

## PUBLIC

### THE PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS MET IN COMMITTEE ROOM 2, PARLIAMENT HOUSE, HOBART ON THURSDAY 20 JUNE 2013.

---

**Mr KIM EVANS**, SECRETARY, AND **Dr LLOYD KLUMPP**, GENERAL MANAGER, BIOSECURITY AND PRODUCT INTEGRITY, DEPARTMENT OF PRIMARY INDUSTRIES, PARKS, WATER AND ENVIRONMENT, WERE RE-CALLED AND RE-EXAMINED.

**CHAIR** (Mr Dean) - Welcome to you both. You have give a substantial amount of evidence previously but is there anything additional you would like to say to us that may have come up in the meantime?

**Mr EVANS** - An update on where we are with the inspectorate service for 2013-14 may be the only material change. We have provided the information requested from our last appearance.

**Dr KLUMPP** - We have taken the view that we don't want to make any decisions until the findings of this committee are presented. I have gone back to the RSPCA board and had a discussion with them, first, to say we are not in a position to make a decision one way or the other about the inspectorate until we hear from this committee and, second, to start up a dialogue again in order to rebuild the relationship.

That is as much about getting an assessment of where they are going with their new board and meeting two out of three of those new board members and I had that meeting. We have agreed that we would continue the current arrangement -

**CHAIR** - Sorry, you said with the new board members as well?

**Dr KLUMPP** - I have met two of the three new board members, and the acting president. So they were the three board members present at the meeting.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - Acting president?

**Dr KLUMPP** - Yes, Angela Ayling is acting president at the moment.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - Instead of Paul?

**Dr KLUMPP** - Yes.

**Mr BOOTH** - I think he is back now.

**CHAIR** - Paul is the president again, and Angela as vice president or vice chairman or whatever she calls it. She was in an acting role.

**Mr BOOTH** - He was on leave.

**Dr KLUMPP** - It was Angela who was at the meeting with two of our new board members.

## PUBLIC

**Mr BOOTH** - Can I just ask, Lloyd, the relationship and the interchange between the department or yourself and the RSPCA, is that ordinarily through the CEO or ordinarily through the board?

**Dr KLUMPP** - Normally our relationship is from the chief veterinary officer to the chief inspector. That is where we have our link and it is only through -

**Mr EVANS** - That is in an operational sense as far as the inspectorate goes but in a broader relationship-sense it would be with the CEO.

**Dr KLUMPP** - Yes, with the CEO although that has not been the case. It has not been a relationship until this event arose. The other relationship we have is through the Animal Welfare Advisory Committee where the RSPCA has a representative at the meeting.

**Mr BOOTH** - In terms of perhaps oversight, if you like, there is government money of \$400 000, for example, that probity in terms of the administration of that money and proper governance and due diligence and so forth, but that normally would be with the CEO, would it, for those matters?

**Dr KLUMPP** - This is a particular circumstance and that relationship was with both, but on the review panel which was attached to this whole event both the CEO and the president of the board were on that review panel.

**CHAIR** - I might just let Lloyd, if you do not mind, continue at this stage and then we will come into questioning. Do you have a question on that point, Adriana?

**Mr EVANS** - Sorry, but you might explain what is to happen from 1 July.

**Dr KLUMPP** - That is where I was going.

**CHAIR** - Just before you do, Adriana had a question first on a point.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - I just do not want to lose the two questions. One is you have just said that you are not going to make any decision until this report is presented?

**Dr KLUMPP** - A long-term decision.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - Funding, for next year?

**Dr KLUMPP** - For the service agreement.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - Which is due to be renewed when?

**Dr KLUMPP** - 30 June.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - It is just that we were discussing this morning, Chair, that it is unlikely that we will be able to present a report until after the winter break. What effect is that going to have their budget?

## PUBLIC

**Dr KLUMPP** - That is what we have agreed. We have agreed that we will roll over the current service agreement for that period of time but with the contingencies in place in a similar way that we have them now.

**Mr EVANS** - And paying on a month-by-month basis.

**Dr KLUMPP** - Yes, paying on a month-by-month basis.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - They are not going to go out the back door financially because we have not put our report in?

**Dr KLUMPP** - No, and equally we need an inspectorate.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - Yes. My second question in relation to this, why has the department not taken up the ex-officio seat on the board when we have all seen that things have not been running so well?

**Mr EVANS** - Maybe I can answer that question. It is a question of governance. I did not think it was appropriate that we put one of our officers in that position given what we understood about the finances and the liabilities that are attached to being a director of a board. We thought it was more prudent that we did not put one of our officers in that position but that we dealt with the organisation through the normal contractual arrangements. At the end of the day, our relationship ordinarily is one where they are a service provider, pure and simple, and that we do not need to be on their board.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - Did you explain that to them, Kim? The board members we talked to this morning certainly just seemed to think that the department had not bothered. That is what I would read into what they said.

**Mr EVANS** - I did not have any discussions personally with them about that but I was consulted about whether or not we should put someone on the board. This is going back maybe a couple of years.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - They claim they have asked you every year.

**Mr EVANS** - They may well have done but not me personally. They may well have talked to the relevant people in the department.

**Dr KLUMPP** - There has been no correspondence.

**Mr EVANS** - I think it may have been verbal conversations.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - They claimed it was written.

**CHAIR** - It is an important point that you making, Adriana. They said it was in writing and it would be interesting to see what happened to it.

**Mr EVANS** - There may well be a written request at some point. There may well be written correspondence, I do not know. The rationale was that they are a service provider for us on our behalf. We do not need to be their board in order to ensure those services are

## PUBLIC

delivered. I did not think it was in the best interests of the agency, and certainly not the best interests of the officer that we would be onto the board as a director, to put them in that position.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - If I can continue with that line. They obviously did not have that understanding. Nobody has made that clear to their understanding. Nevertheless, that is beside the point. I totally agree with you, but they are now of the opinion that it might be great if the government would appoint or pay for a chair to the board so that they can get themselves operationally -

**Mr BOOTH** - Just to clarify that. They did make the point that they did not think the government should appoint someone. It was that they should fund the position and -

**Mrs TAYLOR** - Correct. It was Mr Ruddick who said that.

**CHAIR** - I think, for a period of time at least, to move it in the right direction.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - But if the government pays for a chair of the board position then, again, that puts you in a difficult position.

**CHAIR** - I might let Kim answer that. You said you have just read that. Do you have any comment on that?

**Mr EVANS** - I have only read that as part of the transcripts for this hearing.

**CHAIR** - Do you have a position on it, or have you discussed that, or will you discuss that?

**Mr EVANS** - We have not discussed it. Obviously it would be something that we would want to think about before I responded.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - Because you are doing the same thing then, interfering in a sense in what should be stand-alone organisation.

**Mr EVANS** - I have some sympathy for Mr Ruddick's position, that it does need a very high calibre chair with a lot of expertise in corporate governance. That is what they need. How you get that is a different matter.

**Mr BEST** - There is a bit of a feeling that is coming through from the RSPCA that they do not feel, from the board's point of view, that there is support coming from the department. The thing is, you are about the services and we did talk before you came in about training of board people to get them certain skills and that there has not really been that. In moving it forward, do you have an opinion on some of the things, for example, that Adriana raised, or is that really just up to them?

**Mr EVANS** - I certainly do not think it is our role to providing training and up-skilling the boards to fulfil their corporate governance functions. It is in our best interests to ensure that they do have those skills.

**Mr BEST** - Have you told them that because they seem to think that they are not being -

## PUBLIC

**Mrs TAYLOR** - You should not have to tell a board that, should you?

**Mr BEST** - I know but they have come in here and basically that is how they feel, in not so many words.

**Mr EVANS** - No. I do not think we would have had those discussions in that way. We deal with lots of not-for-profits and small organisations that function very effectively.

**Dr KLUMPP** - The second bit of that meeting that I was talking about was about rebuilding the relationship, and that is an important part of it. As well as the agreement that we would have, the interim service agreement to get us through the next period, we also agree that we would have essentially an informal, regular get-together between myself and the president of the board, so that we could have those discussions. That is not official support but it is the offer of that support.

**Mr BEST** - I understand what you mean.

**Dr KLUMPP** - I think we have demonstrated in the past that when they came to us we gave in-kind support to do some assessments.

**Mr BEST** - I do not have a view. I think you have been very supportive. I am intrigued with the difference of views -

**Dr KLUMPP** - I understand. Half of it is because of the way the relationship has been in the past 12 months.

**CHAIR** - Just continue down this point, then, as a department and because of what is happening, and where the RSPCA has been going over a period of time, have you discussed what could be a reasonable direction for them to take? Whilst it is not your role, have you considered what might be in their best interests to move forward, and to honour the position that they have with the government in providing the inspectorate function and so on?

**Mr EVANS** - As you would know, last year that was the reason that we did work with them and initiate a review of their finances and corporate governance. We were going down the path of doing that review when the relationship internally fell apart to the point where we could not have any constructive dialogue. We had hoped that out of that review we would have come up with some recommendations to help them, but we haven't reached that point. This inquiry has superseded that. So we would be hopeful that out of this inquiry there are some recommendations about how to move forward because there is no doubt from our perspective, and I am sure from the rest of the state's perspective, a well functioning RSPCA is really important.

**CHAIR** - Absolutely.

**Mr BOOTH** - Could I ask along that line, do you have recommendations? I think that is what the Chair was getting at.

**CHAIR** - I am going to get to that. My next question was going to be whilst you had not completed that and this has superseded that to some extent, had you considered any of

## PUBLIC

those points or recommendations that you might have been going to make? Is there any record of that or discussion around that because I would like you to share that with the committee if you could?

**Dr KLUMPP** - Only in general terms, so the same sorts of principles of good corporate governance, efficient business management, and those sorts of higher levels. What that would look like underneath we hadn't gone to the next step. I think that is where the review was headed. Understanding also the RSPCA had been quite proactive in [inaudible] themselves. I think one of the encouraging things for us is the fact that they now have, on the face of it, three new board members who are skills-based and have some solid qualifications behind them. We had not gone that next step about what the detail of what sort of corporate governance they would need to put in place, but certainly in the broader principles we had, and had talked to them about it.

**CHAIR** - At what stage, then, did your review get to? What stage were you at? Had you had a number of meetings, had you put something in writing already? What stage were you at?

**Dr KLUMPP** - I think it is essentially described in where the draft review is that have been provided to you.

**CHAIR** - In that document we have.

**Mr EVANS** - That is as far as it got to, I think. There was a framework of a report, but the detail had to be fleshed out and there were some records of meetings, I understand.

**CHAIR** - We have that, so we have all that on record, but there was nothing additional to that?

**Mr EVANS** - No.

**Dr KLUMPP** - I should say the other thing we agreed to at this meeting, this informal discussion, and Angela and I had a discussion also about 'resuming the review', so that is about us working together to provide whatever advice we could. Not in terms of a formal review and continuing that formal review process, but us providing in-kind support and advice wherever we could in that informal way.

**Mr EVANS** - It would make sense in that respect for this committee to complete its inquiry, make its recommendations, and then for us to respond to those with the RSPCA and undertake that further work in light of the recommendations of this committee.

**Mr BOOTH** - Just on that point, it would be helpful for me, as a member of the committee, to get some indication of the areas that DPIPWE or the department would want to see, so that you could feel confident, which at some point in time you had confidence presumably in the RSPCA's work? At some point in the past?

**Dr KLUMPP** - I don't know that I can make comment on that because of my recency.

**Mr BOOTH** - Money was paid every year so presumably -

## PUBLIC

**Dr KLUMPP** - For the service agreement?

**Mr BOOTH** - Yes, that is what I mean, sorry, the service agreement in terms of funding and then fulfilling the agreement.

**Mr EVANS** - I can make some comments in general terms. In terms of the inspectorate, we feel like we have had pretty good value for money out of that and it has worked quite effectively. We do need to work with them about what is the right funding level and there are questions about whether \$400 000 really is adequate in terms of the services that we are expecting.

I think the broader services that they provide to the community for animal shelters and care for animals is really important. They have a good reputation and have done a good job. Operationally it is a pretty good operation. Where I think it has fallen down is in terms of its corporate governance. I am not an expert in corporate governance and that is why we were undertaking the review and were hoping to get this and recommendations. The Bob Ruddick's work would be helpful, the sorts of observations that he would have about what a good corporate governance model would look like because he certainly has a great deal of experience in this stuff.

**Mr BOOTH** - But in regard to, say, the adequacy of the funding, your department would be amenable effectively to have a discussion about what level that has to be?

**Mr EVANS** - We are already having those discussions.

**CHAIR** - On the inspectorate, evidence has been given to this committee that to run the inspectorate it is costing them \$640 000 - I think that was the figure.

**Dr KLUMPP** - That is about our assessment was as well.

**CHAIR** - That is the service that the government buys from them, or pays for the inspectorate, then is it reasonable to think that that is what the department should pay them?

**Mr EVANS** - I was leaning that way in terms of my comment, that we need to review the level of funding. We either have to scale back our expectations or find some additional funding.

**CHAIR** - They were also saying that the sow stalls, for instance, and the battery hens, and so on, will require a greater effort from them, that whilst it is a shared thing with the department, they will take on some of that responsibility.

**Dr KLUMPP** - It will be extra work for them, yes.

**CHAIR** - That's a good position.

**Mr BOOTH** - Is that factored into the \$640 000 that you are currently accepting is about what it costs or will, when that stuff comes in, add another  $x$  dollars on top of the \$640 000?

## PUBLIC

**Dr KLUMPP** - No, that's factored in.

**CHAIR** - Any further questions? Do you want to say more on where we cut you off previously?

**Mr KLUMPP** - What I was going to say was covered in most of the questions.

**Mr EVANS** - My only observation would be that the current arrangement we have enjoyed in terms of them undertaking the inspectorate on our behalf, I think is probably the best solution all round. It is more effective than us taking it in-house and it would be cheaper than RSPCA Australia doing it. That is the best solution in the long term if we can have the confidence that RSPCA Tasmania is a well-functioning organisation.

**CHAIR** - Where would you go if the RSPCA folded, or if that part of it folded, in particular - I suppose you have local government to talk to but the costs at the end would be far greater than the service you are getting now from the RSPCA.

**Dr KLUMPP** - Given the work we have done an in-house capability would probably be the way we would go, given the resources. RSPCA Australia one was really a stop-gap measure but the logistics and expense of having an interstate organisation running it would be -

**CHAIR** - We raised that with them this morning as to whether the Australian body should become involved and help them move forward. They were talking about their MOU and that they just did not fit, that it would require them to give up too much.

**Dr KLUMPP** - There are also governance issues around the nature -

**CHAIR** - Governance issues around it as well. It is all fit not to sign that MOU which was on the table somewhere.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - Could you do it in-house for the same sort of money?

**Dr KLUMPP** - Probably not.

**Mr EVANS** - Not as effectively either. The one thing about the RSPCA is that it is well recognised by the community. It has a great brand, notwithstanding its financial troubles.

**CHAIR** - It has.

**Dr KLUMPP** - The other advantage they have is that they run shelters and that links very nicely with the inspectorate.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - Yes, they were indicating to us that they need to cut their costs and it might well be that they would like at selling even a part of the southern shelter in Hobart, or closing it altogether. That then defeats that purpose.

**Dr KLUMPP** - I do think over a longer period of time we need to look at other models of animal care with local government, for example, and what capability might be there



## PUBLIC

**Mr BOOTH** - By saying that, Lloyd, is that indicating that the burden at the moment that the RSPCA takes on board is effectively too much for their funding streams or something? Why would you want to move it back into a local government?

**Dr KLUMPP** - No, I am thinking more about future-proofing. In the future I can envisage more and more demand for animal welfare services.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - Can you?

**Dr KLUMPP** - That has been the trend for years.

**Mr BOOTH** - Is that because we are caring more and we are more aware of animal welfare issues?

**Mr EVANS** - More aware.

**Dr KLUMPP** - We are more aware, our standards have increased, we have higher requirements, higher standards. We have a whole raft of national animal welfare standards being developed and coming into place. There is going to be a higher requirement and the community demands more of us, appropriately. Some time in future we should be having a look at the whole system and saying, have we got the right system? I think it is a pretty good system that we have got. Notwithstanding the financial problems there are other models out there and we should not be blinkered in thinking that we should stick down this road.

**Mr BOOTH** - But that would go beyond the inspectorate and you are talking about the shelters.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - Are you looking at those kinds of things?

**Dr KLUMPP** - Not actually looking at the moment but that is my background. I come from that area so I understand the other models in other states and I think that we do need to keep our mind open about what is available.

**Mr BOOTH** - In the interim do you think that there is a responsibility or a role for government through the department to fund, either through local government or some other way, the animal shelter part? Should we be funding that at a government level?

**Dr KLUMPP** - It is a policy decision.

**Mr BOOTH** - Forget about policy. I am not asking you to make up a policy. I am asking for an opinion.

**Dr KLUMPP** - There is a role for government. How do you define government - is it national, state, or local government? There are roles everywhere.

**Mr BOOTH** - That is fair enough. That is a pretty good answer actually in terms of not digging a hole for yourself but committing the state at least. The principle is then that

## PUBLIC

the job that the RSPCA does in terms of all of the bits, responsibilities that it has taken on voluntarily perhaps too much.

**Dr KLUMPP** - I am not sure -

**Mr BOOTH** - What I am saying is that you seem to be saying from a gut-feeling point of view that those responsibilities perhaps should be borne by some one or three tiers of the government, which would then imply that the work that they are currently doing is a pretty big job, it is a reasonable point to make, and that there may be some sympathy for more support for them to do their job or let the government take the responsibility.

**Dr KLUMPP** - Given the rider that I am not here to make up government policy, I think that there is a role for more proactive animal management. Part of that role is government's role. In other jurisdictions a lot of that falls to local government, not because of the funding arrangements but because they are the people in the right place to do that to perform that function. Victoria, about three or four years ago, reviewed their domestic and feral animals nuisance act and turned it into essentially a [inaudible] animals act. That was about ensuring that responsibilities for proactive animal management, not the reactive stuff that the animal welfare inspectorate does. It is contributed to by government, and I think there is a role for government in that area. And payback for government hopefully is less need for the reactive stuff in the inspectorate.

**Mr BOOTH** - It is very helpful to get these comments, Lloyd, as I said, in our consideration to come up with a recommendation as a committee, if we have a broader idea of the kind of sympathy, or otherwise, towards the level of burden they are carrying itself.

**Dr KLUMPP** - I think from a pragmatic point of view it is about a limited resource to all of us, the RSPCA, government, local government, and we need to make sure that is in place that it manages that limited resource for the best outcome for the community.

**Mr BOOTH** - You are clearly of the view that funding the RSPCA to do those functions meets exactly what you just said.

**Dr KLUMPP** - We have done a lot of work having a look at that. Clearly, given we have a vital organisation that we have confidence in and that they can continue to deliver the quality of service and delivering, it is the most appropriate model. There are other advantages to that as well. Quite apart from the access to shelters, vet clinics and the other arrangements they have with other organisations, it is simply the brand. The RSPCA brand is a powerful brand that is worth a lot. We have had this argument about whether there is independence if you are a government inspector. I believe that is a moot point, but the fact is there is a perception that the RSPCA is independent of government, and that is valuable as well.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - That is part of the deal, though, isn't it, that the RSPCA is seen as an independent body. Depending how much government funding or control it gets is going to be at least perceived to be directed to some degree by the government. That is probably self-defeating.

**Mr BOOTH** - It depends on the nature of the funding agreement, doesn't it, to make sure you have decent separation.

## PUBLIC

**Mrs TAYLOR** - Yes, it does. It has been a matter of concern to this committee, looking at their budgets, how hugely dependent they are operationally for bequests each year - \$800 000 in bequests in the last couple of years, and \$600 000 before that. The amount of bequests they have at the moment of \$800 000 is not even sufficient for them to balance their budget. Their reserve is less than one year's worth of bequests. With your experience, and that is not so with RSPCAs in other states, what is the difference here? It is okay to say it because we are smaller in population and whatever, but that is not necessarily right. If you receive bequests and put them into a fund so you have back-up reserves, which is obviously what some of the other states have done, how does that compare with other states' RSPCAs?

**Dr KLUMPP** - All states struggle with the nature of their funding. You hit the nail on the head when you talked about the way that is managed. There are years where they are flush with bequests and years when they aren't. But management should have procedures in place where they can take the years they are flush and make sure they have forward-looking budgets to manage that. That is just good business practice.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - Do other states do that?

**Dr KLUMPP** - Other states are run almost by companies - certainly RSPCA Victoria is a very robust organisation.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - A voluntary board?

**Dr KLUMPP** - Yes.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - Quality people on the board?

**Dr KLUMPP** - Yes.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - How we do fix this one year if they were to fix themselves?

**Dr KLUMPP** - The concern you express is exactly the one I had when I saw the Ruddick report that demonstrated some viability for a short term but did not really demonstrate long-term viability. Of more concern to me was the RSPCA board's attitude to that when they were talking to us. They were saying, 'This shows we are hunky-dory and everything is okay'. I read it and thought, 'That's not what it shows'. What I am getting back from them since that meeting is much more positive in realistic thinking. They are much more open to discussions about the problems they have had and fixing them than they were 12 months ago.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - They did say to us today that in their future funding planning they are planning to put a proportion of their bequest funding aside each year so it builds up the reserve.

**Dr KLUMPP** - It needs a good, decent business management infrastructure in place to do that and that's what they have to do.

## PUBLIC

**Mrs TAYLOR** - Absolutely, but they are not there yet. I am the chair of a voluntary organisation as well and if that was the kind of budget I was looking at I would not be sleeping at night.

**CHAIR** - They made it clear to us this morning that they are all voluntary. They put an enormous amount of work into it; I was amazed at the amount of work they put in to the organisation on a volunteer basis. In that situation it is difficult to attract the right people. They talked about their CEO, being able to attract the right person with the right amount of money. They can't do that and it makes it difficult for them all the way through.

**Dr KLUMPP** - I understand the difficulties. You have to admire the people who step up and have a go and for what they put in.

**Mr BOOTH** - And the risk they take as directors as well.

**Mrs TAYLOR** - Sorry, I do not personally have a great deal of sympathy for that position. There are a lot of voluntary organisations in Tasmania. Many of them are headed by very capable, very well respected, and very well known top people who do it, and it is because it is managed well as a board that you do not have to put a day a week voluntarily into the organisation. This is a case of not quite having the right skills on the board and the right governance model, too.

**CHAIR** - A question I think that was asked the last time you were here and it is a question I will ask you again, if there are not significant changes in their structure, and we have already seen a change in the board for three new personnel and with special skill sets as well, could you be confident as a department to provide the money that you are in the inspectorate services and get what you are paying for into the long-term future without hitting these problems again?

**Mrs TAYLOR** - And more money?

**Dr KLUMPP** - That is the fundamental question for us. That is exactly what we need answered because we need that confidence.

**CHAIR** - I will not answer for you, but your answer would probably be no, you could not be confident if it does not make those significant changes?

**Dr KLUMPP** - That is right. The status quo is not an option.

**Mr BOOTH** - Having said that, you have given evidence that you are happy with the job they do as an inspectorate.

**Mr EVANS** - At the end of the day it is public funds that are being spent so you have to have some confidence that they are managed well.

**Mr BOOTH** - Yes, but you have got confidence in the money that you pay. It is not a question about how the overall organisation is travelling?

## PUBLIC

**Dr KLUMPP** - It is about whether or not that organisation is going to be there and provide that service.

**Mr BOOTH** - That was what I was going to get to. Your concern is not so much that the money your paying at the moment is wasted or misspent, it is whether you might suddenly be caught holding the baby if the organisation did not exist.

**CHAIR** - Are there any further questions?

**Mr BEST** - I think it is okay if I mentioned that was a public session when Mr Ruddick came in.

**CHAIR** - Mr Ruddick was in a public session.

**Mr BEST** - That is right. I guess it is hard for the department to have a view on this because you might not want to have one at all. But there was some questions asked from committee members about putting in an administrator but not an administrator in the sense of an administrator, but maybe two or three people or something like that to get the thing sorted out. Do you have any view? You have already told us that you look at them as a service provider and that is how you look at the relationship, although there are some things you share.

**Mr BOOTH** - Point of order, Chair. Mr Ruddick cautioned against putting an administrator in. He made that clear.

**CHAIR** - I uphold that. In fact, you are right. He said that would tend to spoil the good brand name of the RSPCA. He went away from that. Brenton, I will leave it with you to put the position.

**Mr BEST** - That is okay. I would just like the management - if you were going to have some interim arrangements to get things up and away again?

**Mr EVANS** - That is the how. The end point that we want is a well governed, financially viable organisation and there are lots of ways you could do that. I do not have any strong view about the mechanism by which they get there. It starts with having a good board and they need senior management.

**CHAIR** - Part of that question was answered while you were absent for a short time, Brenton. I think there was some support to the model that was put forward by Mr Ruddick.

I thank you very much. There were some important issues that we had to clarify and I appreciate it very much, both of you giving up your valuable time to be here but it is important to us to get this right, moving forward. We thank you very much.

**Mr EVANS** - It is an important review, thank you.

**CHAIR** - If you could, that extra document on notice, the applications that we have applied for where they sought annually from you, that information in relation to the board support.

## **PUBLIC**

**Mr EVANS** - All right, thank you.

**CHAIR** - Thank you very much.

**THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.**