

Conference Report: “Invisible Livestock”

Highlighting the multiple contributions of livestock to livelihoods and national economies
The Brooke,
Monday 16th November, One Great George Street, London



From left to right: Karen Reed, The Brooke; Paul Wagstaff, Concern Worldwide; Walter Okello, University of Edinburgh

Event background

‘Invisible Workers’ (known internally as the [Livelihoods report](#)) is part of the Brooke’s ongoing policy and research agenda to increase knowledge of the linkages between working equine welfare and human welfare. It focuses on the economic contributions – both direct and indirect - of working horses, mules and donkeys to household incomes, and aims to highlight to policy makers and other development actors the multiple roles that these animals perform in various sectors and which benefit their owners financially. It does so by articulating their role as money earners and money savers.

Through available evidence, including Household Economy Approach (HEA) baselines carried out by the Brooke with the Food Economy Group (FEG) in India, Pakistan and Kenya, the report shows the critical and multiple economic contributions that working equine animals make to people’s livelihoods.

The Brooke aimed to highlight these multiple roles by convening a **one-day high-level policy conference in London on the 16th of November 2015.**

The event was titled ‘Invisible Livestock, Highlighting the multiple contributions of livestock to livelihoods and national economies’ and brought together international institutions such as the OIE,

livestock ministries and NGOs with a mandate and the capacity to take action on working equine welfare.

The event was led by Brooke UK's Advocacy team with support from the CEO, the Director of Animal Welfare and Sustainability, the Fundraising and Communications team and contributions from the Animal Welfare and Research Team, in particular its Head, Karen Reed.

Event objectives

1. Use evidence, and in particular, The Brooke's Livelihoods Report, to highlight the contribution of working animals to livelihoods and food security.
2. Put working animals on the international policy agenda ahead of the 2016 publication of the Committee on Food Security report on livestock.
3. Increase interest and awareness from international institutions, national governments, donors and other stakeholders in working equine animals as valuable livestock.

Attendees

The conference brochure, including the full guest list, is annexed to this report.

It was attended by a range of institutions, research bodies, NGOs and a representative from the Kenyan government, with high level representation on the panel from Derek Belton, OIE, Dr Kisa Juma Ngeiywa, Government of Kenya and Julius Holt, a Partner of the Food Economy Group. Delegates from AU-IBAR, the Government of Senegal and FAO were unable to attend due to unforeseen circumstances, but had provided prior input.

Participating organisations:

World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE)
Government of Kenya
The Brooke
World Animal Protection
Send a Cow
Concern Worldwide
Food Economy Group
The University of Edinburgh
UK Food Group
Vetnetwork UK
World Horse Welfare
The Donkey Sanctuary
Compassion in World Farming
Conservatives against fox hunting
EthicsandAnimal
British Horse Society

With apologies from:

AU-IBAR, European Commission, FAO, DFID, The Government of Senegal, Practical Action

Agenda

Invisible Livestock

**Highlighting the multiple contributions of livestock to livelihoods and national economies
16th of November 2015, One Great George Street, London**

9:30 Registration

10:00 Welcome address

Petra Ingram, CEO of The Brooke

10:10 **The roles and contributions of the multiple functions of livestock: evidence, policy and practice**

Richie Alford, Director of Research and Impact, Send a Cow

Julius Holt, Partner, Food Economy Group

Elisabeth van Delden, Secretary General, International Wool Textile Organisation

Dil Peeling, Director of Animal Welfare and Sustainability, The Brooke

11:00 Q&A

11:30 Coffee break

11:45 **Exploring the current policy environment for livestock's multiple dimensions: challenges and opportunities**

Ricardo Fajardo, Head of Global External Affairs, World Animal Protection

Derek Belton, Head of the International Trade Department, OIE

Ali Mohamed dit Séga Camara, Executive Secretary of the National Council for Food Security, Senegal

Kisa Juma Ngeiywa, Chief Veterinary Officer, State Department of Livestock of Kenya

12:30 Q&A

13:00 Lunch

14:00 **Moving towards a holistic understanding of livestock in policy and programming**

Paul Wagstaff, Agriculture Advisor, Concern Worldwide

Hiver Boussini, Animal Health Officer, AU-IBAR

Walter Okello, Animal Health Economist, University of Edinburgh

Karen Reed, Head of Animal Welfare and Research, The Brooke

14:45 Q&A

15:15 Concluding remarks

15:30 Coffee and refreshments

16:00 End of conference

Proceedings

Proceedings were opened and closed by Petra Ingram, CEO, and included three moderated panel discussions with a short presentation from each speaker and Q&A session.

SESSION 1

The roles and contributions of the multiple functions of livestock: evidence, policy and practice

Richie Alford, Director of Research and Impact, Send a Cow - moderator; Julius Holt, Partner, Food Economy Group; Dil Peeling, Director of Animal Welfare and Sustainability, The Brooke



From left to right: Richie Alford, Send a Cow; Dil Peeling, The Brooke; Julius Holt, Food Economy Group

Key Q&A discussion points / questions

- *Livestock's Long Shadow* (FAO report, 2006) challenged the contributions of livestock by focusing on emissions. However, there is plenty of evidence to refute this; in smallholder systems for example emissions are offset in many ways i.e. manure for compost.
- In the context of development, working equines are the “oil in the machinery” with the main institutional mechanisms being livestock policies. It was noted that development policy has been “dazzled by ramping up food production”; truly poverty-focused livestock development is increasingly less about technical inputs and more about people.
- A review by DIFD (1998)¹ of over 800 livestock development projects showed little evidence of them having a significant impact on the poor. The UNDP has criteria against which it

¹ “...in 1998, DFID undertook one of the most comprehensive reviews of livestock projects and programmes to date (LID, 1998). Over 800 livestock development projects were reviewed for their impact on the poor. Overall,

measures agricultural interventions: whether or not they support food consumption and decrease expenditure, whether it brings improvements in livelihoods. Hence the so-called “livestock revolution” forgets that food (meat) consumption is income elastic and the domain of the wealthy. Livestock is at the top of the list as a priority of the poor, even though it is not a top source of income. People are keep equines for livelihoods services, as non-marketed values of broader services are huge and never accounted for.

- Insights were shared on the HEA study areas with simple examples. If a wounded donkey cannot work, the wife cannot send the child to get water, she ends up having to do it herself, struggling up the hill twice a day. We need to see animal welfare as a development gain.
- Whilst there is a lot of evidence from the field, there remains a huge qualitative data gap. The Brooke is gradually filling part of this gap and continues to call on the research community to assist with this.
- The economic angle is one in many of this debate. Farmers know that their animals matter and also cherish them. Whilst the “language of policy” is economics, there are reasons to cherish animal welfare: as an ethical end in itself (not just a western preoccupation). Animals are assets; they are worth more than their “cash transactional value”.

SESSION 2:

Exploring the current policy environment for livestock’s multiple dimensions: challenges and opportunities

Ricardo Fajardo, Head of Global External Affairs, World Animal Protection – moderator; Derek Belton, Head of the International Trade Department, OIE; Kisa Juma Ngeiywa, Chief Veterinary Officer, State Department of Livestock of Kenya



Derek Belton, OIE

the authors concluded that the majority of livestock projects and programmes had not had a significant impact on the poor..." <http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/pdf/outputs/animalhealth/bsas-33-15.pdf>

Key Q&A discussion points / questions

- **Case study: Kenya.** There are many working animals in Kenya (including camels) which are included in livestock definitions and documented. The absence of accurate data remains a challenge in policy, extension services and for development partners. On top of this, implementation is poor. Donkeys are associated with poverty; their welfare is neglected despite them being crucial to survival. However, Kenya is engaged with OIE processes and has developed draft veterinary policy based on this. The government also work with partners like The Brooke; partnerships are required to address animal welfare concerns.



Ricardo Fajardo, World Animal Protection and Dr Kisa Juma Ngeiywa, CVO of Kenya

- **OIE.** The OIE has 180 member countries, from an initial 28 in 1924 (mostly in Europe and Latin America). Animal health and welfare is a “continuing journey”. The OIE’s strength is in its network and member countries. Its work is strongly science based, with well over 100 members being developing countries needing support to implement OIE standards. 15 standards have been adopted, the first adopted in 2005. Working equids are **the first** in a broader working animal programme, and were selected because of the technical expertise of the Brooke.
- At OIE level, one challenge is visibility. The OIE needs member states to support its ideas and vision. Economics matters but so do emotion and fear, especially when it comes to animal health and welfare. With BSE, fear, risk and paranoia ‘buttons were pushed’. As a result, they invested billions in a disease that has killed fewer people than salmonella every year. The humane slaughter of reptiles was put on the agenda because of Jane Birkin and the Birkin bag; visibility matters. Once recognition is achieved, an ad hoc group is set up and asked to produce standards. At least two rounds of member state comments take place.

Adoption is then by consensus. The next challenge is implementation; there is peer pressure on member states to conform to what the international community have agreed.

- OIE has no role in implementation but works around this by providing the PVS assistance programme; this audits veterinary services. It is desirable to have as many stakeholders as possible backing any one initiative; “animal welfare is not exclusively a developing country problem”.
- We are frequently asked to monetise economic and social contributions of working equids in order to make a successful case to policy makers. In Ethiopia, equid contributions are split between agriculture and transport. Where information is available, it needs to be put forward in a comprehensive way. There is an ongoing debate on the need for studies; many values are undocumented.
- The prospective OIE Code chapter of working equids is already having an impact, i.e. descriptions of what working equids do, although removed from the current version of the draft, have raised awareness. Peer pressure will be an important driver for member states. The OIE is learning from the older standards, which now require updating. ***The working equid standard is a model for future standards.***
- Is anti-microbial resistance something we leave to stakeholders like the OIE and Kenya, or should NGOs get involved? Governments provide a framework but all players are needed.

SESSION 3:

Moving towards a holistic understanding of livestock in policy and programming

Paul Wagstaff, Agriculture Advisor, Concern Worldwide – moderator; Walter Okello, Animal Health Economist, University of Edinburgh; Karen Reed, Head of Animal Welfare and Research, The Brooke



On the podium from left to right: Paul Wagstaff, Concern Worldwide; Walter Okello, University of Edinburgh; Karen Reed, The Brooke

Key Q&A discussion points / questions

- Livestock are multifunctional – Concern Worldwide has tended to ignore non-food functions historically; only 3 projects in 2011 looked at traction. Clearly something was missing and the approach to only helping the poorest of the poor (who usually do not own working animals, but may well use them) was short-sighted. Milk and animal sourced foods are very nutrient-rich and important for child nutrition. However, evidence suggested that the poor often saved these products instead of consuming them. They saw a strong correlation between child nutrition and access to a donkey. Can we find more correlations like these? Concern need to revisit their approach to “invisible livestock”. Nutrition included through the "Scaling up Nutrition initiative (SUN)" provides a strong opportunity to push for greater recognition of working livestock.
- Poor equine health and welfare is a complex problem, stemming from poverty, social inequity, ecological degradation and very weak animal health systems. It is therefore difficult to solve this complex area. Only by working together, and dissecting the issues into manageable challenges, can we tackle this. We need to have a roadmap, a global alliance or partnership.
- We should consider how to best promote evidence. Peer review data or high level conferences like this? How is scientific evidence most effectively communicated / easily received?
- The ‘right data’ defines the questions that are being asked by policy makers. Enough evidence exists to show that this is a real issue.
- Evidence is critical, but so are messages from us as a community. Sectors are already coming together (for example, cross sector working groups on brick kilns).
- We are not starting afresh with the issue; working animals are already in the Sendai framework. The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and governments are bought into animal welfare as a concept (Mexico, India, and Costa Rica). Evidence keeps the momentum going.
- The African Union agrees a common position on OIE standards. However, listening to the voice of the people at a grassroots level is key; we need to ensure that the smallholder is not left behind. We also to engage industry if we are to tackle this collectively.

Event outcomes

Both external feedback on the event concept prior to the conference and feedback received from participants following the event were extremely positive. There was strong agreement from participants on the timeliness of the conference, as well as the crucial opportunity it created for cross-sectoral action to help both working livestock and the people who depend on it for their livelihoods.

The Brooke noted that it would host future fora to continue this integrated policy debate, bringing together stakeholders from both the human development and the animal welfare sector. Thanks to discussions before and during the conference, partnership discussions are progressing with organisations from the animal welfare and human development sectors.