

NSW Office of Local Government- Companion Animals Act 1998 Review

AUSTRALIAN PET WELFARE FOUNDATION

Emeritus Professor Jacquie Rand, BVSc (Melb), DVSc (Guelph),
MANZCVS
Diplomate, American College of Veterinary Internal Medicine

Executive Director & Chief Scientist
Australian Pet Welfare Foundation

Improving the health and wellbeing of pets, people and their environments

Email: info@petwelfare.org.au

Website: www.petwelfare.org.au

NSW Office of Local Government- Companion Animals Act 1998 Review

The Australian Pet Welfare Foundation (APWF) is a peak research body and advocate for pet welfare in Australia. As a not-for-profit organisation, APWF uses science-based research to enhance community well-being and improve the health and welfare of animals and people. APWF specialises in evidence-based solutions to prevent euthanasia of healthy and treatable companion animals in shelters and pounds and the associated mental health damage to staff and community residents. We share research knowledge with the community, shelters and pounds, state and local governments and veterinarians to create change and save animal and human lives. APWF is led by Chief Scientist Dr. Jacquie Rand, Emeritus Professor of Companion Animal Health at The University of Queensland (UQ) and a registered specialist veterinarian in small animal internal medicine. She has worked extensively in shelter research over the last 17 years, including collaborative studies with the RSPCA, Animal Welfare League and local governments. While at UQ Dr Rand taught Urban Animal Management and since 2013 has co-authored over 30 peer-reviewed articles on urban animal management including management of domestic semi-owned and unowned cats.

You can read more about us and our vision on our website: <https://petwelfare.org.au>.

1. Strategic framework for encouraging responsible ownership of companion animals

a. Do you support the Companion Animals Act being amended to focus more on encouraging responsible pet ownership outcomes over strict compliance processes?

Punitive measures such as fines, mandatory containment, and impoundment have long been the default response to managing wandering and nuisance dogs and cats. However, these enforcement-heavy approaches are costly, rarely effective, and often fail to address the root causes of the issues, particularly in disadvantaged communities. Many pet owners in these areas lack the financial capacity to comply with desexing, registration, or containment requirements, making fines and penalties impractical and largely uncollectible. Councils spend significant time and resources pursuing enforcement actions that rarely lead to meaningful change or cost recovery.

Local governments should operate under the principle of "educate first, enforce second." Yet, decades of this approach, without providing adequate support, have not resolved the problem. The fact that we are only now questioning whether a shift in focus is needed is a clear indication that the current system isn't working.

If it were, we wouldn't still be facing such persistent issues with wandering and nuisance dogs and cats.

While councils and the state government provide a range of resources through websites and other channels to support responsible pet ownership and community education, it is important to reflect on whether these materials effectively reach and influence those who are often the source of repeated complaints. Many individuals in these groups may face barriers such as limited literacy or come from culturally diverse backgrounds where understandings of animal welfare differ significantly from NSW standards and legal obligations. This highlights the need for more inclusive, targeted engagement strategies that go beyond passive information sharing and actively address these challenges.

Evidence from successful community-based programs shows that proactive, supportive strategies are far more effective and economical. Free or subsidised desexing, microchipping and targeted community engagement, combined where appropriate, with the use of deterrents for barking dogs and nuisance cats, help reduce the number of uncontained and nuisance animals before they reach crisis point. Particularly for cats, motion-detecting cameras to identify animals resulting in complaints and resolving issues using an assistive approach can be very effective. These programs have led to significant reductions in shelter intakes, euthanasia, and complaints, while fostering better relationships between councils and residents.

Investing in support-focused solutions also benefits community safety, human and animal welfare, social amenity and wildlife. Proactive support and assistance leads to fewer complaints associated with nuisance behaviours such as barking and cat fighting, which reduces the need for enforcement, and ultimately reduces stress on local council resources. These support-focused solutions include targeted desexing programs for cats, which reduce the number of unwanted litters and nuisance behaviours like roaming, spraying and fighting. These strategies also support vulnerable community members to care for their pets responsibly, aligning with the principles of One Welfare: improving the wellbeing of people, animals, and the environment (Pinillos 2016).

In contrast, fines and enforcement without support only serve to penalise those least able to comply, increase impoundments and euthanasia, escalate public frustration and negatively impact the mental health of the staff involved. A shift toward sustainable, proactive approaches is not only more humane, but also far more cost-efficient and effective in the long term.

Recommendation-

- The NSW Government should shift from an enforcement-heavy approach to a "One Welfare" approach that prioritises proactive, support-focused strategies for managing wandering and nuisance companion animals. This includes

investing in free or subsidised desexing, microchipping, containment assistance, and targeted community outreach, particularly in disadvantaged areas where compliance barriers are highest.

- Councils should be resourced and mandated to adopt an “assist and support for voluntary compliance, enforce second” model that is backed by tangible support services, not just warnings or fines. Evidence from successful community-based programs for cats (Rand 2024, Cotterell 2024, Cotterell 2025b, RSPCA NSW 2023) demonstrates that such approaches are not only more effective in reducing nuisance behaviours and shelter intakes but are also significantly more cost-efficient and humane. Embedding this shift in legislation and policy would align enforcement with the principles of One Welfare and build stronger, more cooperative relationships between local governments and the communities they serve, including pet owners, and rescue groups and individuals.
- Animal management should be recognised as a specialist industry requiring formal qualifications and targeted training, given the complexity of the work. Not everyone is suited to the profession. All AMOs and their departmental managers should receive specialist training to ensure they are up to date with the latest research in effective animal management, animal behaviour, and community engagement, and have a clear understanding of the critical roles they perform.

How can responsible pet ownership education be used to manage menacing or dangerous dogs?

Providing appropriate information and supportive assistance has a critical role in managing dogs that may be potentially classified as dangerous or menacing under the law to prevent unwanted behaviours from escalating. The Local Court has the authority to declare a dog as dangerous or menacing based on specific criteria, including the dog's behaviour, or previous classification in another jurisdiction. However, as the damage has already been done, relying solely on court declarations and enforcement actions does little to prevent incidents before they occur. Providing appropriate information in an easily accessible format, for example, on-line videos of dog behaviour that are warning signs and the critical importance of socialisation would provide a proactive alternative that could assist equipping dog owners with the knowledge and skills needed to prevent their pets from developing or displaying aggressive behaviours in the first place. For example, easily accessible videos of behavioural warning signs that a dog feels threatened or stressed by a person or another dog and may attack, and how to safely avoid or deescalate the situation would be useful. Other videos on the critical importance of socialisation including timing and the type of socialisation would be valuable.

Education initiatives focused on responsible pet ownership can cover key areas such as early socialisation, obedience training, safe management of dogs in public

spaces, and recognising early warning signs of aggression. However, accessibility is a challenge in providing information and support to those who would most benefit. Incentivisation should be trialled to determine if it increases use of the resources. For example, trialling free dog registration or vouchers for pet products for residents if they complete relevant sections e.g. socialisation of puppies, and successfully answer simple multiple-choice questions after each component (with questions able to be retaken multiple times until correct answer is obtained). When delivered in conjunction with community engagement and accessible training resources, these programs empower owners to take responsibility for their dogs' behaviour before escalation requires legal intervention.

Many dogs that are later declared menacing or dangerous have had previous incidents of roaming or inadequate containment. However, these early issues often go unreported until a more serious event occurs, at which point witnesses or affected individuals demand immediate action. Had the earlier wandering behaviour been reported and addressed as a containment issue, there may have been an opportunity to intervene and prevent escalation.

One highly effective method is through property visits by Animal Management Officers (AMOs) with wandering dog complaints, who can then provide tailored advice on containment, supervision, and behavioural management. For example, if a dog has escaped, officers can speak directly with the owner to understand how the dog got out, what challenges they are facing, and suggest realistic, cost-effective solutions, such as repairing fencing, using dog-proof gates, or adjusting routines to reduce anxiety-driven behaviours.

By increasing awareness of owners' legal obligations through provision of targeted information on proper confinement, leash use, and the consequences of aggressive behaviour, this can prevent situations that might otherwise lead to a dangerous or menacing declaration by the court. These one-on-one interactions help build trust and shift the dynamic from punitive to supportive, empowering owners to take action before enforcement becomes necessary. In doing so, councils and AMOs promote safety and wellbeing for both people and pets in the community, reduce the risk of future incidents, and avoid the financial and emotional burden of legal proceedings. Ultimately, responsible pet ownership education, when delivered through both community programs that are assistive and direct officer engagement, is key to long-term, sustainable dog management before a dog is declared.

Banning specific dog breeds has proven to be an ineffective and costly approach to improving community safety (National Canine Research Council 2014). In Victoria, breed-specific legislation led to significant expenditure by councils in legal proceedings, enforcement actions, and compliance monitoring, often without delivering a measurable reduction in dog attacks (National Canine Research Council 2014, Parliament of Victoria 2016, RSPCA Australia 2015). Furthermore, this approach unfairly targets entire breeds rather than focusing on the individual behaviour of dogs

and the actions of their owners. Responsible dog ownership and effective dog control should be assessed on a case-by-case basis, with attention given to the specific circumstances and behaviour of the animal involved.

RSPCA Australia's report on preventing dog attacks in the community, states they do not support Breed Specific Legislation (BSL) and these punitive actions fail to prevent further attacks as they do not address the key issues, namely how to ensure all dog owners are made responsible for the actions of their dogs, and how to reduce the risk of any dog within the general population exhibiting aggressive or dangerous behaviour towards people (RSPCA Australia 2015).

Every dog attack should be evaluated based on the incident itself, not on the breed of the dog. A behaviour-based, rather than breed-based, framework promotes fairness, supports better animal welfare outcomes, and allows councils to allocate resources more efficiently toward prevention, education, and early intervention strategies.

Recommendation-

- The NSW Government should invest in responsible pet ownership education as a core strategy to prevent dog-related incidents before they occur. This includes funding community-based education programs and enabling AMOs to conduct proactive property visits in response to complaints about roaming or nuisance behaviour. Shifting the focus from enforcement to early intervention, through tailored advice on containment, subsidised training and behaviour sessions, and safe management, can reduce the risk of dogs being declared dangerous or menacing, improve public safety, and support better outcomes for both pets and their owners.

b. How could the legislation be improved to motivate better dog owner behaviour and encourage owners to manage their dogs more responsibly? (For example, what does responsible dog control in public look like?)

To motivate better dog owner behaviour, legislation and policies should place greater emphasis on **proactive education and support**, rather than relying solely on penalties after incidents occur. Strengthening provisions for councils to implement early intervention strategies, such as free or subsidised training programs, behaviour support for dogs showing early signs of aggression, and routine property visits by AMOs, can help owners address problems before they escalate. Legislation could also mandate or incentivise participation in approved education programs following a first offence, rather than immediately issuing fines. Including a requirement for councils to offer assistance and practical advice before enforcement allows for a more constructive relationship between owners and authorities, ultimately leading to safer outcomes.

Responsible dog control in public includes walking dogs on a leash at all times (unless in a designated off-leash area), ensuring dogs are under effective voice control, picking up faeces after dogs, and actively managing interactions with other animals and people. Legislation could reinforce these expectations through clearer public education campaigns and tools like warning notices or behaviour management plans, rather than immediate punitive measures. Importantly, the law should recognise that responsible behaviour is often a result of **assistive programs and implications, not just regulation**, and empower councils to support dog owners in fulfilling their responsibilities. This should be complemented by proactive programs such as access to free training and behaviour assessments, as well as fencing advice to support responsible pet management.

Recommendation-

- The NSW Government should amend legislation to prioritise proactive education and early intervention strategies over punitive measures for dog control. This includes empowering councils to offer free or subsidised training, behavioural support, and routine property visits by Animal Management Officers (AMO), particularly after first offences. Legislation should encourage or require participation in approved support and assistive programs before fines are issued, fostering a more constructive and preventative approach to public safety and responsible pet ownership.
- Information needs to be accessible on smartphones, Facebook, through community centres and social services and results of a trial of incentivisation should be evaluated to determine if it is effective in increasing uptake of the information by the demographic who would most benefit (Mc Donald 2019).

c. How could the legislation be improved to motivate better cat owner behaviour and encourage owners to manage their cats more responsibly? (For example, cat containment)

Research shows that most people want to do the right thing but financial barriers and other barriers such as property limitations, transport and access to other resources limit their options (Dutton-Degester 2024). For example, it is not lack of motivation but lack of money which most cats are not desexed in time to prevent an unwanted litter, and household income is the strongest predictor of whether a cat is desexed or not (Chu 2009, Benka 2016). Legislation can be improved by shifting away from reactive enforcement toward proactive support strategies that remove barriers to responsible ownership. Current containment and registration laws have had limited effectiveness, particularly because many free-roaming cats are semi-owned or unowned, and their carers often lack the resources or legal clarity to comply. In disadvantaged areas, income and property limitations are major barriers to containment and registration. For example, the current single pension is \$575 a week

which is a barrier to containment, registration and desexing of cats. In disadvantaged areas, many cats are acquired as a stray or free from friends and family. Desexing for a female cat is typically \$300-\$500 and is more if pregnant or lactating. If the cat is more than four months old and not desexed, owners are required to pay an annual breeder permit fee of A\$96, in addition to a lifetime registration fee of A\$69. The breeder permit fee for 1 year remains applicable, even if the cat is promptly sterilized, microchipped, and registered at or shortly after the time of acquisition.

Because the microchip database can be searched by the government to determine who has not paid registration, return to owner rates (3%) are lower than in Queensland and Victoria (both 7%). Legislative amendments should explicitly support **free or subsidised desexing, microchipping, and registration programs**, especially in areas with high complaint rates and socioeconomic disadvantage. This could be strengthened through provisions that allow councils to implement incentive-based approaches, such as waiving fines for owners who voluntarily enrol their cats in support programs, rather than relying on impoundment and penalty notices. Local governments that waive registration fees for low-income pet owners are still obligated to remit the registration payment to the OLG. This requirement increases the overall cost of desexing and microchipping programs when registration is incorporated into the service package.

It is strongly recommended that **registration for cats be abolished (as in Queensland)**, and microchipping made more effective, including legislation which requires the implanter to register the microchip on the database within 7 days of implantation and automatic quarterly emails and SMS reminders to update contact details. The cost of impounding cats and subsequent rehoming or euthanasia in NSW is 7 to 10 times greater than income from registration fees and this does not include administration costs for local governments for registration (NSW OLG 2022, ICE 2022).

Additionally, legislation should better define and encourage practical **cat containment and instead of mandating containment, anti-nuisance laws should be used to mitigate nuisance issues**, while recognising the unique challenges of managing semi-owned cats. Education campaigns, paired with proactive council outreach—including **property visits, direct engagement with carers, and targeted community education**, are more effective than punitive measures alone.

Nuisance issues are typically best addressed through a combination of supportive strategies, with enforcement used only as a last resort when assistive measures are unsuccessful. These strategies include providing motion-detecting cameras to obtain images of trespassing cats, letterbox flyers of images of offending cats with offers of free cat desexing, and the provision of deterrents such as motion-detecting water sprays or helping to construct containment fencing. Typically, a combination of one or more of these methods is effective in resolving nuisance issues (Cotterell 2025b).

Cat containment mandates are not successful because these laws do not relate to semi-owned and unowned cats and, in fact, lead to increased cat-related complaints, increased impoundments and euthanasia, potentially because residents have an expectation that they will not see free-roaming cats (Cotterell 2025a). It is important to note that of owned cats in NSW, **contemporary data shows that 65% of cat owners contain their cats 24/7 and another 24% do at night** (Ma 2023). Therefore, 89% of cats are contained at least some of the time, with only 11% not contained at least at night, which is when species of conservation concern susceptible to cat predation in urban and peri-urban areas are active and when most problematic nuisance behaviours occur. This further highlights the issue of free-roaming cats is not predominantly due to owned cats.

Containment policies fail primarily because most free-roaming cats are strays or semi-owned cats without identifiable owners. For owned cats that are currently not contained, compliance is often unachievable due to property restrictions, financial constraints, and concerns for the welfare of confined cats. These barriers discourage semi-owners from assuming full responsibility for stray cats, which is a proven strategy to reduce free-roaming populations.

Most free-roaming cats and cat-related complaints emanate from low socioeconomic areas, where a higher proportion of residents live in rental properties, which often lack adequate screens on windows or doors and rarely have cat-proof fencing. The cost of installing cat-proof fencing or containment systems typically ranges from A\$700 to A\$2000 or more and poses a significant barrier, especially since tenancy agreements often prohibit property modifications. In general, most owners who can contain their cat, do so with. Notably, 41% of lost cats were described by their owners as indoor-only, but escaped through open windows, doors, or garages (Weiss 2012). A recent Australian study reported that 5% of cats contained 24/7 inside the owner's property had inadvertently escaped in the previous two weeks (Rand 2024b).

Case studies such as the city of Banyule, Victoria (Cotterell 2024, Cotterell 2025 a b), city of Ipswich, Queensland (Rand 2024a), and RSPCA NSW programs (RSPCA NSW Report 2023) show that when owners and semi-owners are supported with practical solutions, nuisance behaviour and cat impoundments drop significantly. To improve outcomes for animals, residents, and councils alike, legislation must enable flexible, supportive strategies that encourage early intervention and shared responsibility. In New South Wales, a significant challenge lies in the high proportion of households living in rental accommodation, where many **landlords still prohibit pets inside**. This makes it practically impossible for many cat owners, particularly those in disadvantaged communities, to comply with containment laws, despite their willingness to do the right thing.

To facilitate supporting people to better care for their cats, and where possible, take ownership of stray cats they are caring for, legislative reform should allow and encourage councils to implement **incentive-based, assistive programs**, including free

or subsidised desexing, microchipping and registration. These programs should include community information on resources available to facilitate good cat-caring behaviour and keeping cats with their owners and carers. These programs have proven more effective than fines or impoundment, especially when delivered alongside **direct council outreach, property visits, and engagement with semi-owners**. Legislation should also address systemic issues, such as rental laws, that prevent tenants from containing or properly caring for their pets, for example prohibiting the pet from being inside the property. The focus should be on assistive programs particularly in socioeconomically disadvantaged areas, including rural towns, within Indigenous communities (AMRRIC) and around housing on mining sites, and farms buildings. By enabling flexible, community-driven solutions and removing systemic barriers, governments can promote early intervention, reduce nuisance behaviour and cat intake to shelters, and support better outcomes for pets, residents, wildlife and councils alike.

Recommendation-

- The NSW Government, through the Office of Local Government, should reform legislation to empower councils to adopt proactive, incentive-based strategies that encourage responsible cat ownership and early intervention, rather than imposing additional mandates. Reforms should include support for free desexing, microchipping, and registration initiatives; programs to assist semi-owners and cat carers in taking full responsibility for the cats they feed and care for; and targeted assistance and outreach efforts, particularly in high-risk and disadvantaged communities.
- Legislation should explicitly recognise and enable Community Cat Programs, which provide humane, cost-effective solutions for managing semi-owned and unowned cats while reducing nuisance complaints and shelter intake. Case studies show that when carers are supported rather than penalised, outcomes improve for animals, residents, and local governments alike. The outcomes need to be aligned with One Welfare principles and balance and optimise the well-being of animals, people, and the environment.
- Abolish registration for cats and increase the effectiveness of microchipping for returning lost cats home.

d. Are there other matters that should be considered?

Councils must be required to collect and evaluate data on wandering and nuisance cat complaints, including the location and frequency of reports. Most complaints arise from low-socioeconomic areas where support, not enforcement, is most needed. If these areas are not adjacent to wildlife-sensitive zones, there is little justification for designating them as cat exclusion areas. Without accurate data, councils risk applying ineffective or unjust blanket measures instead of targeting resources where they are most needed to support both communities and conservation.

Return to owner rates for cats in NSW are less than half that of Queensland and Victoria (3% versus 7%). There are several reasons for this. One reason is a reluctance for low-income cat owners and cat carers who are getting multiple cats desexed but cannot afford the registration costs and breeder permit fee to decline to have the cat microchipped for fear that the state microchip registry can be used to identify their non-payment of registration fees. A second reason is the delay in registration of the contact details of the owner on the microchip database because of double handling of the paperwork to action this. In Queensland, microchip implanters are required to register the microchip within 7 days of implantation, in Victoria this requirement is within 2 days, whereas in NSW, veterinarians send the paperwork to the council to complete the registration of the owner's details. In some councils, this can lead to significant delays and inability to get lost cats (and dogs) home.

There are similar discrepancies in return to owner rates for dogs between the states (37% NSW, 55% Vic, 49% Qld (Chua 2017)). It is recommended that the same requirement as in Queensland be implemented, that the implanter has the responsibility to register the owner's details within 7 days and the penalties for non-compliance be substantial. Registration costs for cats should be abolished and instead the efficacy of microchips to facilitate return of lost cats and dogs to owners be enhanced by sending SMS and email reminders every 3 months for owners to remind them to update contact details if they have changed.

While cats pose limited threat to livestock, they can contribute to disease transmission (e.g., toxoplasmosis) and, in rare cases, prey on poultry. However, many cats, especially in rural or remote areas, are valued as working animals, effectively controlling rodent populations on farms and reducing the need for poisons that may harm wildlife, pets, or children. Recent findings from the Australian Pet Welfare Foundation highlight that farmers view these cats as essential to operations, with desexing shown to improve cat welfare, reduce wildlife predation, and strengthen human–animal bonds (Crawford 2025 a and b).

Effective legislation must distinguish between feral and domestic cats, particularly those in communities, around farms, or in semi-owned settings, and prioritise humane, community-based management strategies. The current legislative approach places undue burden on community members, with little council support or guidance, and fails to record or respond adequately to cat-related complaints.

The current regulatory framework fails to recognise the proven benefits of desexing semi-owned or community cats as a humane and effective approach to managing free-roaming cats in urban and peri-urban areas. TNR is often misunderstood or misrepresented as abandonment, leading to misconceptions that it involves dumping cats in bushland or native parks, which undermines its credibility and uptake. To address this, we urgently need a framework-level shift that formally recognises Community Cat Programs that incorporate desexing of semi-owned cats, including cats at sites with multiple cats (colonies), when implemented with ongoing care, as a

legitimate and lawful practice. This includes desexing cats that are inadvertently getting food from humans such as a food bin and converting them to semi-owned cats with a regular carer or carers. This shift should be aligned with interpretations of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act (POCTA), clarifying that managed desexing programs which incorporate continuing care for semi-owned cats (being fed by one or more carers) does not constitute abandonment. These cats should be microchipped and a welfare agency, rescue group or carer registered as a secondary contact. This has been very effective in trials in Queensland where the primary contact (owner's name) is the suburb and the surname is Community Cat, and the Australian Pet Welfare Foundation is the secondary contact with two mobile phone numbers listed (Rand 2024).

Furthermore, localised cat management plans must be integrated with each council's Biodiversity Reporting and Planning obligations, ensuring that Community Cat Programs for owned, semi-owned and unowned cat which include desexing cats at multi-cat sites and providing continuing care, are designed to satisfy biodiversity protections while enabling better engagement with semi-owners and reducing environmental impacts in a scientifically informed and legally compliant way.

A proactive, cooperative model involving local governments, rescue groups, and the wider community is urgently needed to reduce overpopulation and promote both animal welfare and wildlife protection.

Recommendations:

- Legislation must address current gaps in complaint tracking, community support, and humane handling processes to promote safety, accountability, and compassion in cat management.
- Recognise and support the role of managed community cat programs, including in urban areas with highest cat impoundments and complaints, farms and in Indigenous and remote communities, as essential to both animal and environmental health.
- Provide resources such as training materials for AMOs, and clear guidelines for reporting and managing stray cats to reduce the burden on individuals.
- Mandate training for council officers and their management positions with developed practical guides for community members on humane trapping and care, aligned with animal welfare laws.
- We recommend abolishing cat registration and breeder permit fees. Commercial breeders should be regulated through other mechanisms including through welfare legislation to address inhumane breeding and rearing practices (kitten farms).
- Mandate that the microchip implanter has the responsibility to register the owner's details within 7 days on the database.

- Ensure mandatory microchip scanning and processes for reuniting cats with owners are in place to minimise unnecessary impoundments.
- Require councils to consistently log and track all cat-related complaints and their outcomes, using the data to inform better decision-making.
- Transparent reporting, to all stakeholders on all pound and shelter outcomes as per Animal Welfare Victoria's mandatory reporting of outcomes in shelters and pounds -[Mandatory Reporting of animal welfare outcomes](#)
- Introduce mechanisms to evaluate the outcomes of legislative actions, ensuring they meet conservation and welfare goals without resorting to inhumane practices.
- Mandate a consistent planning and reporting framework across all councils through legislation, requiring the development and implementation of a Domestic Animal Management Plan, modelled on the Victorian approach.
- Councils must consider their social license to operate—ensuring that animal management services not only comply with legislation but also reflect community values and expectations. Gaining and maintaining public support requires transparency, compassion, and responsiveness in how these services are delivered.

2. Compliance and enforcement roles of council

a. What changes to NSW laws, regulations, codes or guidelines could be provided to councils and other enforcement authorities to better support responsible pet ownership?

The misclassification of animals, particularly cats and dogs, as unsocialised or unadoptable based on behaviour exhibited shortly after capture or impoundment is a widespread and problematic practice. In highly stressful environments such as trap cages or shelters, both pet cats and dogs may initially display fear-based behaviours, including aggression, withdrawal, or frantic movement, that are often misinterpreted as signs of feral or dangerous behaviour. Research shows that frightened pet cats may appear more aggressive than truly feral cats in the first 24 hours (Slater 2013; Jacobson 2022), and similarly, dogs experiencing fear or trauma may be labelled as unfit for rehoming before they have had the opportunity to settle. This can lead to the premature euthanasia of healthy, rehomeable animals, particularly when decisions are made within the first 24 hours of admission.

The current Threat Abatement Plan (TAP) dangerously blurs the line between stray and feral cats, reinforcing harmful misconceptions and fuelling public hostility because of misleading information. To facilitate successful management of cats, **the NSW**

government must imbed in legislation cat classification as recommended by RSPCA Australia in their report on Identifying Best Practice Domestic Cat Management in Australia (RSPCA 2018). Victoria has defined cats this way in their recently released statewide Cat Management Strategy (AWV 2025). As recommended by the RSPCA, cats should be classified as either feral or domestic, with domestic cats living in the vicinity of where humans live or work and obtaining food from humans intentionally (owned or semi-owned cats) or unintentionally (unowned cats). Because domestic cats live around humans, they are a cause of complaints associated with nuisance behaviours. Distinct from domestic cats, feral cats live and reproduce remotely from humans and are not a cause of complaints relating to nuisance behaviours

The classification of cats as either feral or pet as recommended by the authors of the TAP (feral cat researchers Legge and Woinarski) is unworkable, lacks understanding of human interactions with stray cats, and is a barrier to solving free-roaming cat issues in urban areas of NSW. It essentially is a recommendation to continue traditional cat management based on trap, adopt or kill, which is costly and ineffective in reducing complaints, free-roaming cats or protecting the environment and damages human wellbeing (Scotney 2023, AVA 2023, Lezon 2025, Paul 2023, Dunn 2019, Rohlf 2018). To improve outcomes for cats, humans and the environment, it's critical that state government legislation and local government by-laws and policies are based on feral and domestic classification, and that councils take greater responsibility in supporting rehoming efforts and community education. Behaviour is not a valid test of whether a cat is feral or domestic (Slater 2013, Jacobson 2022).

Animals, especially those trapped due to nuisance complaints, should be presumed domestic, as these complaints imply the animals are living in or near human environments. For both cats and dogs, accurate assessments of sociability require time and a low-stress environment. A minimum observation period of 3 to 5 days, and ideally up to 14 days or longer, allows animals to begin to habituate and reveal their true behaviour and potential for rehoming (Rochlitz 1998, Di Gangi 2022, Jacobsen 2022, Slater 2013, Kerr 2018). Councils and shelters must be equipped with evidence-based protocols and trained staff to ensure these animals are fairly assessed, rather than condemned based on their initial stress response which is invalid for assessing adoptability or whether the cat is feral or domestic. Establishing consistent standards for behavioural assessment that reflect best practice would significantly reduce unnecessary euthanasia and improve outcomes for both cats and dogs entering the pound system.

Recommendation-

- We recommend urgent reform of current laws to ensure cats are classified using the RSPCA Australia (2018) definitions of 'domestic' cats, as those who rely on humans for food and/or shelter, whether owned, semi-owned, or unowned. Classification must be based on how and where the cat lives, not behaviour exhibited after capture, as stress responses are common and

should not be misinterpreted as indicators of temperament, sociability, or whether the cat is feral or domestic.

- Many councils already have processes in place for cat trapping, but the expectations for community members who borrow traps are often unclear and unmonitored. To ensure animal welfare standards are upheld, a transparent and consistent process for community trapping is essential, including clear guidelines, training, and follow-up.

b. How could NSW laws, regulations, codes or guidelines be improved to support councils to better manage dangerous and restricted dogs?

To better support councils in managing dangerous and restricted dogs, NSW laws, regulations, and codes should be updated to provide clearer, evidence-based guidance and greater flexibility for risk-based decision-making. Current frameworks often place a heavy burden on councils, particularly around enforcement, legal processes, and housing requirements for declared dogs. One major gap is the lack of provisions that support behaviourally informed, tiered responses, such as early intervention and behaviour modification programs, before or alongside enforcement actions. Strengthening statewide coordination, giving councils access to qualified behavioural assessors, and allowing discretion for tailored management plans would result in more proportionate, humane, and effective outcomes.

Additionally, there are significant animal welfare concerns arising from dogs being held for prolonged periods while court proceedings are underway. In some cases, dogs are kept in pounds or kennels for months, sometimes over a year, without adequate environmental enrichment, exercise, or socialisation. This can lead to severe psychological decline, including anxiety, or increased aggression, particularly in high-stress pound environments. In situations where the court ultimately does not declare the dog dangerous, the animal may still be left with long-term behavioural damage due to the confinement. To address this, legislative amendments should mandate minimum welfare standards for dogs held pending court outcomes and require time limits or fast-tracked proceedings to prevent unnecessary harm. Ensuring appropriate mental stimulation, social contact, and welfare monitoring during confinement is essential, not only from an animal welfare standpoint but also to support successful outcomes should the dog return to the community.

Recommendations-

- Where dogs are seized by an authorised Officer, they need to have an independent advocate whose role is to oversee the dogs' welfare. Many impounded dogs are seen as "Dangerous" and are handled with protective contact despite not showing any aggressive behaviour. Dogs may have had their health and physical and mental well-being compromised by these handling

procedures. These dogs may not have anyone to check on them and advocate for their well-being.

- The advocate and assessor of these dogs should be done by veterinary psychiatrists or postgraduate with training/qualifications in dog behaviour as they are uniquely qualified to understand how normal dogs develop, how this is affected by genetics and deficits in their natal and early life environments, how psychopathology presents in dogs and how to diagnose it. The veterinary psychiatrist or postgraduate with training/qualifications in dog behaviour is also uniquely qualified to provide management advice to minimise the risk of further incidents. Council officers and pound staff are not appropriately qualified to conduct assessments of dangerous dogs, as these evaluations require specialized training in animal behaviour, risk assessment, and legal implications. To ensure fairness and accuracy, such assessments should be carried out by independent professionals with relevant expertise.
- For many cases, the Dangerous Dog laws do not result in justice and repatriation for victims commensurate with the injuries experienced in the incident. In some cases, the punishment does not fit the crime. For many cases, suitable solutions could be found at a local level. This would allow more rapid resolution of cases and management plans to be put in place. Where the injuries are minor, an investigation at the local council level involving a veterinary psychiatrist or postgraduate with training/qualifications in dog behaviour would allow understanding of the causes of incidents, suitable risk management strategies to be put in place with follow up to check for compliance. This avoids lengthy, and costly, impoundment of the dog which results in poor welfare for many dogs.
- All dogs involved in an alleged aggressive encounter should receive a regular veterinary health assessment by a registered veterinarian to rule out any physical health conditions which may affect behaviour such as for e.g., a painful physical condition.
- Legislation should ensure there are clearly differentiated outcomes for minor versus serious dog attacks, allowing for proportionate, case-by-case responses that reflect the severity and circumstances of each incident.

c. Are the current enforcement provisions under the Act (including penalties for offences appropriate? If not, what enforcement provisions should be changed?

Cat Registration

In New South Wales, the financial requirements for cat ownership can pose significant barriers, particularly for individuals caring for multiple cats or those who adopt older, undesexed stray cats. A standard lifetime registration fee for a cat is \$68, or \$34 for eligible pensioners. However, if a cat is not desexed by four months of age,

owners must also pay an annual permit fee of \$96, regardless of the cat's age at adoption. Additionally, a late payment fee of \$22 applies if the registration is not completed within 28 days. These cumulative costs can be prohibitive, leading some owners to delay or forgo microchipping and registration altogether. Non-compliance with cat identification requirements undermines efforts to reunite lost and wandering cats with their owners and reduces the effectiveness of animal welfare initiatives, thereby increasing the risk of impoundment and euthanasia. To promote better compliance and animal welfare outcomes, it is crucial to reassess these financial obligations and consider more accessible alternatives for cat registration and desexing.

A survey conducted with councils across Australia revealed that two-thirds required cat registration. However, an analysis of the data provided by these councils estimated that only one-third of pet cats were registered (NESP Threatened Species Recovery Hub). **Registration and breeder permit fees should be abolished for cats.** In NSW, local governments spend 7-10 times the money on cat management than is gained in these fees for cats, and this does not include their costs for administration of the registration process. Instead, it is recommended that the efficacy of microchipping to get cats returned to owners is enhanced by regular reminders to update contact details, and by regulating that microchip implanters must register the owner's contact details on the microchip database within 7 days of implantation.

Human Behaviour Change

While enforcement has an important role to play in deterring serious offences and deliberate acts of animal cruelty, the current provisions under the Act rely almost exclusively on financial penalties, with little to no scope for supportive or rehabilitative interventions. Many instances of non-compliance stem from underlying issues such as mental health challenges, lack of understanding, or financial hardship, rather than intentional neglect. Without addressing these root causes, penalties alone are unlikely to create lasting behaviour change. Incorporating behaviour change programs that focus on education, support, and prevention, rather than punishment alone, would lead to better outcomes for both animals and their owners.

There is currently no formal mechanism within the Act for psychological counselling, behaviour modification programs, or mandatory education as part of enforcement actions. This represents a missed opportunity to intervene meaningfully in cases where offending behaviour is linked to trauma, hoarding disorder, or other complex factors. A more effective and compassionate system would complement financial penalties with targeted interventions, such as court-mandated counselling, mental health support, or enrolment in structured animal care education programs. Embedding these options within the enforcement framework would improve compliance, reduce recidivism, and promote long-term animal welfare.

Recommendation-

- The Act should be amended to allow courts to mandate behaviour change interventions, such as psychological counselling, structured education programs, and animal care training, in cases where non-compliance stems from complex personal or social factors. Incorporating behaviour change programs, such as mandatory counselling, into sentencing outcomes would support rehabilitation, reduce rates of recidivism, and contribute to improved long-term animal welfare outcomes (Glanville 2020).
- Remove the requirements of cat registration and the annual permit fee associated with registration requirements, to assist semi-owners to take full ownership of cats they care for.

d. Are there other compliance and enforcement matters that should be considered?

There is a belief that free-roaming cats are mainly the result of irresponsible cat owners, and therefore the issue needs to be managed by legislation and its enforcement. However, for enforcement to be effective, there must be an identifiable owner, and the reality is that most free-roaming cats in urban areas live in low socioeconomic areas where the costs of registration, microchipping and cat-proof fencing are often too prohibitive for cat owners and semi-owners to comply with. A study conducted with 4482 people across NSW, 65% indicated they keep their cats currently contained to their property and another 24% keep their cats contained at night, resulting in 89% of owned cats contained at least at night (Ma 2023).

Mandating containment is not effective in increasing cat containment of those cats not currently contained. It also leads to unrealistic expectations in the community that they will not see a wandering cat, resulting in increased cat-related complaints. Many councils in Victoria have implemented containment mandates, but there is no peer-reviewed research to show this is effective. When implemented, mandated containment increases cat-related complaints, cat impoundments, cat euthanasia, and costs to local governments and shelters (Yarra Ranges, Hobsons Bay, Hume, Casey Council, APWF 2023). The number of free-roaming cats is greatest in low socioeconomic areas (Cotterell 2024, Cotterell 2025a b). Incomes in these areas are below the Australian average, a larger proportion of residents live in rental accommodation and a higher proportion of households have rent repayments greater than 30% of household income (Rand 2024a b; Dutton-Regester 2024, Cotterell 2024).

Cat containment systems often cost between \$700 and \$2000 or higher, making it highly unlikely a low-income household can afford one if it is needed. For example, in a suburb with a cat intake into the local shelters of more than 20 cats/1000 residents (average for Queensland is 7 cats/1000 residents), individual median weekly income was approximately \$636/week (Rand 2024b). Because of lack of affordability, mandated containment is a barrier to semi-owners taking ownership of a domestic cat and

effectively makes cat ownership illegal for many low-income owners, perpetuating the “it’s not my cat” response.

Cat containment should be encouraged and facilitated but not mandated. Owners can be messaged to provide their cats with a last “bed-time” meal indoors (APWF 2023). At little or no cost to the owner, this method trains the cat to come inside at night when the door out-side can then be closed. Night-time containment is effective in protecting wildlife of conservation concern susceptible to cat predation because most are nocturnal in urban areas of Australia (NSW Govt 2023). Other options where species of conservation concern are located include assisting cat owners with the construction or costs of cat-proof fencing or enclosures. **Electronic fencing (hidden fencing) may be less expensive for some properties and should be legislated that it is legal in NSW.** It is not subject to restrictions for modifying rental properties, and key components can be relocated to another property. It can also be used around doors or windows to stop “door dasher” cats escaping. If used correctly, **electronic fencing is not associated with welfare issues** [Kasbaoui 2016].

The **APWF strongly opposes councils introducing enforceable cat containment** or curfew policies in their local government areas in NSW; for the following reasons listed:

- **Lack of Evidence for Effectiveness:**
 - No scientific evidence supports mandated cat containment laws as a successful model for reducing wandering cats or associated issues such as nuisance complaints or wildlife predation ([APWF 2023 Key Issues Mandated Cat Containment](#), Cotterell 2025a).
 - Local and international data demonstrate that these laws fail in both the short and long term to reduce the free-roaming cat population and complaints.
- **Ineffectiveness in Addressing the Core Issue:**
 - Many free-roaming cats are unowned or semi-owned, making containment laws unenforceable and impractical (Cotterell 2025a).
 - Most impounded cats are not traceable to an owner, preventing enforcement of penalties and leading to increased euthanasia rates.
 - In NSW 65% of cat owners state, they already contain their cats to their property, and a further 24% of owners contained their cat at night – 89% of owned cats are contained at least at night (Ma 2023).
- **Increased Costs and Burden on Local Governments:**
 - Mandated containment leads to higher costs for councils, averaging \$500 per cat, because trapping, impoundment, and euthanasia all increase.



- Enforcement requires significant resources, including staff time and equipment, with no published data showing decreased free-roaming cat populations at the suburb or city level (Cotterell 2024).
- **Negative Consequences:**
 - Increased euthanasia: Cat containment and curfews laws result in higher impoundments and owner surrenders, leading to an increase in euthanasia of healthy cats and kittens. This not only affects animal welfare but also has significant emotional and mental health impacts on shelter staff, including veterinarians and the broader community (Chua 2023, Scotney 2015).
 - Higher nuisance complaints: Unrealistic community expectations lead to more complaints, trapping, and impoundments (Cotterell 2025 a).
 - Reduced cat adoptions: Containment laws discourage adoption of semi-owned cats by their carers', perpetuating the undesexed, unidentified roaming cat population.
 - Social justice concerns: Low-income households and renters face financial and practical barriers to compliance, disproportionately criminalizing vulnerable populations.
- **Impact on Human and Animal Welfare:**
 - The laws increase stress and mental health risks for staff involved in euthanising animals (Scotney 2015, Lezon 2025. Paul 2023, Dunn 2019, Rohlf 2018).
 - Contained cats are at increased risk of obesity, diabetes, orthopaedic issues and urinary tract diseases as well as behavioural problems, which all negatively impact animal welfare and increase the risk of surrender and euthanasia (Amat 2015, Horwitz 2018).
 - Places the burden of unowned and semi-owned cats on the community, impacting them mentally and financially.

Recommendation:

➤ **Alternative Solutions:**

- **Community Cat Programs**, involving free desexing and microchipping in high-complaint areas, are proven to reduce unwanted litters and roaming cat populations effectively (Cotterell 2024, Rand 2024a, RSPCA NSW 2023).
- **Encourage semi-owners of cats in the community** to take full ownership. To facilitate this, support programs are required for cat carers and rescue groups to assist in getting the cats adopted and desexed. Semi-owned cats are the core source of complaints, and stray cat intake

into shelters and pounds. Mandated containment is a barrier to carers adopting the cats and getting them desexed and identified with a microchip.

- **By investing in proactive measures** such as containment fencing in areas where species of conservation concern are present, governments can achieve dual benefits, enhancing conservation efforts while promoting social equity. To effectively protect threatened species, it is essential to compile citizen science data and existing databases, supplemented by camera trap data for confirmation (Lasky 2021), to develop detailed maps identifying key native species at the street and property level. Targeted protection strategies can then be implemented, including support for cat owners with containment enclosures, community education through mail drops, SMS messaging, and door-knocking campaigns to encourage responsible management of dogs and cats, as well as initiatives such as providing native plants for residential gardens and considering reduced speed limits in areas where vehicle strikes are a known threat. Protecting threatened and endangered species is a shared community responsibility, and the financial burden should not fall solely on individuals with cats.

Governments should focus on evidence-based strategies like Community Cat Programs, which effectively reduce wandering cats and associated issues while supporting animal welfare and minimizing enforcement costs and community burdens. Mandated 24/7 cat containment laws should not be implemented due to their proven ineffectiveness and significant negative consequences.

3. Companion animal population and rehoming

a. What more could be done to reduce stray and homeless cats and dogs in NSW?

Implementing innovative desexing programs is essential to effectively manage cat populations and reduce impoundments and euthanasia rates. Expanding targeted initiatives, such as the successful model employed by Banyule City Council (Cotterell 2024) and in the city of Ipswich, Queensland (Rand 2024a) and the RSPCA NSW program (RSPCA NSW 2023) with 11 councils, can significantly mitigate these issues. These programs should establish clear, measurable objectives over a 3–5-year period, concentrating efforts on areas with high complaint and intake rates. Utilising microtargeting strategies allows for the efficient allocation of resources to locations where cats are most at risk of being impounded or kittens surrendered. The intensity of these efforts is crucial; broader targeting may require desexing 30 cats per 1,000 residents annually, while microtargeted approaches might focus on desexing 10 cats per 1,000 residents each year (Cotterell 2024).

Ensuring accessibility and equity for disadvantaged residents within these programs is vital. Eliminating barriers, such as the necessity for government-issued cards to access services, is important because many individuals in disadvantaged areas may not qualify for such documentation yet still cannot afford desexing procedures. Providing subsidized or free desexing services is particularly essential in low-income and regional areas where veterinary access is limited.

Support for regional high-volume desexing efforts is also necessary because these areas are on average lower income and have cost and accessible barriers. Prioritizing free high-volume desexing clinics and mobile veterinary services can ensure coverage in underserved areas, including farming communities. Allocating council resources for transporting cats to desexing clinics is a more effective use of AMO time compared to transporting cats for impoundment and euthanasia.

Current management practices, such as trap–adopt/kill methods, often lead to the unnecessary euthanasia of healthy cats, imposing psychological and emotional burdens on AMOs, shelter staff, and carers. Data indicates that only about 3% of cats entering NSW pounds and shelters are reclaimed, with approximately 32% euthanized in the 2018–2019 period (Chua 2023). Of concern, one quarter of NSW councils operating their own facility and accepting more than 50 cats a year, euthanised 67% to 100%, highlighting the inefficiencies and emotional toll of existing approaches.

These practices contribute to compassion fatigue and mental health challenges among those involved in euthanising healthy cats and managing cat overpopulation (Scotney 2015, Paul 2023, Dunn 2019, Rohlf 2018). To alleviate these issues of negative human mental health impacts, it is recommended to remove legislative barriers to desexing semi-owned cats and practices like Return to Field (RTF) (Humane World for Animals 2025), particularly in areas without wildlife conservation concerns. The current legislative framework often oversimplifies cat management by assuming that free-roaming cats result primarily from irresponsible ownership.

Adopting evidence-based solutions is crucial. Legislation should accurately reflect the underlying causes of free-roaming cat populations and support proven interventions, such as microtargeted desexing programs and community engagement and assistive initiatives. Public messaging should avoid demonising cats, as this can lead to ineffective measures like mandated containment, cat limits and cruelty to cats. Instead, the focus should be on providing practical and targeted information and collaboration to develop humane and effective cat management strategies.

For dogs, targeted programs should be implemented in areas with higher-than-average rates of wandering and lost dogs that are unidentified and not desexed. For example, free microchipping and check-a-chip events (about 37% of dogs entering RSPCA Qld with a microchip did not have current contact details for the owner). Also, providing free collars with engraved contact details for the owners will help neighbours return dogs to their owners without them being impounded. Door knocking and providing assistance to check or implant a chip, provide a collar and tag and advise on

fencing issues for escaping dogs can be effective when it is an assistive approach and not associated with fines, for example, for having unregistered dogs. Information on access to affordable dog desexing and health care is also valuable and aligned with the Pets for Life philosophy and a One Welfare approach. Targeted desexing programs should be implemented where the proportion of un-desexed impounded dogs is high or there are higher than average numbers of unwanted puppies being surrendered.

Free desexing Programs Vs Subsidised Desexing Programs

While subsidised desexing programs can reduce financial barriers, they often fall short in reaching the most vulnerable pet owners, particularly in low-income or marginalised communities and those caring for multiple cats. For these groups, even a reduced fee may remain out of reach, leading to continued overpopulation and poor animal welfare outcomes. Free desexing, by contrast, removes the cost barrier entirely and has been shown to significantly increase uptake, especially in high-need areas. Importantly, subsidised desexing, *offered across the whole community*, often functions as a substitution source (Frank 2007), attracting individuals who would have paid full price anyway, whereas *free programs targeted to areas of greatest need and those who would not otherwise participate*, for example owners and semi-owners caring for multiple cats, deliver greater impact where it's needed most.

Cat Desexing

Free cat desexing is a critical and evidence-based solution for reducing cat overpopulation, improving animal welfare, and relieving pressure on shelters and local councils. Research shows that financial barriers are the primary reason many owned and semi-owned cats remain undesexed, particularly in low-income communities, where residents often care for multiple cats but cannot afford sterilization, microchipping, or registration fees (Cotterell 2024, 2025a b). Without intervention, these cats contribute to unplanned litters and persistent nuisance complaints, leading to impoundment and high euthanasia rates. Free desexing programs directly address this root cause by preventing unwanted kittens, empowering carers to take ownership, and building trust between councils and communities. For cats, however, free desexing is not just an animal welfare strategy; it is a public health, economic, and social justice intervention necessary to break a cycle that punitive laws alone cannot fix.

Dog Desexing

Although kittens comprise over half the cats' entering shelters and pounds, most dogs are typically older, with a small proportion of shelter intake being puppies, except in a few locations (Hemy 2017). In contrast to cats, the impact of subsidized desexing programs for dogs is varied, with some programs reducing shelter intake and others not (White 2010, Scarlett 2012). Because of concerns about increased incidence of some neoplasias and orthopaedic issues, particularly in larger breeds of dogs, desexing is now being frequently advised by veterinarians to be delayed until the dog is older than 12 to 18 months (Hart 2020). A recent study found a greater proportion of cats were desexed (91%) than dogs (73%) (Rand 2024). Although many female dogs are already

desexed before reaching sexual maturity many male dogs are not desexed, although substantially higher registration fees for intact animals and stricter enforcement of registration does encourage desexing. Owner reclaim rates for impounded dogs are significantly higher than for cats, meaning that dogs entering shelters are more likely to return home and less likely to be euthanized. Moreover, dog-related laws and services have received far greater historical investment and community compliance than those targeting cats. While subsidized dog desexing is still important, particularly for low-income households, there is not the same widespread need for *free* desexing programs to control an unmanaged, reproducing population.

Most dogs entering shelters and pounds are owned dogs that have escaped or are wandering and a smaller proportion are surrendered by owners. Therefore, programs which target these populations are needed in areas of high dog impoundments. These include identification programs such as free collars and engraved ID tags, so neighbours can return dogs home, microchipping and check-a-chip programs to get a higher proportion of dogs microchipped with correct contact details, SMS and email reminders to update details, and a policy of returning lost dogs home prior to full payment of fines and fees. Assistive programs to help dog owners with fencing issues to prevent further escapes and behaviour modification programs, accessible health care and other support to prevent surrender of owned dogs are also important.

Recommendations:

- To **effectively address cat overpopulation** and its associated challenges, the APWF recommends a multifaceted approach. This includes supporting targeted desexing initiatives by funding high-intensity programs in high-risk areas, establishing free and subsidised high-volume desexing clinics, and deploying mobile services in collaboration with veterinarians and welfare agencies where there is no readily accessible veterinary clinic, for example, in regional towns, close to farms and in indigenous communities (Cotterell 2024, Rand 2024). Desexing initiatives are needed long-term but numbers of cats requiring to be desexed will decrease over time.
- Additionally, **removing legislative barriers** is essential; this involves permitting the sterilization of cats cared for by semi-owners without requiring formal ownership, with cats microchipped and the secondary contact and phone numbers are for an organisation (welfare or rescue group) or business (for farm and factory cats)(Crawford 2025) and allowing Return to Field (RTF) programs in areas without conservation concerns. These return to field programs involve returning unclaimed, healthy stray cats that would otherwise be euthanised, to the address they were found, after desexing, microchipping and ear-tipping. These cats are unidentified owned cats and semi-owned cats. It prevents the devastating mental health effects on shelter staff tasked with caring for them, to then have to euthanise them. Addressing affordability and accessibility is also crucial to prevent unwanted kittens being born. This can be achieved by

providing access to free and affordable cat desexing services targeted to areas of need, for example, for low-income cat owners and semi-owners and without restrictive eligibility criteria. Transport initiatives are needed for some owners and semi-owners to participate, especially in regional and underserved areas.

- **Improving messaging** and community information is vital to promote understanding of the root causes of free-roaming cats and advocate for evidence-based solutions, while avoiding stigmatizing cat ownership or implementing punitive measures like containment laws that disproportionately affect disadvantaged populations. Implementing these recommendations can lead to humane, effective, and equitable policies that mitigate cat overpopulation, thereby reducing the financial and emotional burdens on communities and stakeholders.
- **Targeted messaging** should utilize methods such as direct mail, SMS, community outreach programs, and local support networks to reach socially isolated residents, ensuring they are aware of available assistance for cat management and welfare (McDonald 2019). Providing clear, practical information on affordable containment solutions, including subsidies for enclosures, DIY options, and local support services, can empower residents to make informed decisions while protecting both their pets and native wildlife. Promoting bedtime feeding is an effective and minimal to no-cost way to contain cats inside at night, a time when both cats and native species of conservation concern in urban areas are most active (Cotterell 2025b).
- **Develop targeted messaging** to help residents understand and comply with NSW building codes for cat enclosures on private residential properties, ensuring clear, accessible guidance tailored to community needs.
- Currently, councils, cat carers, rescue groups, and animal welfare shelters often operate in silos, limiting the collective impact of their efforts to manage cat overpopulation. To achieve meaningful and sustainable outcomes, these groups must be supported to work together through coordinated frameworks, shared resources, and strategic partnerships. A unified approach would ensure more efficient service delivery, broader reach of desexing initiatives, and stronger advocacy for legislative reform, ultimately leading to more humane and effective outcomes for cats and communities alike.

b. What changes can be made to NSW laws, regulations, codes and guidelines to reduce the number of companion animals entering the pound and rehoming system in the first place?

To reduce the number of companion animals entering the pound and rehoming system in New South Wales, **laws and regulations must shift from punitive enforcement to proactive, assistive approaches** that address the root causes of

intake. Traditional compliance-driven models for cats, such as mandatory containment, registration fines, and enforcement of ownership limits, have proven ineffective and often counterproductive. Evidence from NSW, Victoria, and Queensland (RSPCA NSW 2023, Rand 2024, Cotterell 2024, Cotterell 2025a b) shows that such policies disproportionately impact low-income communities, increase impoundments, and lead to the premature euthanasia of healthy but frightened animals.

Assistive programs should also be implemented to return and keep dogs with their owners and prevent problematic behaviours from escalating. In areas with higher-than-average numbers of unidentified wandering dogs, community microchip and check-a-chip days should be implemented. If the area also has higher numbers of undesexed wandering dogs or unwanted puppies, then free and affordable dog desexing should be offered. A fundamental shift from traditional enforcement-based strategies to a community-centred, assistive approach is essential. It is vital that council AMOs have updated training in best practices and engage with communities through targeted support (Cotterell 2025b). An assistive approach is aligned with the One Welfare philosophy (Pinillos 2016), based on the interconnectedness of human, animal, and environmental well-being, and research demonstrating that improving animal well-being will benefit humans and their physical and social environments.

An assistive and supportive approach is characterised by targeted interventions that address the underlying factors contributing to issues. For example, the Pets for Life concept is focused on assisting disadvantaged and marginalised pet owners with the resources, services and information to care for their pets. This supports maintaining the bond and keeping the pet with its family (HSUS 2022). By addressing the root causes and empowering the community, officers can allocate their time more proactively to an assistive approach based on community engagement, rather than reactive enforcement. This maximizes the efficiency and outcomes for all stakeholders, as well as increasing their job satisfaction (Cotterell 2025b). Understanding community needs requires effective communication and trust. Focusing on an assistive approach to resolving complaint issues is very important and, in most cases, is successful, without having to resort to enforcement.

State governments should also take the lead in developing certification programs for current and future Animal Management Officers (AMOs). A strong example can be found in the training provided by the National Animal Care and Control Association (NACA) in Florida, USA. NACA's programs offer qualifications tailored to animal control, including education in animal behaviour, mental health first aid, and strategies for engaging communities through initiatives like community-focused programs (NACA a.). These courses help AMOs navigate the practical realities of fieldwork and build essential skills for interacting effectively with the public. By prioritising this type of training, governments can support a more inclusive and effective model of service delivery, one that strengthens trust and cooperation between AMOs and the communities they work with (NACA b.)

A key legislative reform would be the widespread adoption and funding of **free, council-supported cat sterilisation and microchipping programs**, particularly in areas with high complaint rates or socioeconomic disadvantage. Banyule Council in Victoria achieved savings exceeding four times their initial investment, demonstrating a strong return on cost-effective cat management. This outcome provides a compelling case that is likely replicable for other councils facing similar challenges. These programs empower semi-owners to assume ownership, prevent unplanned litters, and reduce roaming cat populations before they reach crisis levels. By removing financial and regulatory barriers, these reforms would reduce intake pressure on shelters and significantly improve outcomes for animals and communities ([Cotterell 2024](#), [Cotterell 2025a](#), [Cotterell 2025b](#)).

For dogs, targeted microchipping and desexing programs should be implemented where there are higher than average numbers of free-roaming dogs that do not have identification and are not desexed. In addition, door-knocking by animal management officers committed to an assistive approach, and who can provide free collars with engraved tags with contact details of owners, will assist neighbours returning escaped dogs directly to their owner. The officers can also scan dogs for a microchip and update contact details where necessary, and where there is no microchip, implant a microchip. They can also advise on ways to deter dogs from escaping and inexpensive options for desexing and health care, and if necessary, information on food pantries that provide pet food.

Most dogs found in shelters or impounded by councils are owned animals that have either escaped or been found wandering, with a smaller number surrendered directly by their owners. Therefore, to reduce dog impoundments in high-risk areas, targeted strategies are essential. These may include initiatives such as providing free collars and ID tags to make it easier for community members to return lost dogs, improving microchipping rates and accuracy through check-a-chip campaigns, and sending reminders to keep contact information up to date. Allowing dogs to be returned home before full payment of associated fees can also help. Additionally, support services to assist with fencing repairs and advice on preventing escapes, access to behavioural training, affordable veterinary care, and other forms of owner support can help prevent future escapes and reduce the number of surrenders. Electronic fencing should also be legalised to assist with difficult to contain dogs (and cats).

Cat Definitions

Appropriate and evidence-based definitions of cats is foundational to ensure the management of cats is focused appropriately. It is imperative that these definitions be revised in NSW legislation to ensure effective policy responses and management approaches which can be delivered efficiently. The following definitions are adapted from the RSPCA's Best Practice Domestic Cat Management (2018):

- **Domestic cats** have some dependence on people (direct or indirect) and live in the vicinity of where people live or frequent, which includes around farm buildings,

mining sites and in indigenous communities, and are subcategorised as owned, semi-owned and unowned. **Domestic cats may be:**

- **owned**, live in a domestic household, are usually named, have a form of identification, and depend on humans for their food.
- **semi-owned**, are directly dependent on humans and are intentionally fed by people who do not consider they own them. These cats are more abundant in disadvantaged areas and where food resources are available. They are sometimes called stray cats. Recent research documented strong emotional bonds of semi-owners with the cats they care for, and almost identical to the bonds reported by cat owners with their pet cats (Scotney 2023; Neal 2023; Ma 2023; Crawford 2023). These cats are also frequently named.
- **unowned**, are indirectly dependent on humans and receive food from people unintentionally, such as via food waste bins. They are more abundant in areas where food resources are available. These cats are of varying sociability and are sometimes called stray cats. Unowned cats are fairly rare because once they start to hang around where people frequent someone starts to feed them.
- **Feral cats** have no relationship with or dependence on humans (neither direct nor indirect), survive by hunting or scavenging for food, and live and reproduce in the wild (e.g., forests, woodlands, grasslands, deserts). Feral cats do not live in the vicinity of where people live, and they do not receive food from humans intentionally (direct feeding) or unintentionally (e.g. via food waste bins, rubbish dumps). Feral cats are not found or trapped in the vicinity of where people live or frequent and are **not the subject of nuisance complaints relating to behaviour around humans**.

Misclassifying domestic cats, including semi-owned cats, as feral cats creates barriers to effective management and prevents resolution of the issue of free-roaming cats in urban and peri-urban areas. Instead, it promotes continuation of trap-rehome/kill programs which are ineffective and increase euthanasia of healthy and treatable cats and kittens. To allow for successful, community-based management strategies, domestic cats should be excluded from the legal definition of feral cats. This distinction would enable targeted programs that humanely and scientifically reduce the number of urban free-roaming cats over time and reduce the negative psychological impact on shelter and pound staff as well as community members who support and care for them when inhumane, and ineffective methods are used to manage these cats.

Importantly, **behaviour towards humans is an invalid test of whether a cat is feral or domestic**. Despite this, many local governments and some shelters misclassify cats as feral based on behaviour in the trap cage or shortly after admission and euthanise them immediately or within the first 24 hours. **Cats trapped as a result of a complaint about nuisance behaviours are, by definition, domestic cats** because a complaint

implies the cat is living around where humans live or frequent. Sociability and adoptability cannot be judged in a highly stressful environment, such as in a trap cage; frightened pet cats may display more aggressive behaviours towards humans than truly feral cats (Slater 2013; Jacobson 2022). A minimum of 3 to 5 days, and often 14 days or longer, are required for many pet cats to habituate to a new environment and for accurate assessment of sociability,

Recommendations-

- We recommend urgent reform of current laws to **ensure cats are classified fairly** and accurately, using the RSPCA Australia (2018) definitions of '**domestic**' cats, those who rely on humans for food and/or shelter, whether **owned, semi-owned, or unowned**. Classification must be based on how and where the cat lives, not behaviour exhibited after capture, as stress responses are common and should not be misinterpreted as indicators of temperament, sociability, or whether the cat is **feral** or domestic.
- **Shift from punitive to assistive regulation:** Reform laws and policies to prioritise proactive, community-based approaches over traditional enforcement for managing companion animals. This includes reducing reliance on fines and encouraging but not mandating containment, which disproportionately impact low-income communities and contribute to higher cat intake and euthanasia in shelters and pounds.
- **Fund targeted desexing and microchipping programs:** Implement and support free, council-led sterilisation and microchipping initiatives in areas with high complaint volumes or socioeconomic disadvantage. These programs have been shown to deliver strong financial and welfare outcomes, as evidenced by councils like Banyule Council, Victoria, APWF- Ipswich, QLD and RSPCA, NSW.
- **Develop and mandate AMO training programs:** Establish government-supported certification and training for Animal Management Officers that includes animal behaviour, mental health first aid, and community engagement. This would equip officers to work more effectively with the public and support a One Welfare-aligned model of service delivery.
- **Implement assistive programs based on Pets for Life** to help keep dogs and cats with their owners and carers.

c. For companion animals needing to enter the “pound system”, what could be done to increase rehoming?

To increase rehoming rates for companion animals entering the pound system, a multi-pronged approach is needed that addresses both systemic barriers and community engagement. While many community members are stepping up to manage

multi-cat sites (colonies) or take cats and dogs from the pound into their homes through rescue groups, they are doing so at their own personal expense. This volunteer-driven safety net is not sustainable without formal recognition and support. Councils should be required to contribute financially for each animal transferred to a rescue group or rehoming organisation, helping to cover the costs of veterinary care, rehabilitation, and rehoming. Simultaneously, pounds and shelters must be resourced to implement proactive, evidence-based strategies such as open adoption policies, streamlined adoption processes, and targeted marketing campaigns. Funding for behavioural support, desexing, and fostering networks will also improve adoption outcomes and reduce time spent in care. “Pets for Life” (HWFA 2025) community outreach programs decrease pound and shelter intake. These programs assist people who are struggling to care for their pet, but who love it, to keep their pet rather than surrender it. The fewer animals entering pounds and shelters, the fewer that need rehoming or are euthanised.

In addition, lost or wandering dogs and cats should be returned immediately to their owner if able to be identified using various channels, including Facebook. This will minimise impoundment fees and reduce the number of animals abandoned at the pound because fines and fees are unaffordable. Arrangements can be made to have affordable repayments and free registration and desexing, if the dog is desexed and registered within 2-3 weeks. The policy should be to return the animal home as soon as possible rather than holding it until all fines and fees are paid.

If low-income families are unable to afford the fees and fines and choose not to reclaim their animal, the council is still unable to recover these costs, and instead faces additional expenses related to rehoming or euthanising the dog. Costs for fines, fees, impoundment costs and registration may be \$800 to \$1000 or more. Cost for registration, including higher registration costs for an un-desexed animal, and fines for an unregistered animal and for an at-large animal, plus daily impoundment fees all add to high costs for owners, and if they have to be paid before the animal is reclaimed, it may lead to disadvantaged owners abandoning the animal at the shelter or pound. Therefore, affordable payment plans should be worked out, potentially involving assistance with budgeting and financial advice from community support groups. However, as this may take some time, the animal should be returned promptly once the owner is identified. This should be the priority, if the aim is to reduce abandonment and euthanasia.

Improving public awareness and accessibility is equally critical. Many potential adopters remain unaware of the breadth of animals available in local shelters. Municipalities could invest in user-friendly online platforms and inclusive community outreach initiatives to better match animals with suitable homes. Incentivising adoption through fee waivers, trial periods, and post-adoption support services like training and veterinary care can help overcome financial or emotional barriers to adoption. Importantly, policies must also acknowledge the presence of semi-owned or

loosely owned cats and support carers to keep these animals in the community where possible, rather than defaulting to impoundment and often euthanasia.

Empowering communities with information and resources, access to pet-friendly housing, and support services will reduce intake, increase rehoming, and contribute to a more humane and sustainable animal welfare system.

Recommendation

- The NSW Government should consider implementing a localised version of the successful ***Pets for Life*** program from the United States (HWFA 2025), which supports pet retention in underserved communities by providing access to essential veterinary services, desexing, pet supplies, and education. This preventative, community-based model has been shown to reduce intake into shelters and improve animal and human wellbeing, particularly in areas with high rates of disadvantage. By funding mobile outreach teams and partnering with local councils, animal welfare organisations, and community health providers, NSW can improve equity in pet ownership, reduce pressure on the pound system, and strengthen the human–animal bond in vulnerable households.
- Return lost dogs and cats to owners as soon as possible and waive or negotiate affordable payments over time for low-income households.

For further information on this submission, please contact info@petwelfare.org.au

Best wishes,

Jacquie

Emeritus Professor Jacquie Rand, BVSc (Melb), DVSc (Guelph), MANZCVS
Diplomate, American College of Veterinary Internal Medicine

Executive Director & Chief Scientist
Australian Pet Welfare Foundation

References:

1. Amat M, Camps T, Manteca X. Stress in owned cats: behavioural changes and welfare implications. *Journal of Feline Medicine and Surgery*. 2015;18(8):577-586. doi:10.1177/1098612X15590867



2. Animal Management in Rural and Remote Indigenous Communities (AMRRIC). Available online: [Vet Services - AMRRIC](#)
3. Animal Welfare Victoria (2025) Victorian Cat Management Strategy. Available online: [Victorian cat management strategy | Cat management initiatives | Cats | Animal Welfare Victoria | Livestock and animals | Agriculture Victoria](#)
4. Australian Pet Welfare Foundation (2022). Issues to consider about mandated cat containment. Available Online: <https://petwelfare.org.au/2022/09/02/key-issues-to-consider-related-to-mandated-24-7-cat-containment/>
5. Australian Veterinary Association (2023) Animal welfare and human wellbeing- vulnerability of clients and veterinary staff. Available online: [Animal welfare and human wellbeing – vulnerability of clients and veterinary staff](#)
6. Benka VA, McCobb E. Characteristics of cats sterilized through a subsidized, reduced-cost spay-neuter program in Massachusetts and of owners who had cats sterilized through this program. *J Am Vet Med Assoc.* 2016 Sep 1;249(5):490-8. doi: 10.2460/javma.249.5.490
7. Centre for International Economics. Rehoming of Companion Animals in NSW. Available online: https://www.olg.nsw.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/CIE-Draft-Report_NSW-OLG_Rehoming-of-Companion-Animals-in-NSW-FINAL-21.09.22.pdf (accessed on 8 October 2024).
8. Chu, K.; Anderson, W.M.; Rieser, M.Y. Population Characteristics and Neuter Status of Cats Living in Households in the United States. *J. Am. Vet. Med. Assoc.* 2009, 234, 1023–1030.
9. Chua, D., Rand, J., & Morton, J. (2023). Stray and Owner-Relinquished Cats in Australia—Estimation of Numbers Entering Municipal Pounds, Shelters and Rescue Groups and Their Outcomes. *Animals*, 13(11), 1771. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani13111771>
10. Cotterell JL, Rand J, Barnes TS, Scotney R. Impact of a Local Government Funded Free Cat Desexing Program for Owned and Semi-Owned Cats. *Animals*. 2024; 14(11):1615. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani14111615>
11. Cotterell, J., Rand, J., & Scotney, R. (2025a). Rethinking Urban Cat Management—Limitations and Unintended Consequences of Traditional Cat Management. *Animals*, 15(7), 1005. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani15071005>
12. Cotterell, J., Rand, J., & Scotney, R. (2025b). Urban Cat Management in Australia—Evidence-Based Strategies for Success. *Animals*, 15(8), 1083. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani15081083>
13. Crawford, C., Rand, J., Rohlf, V., Scotney, R., & Bennett, P. (2023). Solutions-Based Approach to Urban Cat Management—Case Studies of a One Welfare Approach to Urban Cat Management. *Animals*, 13(21), 3423. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani13213423>
14. Crawford, C., Rand, J., Rohlf, V., Scotney, R., & Bennett, P. (2023). Solutions-Based Approach to Urban Cat Management—Case Studies of a One Welfare Approach to Urban Cat Management. *Animals*, 13(21), 3423. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani13213423>

15. DiGangi, B. A., Cussen, V. A., Reid, P. J., & Collins, K. A. (2022). *Animal Behavior for Shelter Veterinarians and Staff* (Second edition). John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.
16. Dunn, J., Best, C., Pearl, D. L., & Jones-Bitton, A. (2019). Mental health of employees at a Canadian animal welfare organization. *society & animals*, 30(1), 51-87.
17. Dutton-Regester, K.R., J.;. Cat Caring Behaviors and Ownership Status of Residents Enrolling a Cat in a Free Sterilization 1044 Program. *Animals* **2024**, doi:10.3390/ani14203022
18. Frank, Joshua & Carlisle-Frank, Pamela. (2007). Analysis of programs to reduce overpopulation of companion animals: Do adoption and low-cost spay/neuter programs merely cause substitution of sources?. *Ecological Economics*. 62. 740-746. 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2006.09.011.
19. Glanville, C., Abraham, C., & Coleman, G. (2020). Human Behaviour Change Interventions in Animal Care and Interactive Settings: A Review and Framework for Design and Evaluation. *Animals*, 10(12), 2333. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani10122333>
20. Hart, B.L.; Hart, L.A.; Thigpen, A.P.; Willis, N.H. Assisting Decision-Making on Age of Neutering for 35 Breeds of Dogs: Associated Joint Disorders, Cancers, and Urinary Incontinence. *Front. Vet. Sci.* 2020, 7, 388. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2020.00388>.
21. Hemy M, Rand J, Morton J, Paterson M. Characteristics and outcomes of dogs admitted into Queensland RSPCA shelters. *Animals* 2017;7(9):67-99. doi: 10.3390/ani7090067
22. Hobsons Bay Council. Ordinary Council Meeting 16 December 2014- Appendix Cat Curfew Discussion Paper A2036668. Available online: <https://www.hobsonsbay.vic.gov.au/Council/Council-Meetings/Minutes-and-Agendas/Ordinary-Council-Meeting-16-December-2014>
23. Horwitz DF, Rodan I. Behavioral awareness in the feline consultation: Understanding physical and emotional health. *Journal of Feline Medicine and Surgery*. 2018;20(5):423-436. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098612X18771204>
24. Humane World for Animals 2025. Return to Field Handbook. Available online at: <https://humanepro.org/sites/default/files/documents/return-to-field-handbook.pdf>
25. Humane World for Animals (HWFA) 2025. Pets for Life Tools and Guides. Available online at: [Pets for Life Tools and Guides | HumanePro by Humane World for Animals](#)
26. Hume City Council. Ordinary Meeting 16 April 2018-Investigation into the viability of implementing a cat curfew. Available online: <https://www.hume.vic.gov.au/Your-Council/Governance/Previous-Council-Term-%E2%80%9393-Agenda-and-Minutes/2018-Council-Agenda-and-Minutes/16-April-2018>
27. Jacobson LS, Ellis JJ, Janke KJ, Giacinti JA and Robertson JV (2022) Behavior and adoptability of hoarded cats admitted to an animal shelter *Journal of Feline Medicine and Surgery* Vol. 24(8) e232–e243



28. Kasbaoui N, Cooper J, Mills DS, Burman O (2016) Effects of Long-Term Exposure to an Electronic Containment System on the Behaviour and Welfare of Domestic Cats. *PLoS ONE* 11(9): e0162073. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0162073>
29. Kessler, M. R., & Turner, D. C. (1997). Stress and adaptation of cats (*Felis silvestris catus*) housed singly, in pairs and in groups in boarding catteries. *Animal Welfare*, 6(3), 243-254.
30. Kerr, C. A., Rand, J., Morton, J. M., Reid, R., & Paterson, M. (2018). Changes Associated with Improved Outcomes for Cats Entering RSPCA Queensland Shelters from 2011 to 2016. *Animals*, 8(6), 95. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani8060095>
31. Lasky, M., Parsons, A., Schuttler, S., Mash, A., Larson, L., Norton, B., Pease, B., Boone, H., Gatens, L. and Kays, R. (2021) 'Candid Critters: Challenges and Solutions in a Large-Scale Citizen Science Camera Trap Project', *Citizen Science: Theory and Practice*, 6(1), p. 4. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.5334/cstp.343>.
32. Lezon, R., Rohlf, V., Rayment, D., & Howell, T. J. (2025). The Impact of Job Demands, Job Resources, and Organisational Justice on Global Health and Turnover Intentions in Animal Care Workers. *Animals*, 15(3), 420.
33. Ma GC, McLeod LJ. Understanding the Factors Influencing Cat Containment: Identifying Opportunities for Behaviour Change. *Animals*. 2023; 13(10):1630. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani13101630>
34. McDonald, J. L., & Clements, J. (2019). Engaging with Socio-Economically Disadvantaged Communities and Their Cats: Human Behaviour Change for Animal and Human Benefit. *Animals*, 9(4), 175. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani9040175>
35. National Animal Care and Control Association. a. NACA Field Services Series: Community-Centered Programming. Available online: <https://university.maddiesfund.org/products/naca-field-services-series-community-centered-programming> (accessed on 5 January 2025).
36. National Animal Care and Control Association b. Animal Care & Control Professional Development. Available online: <https://nacatraining.org/> (accessed on 5 July 2024).
37. National Canine Research Council 2014. Breed-specific legislation in Australia: a cruel mandate imposes big costs. Available online at: [Breed-specific legislation in Australia: a cruel mandate imposes big costs - National Canine Research Council](#)
38. Neal, S.M., & Wolf, P. J. A Cat is a Cat: Attachment to Community Cats Transcends Ownership Status. *Journal of Shelter Medicine and Community Animal Health* 2023, 2(1), doi:10.56771/jsmcah.v2.62.
39. NESP Threatened Species Recovery Hub. The Management of Cats by Local Governments in Australia: Summary of National Survey Results. Project 7.4 Research Findings Factsheet, Brisbane. Available online: <https://www.nespthreatenedspecies.edu.au/media/uaoncte3/tsr-hub-project->

[7-4-report-the-management-of-cats-by-local-governments-of-australia_final.pdf](#)

40. New South Wales Office of Local Government. Pet Registration Fees. Available online: <https://www.petregistry.olg.nsw.gov.au/registration-and-permit-fees/pet-registration-fees> (accessed on 22 December 2024).
41. Paul, N. K., Cosh, S. M., & Lykins, A. D. (2023). “A love–hate relationship with what I do”: protecting the mental health of animal care workers. *Anthrozoös*, 36(3), 489-508.
42. Pinillos, R. G. (2018). *One Welfare: A Framework to Improve Animal Welfare and Human Well-being*. United Kingdom: CABI.
43. Rand, J., M. Saraswathy, A., Verrinder, J., & Paterson, M. B. A. (2024a). Outcomes of a Community Cat Program Based on Desexing of Owned, Semi-Owned and Unowned Cats in a Small Rural Town. *Animals*, 14(21), 3058. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani14213058>
44. Rand, J., Scotney, R., Enright, A., Hayward, A., Bennett, P., & Morton, J. (2024b). Situational Analysis of Cat Ownership and Cat Caring Behaviors in a Community with High Shelter Admissions of Cats. *Animals : an open access journal from MDPI*, 14(19), 2849. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani14192849>
45. Rohlf, V. I. (2018). Interventions for occupational stress and compassion fatigue in animal care professionals—A systematic review. *Traumatology*, 24(3), 186. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/trm0000144>
46. Rochlitz, I., Podberscek, A.L. and Broom, D.M. (1998), Welfare of cats in a quarantine cattery. *Veterinary Record*, 143: 35-39. <https://doi.org/10.1136/vr.143.2.3>
47. RSPCA Australia (2018) identifying Best Practice Domestic Cat Management in Australia. Available online: [Findings-and-Recommendations-Identifying-Best-Practice-Domestic-Cat-Management.pdf](#)
48. RSPCA Australia 2015. Preventing dog attacks in the community. Available online: <https://kb.rspca.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Preventing-dog-attacks-in-the-community-RSPCA-Information-Paper-Nov-2015.pdf>
49. RSPCA NSW (2023) Keeping cats safe at home report. Available online: [Keeping Cats Safe at Home – progress in 2023 | RSPCA NSW - RSPCA NSW](#)
50. Scarlett J, Johnston N. Impact of a subsidized spay neuter clinic on impoundments and euthanasia in a community shelter and on service and complaint calls to animal control. *J Appl Anim Welf Sci*. 2012;15(1):53-69. doi: 10.1080/10888705.2012.624902. PMID: 22233215
51. Scotney, R.; Rand, J.; Rohlf, V.; Hayward, A.; Bennett, P. The Impact of Lethal, Enforcement-Centred Cat Management on Human Wellbeing: Exploring Lived Experiences of Cat Carers Affected by Cat Culling at the Port of Newcastle. *Animals* 2023, 13, 271. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani13020271>
52. Scotney, R. L., McLaughlin, D., & Keates, H. L. (2015). A systematic review of the effects of euthanasia and occupational stress in personnel working with animals in animal shelters, veterinary clinics, and biomedical research facilities. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association*, 247(10), 1121-1130.



53. Slater, M. R., Miller, K. A., Weiss, E., Makolinski, K. V., & Weisbrot, L. A. (2010). A survey of the methods used in shelter and rescue programs to identify feral and frightened pet cats. *Journal of feline medicine and surgery*, 12(8), 592–600.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfms.2010.02.001>
54. Slater, M., Garrison, L., Miller, K., Weiss, E., Makolinski, K., Drain, N., & Mirontshuk, A. (2013). Practical physical and behavioral measures to assess the socialization spectrum of cats in a shelter-like setting during a three-day period. *Animals*, 3(4), 1162-1193.<https://doi.org/10.3390/ani3041162>
55. Weiss, E., Slater, M., & Lord, L. (2012). Frequency of Lost Dogs and Cats in the United States and the Methods Used to Locate Them. *Animals*, 2(2), 301-315.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/ani2020301>
56. White SC, Jefferson E, Levy JK. Impact of publicly sponsored neutering programs on animal population dynamics at animal shelters: the New Hampshire and Austin experiences. *J Appl Anim Welf Sci*. 2010;13(3):191-212. doi: 10.1080/10888700903579903. PMID: 20563902.
57. Yarra Ranges Council. Yarra Ranges Domestic Animal Management Plan: 2018–2021. Available online: <https://www.yarraranges.vic.gov.au/files/assets/public/webdocuments/council/policies-strategies/animal-management-plan.pdf>