

Ref	Response
0017	Yes
0018	Yes. Reasons stated here/in this document. It will help with strays, disease tracing. I am less convinced about arguments for fouling.
0019	Yes. For traceability of owner AND breeder.
0020	Yes if licensed breeders have to everyone should.
0021	Yes – promotes responsible ownership.
0022	No. Exempt foxhounds if tattooed.
0023	All dogs through the UK not only Wales.
0024	Yes but I think puppies new owners should have the option of doing it if they wish.
0025	It refers to do we microchip dogs yes or no. the answer is yes. If so then all dogs in Wales – UK should be microchipped.
0026	Yes – because they can be returned to owner if lost or stolen.
0027	<p>Yes I consider this to be a vital tool to identify dogs and provide a clear link to owners for the purposes of return in cases of loss and to aid enforcement of dog control and other legislation.</p> <p>There are problems regarding the phrase “all dogs in Wales”, but I will deal with that later in my answer to question 8.</p>
0028	Yes. If dog found without a chip, what happens? Is there any enforcement for dog found with microchip yet owners say not mine or doesn't want dog? Can breeder be contacted as should be traceable if registered as first owner or “breeder” like car manufacturer.
0029	Yes – Not only for the reasons set out in the consultation document but it would help with the control of ‘dog mess’ which is a major issue in the UK.
0030	<p>Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To identify ownership ○ To identify any inherited health issues that the dog may have ○ To identify health records for puppies that will follow the dog through its lifetime <p>I feel larger breeds such as Great Danes should be microchipped at 8 weeks. Smaller breeds could be microchipped at 14-16 weeks.</p>

0031	Yes. Primarily to ensure dog welfare and ownership issues when dogs are lost / stolen. An additional cost may also deter or at least make people think more about getting dogs 'on a whim' without properly thinking through the implications of dog ownership.
0032	Absolutely. Promotes animal welfare and makes owners more accountable
0034	Yes, to safeguard the welfare of dogs and encourage responsible ownership
0035	Yes to reduce the stray dog population and to make dogs owners more responsible
0036	Yes. I agree with the cogent points raised in the consultation document. I would also suggest that if technologically and financially practicable, these microchips be utilised for purpose as Wi-Fi hotspots. I believe this would be good business sense in times of recession. I'm not sure if this would require secondary legislation.
0037	Yes - all dogs, however benign they may appear are a potential danger to the Public Health.They are both a potential physical danger and can carry a number of pathogens dangerous to man.
0038	YES their is no valid reason not to have it done
0039	No. I am in favour of permanent identification, but think people should be given a choice between tattooing or microchipping. So I am in favour of permanent ID
0040	yes - to allow accountability of owners
0041	For reunification in event of loss or theft, also for tracing where a dog has come from should it be abandoned, abused, neglected or put in to a rescue centre. This is the only way some people will ever become responsible
0042	Yes I believe there should be compulsory identification for all dogs though not necessarily Microchipping as there are other means available (tattoo, DNA)
0043	Yes - this would save councils considerable expense in housing strays and enable most of the costs involved with collecting them to be recovered from the owner. It would make it much easier to determine who the owner was when prosecuting under the dangerous dogs or welfare legislation. It may help to reduce theft.
0044	No - Because: 1) The irresponsible people who ought to have their dogs microchipped simply will not do it. 2) The Police will neither have the time or the resources to enforce the legislation. 3) The vulnerable (pensioners etcetera) will be unable to afford it.
0045	Yes – for all the reasons you state
0046	No - Because it simply will not work. Responsible dog owners (me included) would I am sure, comply if legislation were introduced. However, many others would not comply, which would make the whole thesis of microchipping in

	<p>the first place redundant.</p> <p>Take the analogy of compulsory car tax and insurance for example. There are many thousands of untaxed and uninsured cars in Wales even though the Police have proactive automated systems for detecting defaulters. It will be pretty much impossible (or extremely expensive) to 'police' chipped or unchipped dogs, and to put the onus for this on local authorities would certainly not work.</p>
0047	<p>Yes - Compulsory microchipping of dogs in Wales is likely to significantly increase the likelihood of reuniting stray dogs with their owners, as currently only about 30% of dogs arriving in pounds are micro-chipped and a substantial proportion of dogs fail to be re-united. This would be of benefit to both owners and dogs. It would benefit dog welfare by reducing time in kennels, and reducing risks of euthanasia. It should also make available more places at rescue centres for dogs that require rehoming.</p> <p>Compulsory microchipping of dogs, particularly puppies and breeding dogs, has the potential to ensure that puppies developing health or significant behavioural problems may be traced back to the breeder. This would facilitate taking action under trading regulations for provision of unhealthy animals or for misrepresentation. It may also encourage breeders to take steps to prevent health problems arising for which they may be held liable. Microchipping of breeding parents may help determine if they have been tested for genetic disease. It may also provide a basis in the future for veterinary research on aspects of genetically-based disease.</p> <p>Where micro-chipping is widespread, there is likely to be increased potential for holding owners to account for a range of irresponsible actions, from dog-fouling to allowing dogs to be out of control or to behave aggressively.</p> <p>It is possible that in future instances of disease monitoring and management programmes (e.g. in relation to diseases introduced from other countries) that microchipping of dogs may support tracing of routes of transmission or provide other useful information.</p> <p>In each of the above, microchipping will represent only part of any solution and must be considered alongside other measures.</p>
0048	<p>The Kennel Club believes that all dogs in Wales should have to be microchipped as this form of permanent identification is deemed to be the most efficient in identifying and returning stray dogs to their owners and as a</p>

	<p>result, the most beneficial in relation to welfare and cost savings.</p> <p>The most important reason for microchipping is to enable a straying or lost pet to be returned quickly to its owner. Microchipping has also a number of advantages over other forms of identification. With regards to the collar and tag, it may fail to reunify pet and owner as the collar and tag could fall off or the writing on the tag can fade making it illegible. Additionally, if a dog was stolen, the collar and tag could be removed easily. Permanent identification via microchipping would be effective at all times and difficult to remove or alter.</p> <p>All dogs should be microchipped in Wales in order to reap the wide range of welfare benefits that microchipping provides. As stated above, the main welfare benefit is for dogs to be promptly identified and returned to their owners. In addition, microchipping and registration to a database allows quick and simple detection, acts as a deterrent to dog theft, provides easier identification of owners who persistently allow their dogs to stray, cause nuisance or are culpable of animal cruelty, helps puppies be traceable to their breeder and as a consequence helps to tackle puppy farming problems.</p> <p>Lastly, as microchipped dogs can be returned to owners faster, there are significant economic benefits that can be accrued from saving local authority and rescue centres kennelling costs. This is expanded further in question 2.</p>
0049	<p>To assist with encouraging more responsible dog ownership, all dogs should be permanently identified, i.e. through microchipping so that animals can be matched to their owners and traceability can be improved. The RSPCA firmly believes that this should be part of an annual registration scheme. Such a scheme, implemented at a local level, would ensure there are sufficient funding streams for dog wardens and police Dog Legislation Officers (DLO) roles so that the law can be adequately enforced and public safety and animal welfare improvements can be seen in practice.</p> <p>The RSPCA believes that compulsory microchipping is a useful tool to allow for the traceability of dogs back to their owners (providing the owner's contact information remains up to date on one central database). This can be beneficial for ensuring dogs that are lost or stray can be returned to their owner more quickly and also encourages more responsible dog ownership. However, microchipping on its own will not solve irresponsible dog ownership and as such we are concerned that the Welsh Government may be placing too much weight on what compulsory</p>

	microchipping can deliver especially when no extra resources are being provided for local authorities for the enforcement of such provisions.
0050	<p>Yes, we support the compulsory microchipping of all dogs. We believe;-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is an effective way to link a dog to its owner and to make all owners accountable for the actions of their dog. ○ Compulsory microchipping will improve animal welfare by making it easier to reunite a stray dog with its owner. ○ Develop further, responsible ownership by introducing greater traceability of owners (past and current). ○ Act as a deterrent against dog theft.
0051	<p>Yes</p> <p>Rapid identification of dogs would allow enforcement authorities to deal more effectively with straying, fouling and dangerous dog issues, and micro-chipping is the only way in which this can be achieved in a cost effective way.</p>
0052	No – it is not enforceable and will cause good/ honest breeders and owners into spending money as vets wont do this for free.
0053	<p>PDSA would support microchipping all dogs within a year of any legislation coming into effect.</p> <p>If there were no change to the current situation whereby owners can choose whether or not to microchip their puppies and older dogs, this would not be supported by PDSA. Approximately 80% of the public want to see microchipping for all dogs and various organisations have long been promoting microchipping outlining the benefits to the dog and their owner.</p>
0054	<p>Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To improve animal welfare; easier to return stray dogs to their owners, owners more easily identified where suffering is found, greater traceability of dogs from breeders etc. ● Promote responsible ownership; dog's owners could be identified from microchip information.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deter the theft of dogs, as the owners of dogs can be identified from the microchip information. • Aid any investigation in connection with dogs as owner can be identified and held liable.
0055	<p>Yes. Over 120,000 dogs were picked up as strays by Local Authorities across the UK last year, an overall increase. In Wales some 9,482 dogs were dealt with as strays, which is a slight decrease on the year before (<i>Dogs Trust; Annual Stray Dog Survey 2011</i>). However, despite the slight decrease the number being returned to their owners remains below half at just 42%.</p> <p>The result of this is financial cost to the Local Authorities, a continuing burden on rehoming and rescue organisations, and the destruction of hundreds of dogs for want of a good home. The introduction of mandatory permanent identification by microchip would enable many more dogs to be returned to their owners and fewer having to be destroyed, or passed on to already overstretched rehoming and rescue centres.</p> <p>Permanent identification would also allow the easy identification of an owner where allegations of cruelty are being investigated, the policy could have a positive impact on the problem of puppy farming and irresponsible breeding, and it will promote the principles of responsible dog ownership. It is also hoped that the need to permanently identify a dog, combined with useful outreach work to inform the dog owner of their responsibilities, will also have a positive impact on the dangerous dog problem in Wales.</p>
0056	<p>In principle the micro chipping of all dogs is agreed because it would enable the Council's dog wardens to trace the owners of any stray dogs collected and return them directly to the owners; this would effectively reduce the kennelling costs for the Authority.</p>
0057	<p>Yes but it isn't just the micro-chipping that is the issue it is making sure that details are kept up to date.</p> <p>I don't think that compulsory micro-chipping is going to miraculously solve all dog related problems including dog attacks as many people seem to think it will. However, I do think it is a good starting point and a step forward in responsible dog ownership and it should in theory help Local Authorities and stray dog facilities in identifying owners of dogs which may be straying, fouling or behaving in a dangerous manner.</p>

	<p>We have been offering free micro-chipping at Cardiff Dogs Home for a number of years and although we micro-chip all the dogs we home and many public take up the offer of micro-chipping there are still a large number of people that don't get their dogs chipped. Further action is needed to make it compulsory but not only compulsory to get it done but to also keep records updated.</p>
0058	<p>Yes. Compulsory microchipping is an essential element of the excellent animal welfare work already in place in Wales.</p> <p>The benefits of permanent identification are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The easy return of stray dogs; b. The ability to identify any dog that may transgress including being out of control or dangerously out of control; c. The ability to identify the owner of a dog where there may be an offence under the Animal Welfare Act 2006 and subsequent secondary legislation introduced by the Welsh Assembly Government; d. The ability to trace the provenance of a dog to its breeder; e. The ability to trace dogs for disease control purposes. <p>None of these benefits can be attained except by the introduction of compulsory permanent identification and this is currently best achieved using the microchip.</p> <p>While voluntary microchipping has been available for more than fifteen years, it is clear that dogs belonging to two groups are most likely to be microchipped: the responsible owner who wishes to ensure their lost dog can be returned promptly; and the dog owner who has had their dog microchipped free of charge or at a reduced rate by a charity. Sadly this latter group are less likely to amend their contact details and it seems likely that their dogs represent the majority of microchipped stray dogs whose owners cannot be traced. A properly constructed compulsory scheme is likely to encourage this latter group to keep their details up to date.</p>

	<p>The owners of dogs that have not been microchipped probably fall into two groups: those who just haven't got round to it and the majority of whom will comply with a compulsory scheme; and those who have no regard for any legislation and are probably the most irresponsible owners. While some of this group may be forced to comply by their housing provider, there will inevitably be some who will never do so.</p>
0059	<p>No, we do not think that all dogs in Wales should have to be microchipped, we believe it is overly intrusive and only offers limited suggested "possible benefits".</p> <p>At a time of national austerity and public sector cut backs, it would place an unnecessary financial burden on many hundreds of thousands of already responsible dog owners and an additional financial and administrative burden on our already overstretched public sector services, and is also likely to be ignored by those less responsible dog owners it is most intended to target.</p> <p>The enormity and the financial and administrative implications of enforcing and <u>accurately</u> maintaining such records should not be underestimated. Particularly bearing in mind that not only do dogs change owners, but that owners also change addresses. This coupled with the fact that new owners may have no way of verifying for themselves that a dog is microchipped, or that any microchip number with which they are provided is accurate, it has the potential to become an administrative nightmare which realises few of the suggested benefits and at significantly higher costs.</p>
0060	<p>Given the increasing concerns of NFU Cymru members throughout Wales of livestock worrying by stray dogs, particularly with sheep worrying around the spring lambing season, it is our view that dogs in Wales should be microchipped.</p>
0061	<p>Like the majority of individuals and organisations involved in dog welfare, I believe that microchipping can help with a number of welfare issues. Microchipping can reunite lost and stray dogs with their owners. When dogs are tragically killed in road accidents, scanning for chips can allow information to be relayed back to an owner who may be worried about a missing dog.</p>

	<p>I am involved in voluntary work with greyhounds. Currently, these are routinely tattooed for identification in the racing industry. Sadly it is not unknown for dogs to have their ears mutilated (cut off) to eliminate tracing identification. Universal microchipping would ensure there is less motivation for this to occur, and may assist in reducing the problem of ex-racing dogs being abandoned.</p> <p>Easier identification of dogs will assist considerably in managing the problems caused by irresponsible dog ownership and “status dogs” – compulsory chipping for dogs who belong to social housing tenants will help in the management and identification of disputes caused by episodes of anti social behaviour linked to dog ownership.</p> <p>Easier identification of dogs will assist in the enforcement of dog fouling legislation.</p> <p>Clear identification of individual dogs will assist in the welfare issues associated with management of dog breeding premises. The issues attached to this are already being dealt with via the proposed changes to dog breeding legislation in Wales, so it is unnecessary to repeat the points here, except to say that chipping will be warmly welcomed.</p> <p>Finally, chipping of the dog population could be of considerable assistance in respect to issues of disease management.</p>
0062	<p>Yes</p> <p>Our experience as Dog Wardens is that it is often difficult to identify owners of dogs that are straying, fouling or acting in a dangerous manner. Rapid identification of dogs would allow enforcement authorities to deal more effectively with these issues, and micro-chipping is the only way in which this can be achieved in a cost effective way.</p> <p>Free or low cost micro-chipping has been offered by charities and local authorities across Wales over many years, but this has not led to universal coverage and further action is therefore required.</p>
0063	<p>We understand the reasons for microchipping as set out in the consultation document and agree with the points made. We recognise in particular that microchipping will assist greatly with returning lost, stolen or stray dogs to</p>

	their respective owners.
0064	We are in support of compulsory microchipping of puppies for the reasons given in the consultation document.
0065	<p>The Union supports in principle microchipping dogs as a backup mechanism for identification should collars and tags be lost or tattoos faded, although it does believe that some of the issues raised in the document in support of compulsory chipping, such as encouraging responsible dog ownership, will be dependant on owners actually microchipping their dogs in the first place. There is also concern at the use of legislation rather than positive voluntary measures, which adds another layer of unnecessary bureaucracy whilst achieving very little in return.</p> <p>The Union fully supports the promotion of voluntary microchipping for older dogs, although agrees that there might be a case for microchipping puppies from licensed breeders to improve the perception of Wales as a centre of puppy farming. This, however, will only work if the public buy microchipped puppies.</p>
0066	<p>Yes</p> <p>Our experience as local authorities – and specifically in this instance – dog wardens- is that it is often difficult to identify owners of dogs that are straying, fouling or acting in a dangerous manner. Rapid identification of dogs would allow enforcement authorities to deal more effectively with these issues, and micro-chipping is the only way in which this can be achieved in a cost effective way.</p> <p>Free or low cost micro-chipping has been offered by charities and local authorities across Wales over many years, but this has not led to universal coverage and further action is therefore required.</p>
0067	<p>We have long called for the microchipping of all dogs to be made compulsory. Compulsory microchipping is beneficial for animal welfare and responsible pet ownership for the reasons given below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Microchipping is a permanent form of identification; 2. It enables pets and owners to be reunited in cases of straying, accident or theft; 3. It could help reduce the numbers of stray dogs; 4. As the owner/breeder of the animal can be identified, it can promote responsible pet ownership and responsible breeding practices; 5. It allows for the identification of individual animals for certification, test results and medical history; 6. It enables veterinary surgeons to contact owners more easily in case of an emergency – e.g. with an animal

	<p>brought in after a road traffic accident.</p> <p>It is important to stress, however, that compulsory microchipping will be ineffective without a robust registration system that needs to be well regulated in any legislation along with a requirement for the owner/registered keeper to be responsible for keeping the details up to date. A central reunification mechanism for databases will need to be established to facilitate access through a single point of entry.</p>
0068	YES - It will promote traceability, enabling authorities to reunite stray dogs with their owners and make it very difficult (if not impossible) for irresponsible owners to deny ownership and avoid liability for their dogs. It will also deter dog theft
0069	BASC believes that whilst micro chipping has benefits, its use should be down to individual choice and not a mandatory requirement and that the case for compulsory microchipping has not yet been made. The consultation document quotes figures from a 2009 survey regarding local authorities in which seven of the twelve that responded were in favour 58.3%. It would therefore follow that 41.7% were not. With 22 Unitary Authorities in Wales, if all of these were surveyed the proportion of positive responses received actually decrease. The same could be true in respect of the figures quoted for vets. Whilst 65% of the 81 who responded felt that microchipping should not remain voluntary. What was the original number surveyed? Is this a true representation?
0071	Yes, we believe that all dogs in Wales should be microchipped irrespective of where they have been bred, and that this will be a major step forward in improving animal welfare. From an enforcement perspective, compulsory microchipping proves ownership and therefore who is liable/responsible for an animal. In addition, it will also reunite stray dogs with their owners and reduce incidences of stolen dogs as it will act as a deterrent. Compulsory microchipping will reduce the numbers of dogs that have to be impounded and will be a very useful tool for the Police when dealing with dangerously out-of-control dogs as they will be able to quickly identify owners.
0072	Yes. For welfare reasons with stray or abused dogs and traceability of breeders as well as owners. This would make them responsible for their dogs.
0073	Yes

0074	no. My experience of microchipping companion animals is that the system does not always work. An animal of mine was killed by a car, left on the side of the road and neighbours arranged for local environmental services to destroy the remains whilst I was at work. The animal was microchipped. So it did not help in this situation.
0075	Yes because there are too many irresponsible owners who abuse, abandon and use their dogs for harmful acts such as dog fighting or training them to be aggressive towards people. In order to hold them accountable they need to be traced.
0076	No. But I have to say that all our lggies are microchipped, I just don't agree with compulsory chipping, as there are perfectly good alternatives ie tattooing
0077	yes because I think the owner will then take better responsibility of the dog, police will have better evidence to act on dogs that have attacked someone so there is no question then who the dog belongs to and the animal welfare would be able to take action much quicker.
0078	Yes - to deter owners from abandoning dogs and from irresponsible breeding (breeders should take responsibility for dogs they have bred.) This should include ALL breeders - not just those licensed by their local authority.
0079	I think it would be a good idea for all dogs in Wales to be microchipped when they are born. This will ensure all dogs are registered to an owner and the types of dogs that people own is also registered.
0080	Consolidate responsibility of dog owner /positive ID of dog throughout its life. makes dog a member of society by association with owner/not anonymous/traceable/ accountable.
0081	Yes, it will improve the ability of councils to trace the owners of stray dogs and hopefully discourage people from abandoning dogs. It will aim to create a culture of responsible dog ownership.
0082	Yes. It will encourage owners to take greater responsibility for their dogs.
0083	yes It will improve identification and help reunite lost animals it will help prove accountability and liability of ownership and help prevent theft.
0084	No, worthwhile objective but unworkable, what happens to an owner who has had their dog chipped and the chip migrates/ceases operating? is the owner prosecuted? if only 1% are not readable that is over 4,000 dogs (some evidence suggests the figure is nearer 5% failure. consultation states that tattoos can be removed so can microchips either surgically or with more cruel methods (there is thriving underground vet side to dog fighting) what is the position with dogs that come in from countries where it is not compulsory to microchip. Obviously this will not be a factor if all parts of the UK implement at the same time with the same rules.
0085	Yes, to ensure that traceability of dogs can be ascertained. That puppy farms can be monitored accordingly and that

	criminals can be prosecuted by proving ownership of dogs in cruelty cases etc.
0086	Yes. Battersea Dogs & Cats Home, one of the oldest and best-known animal welfare organisations in the world, supports the compulsory microchipping of all dogs in Wales and throughout the UK. Although not a catch-all solution in its own right, we believe that compulsory microchipping will provide an essential framework for creating a culture of responsible ownership of dogs. Compulsory microchipping of all dogs in Wales would be an efficient way of reuniting lost dogs with their owners and would combat unidentifiable strays. Both of these create higher kennelling costs organisations such as Battersea and Local Authorities.
0087	Unlike other animals dogs are associated closely with areas inhabited by humans. Dog numbers are increasing. Dogs do not have a moral compass and their safe and civil conduct is under the direct control of their owners. There must be a means to identify and hold to account the owner of animals causing civil nuisance and exhibiting behaviours that threaten the well being of citizens.
0088	Will help control of stray dogs and make it easier for authorities to deal with owners who do not control their dogs. It will make it easier for victims of dog attacks to get justice from the owner.
0089	Yes, logged on a single database. This would enable the owners of dogs to be identified so that prosecutions can be brought against their owners when a dog attacks a horse or rider, or any other person. It would also help to ensure improved regulation of breeding dogs in a region that is stigmatised by the number of <u>_puppy farms_</u> . Legislation regarding the passporting and microchipping of horses has been in place for a number of years now, microchipping dogs would be the modern replacement for the licence that owners used to have to have. Responsible dog owners would welcome the introduction of microchipping; it would help to relocate dogs if lost, it could be used to improve breed standards (to confirm that it is the correct dog) and help to reduce the number of <u>_puppy farms_</u> .
0090	No, it should be the owner's free choice.
0091	yes. My cat was chipped and when he got lost someone took it to a vet and so he was identified and came home.
0092	Tracability
0093	Yes. This will control all dogs especially violent and illegal dogs. It will make policing the dog problem a lot easier.
0094	Yes It would make people more responsible for their animals' behaviour and safety, and for leaving their faeces in inappropriate places. It would make people think more responsibly about acquiring dogs at all.
0095	Yes, to reduce the number of stray animals and to improve animal welfare, forcing owners to take responsibility for thier dogs.

0096	<p>No: Whilst the Pet Care Trust supports microchipping and believes that microchipping is an excellent method of permanently identifying a dog, it should not be made mandatory.</p> <p>The present legal requirement for dogs in public to wear a collar and tag showing the owner's name and address is perfectly serviceable as a way of reuniting the vast majority of dogs with their owners. Whilst microchipping is desirable as an extra safeguard in case the collar falls off, it would be disproportionate to criminalise pet owners who do not comply.</p> <p>You state that compulsory microchipping could :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><i>1. Shorten the period of confinement for stray dogs, thus reducing stress for the animal and costs for the local authority.</i> However this does not guarantee that animals will be reunited with their owners. For instance, if a vet finds a chip which has different owner details from that of his client, he is under no obligation to inform the original owner.<i>2. Introduce greater traceability</i> This will only happen if transfer papers are up to date, this is also important when establishing liability and proof of ownership<i>3. Could act as a deterrent against theft</i> This is not an automatic deterrent to theft, as microchips are not visible. How will it be policed? Will owners become criminalised if the chip has become dormant? What level of fine would be levied on an owner? Who will bring prosecutions? <p>The Pet Care Trust believes that enforcement of mandatory microchipping would only further burden an overworked police force and local authority. It would require further investment in infrastructure.</p> <p>The Pet Care Trust strongly recommends the Welsh Assembly Government adopt option 1.</p> <p>Not introduce legislation but continue to work with local authorities and third sector organisations to</p>
------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>encourage owners to microchip their dogs on a voluntary basis</p> <p>STATE This approach also complies with the Hampton review for better regulation by making use of bodies and systems already in place.</p>
0097	<p>The SHG is opposed to compulsory micro-chipping. The decision to micro-chip should remain with the individual dog owner in Wales.</p> <p>The UK government has recently committed to closing down the ID card database. Dog microchipping is just another register of people. It does nothing to prevent dog theft or to help find dogs that are lost. Indeed, reading reports of missing dogs there seem to be as many lost and stolen that are micro-chipped as those that are not. There is no evidence that this leads to an increased percentage of dogs that are micro-chipped being found and returned to their owners when either lost or stolen. See <i>“Pet owner hits out as dog re-homed”</i>. http://www.blackpoolgazette.co.uk/news/local/pet-owner-hits-out-as-dog-rehomed-1-4733856</p> <p>The SHG opposes compulsory micro-chipping on the grounds that it is dog registration and licensing under another name, that it creates a database registry of people and their movements, thus representing great intrusion into people's privacy, and that it punishes responsible dog owners for the actions of a minority.</p> <p>We know that any problems are caused by a minority because Welsh Environment Minister John Griffiths said: <i>“We believe the majority of dog owners in Wales are responsible and take good care of their animals.”</i> http://www.vetsonline.com/actualites/detail/53831/welsh-to-consult-on-compulsory-dogmicrochipping.html</p> <p>Clearly the Welsh Government must consider the proportionality of forcing uncalled for restrictions on the peaceful enjoyment by people of their property (dogs) when it is clear from the proposals that the majority of people have chosen not to take up offers of free or cheap micro-chipping.</p> <p>We have been unable to find any figures to show the actual voluntary uptake of micro-chipping among Welsh or UK dog owners. Nor have we found any figures for compliance with compulsory microchipping in Northern Ireland although we accept that this is new legislation. It should be remembered</p>

	<p>that when the dog licence was abandoned it had an uptake of only 50%. A large number of people who would need to be forced to comply.</p> <p>There are serious health issues with microchips. They may move within the dog's body. There are certainly instances where chips that have been inserted for pet passports have not been found resulting in dogs facing long stays in quarantine. Microchips appear to be associated with the appearance of tumours at the site of the chip. No responsible pet owner is going to want to risk the health of their animal for a dubious benefit. Indeed, the procedure might well be in breach of the Animal Welfare Act 2006 (AWA), although we note that the Act makes government sponsored cruelty exempt. See: http://www.chipmenot.org/ and http://www.antichips.com/cancer/</p> <p>This does not sit easily with the claim that these proposals will serve to improve animal welfare. Worse, by creating compulsory micro-chipping the Welsh Government will provide micro-chippers with the protective cover of S. 4(3)(b) of the Animal Welfare Act 2006. This essentially states that state sanctioned cruelty is exempt from prosecution – and arguably from any financial claims for compensation for injury and suffering caused to dogs and the inevitable associated veterinary fees.</p> <p>Tattooing appears to be a far less dangerous procedure and at least is visible on the dog, unlike microchipping which needs specialist equipment. There is already a dog tattoo register and it should be noted that the Dangerous Dogs Act insists on a tattoo as well as a micro-chip. http://www.dog-register.co.uk/ .</p> <p>It is impossible to see how micro-chipping could reduce dog fouling.</p>
0098	<p>Yes. So that strays and lost dogs can be found easier. It could also mean that puppy farms and breeders would need to take more responsibility so that you could see just how many they are breeding, plus the welfare of these dogs can be monitored. An entire history of a dogs life can be recorded and the issues surrounding them tackled more easily.</p>
0099	<p>Yes, because it would force owners to take responsibility for their animals and make any necessary actions against those owners easier, as it would be like owning your car..... you're responsible for the actions of anyone driving your car etc.</p>
0100	<p>DEFINATELY!!! I think if all dogs were microchipped, you could trace owners who dump or neglect their dogs. I also</p>

	believe there should be a ban on breeding also, social networking sites are rife with dogs for sale or free, ban on advertising on networking / selling sites.. with ever increasing horror stories of dogs being used for dog fighting etc. Neutering should also be compulsory to prevent breeding unless people have applied for a special licence. We need dog licences, special licences to allow breeding with restrictions and guidelines on re-homing, making people take responsibility, ownership.. this cruelty has to stop!!
0101	Yn bendant. Mi fyddai hyn yn golygu bod perchnogaeth ci yn rhywbeth i'w ystyried o ddifrif. Mi fyddai hefyd yn golygu bod modd canfod perchnogion cwn strae.
0102	Yes, I work for an animal rescue centre and promote microchipping as a responsible way of taking responsibility for dogs. People should be prepared to look after animals they buy or adopt.
0103	Absolutely, definitely NOT. Irresponsible owners will take no notice and how can it possibly be enforced. Local councils already stretched to deliver essential services. Dog licences were dropped as impossible to administer. Won't help dangerous dog situation. Identification following dog attacks not usually a problem as it is more often than not a family pet or neighbour's dog who commits attack. Won't help stray situation. Most strays are abandoned and owners don't want them back. An owner whose dog is genuinely lost will move heaven and earth to get them back. Highly efficient websites have an interactive network, rescue centres, dog wardens, vets etc would be contacted routinely
0104	YES - to tackle the increasing problem of strays, fouling and encourage more responsible dog ownership.
0105	No, we do not think that all dogs in Wales should have to be microchipped, we believe it is overly intrusive and only offers limited suggested "possible benefits". At a time of national austerity and public sector cut backs, it would place an unnecessary financial burden on many hundreds of thousands of already responsible dog owners and an additional financial and administrative burden on our already overstretched public sector services, and is also likely to be ignored by those less responsible dog owners it is most intended to target. The enormity and the financial and administrative implications of enforcing and accurately maintaining such records should not be underestimated. Particularly bearing in mind that not only do dogs change owners, but that owners also change addresses. This, coupled with the fact that new owners may have no way of verifying for themselves that a dog is microchipped, or that any microchip number with which they are provided is accurate, has the potential to become an administrative nightmare which realises few of the suggested benefits and at significantly higher costs.

0106	<p>Microchipping is proven to be the most effective way of ensuring lost dogs are returned to their owners. However of the 8.2 million pet dogs currently in the UK, more than a third remain unidentifiable, by permanent means.</p> <p>As a further encouragement, according to recent independent economic research carried out by the Alliance, it has revealed that if the Welsh Government were to introduce compulsory microchipping it could save the public purse between £2.39 and £2.67 million per year¹.</p> <p>If more dogs were microchipped, more could be returned direct to their owners enhancing animal welfare as well as the cost savings to local authorities. We believe that microchipping could help with the enforcement of other existing legislation such as the Animal Welfare Act 2006 and the Dangerous Dogs Act 1991 or Dogs Act 1871.</p> <p>The most important reason for microchipping is to enable a lost, stolen or straying dog to be returned promptly to its owner. Permanent identification has a number of advantages over the use of a collar and tag. A collar and tag can easily be removed from a stray or stolen dog. Conversely, permanent identification by means of a microchip is effective at all times, is impossible to alter and extremely difficult to remove.</p> <p>However, the microchip number on its own is meaningless. Owners need to register the microchip number along with their personal details with an appropriate computerised database. The databases currently used in the UK can only be accessed by authorised bodies such as animal wardens, the police, animal welfare centre personnel and vets. Once an individual or organisation has been verified they are allocated a PIN number to facilitate such access. It is essential that database details are kept up to date, and, that the database is available 24 hours a day. All databases must be compatible with a single point of entry.</p> <p>We believe that the introduction of compulsory microchipping of all dogs will help to improve animal welfare, aid the government in tackling a large number of issues relating to irresponsible dog ownership and ease financial pressures on local authority services.</p>
0107	<p>Yes. Guide Dogs concur with the potential benefits identified by compulsory microchipping within the consultation document. We believe that the compulsory microchipping of all dogs at the earliest opportunity is the best and most</p>

¹ Microchipping Alliance independent economic research 2011

	<p>effective way of improving animal welfare; reducing the level of stress for a dog when separated from it's owner and helping establish ownership liability where required. We believe compulsory microchipping should be an important element of any future dog control legislation that may be introduced as the result of the forthcoming Control of Dogs (Wales) Bill consultation that was recently announced.</p>
0108	<p>Yes. Dogs if strayed, can be reunited with their owners. Dogs that do damage can be traced back to their owners.</p>
0109	<p>Yes. I think there are many benefits to having all dogs microchipped and it will encourage dog owners to take more responsibility for their animals.</p>
0110	<p>Yes encourages responsible ownership. I particularly relate to geyhounds who are often abandoned after their racing days. Also if you loose your dog can be easily identified.</p>
0111	<p>Dogs Trust believes that all dogs in Wales should have to be permanently identified via a microchip.</p> <p>Microchipping is proven to be the most effective way of ensuring lost dogs are returned to their owners. However, of the estimated 8.2 million pet dogs currently in the UK, more than a third remain unidentifiable by a permanent means of identification. According to recent independent economic research carried out by Dogs Trust on behalf of the Microchipping Alliance, if the Welsh Government were to introduce compulsory microchipping it could save the public purse between £2.39 million and £2.61 million per year. If more dogs were microchipped, more could be returned to their owners and in a timelier manner. As such the cost to local authorities would be vastly reduced. Dogs Trust is aware that the Local Government Authority believes voluntary microchipping is working. However, despite years of endless education and free microchipping offers from charities, only an estimated 59% of the dog population is currently microchipped and stray dog figures for the UK continue to rise year on year, last year standing at over 9,482 in Wales.</p> <p>The most important reason for microchipping is to enable a lost, stolen or stray dog to be returned promptly to its owner. Permanent identification has a number of advantages over the use of a collar and tag. Some dogs are not left with their collar and tag on at all times and dogs, stolen from owners' premises, are likely to have their collar and tag removed if they are wearing them at the time. Permanent identification is effective at all times, is impossible to alter and extremely difficult to remove.</p> <p>As stated above, the main welfare benefit is for dogs to be promptly identified and returned to their owners. In</p>

	<p>addition, microchipping and registration to a database allows quick and simple detection, acts as a deterrent to dog theft, provides easier identification of owners who persistently allow their dogs to stray, cause nuisance or are culpable of animal cruelty, helps puppies be traceable to their breeder and as a consequence helps to tackle puppy farming problems.</p> <p>However, the microchip number alone is meaningless. Keepers need to be compelled to register the microchip number and their details with an appropriate computerised database. It is essential that dog owners update their personal details; to be effective this needs to be mandatory with a penalty imposed for non-compliance. Any database should be available 24 hours a day and all databases compatible and communicate with each other. Dogs Trust is adamant that an independent single point of access to the databases, signed up to a Code of Practice, is essential. A PIN number is needed to access the databases, which can only be accessed by authorised bodies such as animal wardens, the police, social housing landlords, animal welfare centre personnel and vets.</p>
0112	Yes eventually all dogs ... so each owner can take responsibility
0113	Yes Because it would make dealing with the huge numbers of stray dogs so much easier and make owners more responsible for their dogs
0114	Yes. To enable easy identification of stray or lost dogs. To ensure that the necessary authorities can track down owners in the case of animal maltreatment or dog attacks against humans. To ensure that farmers can locate dog owners if a dog is worrying their flocks to help prevent immediate premature shooting of dogs. Chipping might also encourage a more responsible attitude towards dogs e.g. fouling.
0115	Yes.It would result in a full data base of all dogs in Wales. Lost dogs would be rehomed quicker and save on expensive kennelling costs, it would demonstrate responsible dog ownership and identify those dogs that are repeatedly allowed to stray.
0116	Yes, as hopefully this would prevent as many dogs finding thier way into pounds that are there now.
0117	No, there is already to much legislation surrounding hunting, docking tails, etc the goverment should concentrate on more important & relevant issues. eg education, economy health
0118	No. There are health issues arising from the use of microchips. If my dog develops a tumour at the site of the microchip, will I be able to sue the government? The chips can also migrate .
0119	Yes. Animal welfare reasons such as reunite lost animals with owners and potential prosecution of owners for animals discovered in poor health. Public health reasons such as identifying and potentially prosecuting owners of

	dangerous dogs - and by dangerous I mean an animal that is behaving dangerously NOT an animal that simply passes some measurements and ticks a few dubious boxes relating to 'type'
0120	Yes – it will promote traceability, enabling authorities to reunite stray dogs with their owners and make it very difficult (if not impossible) for irresponsible owners to deny ownership and avoid liability for their dogs. It will also deter dog theft