

Using the APWF WA Cat Act Review Submission with AI Assistant

Suggested prompts for preparing an original community submission

Western Australian Cat Act 2011 Review

Purpose of this guide. This document provides copy-and-paste prompts that supporters, community members, veterinarians, rescuers, carers, welfare organisations and local advocates can use with AI Assistant to prepare their own submission. It is designed to help people use the APWF long submission as a source document while writing in their own voice.

- **Use the APWF submission as a source, not as a script.** The aim is to create an original submission that reflects the person's own experience and priorities.
- **Do not add unsupported information.** Each prompt asks AI Assistant to use only the uploaded APWF document unless the user specifically requests separate research.
- **Check all references.** AI Assistant should include only references that are actually used in the draft and that appear in the APWF document.
- **Personalise before submitting.** People should review the draft, add their own examples where relevant, and remove anything they do not support.

1. How to use these prompts

- Open AI Assistant and upload the original long APWF submission to the WA Cat Act Review.
- Copy one of the prompts below and paste it into AI Assistant after the document has uploaded.
- Replace the text in square brackets, such as [cat owner], [rescuer], [local government area], or [5 pages].
- Ask AI Assistant to revise the draft until it sounds like the person or organisation making the submission.
- Read the final submission carefully before lodging it. The person submitting it is responsible for the final content.

Core instruction to paste at the start of any AI Assistant request

I have uploaded the APWF long submission to the WA Government review of the Cat Act. Please use that uploaded document as the only source of evidence, statistics and references. Do not copy sentences from it. Rewrite ideas in original wording suitable for a separate community submission. Do not add new facts, statistics, studies, references or URLs that are not in the uploaded document. If a point is not supported by the uploaded document, tell me rather than inventing support.

2. Master prompt: create a full submission

This is the best all-purpose prompt for someone who wants AI Assistant to turn the long APWF document into an original submission they can edit.

Master prompt for an original submission

Using the uploaded APWF long submission as the only source, please draft an original submission to the WA Government review of the Cat Act from the perspective of [a concerned community member / cat owner / cat carer / veterinarian / rescue volunteer / animal welfare organisation / local resident].

Please keep the same broad topic order as the APWF submission:

Executive summary

1. Registration, microchipping and identification
2. Sterilisation
3. Breeding
4. Enforcement
5. Additional suggestions
6. Successful initiatives from other jurisdictions

The submission should be approximately [2 pages / 5 pages / 8 pages / 1,500 words]. Please keep the policy positions strong, including: abolishing cat registration, retaining and improving microchipping, replacing punitive mandatory sterilisation with accessible targeted sterilisation programs, regulating intentional breeding while creating non-punitive pathways for accidental litters, using an assistance-first enforcement model, not introducing mandated cat containment, requiring annual public reporting, and funding Community Cat Programs.

Please write in a clear, respectful and persuasive tone suitable for a government submission. Include only references that are used in the text and that are present in the uploaded APWF document. At the end, provide a short reference list for those cited sources only.

3. Prompt: shorter version for people with limited time

Short submission prompt

Using the uploaded APWF submission as the only source, please draft a concise 1-2 page community submission to the WA Cat Act Review. Write it in original wording and in the voice of [a concerned member of the public / a cat owner / a rescuer / a veterinary professional].

Please focus on the strongest points: make cat management supportive rather than punitive; abolish cat registration; retain microchipping but make it work better; support accessible early-age sterilisation rather than punishment; do not introduce mandatory containment; require transparent public reporting; and fund targeted Community Cat Programs.

Do not add new information or references. Include only the references from the uploaded APWF document that directly support the points used.

4. Prompt: executive summary

Executive summary prompt

Please write an original executive summary for my WA Cat Act Review submission using only the uploaded APWF document. The summary should explain that the Cat Act should be modernised as a prevention, support and evidence-based framework rather than relying mainly on punitive compliance.

Please include the key recommendations: clearly distinguish domestic and feral cats; improve microchipping and reunification; abolish cat registration; replace punitive sterilisation mandates with accessible targeted sterilisation programs; regulate intentional breeding while supporting accidental litter pathways; use assistance-first enforcement; avoid mandatory containment; require transparent annual reporting; and fund Community Cat Programs.

Keep it formal, persuasive and suitable for government. Do not copy the APWF wording directly.

5. Section-by-section prompts

These prompts can be used one at a time to build a submission section by section. They are also useful if someone wants to emphasise only the parts most relevant to them.

1. Registration, microchipping and identification

Registration and microchipping prompt

Using only the uploaded APWF submission, draft the section titled “Registration, microchipping and identification” for my WA Cat Act Review submission.

Please explain that microchipping should remain mandatory and be required by 4 months of age, because it supports return of lost cats to owners. Explain that microchipping only works if contact details are accurate, so WA should require regular SMS or email reminders to update microchip records and consistent scanning of cats at first contact and again before transfer, rehoming or euthanasia.

Please also argue that cat registration should be abolished because it creates cost and administrative barriers, has low compliance, adds little to reunification beyond microchipping, and can discourage microchipping. Mention that visible tags can be encouraged but should not be the legal basis for determining ownership.

Use original wording. Include only references from the uploaded document that are relevant to this section.

2. Sterilisation

Sterilisation prompt

Using only the uploaded APWF submission, draft the “Sterilisation” section for my WA Cat Act Review submission.

Please support sterilisation as a core cat population management tool, but argue that punitive mandatory sterilisation should be replaced with accessible, targeted, early-age sterilisation programs. Explain that the main barrier is often affordability and access to veterinary care, not lack of motivation.

Please recommend free or low-cost sterilisation and microchipping by 4 months of age, targeted to areas with high cat intake, kitten admissions, complaints and socioeconomic disadvantage. Include the key evidence from the uploaded document showing that supportive programs reduce intake, euthanasia and complaints.

Use original wording and include only relevant references from the uploaded document.

3. Breeding

Breeding prompt

Using only the uploaded APWF submission, draft the “Breeding” section for my WA Cat Act Review submission.

Please support strong regulation of intentional, repeated and commercial breeding, including traceability, breeder approval, microchip numbers in advertisements, breeder approval numbers, welfare standards and enforcement for poor welfare or overbreeding.

Please also explain that accidental litters, free kittens, cat carers and semi-owners should not be treated as commercial breeders. Recommend a non-punitive last-litter pathway where the mother cat and kittens can be sterilised, microchipped and responsibly rehomed without breeder approval fees or prosecution.

Use original wording and include only relevant references from the uploaded document.

4. Enforcement

Enforcement prompt

Using only the uploaded APWF submission, draft the “Enforcement” section for my WA Cat Act Review submission.

Please argue for replacing a complaint-led “catch and punish” model with an assistance-first, data-driven compliance model. Explain that enforcement is often difficult where ownership is unclear and that punitive approaches can unfairly affect people with the least capacity to comply.

Please recommend that councils provide support before penalties, including access to free or low-cost sterilisation, microchipping, transport, information, amnesty pathways and practical help. Fines and prosecution should be reserved for repeated, deliberate and serious non-compliance after assistance has been offered.

Please include the position that mandatory containment should not be introduced because the uploaded APWF submission states that available evidence does not show measurable benefits for complaints, impoundments or euthanasia, and because containment can create equity issues for low-income residents and renters.

Use original wording and include only relevant references from the uploaded document.

5. Additional suggestions

Additional suggestions prompt

Using only the uploaded APWF submission, draft the “Additional suggestions” section for my WA Cat Act Review submission.

Please focus on three points: first, WA should administer the Cat Act as a prevention and support framework; second, the Act should clearly distinguish domestic cats from feral cats using definitions consistent with the RSPCA best-practice framework; third, WA should require transparent annual reporting of cat intake, outcomes, complaints, enforcement activity and preventive program expenditure.

Please explain that domestic cats living near people need community-based management, including sterilisation, microchipping, caregiver engagement and return-to-owner pathways, while genuinely feral cats in remote or wild environments require separate science-based conservation management.

Use original wording and include only relevant references from the uploaded document.

6. Successful initiatives from other jurisdictions

Successful initiatives prompt

Using only the uploaded APWF submission, draft the section “Successful initiatives from other jurisdictions” for my WA Cat Act Review submission.

Please summarise Community Cat Programs as successful models because they combine targeted high-intensity sterilisation, accessible veterinary services, microchipping, caregiver engagement, complaint resolution and rehoming pathways.

Please include concise examples from the uploaded document, including Banyule in Victoria, Ipswich in Queensland, Keeping Cats Safe at Home / StrayCare Metro in New South Wales, and Salisbury in South Australia. Mention reported reductions in intake, euthanasia, complaints and free-roaming cat numbers where those figures are provided in the uploaded document.

Please also recommend that WA adopt the Victorian-style reporting model, including Domestic Animal Management Plans and mandatory annual public reporting by councils and shelters.

Use original wording and include only relevant references from the uploaded document.

6. Prompts for tailoring the submission to different people

Personalisation prompt

Please revise this draft so it sounds like it was written by [a cat owner / a wildlife carer / a veterinarian / a rescue volunteer / a local resident / an animal welfare organisation / a person who cares for semi-owned cats]. Keep the evidence and references from the uploaded APWF document, but make the introduction and conclusion more personal and authentic.

Please add placeholders where I can insert my own local examples, such as [brief personal experience], [local council area], or [impact on my community]. Do not invent personal experiences for me.

Veterinary or shelter worker perspective prompt

Please revise the submission from the perspective of a veterinary, pound, shelter or rescue worker. Use only the uploaded APWF submission. Please emphasise preventable intake, euthanasia of healthy and treatable cats, staff wellbeing, the importance of reducing unnecessary euthanasia, and the value of Community Cat Programs and assistance-first compliance.

Keep the tone professional and respectful. Do not add new research or references.

Wildlife-focused perspective prompt

Please revise the submission for someone whose main concern is wildlife protection. Use only the uploaded APWF submission. Please explain that reducing free-roaming cat numbers requires targeted sterilisation, microchipping, caregiver engagement and Community Cat Programs, rather than relying on mandates that are difficult to enforce.

Please also include the point that threatened and endangered species in urban areas are a public conservation responsibility, and residents should not personally bear the cost of expensive protective infrastructure where broader conservation outcomes are being sought.

Keep the tone constructive and evidence-based. Do not add new research or references.

Equity and social justice perspective prompt

Please revise the submission to place stronger emphasis on equity and social justice. Use only the uploaded APWF submission. Please explain that punitive cat management measures can disproportionately affect low-income residents, renters, elderly people, people experiencing hardship, and people caring for semi-owned cats.

Please recommend practical support, amnesty pathways, accessible sterilisation and microchipping, and assistance-first enforcement as fairer and more effective ways to achieve compliance. Do not add new research or references.

7. Prompts for refining tone and length

Make it more formal

Please revise this submission to make it more formal and polished for a government consultation. Keep the wording clear and respectful. Do not make it aggressive or emotional. Do not add new information or references.

Make it more concise

Please reduce this submission to approximately [word count] words while keeping the key recommendations and strongest evidence. Preserve the heading order. Remove repetition, but do not remove the main policy positions. Use only the uploaded APWF document and the references already included.

Make it easier for a general audience

Please rewrite this draft in plain English so it is easier for a community member to read and adapt. Keep it suitable for a government submission, but avoid technical language where possible. Do not change the meaning or add new information.

Make it diplomatic but firm

Please revise this draft so it remains firm on the policy positions but sounds diplomatic and constructive. Use phrases such as “we recommend”, “the evidence suggests”, “a more effective approach would be”, and “government should consider”. Do not weaken the key recommendations.

8. Prompts for references and evidence checking

Reference check prompt

Please review this draft against the uploaded APWF submission. Check that every statistic, program outcome and research claim is supported by the uploaded document. For each reference in the text, confirm that it appears in the APWF reference list. Remove any reference that is not used in the text. Do not add any new references.

No-new-information check

Please check this draft and identify any sentence that appears to introduce information, statistics, claims or references that are not contained in the uploaded APWF submission. List those sentences and suggest how to remove or reword them so the draft relies only on the uploaded source document.

Plagiarism avoidance prompt

Please compare this draft with the uploaded APWF submission and revise any wording that is too close to the original. Keep the same meaning and evidence, but write it in new sentence structures and in my own voice. Do not change the policy positions or add new information.

9. Prompt for online form responses

Online consultation box prompt

The WA Government consultation form has a short response box for this question: [paste question]. Using only the uploaded APWF submission, please draft a response of no more than [number] words.

Please make the response clear, original and suitable for a community member. Keep the strongest recommendation, give one or two reasons, and include only one or two references if needed. Do not add information that is not in the uploaded document.

10. Final submission review prompts

Final quality review prompt

Please review my final draft submission before I lodge it. Check for:

1. Clear heading order
2. Consistent policy positions
3. Original wording rather than copied wording
4. No unsupported claims
5. Correct references drawn only from the uploaded APWF submission
6. A respectful and persuasive government-submission tone
7. Repetition that can be removed

Please provide suggested edits, not a complete rewrite unless needed.

Submission checklist prompt

Please create a checklist for this final submission showing whether it includes: an executive summary; registration, microchipping and identification; sterilisation; breeding; enforcement; additional suggestions; successful initiatives from other jurisdictions; references used; and a clear closing recommendation. Identify any missing or weak areas.

11. Simple prompt template for supporters

This shortened template can be shared with people who are less familiar with AI Assistant.

Simple supporter template

I have uploaded the APWF long submission to the WA Cat Act Review. Please help me write my own original submission using only that document as the source. I am writing as [describe yourself].

Please make the submission [short / medium / detailed] and include these headings: Executive summary; Registration, microchipping and identification; Sterilisation; Breeding; Enforcement; Additional suggestions; Successful initiatives from other jurisdictions.

Please keep the strong recommendations from the APWF document, but write in my own words. Do not copy sentences from the APWF document. Do not add new facts, statistics or references. Include only references that are used and that appear in the uploaded document.

12. Before lodging a submission

- Read the whole draft carefully and delete anything that does not reflect your own view.
- Add one or two personal or local examples if relevant, but do not invent examples.
- Check that all references appear in the original APWF document.
- Make sure the submission answers the actual consultation questions or fits the response form.
- Keep the tone respectful, even where the recommendation is strong.
- Save a copy of the final submission for your own records.