

# **Animal Welfare and the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS)**

*A briefing paper for the LEGS Steering Group*

**February 2013**



**Ian Dacre**

# **Animal Welfare and the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS)**

*A briefing paper for the LEGS Steering Group*

**February 2013**

**Ian Dacre**

Suggested citation:

Dacre, I. (2013). Animal Welfare and the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS): A briefing paper for the LEGS Steering Group. Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards, Addis Ababa

Disclaimer:

This publication was commissioned by LEGS and produced independently by the author. The views expressed in the paper are not necessarily endorsed by LEGS.

Cover photo: Valerie Gwinner

## **Contents**

Abstract .....	1
1. Introduction .....	1
2. Literature Review .....	2
3. Conclusions .....	5
4. Recommendations .....	6
Bibliography .....	6
Annex 1. Case studies .....	8
Annex 2: Detailed editing suggestions .....	12

## Abstract

*In 2012, three years after initial publication, the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS) handbook is being reviewed. As animal welfare continues to gain importance as a global issue, the purpose of this paper has been to identify how animal welfare may be better represented in the forthcoming second edition of the LEGS handbook without losing the primary purpose of the material, namely to address the overlap between emergencies, livestock and livelihoods. These recommendations have been formulated through external consultation conducted independently of the LEGS Steering Group. Firstly the author identified the general trends towards animal welfare in the current edition through external input, and secondly using these commentaries for guidance, identified where specific edits and recommendations may be incorporated into the second edition, and within the existing LEGS structure.*

## 1. Introduction

As stated in the Introduction of LEGS (Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards, 2009), LEGS aims to mirror the process for developing the ‘Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Disaster Response’ – the Sphere Project (The Sphere Project, 2011), first published in 2000. Since then the Sphere Project has been revisited twice with the latest third edition being published in 2011. In 2009 the first edition of LEGS was published, which later went on to become recognised as ‘Sphere companion standards’ in 2010. In mirroring these guidelines the LEGS handbook is now under review and various technical aspects of handbook are being reviewed. This briefing paper on animal welfare aims to provide detailed recommendations for the LEGS Steering Group regarding how animal welfare issues can be better represented in the revised edition of the LEGS handbook.

It is recognised that the development of LEGS has proved to be of benefit to animal welfare, where and when it has been implemented and as shown by the case studies in Annex 1. The LEGS project is now entering a second phase and the proponents for LEGS should look to ensure that it continues to enhance the welfare of animals caught up in disasters. This will likely involve incremental changes to future editions of LEGS.

At certain levels, the profile of animal welfare is increasing. For example, the 2012 OIE (World Animal Health Organisation) 3<sup>rd</sup> Global Conference focused on animal welfare (OIE, 2012a). At the conference it was reported how some countries in both the developed and developing worlds were addressing animal welfare issues through strategic planning, the development of standards and guidelines, and legislative change. This global trend is one of the reasons that the LEGS Steering Group has considered animal welfare to be a priority issue to be addressed in the first revision of the LEGS handbook.

The OIE defines that animal welfare, “... means how an animal is coping with the conditions in which it lives. An animal is in a good state of welfare if (as indicated by scientific evidence) it is healthy, comfortable, well nourished, safe, able to express innate behaviour, and if it is not suffering from unpleasant states such as pain, fear, and distress. Good animal welfare requires disease prevention and veterinary

*treatment, appropriate shelter, management, nutrition, humane handling and humane slaughter/killing. Animal welfare refers to the state of the animal; the treatment that an animal receives is covered by other terms such as animal care, animal husbandry, and humane treatment” (OIE, 2012b).*

Further to this, in the introduction to the 3<sup>rd</sup> OIE global conference on animal welfare, the OIE states that, *“Animal welfare is a complex, multi-faceted public policy issue that includes important scientific, ethical, economic and political dimensions. Because of its growing importance to society, animal welfare must be addressed in a scientifically credible manner. It is essential to engage with stakeholders on the development and implementation of animal welfare standards, to ensure that cultural and religious sensibilities are taken into account, as well as economic issues. The OIE standards are based on science because this is the sole ‘common ground’ for all Members.”* These pragmatic definitions of animal welfare suit the focus of LEGS and this paper as they refer to a similar approach to animal welfare, namely that it is science based and credible, but also complex.

In the brief to this paper five key organisations were listed – the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), World Society for the Protection of Animals (WPSA), The Brooke, The Donkey Sanctuary, and the Royal Society for the Protection of Animals (RSPCA). To this the author added the OIE as a global organisation for standards setting in regards to animal health and welfare, having representation currently in 178 countries.

Finally, by way of an introduction, LEGS refers specifically to the approach as being the same as that of the Sphere Project, namely a ‘rights-based approach’. In the humanitarian context this is a well-known perspective but in the context of animal welfare, it quickly becomes confused with ‘animal rights’ – a perspective which differs significantly from that of ‘animal welfare’. Whilst the consensus amongst those that were contacted during this consultative process was that animal welfare did fit the remit of LEGS, that of ‘animal rights’ did not. Therefore this paper does not include any discussion on the subject of animal rights other than that animal ‘rights’ are not appropriate to be included in any current revision of LEGS.

## **2. Literature Review**

The literature review began with a review of the LEGS handbook, and a detailed list of suggested edits is provided in Annex 2. These edits are proposed noting that the length and overall structure of the handbook is unlikely to change in the second edition.

It is timely that the current LEGS review should follow the publication of the 3<sup>rd</sup> edition of Sphere handbook in 2011, as in Sphere ‘livestock’ is indexed 23 times and animal welfare is it mentioned; food insecurity is referenced 84 times; flies are indexed seven times. This might give the impression that animal welfare is completely ignored however looking to the references on livestock we can see that this is not the case. For example on several occasions the reference to livestock is in association with the viability of the animal. Often this is related to the provisioning of adequate water or shelter. These are directly related to two aspects of the ‘five freedoms’ (Brambell, 1965), which is recognised as a cornerstone to animal welfare.



LEGS is specifically referred to seven times in the 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, with four times being within the main body of the text, and three times as a reference.

In terms of reviewing government literature, a key event was the failure of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) of the United States to respond appropriately to the communities, and in this regard to respond to the needs of the animals, when Hurricane Katrina destroyed much of New Orleans in August 2005. When describing the impacts of the hurricane on people and their animals, Irvine (2008) explains how this led to President George Bush signing the Pets Evacuation and Transport Standards (PETS) Act into law on October 6<sup>th</sup>, 2006. However, “*Although we have the closest bonds with companion animals, they constitute only about 2% of the animals living in the United States*” and livestock – especially in intensive systems – were vulnerable to adverse events such as hurricanes or floods. Yet farm animals were excluded from emergency contingency laws or planning structures in the United States (Irvine, 2008). Although as an industrialized country the US is not directly relevant to LEGS, it is important to consider these experiences as many developing nations aim to intensify their animal production systems (Otte, 2013).

The European Union (EU) does not currently have any coordinated emergency plans for animal welfare (FAWC, 2006). In trying to address this, the Farm Animal Welfare Committee (FAWC) commissioned a paper *Opinion on Contingency Planning for Farm Animal Welfare in Disasters and Emergencies, 2012*. This was referenced by the UK’s Department for Food, Environment and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) and raised two critical issues:

Point 46: The welfare of farm animals is at risk during disasters and emergencies. Confinement means that farm animals rarely have the option to escape danger. Dependence upon humans for food and water, shelter and other interventions, ensures that when these are disrupted, animal harm may result. Unlike companion animals, farm animals rarely accompany humans to safety. Although they are often critical to the rural economy, they are usually invisible in disaster planning and management.

Point 47: While formal structures already exist to plan for and manage disease outbreaks, contingency plans specifically for farm animal welfare during non-disease emergencies do not currently exist at national or EU level.

Given the situation in the US and EU, it is not surprising that in general, developing lack planning and preparedness for animals in disasters. A notable exception is India where the current National Policy on Disaster Management 2009 states, “... *animals both domestic and wild are exposed to the effects of natural and man-made disasters. It is necessary to devise appropriate measures to protect animals and find means to shelter and feed them during disasters and their aftermath, through a community effort, to the extent possible... these efforts need to be formalised in the preparedness plans.*” The effective implementation of this policy was being considered during the drafting of the 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan 2012-2017 in India.

In journal publications, there have been justifications for recognizing animal welfare in times of disaster. For example, “...*incentives to care for nonhuman animals derive*

*in part from the extent to which people depend on animals for food, for livelihood, and for cultural and psychological reasons as well as from the duty to protect animals in their care. When attention is turned to solving and preventing animal welfare problems at times of crisis, it becomes clear that those problems are also associated with problems for human welfare and environmental impact”* (Appleby and Stokes, 2008). This paper illustrates how by proactively supporting the welfare of animals during a crisis, we indirectly improve the welfare of people.

In the veterinary literature a limited number of books are available on animals in disasters, and veterinary roles and responsibilities. Again most of these have been developed from a western perspective, but can add technical input to the field. The book *Veterinary Disaster Medicine: Working Animals* (Wingfield et al., 2009) focuses on clinical approaches to animals in disasters, and does not discuss animal welfare. However, animal welfare is discussed in *Veterinary Disaster Response*, which asks, *“The most fundamental question pertaining to veterinarian involvement in disaster relief is a jarring, politically incorrect one – why spend (waste?) resources on animals when the same money could be spent to benefit humans?”* (Wingfield and Palmer, 2009). This seems to reflect the position of many humanitarian organisations, which have focused for decades uniquely on human welfare, failing to see the connection between animals and their owners.<sup>1</sup> Other veterinary or technically oriented texts exist (Giminez, 2008; Heath, 1999) but again, these are western oriented and technical in nature.

Looking more at developing countries, it has been argued that veterinarians should be involved in assisting animals in emergencies including large scale disasters (Madigan and Dacre, 2009), and that veterinarians are uniquely qualified to provide this support. In many countries veterinarians are also sworn to an oath requiring that they are also the profession responsible for animal welfare, and this paper tries to quantify the current ability of the veterinary profession to undertake such an obligation to animals in disasters.

In the specific field of animal welfare the amount of literature available continues to grow exponentially. For many, the current conceptualisation of animal welfare began in 1965 when the UK government commissioned an investigation, led by Professor F. W. Rogers Brambell, into the welfare of intensively farmed animals. The Brambell Report stated that animals should have the freedom to, *“... stand up, lie down, turn around, groom themselves and stretch their limbs”*. This recommendation became known as Brambell's ‘Five Freedoms’. Currently the UK’s FAWC states these as being:

1. **Freedom from hunger or thirst** by ready access to fresh water and a diet to maintain full health and vigour
2. **Freedom from discomfort** by providing an appropriate environment including shelter and a comfortable resting area
3. **Freedom from pain, injury or disease** by prevention or rapid diagnosis and treatment

---

<sup>1</sup> However we also see evidence that this attitude is changing e.g. with the International Federation of the Red Cross requesting that a job description be drafted for a ‘Technical Advisor for Animals’ to help in their Shelter and Camp management (Dacre, 2012).

4. **Freedom to express normal behaviour** by providing sufficient space, proper facilities and company of the animal's own kind
5. **Freedom from fear and distress** by ensuring conditions and treatment which avoid mental suffering  
(<http://www.defra.gov.uk/fawc/about/five-freedoms/>)

How these five freedoms relate to aspects of the LEGS were discussed by several external commentators to this paper (see Annex 2).

### 3. Conclusions

This briefing paper and the revision of LEGS for a second edition have come at an appropriate time, both in terms of the recent republication of the Sphere standards, and since the publication of the first edition of LEGS. It has also come at an appropriate time in terms of a general mainstreaming of animal welfare by some key international organisations – especially FAO and OIE, and some governments. One of WSPA's key objectives is to continue the mainstreaming of animal welfare into every day conversations, just as 'climate change' has become over the past decade.

Several well-known international humanitarian NGOs also now consider animals as a key element to their own workspace (e.g. IFRC, Oxfam, Save the Children, Mercy Corps). LEGS has helped humanitarian organisations rationalise and recognize the importance of animals to their own humanitarian interventions. At a recent workshop held by the AADMER Partnership Group (APG comprises seven humanitarian INGOs who report directly to the ASEAN Secretariat) which is funded by ECHO, WSPA was invited to join the as the sole 'animal' specific INGO. When a vote was held to see which three INGOs should be represented on a forthcoming ASEAN Civil Society meeting on Disaster Management and Emergency Response, WSPA received the greatest number of votes (after APG members and IFRC had already been selected). This shows how the importance of animals (and their welfare) has become recognised. This is a clear indication that humanitarian agencies no longer ponder on the relevance of animals in disasters, or the use of animal oriented organisations as part of the humanitarian response network, but rather they actively want such expertise to become a part of the overall integrated humanitarian response. This is more than just being a part of the UN Transformative Agenda, but rather indicates that after years of neglect, animals have finally found a voice in disasters through LEGS and the organisations and governments that support their use.

Of the organisations who fed back into this consultative paper, all emphatically supported LEGS to actively include animal welfare into the second edition, with some stating not to do so would hold back the general onward incorporation/acceptance of the LEGS globally (by some organisations feeling excluded if animal welfare were seen to be actively excluded). When organisations such as FAO and OIE actively endorse the incorporation of animal welfare into LEGS, and the greater awareness of the general humanitarian community to the relevance of animals in their communities, it is difficult to give an argument as to why this should not be done.

#### 4. Recommendations

- It is the recommendation of this paper (based upon the author's experience and feedback from consulted organisations) that animal welfare be actively included in the revision of LEGS
- Unfortunately there still remain many areas where there is still a lack of quality evidence-based literature in the field of the relationship between animal welfare, livelihoods and disasters. This paper recognises this and therefore actively encourages any organisations working in this field to develop better tools so that they may contribute to the literature in this area. The LEGS Steering Group may wish to explore the linkages between animal welfare and productivity as a start to this process.
- This paper has identified several areas where animal welfare may be incorporated into a second edition of LEGS, and to include them all would unbalance the document. This paper should therefore serve as the basis for a discussion to be held by the LEGS Steering Group as to which aspects of this paper would be the most appropriate way for the inclusion of animal welfare into a second edition of LEGS. The author would be available to attend such a discussion
- One of the more controversial suggestions made is that animal welfare (or animals) may even be considered as a cross-cutting issue. The LEGS Steering Group are recommended to consider this in its own right
- The LEGS Steering Group are to be commended for their insight into the changing nature of the humanitarian workspace and also the changing nature of society's views on animal welfare both in the developing and developed world

#### Bibliography

Appleby, M. & Stokes, T. (2008): *Why should we care about nonhuman animals during times of crisis?* Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science, 11:2, 90-97. doi: 10.1080/10888700801925612

Dacre I., Personal communication, June 2012

FAO (2008). *Capacity building to implement good animal welfare practices*. Report of the FAO Expert Meeting, 30 September – 3 October 2008, Rome.

Farm Animal Welfare Council (2012). *Opinion on Contingency Planning for Farm Animal Welfare in Disasters and Emergencies* [www.defra.gov.uk/fawc](http://www.defra.gov.uk/fawc)

Farm Animal Welfare Council. Five Freedoms (n.d.). <http://www.fawc.org.uk/freedoms.htm>

Farm Animal Welfare Council. *Strategic Plan 2006-2010 (2006)*. <http://www.fawc.org.uk/pdf/strategicplan2006-10.pdf>

Gimenez R, Gimenez T, May K. A., (2008). *Technical Large Animals Emergency Rescue*. Iowa. Blackwell Publishing.

Health S. E., (1999). *Animals Management in Disaster*. Missouri. Mosby

*Implementing the OIE standards - addressing regional expectations.* (2012a).  
[http://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/Conferences\\_Events/docs/pdf](http://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/Conferences_Events/docs/pdf)

India, New Delhi. Government of India/ Planning commission. (2011, October, 31). *Report of the working group on disaster management for the twelfth five year plan (2012-2017.* New Delhi

Irvine, L. (2008). *Filling the Ark.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press

*Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards.* (2009). Rugby: Practical Action Publishing.

Madigan J., Dacre I, *Preparing for Veterinary Emergencies: Disaster Management and the Incident Command System* (2009). *Revue Scientifique et Technique.* 2009 Aug, 28(2), 627-33.

National Disaster Management Authority (2009). National Policy on Disaster Management 2009.  
<http://www.library.mun.ca/guides/howto/apa.php>

OIE. (2012b). *Terrestrial Animal Health Code.* (21<sup>st</sup> ed., V. 1). Paris. OIE Publisher

Otte, J. (2013). International Conference of Veterinary Scientists  
[http://www.aphca.org/dmdocuments/PRE\\_130118\\_Animal%20Health%20Food%20Safety%20&%20Env\\_Otte%20\(Final\).pdf](http://www.aphca.org/dmdocuments/PRE_130118_Animal%20Health%20Food%20Safety%20&%20Env_Otte%20(Final).pdf)

*The Sphere Project.* (2011). Bangalore: National Printing Press.

United States Congress (2006). *Pets Evacuation and Transportation Standards Act of 2006* (Public Law 109–308)

Wingfield W. E., Nash S. L., Palmer S. B., Upp J. J., (2009). *Veterinary Disaster Medicine: Working Animals.* Iowa, Blackwell Publishing.

Wingfield W. E., Palmer S. B., (2009), *Veterinary Disaster Response,* Iowa, Blackwell Publisher

Wittnich C. & Belanger M. (2008): *How Is Animal Welfare Addressed in Canada's Emergency Response Plans?* *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science*, 11:2, 125-132

## **Annex 1. Case studies**

### **Case Study 1: Donkey Sanctuary, Mwingi, Kenya**

In normal times the people use donkeys to fetch water from up to five km away, and carry firewood, charcoal and farm produce. The distances and loads were relatively manageable.

But, as the Donkey Sanctuary Kenya team note in their joint report, “In times of drought, it is clear that donkeys take on a new significance for the people of Mwingi. From observation, it was noted that donkeys are used as a central part of the people's coping strategy during drought, and this makes them part of the intervention to lessen the effects of the disaster on the people and other animals.

“For example, a donkey owner in Mwingi Central indicated that the nearest water point to her home in normal times is about 2km away, and she collects water twice a day so the donkey is likely to cover 8km in a day. But during this drought, the nearest water point to her home is about 7km away, and doing the same two trips means that her donkey walks at least 28km in a day. This means walking longer hours with the load of water on its back, and hardly any time to feed.”

Donkeys were being used to ferry water and food for other livestock which were too weak to walk to the watering point. Owners were loading them with water containers, plus any dry grass or fodder they could find. The donkeys were also used to collect emergency supplies of grain distributed from relief centres by the government and humanitarian organisations.

The report quotes a donkey owner called Lucy, who said, “If you do not have a donkey here, life would be very difficult.” Another donkey owner called Ngoenze agreed, saying, “without a donkey here, you cannot manage”.

But despite the vital role played by donkeys, the humanitarian agencies working in the area were making no provision for them. Donkeys were found to be in poor body condition (1 or 2 out of five) and obviously weakened. There was little food and water available for them. Harness wounds were common, due to owners using inadequate padding and thin ropes; the loss of body condition was exacerbating this problem. Many foals were dying or being born weak or diseased, and pregnant mares were aborting, because of fatigue and lack of nutrition. There were many cases of mange and suspected haemoparasites.

### **Case Study 2: WSPA response to flooding in Vietnam**

In 2011 flooding as a result of heavy rains from Tropical Storm Haima (known locally as Storm Number 2) severely affected ten of the twenty districts in Nghe An Province in the North Central part of Vietnam. The flooding caused the death of at least 3,522 livestock animals and left the remaining animals at risk of an outbreak of disease, such as foot and mouth disease, haemorrhagic septicaemia and hog cholera, which had resulted in the deaths of many animals after previous floods in Nghe An.



Yen Tinh and Luu Kiem communes in Tuong Duong District experienced separate outbreaks of disease in pigs and cattle in the days immediately preceding the assessment by the World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA). Community workshops with animal owners, using LEGS Participatory Response Identification Matrix (PRIM) as the tool, found priorities for pig feed, repair to water and shelter and support for veterinary services.

WSPA therefore provided emergency feed, shelter and veterinary services for Yen Tinh and Luu Kiem communes for a total of 5,139 animals and indirect support for at least 10,000 animals. Each pig in Luu Kiem commune received two 25kg bags of pelleted feed which would last approximately two to three months. WSPA supported veterinary equipment to Tuong Duong District Veterinary Station (DVS) and 14 village para-veterinarians and 2 commune veterinarians in Luu Kiem and Yen Tinh Communes in order to improve their capacity in implementation of veterinary public health functions. In Yen Tinh commune, WSPA funded the repair of animal shelters by the provision of plastic sheeting to weather proof animal shelters. This would both repair those shelters damaged during the flooding and also improve overall the effectiveness of animal shelters in the commune to protect animals.

The implementation of the operation received strong support from Nghe An Livestock Department, the commune, district and provincial Peoples' Committee as well as the International Cooperation Department of Ministry Agriculture and Rural Development. It is evident that this response was successful because all activities involved participation and strong collaboration and coordination between WSPA, the government and stakeholders concerned.

Source: Dr Ong-orn Prasarnphanich, World Society for the Protection of Animals

### **Case Study 3: WSPA livelihoods protection in the Fiji Islands**

On 30 March, 2012 widespread flash floods affected the Fiji Island of Viti Levu with severe damages occurring across most of Fiji's Western Division. These events occurred less than two months following a previous cyclone and flooding disaster event in the same areas of Fiji. Impact assessment reports indicated that it was possibly the largest (highest water levels) seen in Fiji for perhaps three or more decades, attributed to excessive rainfall and land use changes affecting surface runoff. The floods occurred during the early hours of the morning in darkness while people were sleeping and animals were secured and little warning was given before waters in excess of 3 meters inundated communities. Flood waters took nearly 4 days to recede to safe levels in most communities for access by assessment teams. Fiji Government declared the Western and Central Districts a State of Natural Disaster.

A collaborative intervention strategy planning session between WSPA and the Fiji Government occurred, which included a coordinated disaster needs assessment. With two major flooding events between January and March, crops and grazing areas were highly compromised being either partially damaged or completely destroyed and significantly reduced crop production and yields. Most farmers in the flood affected areas of Fiji are at the poverty level and had little means of financial resilience to crop damages except for their small-hold livestock populations. During joint Fiji Government-WSPA field assessment, both local governance offices and farmers

indicated that animals were the only financial security for their families, all of whom will urgently need money to rebuild their homes, lives and provide for other needs such as school fees. Livestock also are needed to provide food security via milk production and as a direct meat source. Intervention focus, therefore, was placed on protecting these security assets of farmers by improving the animal welfare situation for surviving livestock.

The doubling flood events in Fiji caused the extensive grassy areas usually used for livestock grazing to be destroyed or significantly damaged, mostly covered by thick sediments and large debris. For many weeks, animals were not able to access appropriate amount of feed and were often limited to roadside grazing only. In response to this immediate need, WSPA was able to provide emergency feed for cattle and horses, determined as the most vulnerable to food shortages within the flood-affected areas in Fiji's Western Division.

Animals were often forced to stay in intermittent rain and persistent standing water on the ground for days to weeks following flooding. These combined with stresses from surviving the actual flooding event could directly contribute to stress-related vulnerabilities. This provided significantly increased risks to animals of contracting disease and prolonged suffering. Fiji's Western Division had limited veterinary resource capacity, only 6 paravets and one vehicle. WSPA provided funding and support for external veterinary capacity, which included providing a full-time field veterinarian during assessment and intervention implementation and constructing a field-day rotation during recovery efforts allowing paravets to balance covering vet clinic responsibilities and spending time in the field where they were urgently needed. Transport and access to vehicles was a limiting factor for the paravets and the Fiji Government was able to provide additional vehicle support during recovery efforts. The combined support from the two flooding events, WSPA additionally provided the Fiji Government with emergency veterinarian supplies for a targeted 37,000 cattle, horses, goats and sheep in the most severely flood-affected areas across Fiji's Western Division.

In this case, it should also be noted that animal response was successfully harmonized with humanitarian response work, specifically within the Food Security, Livelihoods, Health, and Shelter Clusters. To accomplish this, WSPA actively participated in regular UNOCHA lead Cluster Coordination meetings in Suva, Fiji. WSPA provided debriefs during these meetings to the various participating local and international humanitarian response partners. These discussions ensured appropriate linkages and aimed at proper alignment of the LEGS-based animal intervention strategy with concurrent humanitarian response and recovery strategies.

Source: Mr Steven Clegg, World Society for the Protection of Animals

#### **Case Study 4: WSPA strengthening the local capacities through animal welfare during West Bengal flood intervention in India**

During the West Bengal flood of 2011, a number of initiatives were undertaken to reduce impacts on livestock through adopting Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS) and Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) approaches. The

intervention was implemented in two phases i.e., Short Term Response (STR) and Long Term Response (LTR) to achieve the identified two main objectives:

1. To save the surviving livestock population and protect the livelihood of the community
2. To strengthen local capacities on livestock flood management for coping to future disasters.

The response was implemented by a Disaster Assessment and Response Team (DART) with representatives from the affected community, World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA), Department of Animal Resources Development, Inter Agency Group (IAG), local government and local NGO. Based on the Disaster Assessment and Needs Analysis (DANA), animal welfare needs were identified and implemented from June to December 2011 benefitting a total of 20,046 livestock and 6859 households in the most affected villages of West Bengal.

Through the Short Term Response (STR), concentrate feed supply, shelter materials were distributed and veterinary health camps were organized in the most flood affected areas to cater the immediate animal welfare needs of the flood affected animals. As part of contributing towards long term solutions in the disaster cycle , trainings to animal owners on livestock flood management and village veterinary disaster management plans were prepared to meet the following purpose:

1. Build community resilience to address the emergency needs of their animals
2. Provide socio economic village information for conduct of rapid disaster assessments
3. Act as a telephone directory to contact and mobilize emergency resources
4. Guide the community in evacuating their animals to safer areas through illustrations
5. Help the community in deliberating tasks during emergency to locally manage the situation
6. Guide the animal owners in availing government benefits and services during emergencies.

Through the trainings, 95% of animal owners gained knowledge on the management of animals in disaster, prior to the trainings only 65% were aware. The trainings showed a 30% of increase in awareness level and reinforcing the importance of animal welfare to rest of the participants.

In this flood intervention, the DART made optimum use of the existing government resources for communication, stocking materials, identifying beneficiaries and implementation of the activities. The local government acknowledged and thanked WSPA to help realize a response strategy to be adopted for responding to future disasters.

Source: Dr Ashish Sutar, World Society for the Protection of Animals

## Annex 2: Detailed editing suggestions

This annex provides comments in the format requested by LEGS for general edits to the LEGS first edition text. Where comments originate from a specific agency, this is prefixed to the comment (BH, DS, FAO, OIE, WSPA), otherwise they are the author's own comments.

The author submits these suggestions with the intent to identify as many approaches as possible to address the principal objective *'to provide detailed recommendations for the LEGS Steering Group regarding how animal welfare issues can be better represented in the revised edition of the LEGS handbook.'* It is felt that accepting too many of these suggestions would be inappropriate and give too strong a bias within the text towards animal welfare. Instead it is for the LEGS Steering Group to determine which suggestions they feel are most relevant and may be incorporated into a second edition of LEGS.

Specific Comments			
Chapter	Page	Line #	Comment [suggested additions/deletions/alterations, with reasons: max 250 words per comment]
'Praise for the book'	N/A	N/A	Four authorities have made positive comments on the usefulness of LEGS. A fifth person from an animal welfare organisation might also be included e.g. CEO WSPA, DG OIE or Chair of the OIE Animal Welfare Working Group
Intro	2	Who Should Use LEGS?	<u>DS</u> : As a set of internationally recognised standards, if LEGS were to include animal welfare as something that LEGS did cover, then LEGS would also be of direct relevance to animal welfare organisations and the animal welfare movement in general
Intro	3	5	LEGS has now been used in the Pacific, Asia and Latin America where it has equal relevance. LEGS should be satisfied that it has attained a truly global reach.
Intro	3	11	This paragraph could be split into two, the first focusing on 'human rights' as indicated, with a second to include animal welfare e.g. <i>'...disaster affected populations have a right to the protection of their livelihood. This does not simply mean keeping their livestock alive, but also in conditions of good welfare where they may be more productive and cause less potential for disease.'</i>
Intro	4	What LEGS Does Not Cover	<u>DS</u> : there is an opportunity for LEGS to say that it does include animal welfare. Just as the OIE has made animal welfare one of its key areas of work, recognising the clear linkages between animal health and animal welfare, the LEGS may do similarly
Intro	4	What LEGS Does Not Cover	<u>FAO</u> : Throughout the document, it should not be " <i>assumed</i> " that certain interventions have a positive impact on animals' welfare, unless this was specifically taken into account. I refer, for instance to pg. 4, where it is stated " <i>It is assumed that livelihoods-based interventions that aim to benefit people through improved animal health, animal shelter and animal feeding have positive impact on both people and the animals.</i> "; this could be valid in many cases, but not necessarily always, unless specific care is given also to the welfare of the animals
Intro	4	What LEGS Does Not Cover	<u>FAO</u> : More explicit indications could be given on the need to comply with existing, relevant recommendations on animal welfare, like the OIE ones, mentioned...
Intro	4	What LEGS Does Not Cover	With the OIE having adopted 11 international animal welfare standards at the annual World Assembly of Delegates representing 178 countries, there is clear evidence that animal welfare can be main-streamed and the LEGS could be referenced as such with little risk of loss of value or reputation, just as OIE standards have been
Intro	5	Key Indicators	Although not to be mentioned here, animal welfare indicators may be included in this area in subsequent chapters.
Intro	6	8	If a paragraph were to be included on animal welfare it would be best to follow the paragraph on the 'Technical chapters for different types of

			livestock interventions.’ There is a clear linkage, as pointed out by several individuals contacted, between these six technical chapters and Brambell’s ‘Five Freedoms’ mentioned previously. The author would be happy to draft (FOC) this if the SG agrees to the idea
1	8	12-19	This section although not directly stating animal welfare as an issue, recognises the importance of animals in both emergency relief and recovery, both of which can lead on to development (under the UN principle of Build Back Better).
1	8	19	Consider adding the sentence: “The health and welfare of livestock should be considered when any humanitarian intervention is looking to change the current / previous status of a communities’ relationship to their animals.”
1	8	24	Listing species for ‘livestock’ (already well referenced) may cause confusion to inexperienced LEGS practitioners. This section might give a broader definition of animals that may be included in LEGS from the outset if the goal is to translate LEGS into multiple languages. This is given as a general comment aside from that of animal welfare. Having observed the translation process of LEGS into two Asian languages, where possible, specific terminology given with (Western / North-South) connotations might be given more generically. A comment from <i>DS</i> also refers to dogs as being potentially included (see Appendix 2).
1	8	38	As well as considering livestock as ‘ <i>financial assets</i> ’ as they are currently being referenced in LEGS, being an integral part of the community their loss may additionally have an element of <i>psycho-social</i> impact as well as financial and for food-insecurity. Impacts upon their welfare may also have a psycho-social impact upon the community. We may consider the impact nursing injured / diseased animals post-disaster may have upon livestock <i>owners</i> ; as well as the decreased health having an ongoing loss in productivity.
1	9	Fig1.1	This figure could be updated to include animal welfare as aspects of culture, law and policy. In general in training this figure has been difficult to get across to delegates.
1	10	Box 1.2	As there is a box explaining the human-rights based approach, a similar box might be inserted to either: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Explain concepts of animal welfare</li> <li>2. Explain the difference between animal welfare and animal rights, noting that LEGS refers to animal welfare, and specifically not to animal rights. Reference to the ‘five freedoms’ could be drawn as a parallel reference easily here. The WSPA Universal Declaration on Animal Welfare might also be referenced. Again the author would be able to draft (FOC) this if the SG thought appropriate</li> </ol>
1	11-13		Animal welfare can be compromised in both slow and rapid onset disasters but through very different mechanisms as could be noted in the text with practical examples (this might help new LEGS practitioners gain practical evidence as to where animal welfare is of relevance to their work).
1	14	Cross-cutting Issues	<i>FAQ</i> : Animal welfare, which for FAO is a global common good per-se, could be indicated as a cross-cutting issue, among the ones named on page 14.
1	14	Cross-cutting Issues	It has already been proposed at international meetings (e.g. Aid International Development Forum - AIDF, Bangkok 2013) by the author that animals and their welfare might be considered as an important cross-cutting issue. When proposed at the above forum to an almost entirely humanitarian audience (with HIV/AIDS as a reference point) there was general agreement by the delegates. The LEGS might be a document to further pursue this.
2	20 (33,35)	12	A fourth assessment criterion might be considered in addition to the three already present: namely the animal’s welfare both in the current and near future circumstances. Giving this additional layer of assessment should allow LEGS practitioners a greater depth to their analysis of the current conditions of livestock present. A checklist could be added as per others in Appendix 2.1. Alternatively it could be added under Preliminary Assessments 2 and 3.
2	24 (37)	Table 2.1 (Table 2.5)	An additional / separate approach to incorporate animal welfare within the LEGS could be to include it in addition to the four technical options under section 2: protection of key livestock assets. Ensuring the welfare of

			livestock will implicitly aid in their protection and may offer broader options not currently considered under LEGS e.g. legislation (as although this is not likely to change in a rapid response phase of a disaster, may be relevant in recovery). However the author notes that this approach may disrupt the current LEGS format excessively from that of the present. A simpler approach could be to include a welfare methodology as a participatory assessment (Table 2.5)
2	39		As highlighted by the number of areas where Animal Welfare may be incorporated into Chapter two, equally a dedicated section on Animal Welfare reference resources could be added here, including general links such as to the 'FAO Animal Welfare Gateway' which may not be referenced elsewhere within the handbook text
3	45		As previously mentioned the opportunities to incorporate animal welfare into LEGS (2) are numerous. Animal welfare can be considered as a 'common standard' and either be incorporated into the eight current 'common standards' or detailed separately as a ninth standard. The most appropriate standards where it may be incorporated are 2, 5, 6 and 8
3	48	KI	Animal welfare is a key indicator being included in the initial assessment. Guidance notes would give reference to criteria for such assessment
3	53	KI	Animal welfare is included in M&E
3	55	KI	Livestock workers are familiar with Animal Welfare concepts and their relevance to livestock interventions
3	58	25	Animal welfare policy / legislation should also be included as an example where national / state policy may affect an intervention
4	63 (KI pg 71)		Although not as specific as the relation to other technical chapters, all of the 'five freedoms for animal welfare' are applicable to destocking when we consider removing an animal from a state of disaster (e.g. in slow onset flood, drought) to a place where it may resume its 'normal' behaviour. Whether this is discussed in this chapter is open to debate
4	63		Under 'Accelerated Livestock Take-off' reference should be made to the OIE standards for the transport of animals in Chapter 7 of the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Code
4	64 (KI pg 76)		Under 'Slaughter destocking' reference should be made to the OIE standards for the slaughter of animals (both for disease control and consumption) in Chapter 7 of the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Code
4	65	22	<i>FAO:</i> As a general principle, LEGS could take into account to pair the word "health" when referred to animals, with "welfare"
4	70	KI	An animal's state of welfare may also be considered as a KI in selecting the appropriate type of destocking being considered, given current options available
4	81	App.4.1	Animal welfare or OIE standards added to checklists
4	82	App.4.2	Animal welfare or OIE standards added to checklists
4	85	Refs	OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Codes added
5	89		A section stating the relevance of 'Freedom from pain, injury or disease by prevention or rapid diagnosis and treatment' as one of the 5 freedoms may be added at the start of this chapter
5	89	34	OIE and FAO websites are mentioned. If Animal Welfare is considered as part of LEGS, the FAO Animal Welfare Gateway website might be referenced here
5	100	6	It should be considered that in many countries veterinarians take a professional oath stating they will uphold certain principles of Animals' welfare under their care. This may be given in following guidance notes (3. Policy and legal factors).
6	115		A section stating the relevance of 'Freedom from hunger or thirst by ready access to fresh water and a diet to maintain full health and vigour' as one of the 5 freedoms may be added at the start of this chapter
6	126	KI	Upholding OIE standards for transportation of animals may be a KI
7	145		As above a section stating the relevance of 'Freedom from hunger or thirst by ready access to fresh water and a diet to maintain full health and vigour' as one of the 5 freedoms may be added at the start of this chapter
8	169		A section stating the relevance of 'Freedom from discomfort by providing an appropriate environment including shelter and a comfortable resting area' as one of the 5 freedoms may be added at the start of this chapter
8	178	KI	Depending upon the species, there may be relevant OIE minimum standards to follow here (as per Chapter 7 OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Code)



9	187 189	4 onwards	Again as with 'destocking' all 'five freedoms' can be considered here. If these basic freedoms cannot be met, then it is likely the animals to be restocked are likely to be underproductive. These five freedoms may even be considered as a 'checklist' in their own right. If 'freedom from disease' (at least equal to that of conditions pre-disaster) cannot be assured (e.g. due to damage to previously existing veterinary infrastructure or current disease spread by the rapid movement of large numbers of animals with endemic disease) then restocking should be carefully reconsidered as an option. Many times we have seen restocking attempted too early with serious welfare implications following, including animals' death.
9	194/5	Fig 9.1	Animal welfare assessment may be inserted as a filter
9	196	KI	Animal welfare (e.g. consider 5 freedoms being applied) may be included
Annex 1	242		A definition of 'Animal Welfare' may be given
Annex 2	245		WSPA would be very pleased to be added to the list...
Index	254		Animal welfare could be indexed