pad was deemed as acceptable by the stockmen | Similar | Deck 5 had no wash performed as the pad conditions were deemed adequate based upon an assessment made by the stockpersons.VALE COMMENT: this is false and misleading. The reason Deck 5 was not washed was due to dead and dying cattle. Decks 7-9 were not washed because deemed adequate |
| A decision for deck washing was already decided by day three so the chief officer could plan the order for emptying water tanks to livestock and control the ships trim to facilitate effluent drainage during washing | Similar | No mention |
| **Table 1 Morbidity and Mortality** Exporter redacted and appears as though mortality numbers redacted as no “n” included | Table 1 Morbidity and Mortality. Exporter deleted and mortality number deleted. Added comment: “The Observer did not witness any post mortems, however one recorded in the daily report” | This detailed information was not presented in the IO Summary. It is interesting that that this seemingly diligent IO was not present for the post-mortem and made this comment as the comment could be taken to imply that the IO believed the post-mortem record on the daily report was incorrect. There is no clarification to determine whether this is a statement of fact (eg “I wasn’t there”) vs dubious record (eg “did it happen” or “was this an incorrect record?”).  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Draft IO Report | Final IO Report | IO Summary |
| **THE VOYAGE** |  | **PERSONNEL** |
| Four of the five stockmen were easy to approach and always helpful to supply information as requested. One of the stockmen from SEALS however was not | This was altered to “most of the stockmen were easy to approach and always helpful”. Reference to the difficult stockman removed.  | “Communications between all staff was generally easy going and professional during the voyage”VALE COMMENT: Despite extensive documentation of very concerning problems with one SEALS stockperson, this was not included in the personnel section. Wording was thus misleading to public.  |
| **Documentation** |  | **LOADING** |
| The load plan was missing some information about deck identification correlating to total livestock numbers and numbers less than on load plan. There is a comment that this resulted in IO confusion | Comment re “This caused the IO some confusion as to total numbers of cattle per deck and exporter” was removed | No mention of the load- plan issues |
| **Loading** |  | **LOADING** |
| A potential hazard for livestock injury was identified during loading. Two sections intersected on the load ramp (port to ship) loosely fastened together with hay twine. Some cattle were hit by the flapping walls as they passed this intersection. After ship loading it was noted that three larger framed cattle had haematomas around the hip and thigh areas. It is conceivable these injuries occurred due to hits from the unsecured load ramp walls | Comment added: “This was an observation made retrospectively after reviewing the footage and photos. No discussion took place at the time” | “No animal welfare issues were observed during loading”VALE COMMENT: This is in direct contradiction to the welfare issues noted in both the initial and final draft reports. Haematomas (ie bleeding/bruising) are an animal health and welfare issue |
| **Pen Construction** | **Pen construction** | **PEN CONDITIONS** |
| Several cattle pens had floor surfaces covered in metal gridding and other protrusions 2-3cm in height – identified as hazard for cattle | Comment added: “The Chief [Officer? Or DAWR?] was advised of the floor surfaces. | The observer identified sections of flooring were a potential welfare risk for the cattle. VALE COMMENT: Actual details not provided |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Draft IO Report | Final IO Report | IO Summary |
| **Pen Construction** | **Pen construction** | **PEN CONDITIONS** |
| A further hazard for cattle injury was identified in several pens where gates were left on the ground. Cattle were observed slipping on the gates. On deck 5 forward in a nearby hospital pen, a heifer that had been residing in a pen with a gate on the ground did have a major laceration to the hind coronet band. Stockman should remove fallen gates to avoid limb or hoof injury to cattle | The comment: “stockman should remove fallen gates…to cattle” was removed and replaced by “A crew member was advised of the gates however there was no change to the conditions of the pen”. | Re stacked gates: “The observer noted cattle slipping on these gates. One heifer ….foot laceration. No other animals were noted to have negative health or welfare implications as a result of this issue.VALE COMMENT: the phrase “No others animals..” has been added by DAWR and is potentially misleading as it is not in the draft or final report AND the number of cattle slipping is not detailed…..ie how many cattle were affected?  |
| **Ventilation** |  | **VENTILATION** |
| The hottest area was 9th Nov on deck 6, 30.6 WBT and cattle showed elevated respiration rates and oral drooling. Some dairy heifers on deck 7 showed heat stress (elevated respiration and oral drooling) whilst in Jakarta….the dairy heifers were given more space by opening gates and this appeared to alleviate heat stress…the heifers were the first to be discharged | Description of heat stress removed and replaced with “showed heat stress score of 2”…Comment added after “given more space” – “by the stockpersons opening…”Added after discharge: “This was coordinated by the Stockpersons | No description of the heat-stressed cattle on Deck 6. But score providedHeat stress on Deck 7 mentioned with score given but no breed (dairy heifers) recorded |
| **Feed/Water/Pen Management**  | **Feed/Water/Pen Mgmt** | **FEED AND WATER** |
| Water fill rates in many troughs were slow, water levels often not more than 5cm full in many troughs and several malfunctions observed where troughs were empty or leaked. | Comment added: “There was no identifiable significant welfare concerns as a result” | Described trough issues with a comment that no welfare concerns as a result.VALE: Did DAWR insist on this with IO clarifying as “identifiable” in Final Report or was this the IO observation?  |
| Draft IO Report | Final IO Report | IO Summary |
| **Feed/Water/Pen Management** | **Feed/Water/Pen Mgmt** | **PEN CONDITIONS** |
| No evidence of sawdust in hospital pens managed by SEALS on decks 2 and 5 | Changed to “No evidence of sawdust in hospital pens managed by SEALS on decks 2 and 5 which contained cattle.”IO or DAWR highlighting welfare issue | “pad conditions in the ..and hospital pens were managed acceptably throughout the voyage. DAWR has deleted reference to lack of sawdust in the hospital pens on two decks, which was of concern to the IOVALE COMMENT: it is of grave concern that sawdust bedding was not provided to hospitalised cattle and that this information was omitted from the IO Summary. |
| **Cattle management (Sick/injured/dead)** | **Cattle management (Sick/injured/dead)** | **HEALTH AND WELFARE** |
| Incident on deck 5: downer cow trampled due to fear from crew noise. The stockman was notified but did not come to assist for a further 30 minutes and cow was further trampled…she was in a state of shock…ten hours before she was moved to the hospital pen. She remained severely tucked up and depressed during the rest of the voyage...on the same day, a cow found dead in the pen where the stockman had been earlier. Three more cows died in that same pen..from suspected handling stress induced pneumonia | SimilarAdded: the section on reject cattle being loaded that was in the original executive summary“Three more” redacted.“from suspected stress handling pneuomonia” removed | Not included in the IO Summary. There is a brief list of mortality number and causes of mortalities.VALE COMMENT: gravity of the health and welfare issues is omitted from the IO summary |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Draft IO Report | Final IO Report | IO Summary |
| **Cattle management (Sick/injured/dead)** | **Cattle management (Sick/injured/dead)** | **HEALTH AND WELFARE** |
| A recumbent cow in the hospital pen with depression, difficulty breathing and nasal/ocular discharge was not offered water and found dead in the same position as filmed 12 hours earlier. “Her position indicated a failed attempt to reach water – her back legs were underneath her body but splayed and her head and neck outstretched less than a meter from the water trough. To gain access to water she needed to place her head between the fence rails” | Added comment after “rails”: “This pen only had one water trough and cattle were required to place their head between the railings to reach this trough. There was up to 10 head in this pen” | Not included in the IO Summary |
| [Redacted] cow found dead..not removed from the pen for >12 h. “This was not optimal managedas it had died in a position that reduced access of the other cattle to the feed/water troughs and created an injury risk for the other cattle tripping over it…There are also ethical concerns relevant the cohorts in forced proximity to the dead carcass for such duration”.  | Removed “This was not optimal management” and “There are also ethical concerns….duration” | Not included in the IO Summary |
| [Redacted] other cows placed in the hospital pen where they remained recumbent over several days and developed symptoms indicative that death was imminent **…** difficulty breathing, sunken eyes, no reactivity to touch. IO alerted daily contact (DAWR?). The cattle died was were not euthanased | Removed: “and developed symptoms indicative that death was imminent” | Not included in the IO summary |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Draft IO Report | Final IO Report | IO Summary |
| **Cattle management (Sick/injured/dead)** | **Cattle management ..** | **HEALTH AND WELFARE** |
| On the same deck (“5 forward”) two other cattle (heifers) were placed in the hospital pen on account of lameness according to daily voyage reports. They developed unusual clinical signs ie arched back, splayed leg stance, outstretched neck, head down, dropping ears, severe listlessness, respiration rate >100 bpm and difficulty walking. Questions possible overdosing of medications and combination. Heifers did not improve and continued to show signs of pain and discomfort. IO concerned that the pain and suffering justified euthanasia especially as not appropriate for transport in Jakarta | Changed to “5 forward- SEALSRemoved comment: “It was suspected that they may have been overdosed as the clinical signs suggested toxicity related gut problems” and changed to “The clinical signs (as above) suggested toxicity related gut problems”Removed comment: Photos and films of the heifer’s conditions were sent to the daily contact person, where concern was expressed that the level of pain and suffering would justify euthanasia. Removed comment “This was especially an issue as the anticipated level of further handling and long transport times in Jakarta were not considered appropriate to provide an environment conducive to recovery” and changed to “This was a concern for the Observer due to the anticipated level of further handling and long transport times in Jakarta” | Not mentioned in the IO summary |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Draft IO Report | Final IO Report | IO Summary |
| **Cattle management (Sick/injured/dead)** | **Cattle management ..** | **HEALTH AND WELFARE** |
| “Several concerns for the responsible use of Schedule 4 veterinary drugs were identified. There was no record of veterinary meds recorded in the daily voyage reports for SEALS despite evidence of used medical packages by the hospital pen (photos 29,30). …Flunixil, Trisoprim and Dexaprin. As these are considered Schedule 4 drugs, a withholding period before slaughter would have been necessary (of 28 days) yet no cattle in the sick pen were identified with ear tags to indicate they had been medicated” | Entire paragraph removed. | Not mentioned in the IO Summary |
| On Nov 6th another SEALS heifer was noticed in the hospital pen as having a deep gash to coronet band and showing signs of pain and discomfort. Wound covered in dirt, no cleaning, treating with topical ointment. Heifer was unable to bear weight on the injured foot even up to the day of discharge. Voyage reports also showed no record of entry for this lame heifer or if she was treated with medication | Unchanged | Not mentioned in the IO Summary |
| On the 8th November ..a SEALS steer, also under the management of [redacted] was identified with extremely swollen knee and fetlock joints and in acute pain. It was not placed in a hospital pen and there were no records in daily voyage reports of this steer being lame until 2-3 days later when it was “apparently” euthanised  | Removed “also under the management of [redacted]Added re acute pain “these were vocalisations, eyes rolled back, head tilted backwards and lying down”Removed “apparently” | Not mentioned in the IO Summary |
| Draft IO Report | Final IO Report | IO Summary |
| **Cattle management (Sick/injured/dead)** | **Cattle management ..** | **HEALTH AND WELFARE** |
| [Redacted -number most likely] of 325 SEALS cows died and a further three showed continued signs of illness at discharge. This [redacted] mortality and 3.4% morbidity was an animal welfare concern. Given that the cows were [Redacted] according to brand marks (and had a nervous disposition, indicating a possible lack of exposure to previous handling conditions pre-shipment their tolerance for coping with the ship stressed was low….perhaps compromised their immune system, causing many to succumb to pneumonia. This indicates a deficiency by the exporter in appropriate selection of cattle fit to export | [Redacted] (above mentioned) of 325 SEALS cows…(above mentioned added)Removed “their tolerance…..fit for export”Removed “their tolerance for coping with the ship stressed was low….perhaps compromised their immune system, causing may to succumb to pneumonia. This indicates a deficiency by the exporter in appropriate selection of cattle fit to export” | Not mentioned in the IO summary. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Draft IO Report | Final IO Report | IO Summary |
| **Deck conditions** | **Deck conditions** | **PEN CONDITIONS** |
| Day 7 described During discharge in Jakarta alleyways filled with effluent, aisle pens with cattle on decks 6 and 7 aft became completely waterlogged, challenging conditions for livestock crew as up to 20cm deep in places. On deck 6 aft on 9th Nov water leaking out of a major scupper pipe and from several troughs… Contravention of Sections 6.2 of MO: fluids should be kept clear of pens and associated work and access spaces | Comment added to Day 7 “See photos in mics section of media suppliedRemoved : “on the 9th November in Jakarta port”Shortened explanation of chief officer. | Re the effluent on Decks 6 and 7 – states 30cm deep not 20cm deep. “No negative health or welfare implications were observed upon the cattle due to these pad conditions with affected animals discharging at this portVALE COMMENT: DAWR mistake re depth of effluent DAWR and misreporting the situation to a more favourable welfare situation. The IO actually wrote that “Heat stress may have been a result of excess moisture from the effluent” ie there was a negative welfare outcome and that it was not conducive to acceptable animal welfare.DAWR says IO couldn’t ascertain a cause but this does not appear in the reports (there is no comment about cause). No mention of AMSA or MO 43 despite contravention of MO 43. |
| Section 6.5 of MO states that trainer plates should be placed over drains in passageways to avoid causing injury but in Jakarta several drain openings left uncovered. In some places, these open drainage holes became submerged with effluent and were obscured; plastic gird covering placed over one 2sq m hatch without any rigid undersupport – risk for people. | Similar | No mention in IO summary |
| Despite signs stating no smoking was permitted throughout the decks, Indonesian port crew were observed frequently smoking throughout decks and butting cigarettes I sawdust – obvious fire risk | Similar | No mention in IO Summary |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Draft IO Report | Final IO Report | IO Summary |
| **Discharge** | **Discharge** | **DISCHARGE** |
| Panjang handlers good. Jakarta – indiscriminate use of electric prods on face and body and used on cattle that went down on the ships unload ramp and were trampled or collided with cattle moving the opposite direction | Comment: added “inside the ship and on the ramp” after “use of electric prods on both face and body” | Details not provided in IO summary: the observer witnessed non-compliant handling. This matter has been investigated and outcome purportedly available on department website. However, the Dept website has no record of an IO report from an Oct 2019 voyage: See https://www.agriculture.gov.au/export/controlled-goods/live-animals/livestock/regulatory-framework/compliance-investigations/investigations-regulatory-compliance#2020 |
| Several hazards for causing injury at discharge including a piece of wood loosely fixed at the bottom of the load ramp where cattle hit their hip and a piece of wire across the path of cattle just before entering trucks. There were also up 15 people at any one time standing on ramp and caused discharging cattle to stop and consequently receive electric proddings.  |  | Details not provided in IO summary |
| In Panjang shadow and plastic green sack caused cattle to balk and then jump over it where many slipped heavily afterwards. The IO suggested to the port crew to lay more sawdust over the ramp and this improved the general flow of cattle. Cattles were also observed slipping over heavily on an unstructured metal platform floor surface where they turned 90-degrees to enter the trucks. The floor was so slick that sawdust had little effect in adding tractions | Removed: The IO suggested to the port crew to lay more ……sawdust had little effect in adding tractionsAdded: “potentially filled with sand and used as a weight after “a plastic green sack” | No mention in IO summary |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Draft IO Report | Final IO Report | IO Summary |
| **Discharge** | **Discharge** | **DISCHARGE** |
| Once cattle were loaded into trucks, many were observed getting their head or horns stuck in nets that were fixed over the truck..in several cases began to choke; some trucks had rods to lift the nets which reduced the risk. | Removed | No mention in IO Summary |
| The incidents observed at discharge indicated that ESCAS inspectors were not present or that discharge was being ineffectively monitored | Removed | No mention in IO Summary |
| **Summarised Animal Welfare Issues** |  |  |
| included cattle unfit to load, discharging animals not fit for transport, inadequate care of sick and lame cattle by a SEALS stockperson and delayed euthanasias despite hopeless Px | Removed this whole section | Not included in IO Summary |
| **Conclusions** |  |  |
| Cattle in some pens were standing in liquid effluent for over 30hours, a situation not conducive to acceptable animal welfare. Some cattle in these areas also showed elevated panting scores indicative of heat stress.  | Removed: “a situation not conducive to acceptable animal welfare” | No mention of heat stress in association with the effluent |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Draft IO Report | Final IO Report | IO Summary |
| **Conclusions** | **Conclusions** |  |
| Sick cattle in hospital pens lacked saw dust despite it being abundantly available, recumbent animals were not given adequate access to water and 10 acutely sick cattle despite showing poor prognosis for recovery and imminent death were not promptly euthanised in consideration for their welfare. No records in the Daily Voyage Reports were made for the Schedule 4 Veterinary medications used on sick or injured cattle. Furthermore [redacted] cull cows that died due to stress related illnesses, suggested that they were not fit to transport. Furthermore, the captive bolt stunner was left unattended by the SEALS stockman over several days on deck.  | Similar | No mention in IO summary |
| Poor effluent drainage capabilities of the ship while in port, caused challenging conditions for livestock crew to work during feeding routines. It also contributed to sloppy manure pads and cases where cattle showed visible signs of heat stress. | Similar | No mention of challenging conditions for crew.No mention that it contributed to heat stress. |