



Original: English  
June 2008

## REPORT OF THE SEVENTH MEETING OF THE OIE WORKING GROUP ON ANIMAL WELFARE

Paris, 17–19 June 2008

The OIE Working Group on Animal Welfare held its seventh meeting at the OIE Headquarters in Paris on 17-19 June 2008.

The members of the Working Group and other participants are listed in [Appendix A](#). The Agenda adopted is given in [Appendix B](#). Dr D. Bayvel chaired the meeting.

Dr B. Vallat, Director General of the OIE, welcomed the members of the Working Group congratulated them on work undertaken to date and thanked them for agreeing to continue working on this important mandate of the OIE.

Dr Vallat recommended that the priorities of the AWWG should be to finalise the work that is under way, including the control of stray dog populations, laboratory animal welfare, and animal welfare in livestock production systems. In terms of new topics, Dr Vallat considered that it would be timely to address the issue of harvesting wildlife, given that there are current problems with international trade in products harvested from wild animals, such as fur seals.

Dr Vallat also noted the good progress being made in organising the 2<sup>nd</sup> OIE Global Animal Welfare Conference in Cairo, which will be followed by a high level meeting on Avian Influenza that will be held in Egypt at Sharm El-Sheik.

Dr Vallat advised the members of the AWWG regarding his concerns about the recently announced FAO expert meeting and open forum on animal welfare, to be held 3 weeks prior the OIE Global Animal Welfare conference. In particular, Dr Vallat did not accept the proposed objective of reviewing standards, as the role of FAO could be to assist member countries in meeting the OIE standards, not to review the standards democratically adopted by OIE Members. Dr Vallat advised that he would be writing formally to the FAO emphasising his concerns. Dr Fraser subsequently clarified that the review of standards planned for this meeting simply meant that participants would be made aware of standards and their content as background to identifying how FAO could help member countries comply with the standards; reviewing did not imply evaluate or suggest changes to the standards as they were seen as an OIE mandate. Dr Gavinelli commented that it will be necessary to clarify the different roles of international organisations working on animal welfare.

Dr Vallat welcome Dr Molomo, Delegate of Lesotho, as the new Member of this WG replacing Dr Walter Masiga. Dr Vallat thanked Dr Masiga for his much appreciated input to the AWWG during the past six years.

## **1. AWWG 6th Meeting Report and Action Minutes**

Members noted the report. Dr Bayvel updated the action list that had been produced for review at teleconferences with the OIE Central Bureau. It was decided to continue to hold teleconferences and to share the record with members of the AWWG. It was also agreed to develop a similar list of actions agreed at this meeting.

Due to the number of internationally significant animal welfare developments there was a feeling in the group that more than one meeting a year is needed. It was proposed that the AWWG should hold a side meeting at the Cairo Conference, noting that it may not be possible for OIE Headquarters staff to attend this meeting, due to conference commitments. Another possible forum for a side meeting of the AWWG is the Forum on Animal Welfare and Trade to be organised in Brussels by the European Commission and other stakeholders in January 2009. This idea was supported by Drs Wilkins and Gavinelli.

Dr Wilkins proposed that other members of the AWWG consider participating in the routine teleconferences, with a focus on those that take place before Code Commission meetings.

Dr Rahman proposed to develop a summary document providing an update on the animal welfare activities at the OIE. This document could be used for public communication purposes. Dr Bayvel proposed that the OIE Bulletin could also be used as a mechanism to distribute this information. He and Dr Rahman will explore possibilities with the OIE Publications Department.

Dr Wilkins confirmed that it had been decided not to proceed with the proposed WSPA – ISAE scientific symposium planned as a side meeting to the OIE Conference in Cairo due to problems with the venue.

Dr Kahn informed members that the Director General had agreed to write the foreword for the “Guide to Good Animal Welfare Practice in Milk Production” to be published later this year by the International Dairy Federation. She also mentioned that the OIE is monitoring the work of EFSA on Animal Welfare Risk Analysis and welfare indicators but is not actively working on these issues.

## **2. OIE General Session 2008**

Dr Bayvel provided feedback to the WG on his presentation and the discussion that had taken place during the 76<sup>th</sup> General Session in May (76 GS).

### **2.1. Resolution on Animal Welfare**

The Animal Welfare Resolution was adopted by consensus, with little discussion.

### **2.2. MOUs**

Two new Agreements relevant to animal welfare were adopted at 76 GS, one with the International Council of Laboratory Animal Science (ICLAS) and one with the International Poultry Council (IPC).

### **2.3. IATA Agreement**

Dr Stuardo informed members that the proposed Agreement with the International Air Transport Association (IATA) was approved by the International Committee. It is expected that this Agreement will be ratified by the IATA Board in 2009. Dr Gavinelli highlighted the importance of this Agreement due to the volume of animals transported internationally by air and the important investments involved to develop the IATA guidelines.

### **2.4. Updated five appendices on Animal Welfare in the Terrestrial Animal Health Code**

Dr Stuardo advised that few changes had been made to these appendices. It is proposed that the AWWG analyse a proposal from the European Union concerning the inclusion of a third method for killing poultry by the use of gas.

Dr Gavinelli explained that the proposed method is based on a EFSA Opinion and an impact assessment study conducted by the European Commission (EC), which for the purposes of ensuring better conditions for the welfare of the animals supported the use of this method under specified conditions.

At the request of Professor Fraser, the AWWG held a teleconference with an expert from the Animal Welfare Unit of the Commission. Dr. Gavinelli undertook to submit to the AWWG new information which will clarify the questions raised by Dr. Fraser on these killing method.

Dr. Beaumont informed the WG that in previous discussions groups in France initiated by the government, there had been some pressure to introduce labelling which identified products produced according to specific slaughter methods. He stated that industry has concerns about this possible development due the potential risks of promoting tensions between communities and urged the OIE to provide more detailed guidelines covering these methods of slaughter.

## **2.5. Review of the existing OIE guidelines Slaughter, Killing and Transport of Poultry.**

Dr. Wilkins presented a document containing an analysis of the gaps. There needs to be an update on the existing guidelines on poultry transport, slaughter and killing for disease control. In conclusion several aspects need to be reviewed.

Professor Fraser recommended revision of the sections covering the analysis of stunning methods and associated animal welfare issues, including animal welfare consequences of bleeding out.

It was agreed to seek input from recognised international experts on these issues along with scientific comment on foam based techniques for depopulation. It was subsequently agreed that Drs Wilkins and Fraser will propose appropriate experts to the Central Bureau. The Central Bureau will then coordinate electronic consultation.

## **2.6. Definition of animal welfare – decision taken at 76 GS**

Dr Thiermann explained the modification proposed at 76 GS, which had resulted from concerns raised by several OIE Regions at the meeting of the OIE Administrative Commission. In consultation with the International Trade Department, a revised version was developed and adopted by the International Committee.

## **2.7. OIE Resolution on Private Standards**

Dr. Bayvel advised that a technical item on private standards was discussed at 76 GS and the International Committee adopted Resolution N° XXXII on the “Implications of private standards in international trade of animals and animal products”.

Dr. Wilkins suggested that if the OIE took a strong position against private animal welfare standards, this could be seen in a negative light by some NGOs, which have been working for a long time with private assurance schemes.

Dr. Kahn clarified that the OIE is primarily concerned with private standards that conflict with official standards of the OIE.

The WG agreed to monitor further developments on this issue.

## **2.8. Welfare of animals produced using biotechnological interventions**

Dr Wilkins expressed the interest of NGOs in the welfare of animals produced using biotechnology interventions and raised concerns that the AWWG had not been consulted in the development of the “Animal Health Guideline for Transgenic Animals”.

It was generally agreed that there are animal welfare issues relating to the production of animals using biotechnology interventions, including cloning. While the stated scope of the document is limited to animal health, some comments on animal welfare are included. Dr Wilkins noted that there are also references to fish in the document.

Dr Kahn outlined the current priorities of the OIE biotechnology work program, which include the animal health and food safety implications of the use of r-DNA vaccines. The AWWG recommended that the animal welfare aspects of the use of biotechnology to produce animals should be addressed by the OIE in future.

## **2.9. World Animal Health and Welfare Fund (World Fund)**

Dr Wilkins asked for clarification regarding the possibility that external organisations, including NGOs, could apply for resources from the fund to conduct projects relevant to the OIE.

Dr Kahn clarified that the contributors of resources to the World Fund generally specify the content of projects they wish to support. To date the sole donor to the World Fund financing Animal Welfare activities is the European Commission, and funding to external organisations, including NGOs is not eligible in this context. However, should new resources be supplied specifying eligibility of projects from external organisations, including NGOs, then the possible beneficiaries could, in principle, apply to access such funds. This is not foreseen in the near future.

Dr Gavinelli recalled that the Community has supported OIE initiatives for animal welfare through the financing of the Fund with an amount of 100.000 € and in the future the Community foresees to allocate a similar amount for the same purposes.

## **2.10. Other issues raised**

Dr Wilkins thanked Dr Vallat for allowing ICFAW to host a reception during 76 GS to present the campaign “ Handle with Care” and the book ‘Long Distance Transport and Welfare of Farm Animals’.

## **3. Second Global Conference on Animal Welfare (Cairo 2008)**

### **3.1. Organisation update**

Dr Aidaros advised the AWWG about the local arrangements in Cairo.

### **3.2. Programme and speakers**

Dr Stuardo informed participants that the final programme was available on the conference website and that registration had been launched in the week before the 76 GS.

### **3.3. Abstract and posters received**

Dr Stuardo noted that the review of abstracts has been undertaken by the Members of the Scientific Committee and that the OIE expects to finalise this process by the end of July. He confirmed that some 15 posters had been received to date.

Dr Stuardo also advised that a Questionnaire covering the implementation of the OIE animal welfare standards is being finalised for distribution to OIE Members. Dr Kahn will present an analysis of the responses to the Questionnaire at the Conference in Cairo.

### **3.4. Implementation of OIE standards – brainstorming session on Members’ needs**

Professor Fraser requested input to the FAO Expert Meeting proposed to take place in September. One suggestion was for the FAO to provide advice to countries on national legislation to support the implementation of the OIE standards.

## **4. Work of the Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commissions**

### **4.1. Update on aquatic animal welfare standards. Report of the March 2008 meeting of the Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission**

Professor Hastein commented on the revised “Introduction to Guidelines for the Welfare of Farmed Fish”, which was adopted at the 76 GS, noting the removal of the reference to the “3 Rs”. Professor Hastein commented that fish are used widely in experiments, e.g. for the development of vaccines, so the “3Rs” are relevant and should be supported, as these principles are supported for terrestrial animals.

Dr Bayvel confirmed that the Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission had taken a decision to restrict the scope of their current text on animal welfare to farmed fish, as recommended by the Animal Welfare Working Group in 2007

The new Appendix adopted at 76 GS is in [Appendix C](#).

### **4.2. Next steps in the development of a text on aquatic animal welfare**

Dr. Stuardo indicated that the Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission is working to develop a suitable text on killing and transport of farmed fish, which will be further discussed at the Commission’s next meeting. Dr Kahn indicated that the President of the Commission had confirmed the intention to continue working on fish welfare texts with a view to adoption at the General Session 2009. The WG asked for the opportunity to review the proposal of the Commission before their adoption by the International Committee.

## **5. Report of the *ad hoc* Group on Laboratory Animal Welfare**

### **5.1. First draft report**

Dr Bayvel summarised the findings of the *ad hoc* Group, noting that their work was based on the terms of reference presented in the “issues and options” paper.

Dr Gavinelli commented that this is a sensitive topic in the EU and that it is important for the OIE to produce clear and positive communication regarding this new set of guidelines. The OIE guidelines should in particular become a useful tool in this area for less developed countries where there is little support for introducing welfare standards.

Dr Bayvel confirmed that and it was seen as more useful for developing countries to use the term Animal Care and Use Committees as opposed to Animal Ethic Committees. There was some debate about whether a statistician should be included in committees. This had been debated in the *ad hoc* Group but was not seen as feasible for all countries.

Dr Beaumont suggested that there should still be consistency in the animal welfare guidelines regardless of whether animals were used in livestock production or in laboratory situations.

### **5.2. Next steps**

The AWWG commended the report of the *ad hoc* Group and will review the report of the second meeting of this *ad hoc* Group, with the intention of securing a prompt finalisation of the work.

## 6. Report of the *ad hoc* Group on Animal Welfare in Livestock Production Systems

### 6.1. First draft document

Dr Kahn gave an update on the *ad hoc* Group on Animal Welfare in Livestock Production Systems. Dr Kahn noted that the Group did excellent work and found some areas in the discussion paper may need to be further explained to OIE Delegates, such as the difference between “design criteria” and “outcome based criteria”. The group contained a good balance of representation, including various production sectors and OIE regions.

Dr Kahn indicated that the *ad hoc* Group defined two priority areas in which the OIE should start developing Animal Welfare Guidelines for Livestock. These were broiler chickens and beef cattle.

Dr Gavinelli suggested that the priorities should also be related to those species where the standards may be easily implemented and less controversial. This may increase future success when other species and systems are approached

Dr. Thierman suggested that the next step would be to convene an expert *ad hoc* Group on broiler chickens and to progress this issue before moving on to other areas.

Dr. Olsen found that the working group had made a good job even though it was still a little difficult to see the clear interface between “design criteria” and “outcome based criteria”. Dr. Olsen supported that broilers might be the first area to establish an expert group as broilers also is the area with most knowledge on “outcome based criteria”. Therefore, the experience from such a working group also might be useful in relation to coming working groups in other areas.

Dr Kahn informed the group that the *ad hoc* Group stated the OIE should undertake a review of published scientific literature on animal based and resource based criteria relevant to each guideline proposed for development, and the relationships of affective states and animal behaviour to animal health. This review will be conducted by Dr Jennings and Dr Mukakanamugire, interns from New Zealand and Rwanda respectively, at the International Trade Department.

The working group noted the large volume of scientific literature on dairy cattle in housed or partially housed systems, compared to beef cattle. It will seek advice from the *ad hoc* group on whether beef cattle or housed or partially housed dairy cattle should be the second priority area after meat chickens. The forthcoming availability of a comprehensive EFSA Report on Dairy Cattle Welfare was confirmed by Dr. Gavinelli.

### 6.2. Next steps

Dr. Bayvel summarised that the WG considers that a specific *ad hoc* Group on broiler chickens should be convened as the next step to develop OIE Guidelines on animal welfare in Livestock production Systems and that the *ad hoc* Group should be congratulated on the report.

The Report of the first *ad hoc* Group meeting to be presented to the Code Commission appears in the WG Report as [Appendix J](#).

## 7. Draft Guidelines on Dog Population Control

### 7.1. Response to Member comments on the Draft Guidelines on Dog Population Control

The WG reviewed the latest version of the Guidelines, which included Member comments sent to the last Code Commission meeting.

Dr. Bayvel informed the group that Dr Wilkins had done a lot of work on the Draft Guidelines on Dog Population and thanked him on behalf of the group. The WG revised the modified draft prepared by Dr Wilkins and introduced some modifications based on comments of WG members.

Dr Aidaros indicated that that the proposed guidelines well exceed the capacity and resources of most the OIE Members. The size of the stray dog problem varies significantly, with some countries having several thousand stray dogs and sufficient resources and some having millions of stray dogs and minimal resources, no legislation and high risk of zoonotic diseases. The difference is primarily between developed and developing countries.

Dr Rahman and Dr Aidaros stressed the importance of addressing the problems of developing countries concerning stray dog control guidelines. Dr Rahman explained the rabies situation on the Asian Subcontinent and parts of the Middle East and East Asia and the need to address dog population control programs keeping in mind the limitations of some countries.

The WG recommended that the modified version of the Draft be presented to the Code Commission at its next meeting with a view to adoption at the 2009 General Session and agreed that further steps should be taken to ensure good communication on the Draft Guidelines and to encourage OIE Members, especially developing countries, to submit comments.

The Draft Guidelines are in the WG Report at [Appendix K](#).

## **8. Other business**

### **8.1. WSPA Concepts on Animal Welfare ( Dr Wilkins presentation)**

Dr Wilkins presented the latest version of the WSPA educational DVD “Concepts in Animal Welfare”, jointly prepared by WSPA and the University of Bristol. This syllabus was originally produced in 2003 as an aid in teaching animal welfare to veterinary students. He advised that three new Modules were added in the latest version, covering environmental enrichment; welfare of fish; and food animal welfare. Dr Wilkins asked AWWG members to send comments on this new version to Mrs Jasmijn de Boo (jasmijndeboo@wspa.org.uk).

Dr Bayvel indicated that this DVD has received international recognition for its quality and is a very useful resource for future veterinarians.

### **8.2. FAWC Working group on Economics of Farm Animal Welfare and Animal Welfare Policy Instruments - briefing from UK delegation.**

Dr Bayvel welcomed Dr M. Appelby and Professor S. Edwards from the UK Farm Animal Welfare Council who wished to provide an update to the Working Group on the FAWC’s work on Economics of Farm Animal Welfare.

After a brief introduction to the FAWC, Professor Edwards explained the objectives of the FAWC Working Groups, particularly the one dealing with the economics of farm animal welfare. This Group will report on the micro and macroeconomic implications of implementing animal welfare standards at the farm level. Professor Edwards informed the WG that the draft report of the FAWC Working Group would be ready in 6-12 months. She anticipated further contact with the OIE in the interim

Dr Thierman noted it will take a long time to gain OIE Members’ support for animal welfare standards that are not directly related to animal health in light of the wide variety of animal production situations in the 172 OIE Members. Support for the implementation of animal welfare standards may be more related to consumer opinion than WTO/legal issues, at least in the short term.

Dr Gavinelli commented that the WTO may well be called upon to address animal welfare issues e.g. regarding trade in seal products, and that there are likely to be several developments of international significance in the next few months.

Dr Rahman reminded the Working Group members that developing countries rely on the OIE for guidance on animal health and welfare standards.

The WG also discussed marketplace forces that are creating impetus to implement animal welfare standards.

### **8.3. OIE Animal Welfare Collaborating Centres (University of Valdivia - Chile)**

Dr Gavinelli informed working group members of EU support for an application from the University of Valdivia, Chile in association with an institute from Uruguay to become an OIE Collaborating Centre on Animal Welfare.<sup>1</sup>

Dr Fraser, referring to the criteria for accepting OIE Collaborating Centres, felt that the application was appropriate. He noted that there are several well recognised scientists involved in this centre and a history of involvement over a number of years. Their speciality is primarily the handling and transport of livestock. He recommended it may be useful to ask for specification of their intended areas of activities, as part of the OIE acceptance process.

Dr Stuardo mentioned that there had been regional efforts to develop a consortium of animal welfare centres in South America and that this activity was ongoing.

Dr Bayvel advised that OIE Members had indicated strong support and interest in animal welfare collaborating centres when this information was presented as a Technical Item at 75 GS .

Centres must produce a brief annual report to the Director General, that is circulated to OIE Members. Working group members requested to see a copy of the annual reports of collaborating centres on animal welfare, which could be a standing agenda item for the annual meetings.

Dr Fraser raised concerns that many of the major international animal welfare centres are not likely to apply for collaborating centre recognition. Dr Bayvel suggested that this may be due to institutional policy decisions relating to cost/benefits. Some minor centres may be seeking prestige whereas major ones are not. He noted the motivation for the animal welfare collaborating centre in New Zealand was to contribute to international discussions and standard setting activities of the OIE.

The Working Group supported the application of the University of Valdivia with a special emphasis on animal handling and transport in South America.

The Central Bureau was asked to provide copies of the annual reports of the animal welfare collaborating centres for consideration at the annual meeting of the Working Group .

### **8.4. Animal Welfare aspects of the killing and skinning of seals - Scientific Opinion of the EFSA Panel on Animal Health and Welfare**

Dr Gavinelli provided an update on the background to, and content of, the December 2007 EFSA opinion on the killing and skinning of seals. Dr Hastein tabled a Norwegian document, which had been submitted as an input to the EFSA review.

---

<sup>1</sup> The OIE is Also in discussion with the Delegate of Uruguay for a possible consortium between the University of Valdivia and an Institute from Uruguay.

After discussion, and in view of Dr Vallat's request, it was agreed that the Working Group would develop an Issues, Options and Recommendations paper relating to possible work of the OIE in relation to wildlife and feral animals harvesting and culling for sanitary /environmental purposes.

Dr Wilkins agreed to prepare a first draft paper, by the end of August, utilising material already prepared by the OIE Animal Welfare Working Group. This draft will be circulated to Drs Fraser, Gavinelli and Bayvel prior to circulation for comment to all group members and finalisation by early November.

#### **8.5. OIE Regional Strategies for animal welfare (Regional Strategy Asia, the Far-East and Oceania and other initiatives)**

The development in the last nine months of a draft Regional Animal Welfare Strategy for the Asia, Far East and Oceania Region was commended and seen as a useful model for other OIE Regions.

To ensure appropriate involvement of all Regional Commissions in supporting implementation of the OIE animal welfare standards and, more generally, contributing to the OIE's international leadership role, the Working Group recommended the following:

- The final version of the Regional Animal Welfare Strategy for Asia the Far East and Oceania be distributed to all OIE Regional Commissions.
- That Regional Commissions be encouraged to include animal welfare as a standing agenda item in Regional Commission conferences.
- That Regional Commissions be asked to produce status reports on the implementation of the OIE animal welfare standards in their regions for consideration at Working Group meetings.

#### **8.6 Operational procedures for AWWG**

Following a request from the International Dairy Federation at 76 GS, the Working Group established a new protocol of sending the Meeting Agenda and working documents in advance. The Working Group agreed to send the Draft Agenda four weeks before the meeting and the working documents no later than three weeks before the meeting.

#### **8.7. Outcomes of the Brussels Forum on Animal Welfare and Trade - April 2008**

Dr Gavinelli reported on the Forum on Animal Welfare and Trade organised by the EU Commission (DG Health and Consumer and DG Trade), WSPA and Eurogroup for Animal Welfare, which was attended by representatives of the major organisations (public and private) and key scientists. The main conclusions of the forum included the call by participants for further discussions, and the organisation of a Conference in Brussels in January 2009 to provide for examination and consolidation of strategies on trade and animal welfare.

The integration of animal welfare with other issues, such as protection of the environment and sustainable agricultural production is seen as an important development for trade and marketing of animal products in developed countries.

The future involvement of the WTO in animal welfare was also discussed. The OIE is recognised for its international leadership and its role in the development of animal welfare standards. FAO support for capacity development to enable countries to implement the OIE standards has also been identified by the participants as an important issue. It will be important to take advantage of synergies between the relevant international organisations. The OIE Conference in Cairo will be an important forum to clarify roles and responsibilities and to ensure coordination of activities.

### **8.8. OIE Technical Series Vol. 10, 2008**

Dr Bayvel informed members on progress with the publication of the OIE Technical Series Vol. 10, 2008 on the Scientific Assessment and Management of Animal Pain. He confirmed that the publication, in English, should be available for distribution at the Cairo conference. French and Spanish versions will follow.

### **8.9. Animal Welfare Statement of the International Federation of Agriculture Producers**

Dr. Olsen thanked on behalf of IFAP for a good collaboration during the last year including Dr Vallat's presence and presentation at the 38th World Farmers' Congress in Warsaw, Poland in the beginning of June 2008.

Dr Olsen, on behalf of IFAP presented the document 'Statement by the Farmers of the World on Animal Welfare' and distributed copies to members. Dr. Olsen summarised the document and stated that minimum standards should be internationally applicable. IFAP strongly supports the work of the OIE, particularly the OIE's science based approach to animal welfare. Dr Olsen indicated that private standards may offer a pathway to raise the profile of animal welfare. It is important that implementation of animal welfare standards not adversely affect production, and, in extreme circumstance cause industries to cease operation. Lastly Dr. Olsen expressed appreciation at being included in the AWWG as the industry member for 2008.

Dr Bayvel and other Members welcomed the support from IFAP and commended the document. Dr Bayvel recalled that one criticism of the 2004 OIE welfare conference was the absence of a producer voice, which has been addressed in the planning for the Cairo Conference by the IFAP representation.

On a question regarding whether better animal welfare was without extra costs for the farmers Dr. Olsen answered that if all the world have the same minimum standards then the costs associated with securing those standards might be minimized but unless there is a price premium for additional animal welfare standards their still might be extra costs for the farmers to such demands.

The IFAP document will be included in the final report of the meeting as Appendix L.

### **8.10. Dr Walter Masiga**

It was agreed that the OIE would write to Dr Masiga to formally thank him for his significant contribution to the Working Group since its establishment in 2001

## **9. Work programme 2009**

The contents of the 2009 Work Programme was discussed and it was agreed that Dr Bayvel and the Central Bureau would circulate a draft work programme prior to the end of the year.

## **10. Next Meeting**

It was agreed that the next meeting of the Working Group will be held from 30 June to 2 July, 2009.

---

.../Appendices

**7<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE OIE WORKING GROUP ON ANIMAL WELFARE****Paris, 17–19 June 2008****List of participants****MEMBERS OF THE OIE WORKING GROUP**

---

**Dr David Bayvel (Chair)**

Director Animal Welfare  
MAF Biosecurity NZ  
Box 2526  
Wellington  
NEW ZEALAND  
Tel.: (64-4) 894 03661  
Fax: (64-4) 894 0747  
E-mail: [bayveld@maf.govt.nz](mailto:bayveld@maf.govt.nz)

**Prof. Hassan Aidaros**

Professor of Hygiene and Preventive  
Medicine. Faculty of Veterinary Medicine  
Banha Univ.  
5 Mossadak st  
12311 Dokki  
Cairo  
EGYPT  
Tel.: (2012) 218 5166  
E-mail: [Haidaros@netscape.net](mailto:Haidaros@netscape.net)

**Prof. David Fraser**

Professor and Chair in Animal Welfare  
Faculty of Agricultural Sciences and  
Centre for Applied Ethics  
University of British Columbia  
2357 Main Mall-Suite 248  
Vancouver V6T 1Z4  
CANADA  
Tel.: (1-604) 822 2040  
Fax.: (1-604) 822 4400  
E-mail: [dfraser@interchg.ubc.ca](mailto:dfraser@interchg.ubc.ca)

**Dr Andrea Gavinelli**

Acting Head of Unit  
European Commission  
Directorate General Health and  
Consumer  
Unit D5 Animal Welfare  
Rue Froissart 101 – 61168  
1040 Brussels  
BELGIUM  
Tel.: +32.2.2966426  
GSM: +32.498.981137  
E-mail: [Andrea.Gavinelli@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Andrea.Gavinelli@ec.europa.eu)

**Prof. Dr Tore Håstein**

Past President of the OIE Fish  
Diseases Commission  
National Veterinary Institute  
Ullevålsveien 68  
P.O. Box 8156 Dep.  
0033 Oslo  
NORWAY  
Tel.: (47-23) 21 61 50  
Fax: (47-23) 21 60 01  
E-mail: [tore.hastein@vetinst.no](mailto:tore.hastein@vetinst.no)

**Dr Marosi Molomo**

Director of Livestock Services  
Department of Livestock Services  
Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security  
P/A A 82  
Maseru 100  
LESOTHO  
Tel.: (266) 22317284/22324843  
Fax: (266) 22311500  
E-mail: [marosi\\_molomo@yahoo.com](mailto:marosi_molomo@yahoo.com)

**Dr Sira Abdul Rahman**

Retd. Dean Bangalore Veterinary College  
No 123, 7<sup>th</sup> B Main Road  
4th Block(West)  
Jayanagar, Bangalore 560 011  
INDIA  
Tel.: (91-80) 6532168  
Fax: (91-80) 6635210  
E-mail: [shireen@blr.vsnl.net.in](mailto:shireen@blr.vsnl.net.in)

**Dr David Wilkins**

Secretary  
ICFAW  
c/o WSPA, 89, Albert Embankment  
London SE1 7TP  
UNITED KINGDOM  
Tel.: (44) 1243 585011  
Fax: (44) 1243 585011  
Email: [wilkinsvet@btinternet.com](mailto:wilkinsvet@btinternet.com)

**Dr Per Olsen**

Chief veterinary adviser  
Danish Agricultural Council  
Axeltorv 3  
DK-1609 Copenhagen V  
DENMARK  
Tel.: +45 33 39 42 81  
Fax: + 45 33 39 41 50  
E-mail: [pol@agriculture.dk](mailto:pol@agriculture.dk)

Appendix A (contd)**OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

---

**Dr Alex Thiermann**

President of the Terrestrial Animal Health  
Standards Commission  
OIE  
12, rue de Prony  
75017 Paris  
FRANCE  
Tel.: 33-(0)1 44 15 18 69  
Fax: 33-(0)1 42 67 09 87  
E-mail: [a.thiermann@oie.int](mailto:a.thiermann@oie.int)

**Dr Nils Beaumont**

INTERBEV –  
Relations internationales  
Maison Nationale des Eleveurs  
149, rue de Bercy  
75595 Paris cedex 12  
FRANCE  
Tel.: +33 6 8608 4369  
E-mail: [n.beaumont@interbev.asso.fr](mailto:n.beaumont@interbev.asso.fr)

**Dr Laura Kulkas**

Chair of the International Dairy Federation  
Standing Committee on Animal Health  
DVM Herd health veterinarian  
Valio  
P.O.B. 10  
FI - 00039 Valio  
FINLAND  
Tel.: +358 50 3840163  
Fax: +358 10381 2385  
E-mail: [laura.kulkas@valio.fi](mailto:laura.kulkas@valio.fi)

**OIE HEADQUARTERS**

---

**Dr Bernard Vallat**

Director General  
12, rue de Prony  
75017 Paris  
FRANCE  
Tel.: 33 - (0)1 44 15 18 88  
Fax: 33 - (0)1 42 67 09 87  
E-mail: [oie@oie.int](mailto:oie@oie.int)

**Dr Sarah Kahn**

Head of Department  
International Trade Department  
E-mail: [s.kahn@oie.int](mailto:s.kahn@oie.int)

**Dr Leopoldo Stuardo**

Deputy Head  
International Trade Department  
E-mail: [l.stuardo@oie.int](mailto:l.stuardo@oie.int)

**Dr Alice Mukakanamugire**

Intern  
International Trade Department  
E-mail: [a.mukakanamugire@oie.int](mailto:a.mukakanamugire@oie.int)

**Dr Rebecca Jennings**

Intern  
International Trade Department  
E-mail: [r.jennings@oie.int](mailto:r.jennings@oie.int)

**7<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE OIE WORKING GROUP ON ANIMAL WELFARE****Paris, 17–19 September 2008**

---

**Adopted Agenda****Introduction and priorities / Dr B Vallat****Introduction of participants / Dr D Bayvel****Administrative arrangements / Dr S Kahn****Adoption of the agenda****1. AWWG 6th Meeting Report and Action Minutes****2. OIE General Session 2008 outcomes**

- Resolution on Animal Welfare
- MOUs
- IATA Agreement
- Updated five appendices on Animal Welfare in the Terrestrial Animal Health Code
- Review of the existing OIE guidelines Slaughter, Killing and Transport of Poultry. (Dr Wilkins document)
- Definition of animal welfare – decision taken in GS 2008
- OIE Resolution on Private Standards
- Welfare of animals produced using biotechnology interventions
- World Animal Health and Welfare Fund
- other issues raised

**3. Second Global Conference on Animal Welfare (Cairo 2008)**

- Organisation update
- Program and speakers
- Abstract and posters received
- Implementation of OIE standards – brainstorming session on Members' needs

Appendix B (contd)**4. Work of the Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commissions**

- Update on aquatic animal welfare standards. Report of the March 2008 meeting of the Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission
- Next steps in the development of a text on aquatic animal welfare

**5. Report of the *ad hoc* Group on Laboratory Animal Welfare**

- First draft Guidelines
- Next steps

**6. Report of the *ad hoc* Group on Animal Welfare in Livestock Production Systems**

- First draft document
- Next steps

**7. Draft Guidelines on Dog Population Control**

- Response to Member comments on the Draft Guidelines on Dog Population Control

**8. Other business**

- WSPA Concepts on Animal Welfare ( Dr Wilkins presentation)
- FAWC Working groups on Economics of Farm Animal Welfare and Animal Welfare Policy Instruments - briefing from UK delegation.
- OIE Animal Welfare Collaborating Centres (University of Valdivia - Chile)
- Animal Welfare aspects of the killing and skinning of seals - Scientific Opinion of the Panel on Animal Health and Welfare
- Animal Welfare Regional Strategies (Regional Animal Welfare Strategy Asia, the Far-East and Oceania and others initiatives)
- Operational procedures for AWWG

**9. Work programme 2009****10. Next Meeting**

## INTRODUCTION TO OIE GUIDELINES FOR THE WELFARE OF LIVE AQUATIC ANIMALS

Article X.X.X.1.

### **Guiding principles for aquatic animal welfare**

- 1 That there is a critical relationship between *aquatic animal* health and *aquatic animal* welfare.
- 2 That the use of *aquatic animals* in aquaculture, harvest or capture fisheries, research and for recreation (e.g. ornamentals and aquaria), makes a major contribution to the wellbeing of people.
- 3 That the use of *aquatic animals* carries with it an ethical responsibility to ensure the welfare of such animals to the greatest extent practicable.
- 4 That improvements in *aquatic animal* welfare can often improve productivity and hence lead to economic benefits.
- 5 That the internationally recognised 'five freedoms' (freedom from hunger, thirst and malnutrition; freedom from fear and distress; freedom from physical and thermal discomfort; freedom from pain, injury and disease; and freedom to express normal patterns of behaviour) provide valuable guidance in *aquatic animal* welfare.
- 6 That the scientific assessment of *aquatic animal* welfare involves both scientifically derived data and value-based assumptions which need to be considered together, and the process of making these assessments should be made as explicit as possible.
- 7 That equivalent outcomes based on performance criteria, rather than identical systems based on design criteria, be the basis for comparison of *aquatic animal* welfare standards and guidelines.

Article X.X.X.2.

### **Scientific basis for guidelines**

The scientific assessment of *aquatic animal* welfare has progressed rapidly in recent years and forms the basis of these guidelines. Many areas of *aquatic animal* welfare require further research to understand in full the ability of *aquatic animals* to feel pain and to be sentient. [To be developed]

---





Original: English  
April 2008

## REPORT OF THE FIRST MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON ANIMAL WELFARE AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION SYSTEMS

Paris, 8–10 April 2008

The OIE *ad hoc* Group on Animal Welfare and Livestock Production Systems (hereinafter referred to as the *ad hoc* Group) met at the OIE Headquarters from 8 to 10 April 2008.

The members of the *ad hoc* Group and other participants at the meeting are listed at [Appendix I](#). The adopted Agenda is at [Appendix II](#).

### Agenda Item 1

On behalf of Dr Bernard Vallat, Director General of the OIE, the Deputy Director General of the OIE, Dr Jean-Luc Angot, welcomed all members and thanked them for their agreement to work with the OIE on this important topic. He indicated how the work done in animal welfare had been addressed by the OIE through its permanent Animal Welfare Working Group (AWWG), which provides advice and draft texts to the Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (the Code Commission) and, for aquatic animals, to the Aquatic Animal Health Standards Commission. Draft texts are provided by the Code Commission to OIE Members for comment and consideration, with a view to final adoption in the Terrestrial Animal Health Code (the Code). Dr Angot also discussed the overall animal welfare work programme and expectations of OIE Members.

An extract from the report of the fourth meeting of the AWWG is presented in [Appendix III](#).

### Agenda Item 2

Dr Correa referred to the inclusion of animal welfare in the OIE's third and fourth strategic plans and the progress made to date in developing the four adopted sets of guidelines and working closely with international organisations representing the industry and animal welfare NGO interests. The first OIE Global Conference on Animal Welfare (2004), the 2005 publication "Global Issues, Trends and Challenges" and the decision to hold the Second Global Conference on Animal Welfare in Cairo in October 2008 are all important elements of the strategic commitment to communication and stakeholder engagement. After this introduction Dr Correa opened the discussion on the proposed TOR's for the *ad hoc* Group.

Appendix D (contd)

Dr Agulto and Dr Sehularo noted that the *ad hoc* Group should take into account the potential difficulties for the implementation of this kind of guidelines for developing countries.

Dr Manteca, commenting on the first element of the proposed terms of reference (TOR) noted that in some cases the linkages between animal welfare and animal health are not clear or are not scientifically well established.

For example:

Dr Schrader noted that the *ad hoc* Group discussion should closely follow the recommendations of the relevant OIE discussion paper. The first objective should be to protect the health and normal functioning of animals, followed by protecting the psychological well-being of animals and providing living conditions that are considered to be 'natural' for the species. Regarding these three aspects, Dr Mench noted that in some case ameliorating only one aspect could be harmful for the welfare of the animals; therefore it should be recommended the consider the three aspects in making decisions on management.

The *ad hoc* Group adopted the proposed TOR (see Appendix IV), which were based on the OIE discussion paper (see Appendix V).

**Agenda Item 3**

In its discussion on the working documents, the *ad hoc* Group agreed with the recommendations of the OIE discussion paper and identified some additional relevant considerations, as follows.

Dr Agurto noted that the future guidelines should not be oriented both to large and small scale producers. Dr Sehularo similarly commented that is important to take into account cultural aspects.

Dr Mench noted that the criteria to be used in developing guidelines should be explained at the outset, to avoid any confusion or misinterpretation on the objectives of the Guidelines.

The *ad hoc* Group noted that, in some regions, public perception and political expectations may demand animal welfare standards that are not necessarily consistent with the science related to animal health or with economic considerations.

Dr Correa expressed his satisfaction concerning the consensus support of the discussion paper within the *ad hoc* Group, including with OIE Member comments on the discussion paper.

**Agenda Item 4**

The *ad hoc* Group addressed the issues identified in the TOR and developed '**Recommendations to the OIE in developing Guidelines on Animal Welfare in Livestock Production Systems**' for consideration by the Code Commission at its September 2008 meeting. In this document the *ad hoc* Group established the justification for its recommendations on the main elements in the TOR (how the OIE guidelines should address the objectives and the different criteria, how to ensure that guidelines are clearly and transparently based on relevant science and whether to approach the development of guidelines based on species or production systems.

This document identifies and recommends the strategies to follow in regard to the priority areas identified by the *ad hoc* Group for consideration by the Code Commission. The *ad hoc* Group also identified elements that should be included in future OIE Guidelines on animal welfare in livestock production systems .

Appendix D (contd)

The *ad hoc* Group agreed that the next OIE Second Global Conference on Animal Welfare in Cairo, Egypt would provide a further opportunity to identify the priorities of OIE Members and stakeholders, which would help to define the OIE's priorities for the development of guidelines in this area.

The text of these recommendations is at Appendix VI.

**Agenda Item 5**

The *ad hoc* Group discussed and agreed on further work that would be needed to support the future development of guidelines (see Appendix VII).

**Agenda Item 6**

Dr Kahn explained the *ad hoc* Group Members that the decision on next steps would be taken by the OIE, based on the recommendations of the Animal Welfare Working Group.

**Meeting with the Director General**

Following his return from mission travel, Dr Vallat participated in the *ad hoc* Group meeting on the morning of 10 April. After thanking the *ad hoc* Group members for their cooperation with the OIE in this important new area of work, Dr Vallat noted that the OIE places high priority on supporting OIE Members in the implementation of the OIE animal welfare standards.

Dr Kahn summarized the work done by the *ad hoc* Group in the two previous days and in particular the recommended approach for the future development of OIE Guidelines on animal welfare in livestock production systems.

Dr Vallat agreed with the approach recommended by the *ad hoc* Group, in particular the need to emphasise that animal health is one of the key components of animal welfare. He also asked the *ad hoc* Group to ensure that existing OIE standards relating to disease prevention and management (including aspects such as biosecurity of animal production systems and animal feeding standards) were appropriately referenced in their recommendations.

---

.../Appendices



**MEETING OF THE OIE AD HOC GROUP ON  
ANIMAL WELFARE AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION SYSTEMS**

**Paris, 8–10 April 2008**

**List of participants**

**MEMBERS OF THE AD HOC GROUP**

**Dr Carlos A. Correa Messuti**  
(Chair)  
Ministerio de Ganadería,  
Agricultura y Pesca  
Constituyente 1476  
Montevideo  
URUGUAY  
Tel.: (598-2) 412 63 58  
Fax: (598-2) 413 63 31  
E-mail: ccorream@multi.com.uy

**Dr Xavier Manteca Vilanova**  
Profesor Titular de Universidad,  
Departamento de Ciencia Animal y  
de los Alimentos,  
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona  
(UAB)  
Unidad de Fisiología Animal,  
Facultad de Veterinaria  
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona  
08193 (Bellaterra) Barcelona  
ESPAÑA  
Tel.: (+34) 93 581 16 47  
Fax: (+34) 93 581 20 06  
E-mail: xavier.manteca@uab.es

**Dr Lars Schrader**  
Federal Research Institut for  
Animal Health - FLI  
Institute for Animal Welfare and  
Animal Husbandry  
Dörnbergstabe 25/27  
29223 Celle  
GERMANY  
Tel.: (49) 5141 3846 - 101  
Fax: (49) 5141 3846 - 117  
E-mail: Lars.schrader@fal.de

**Dr Abelardo B. Agulto, DVM,  
MPH**  
Board of Veterinary Medicine,  
Professional Regulation  
Commission, P. Paredes corner  
Morayta, Sampaloc  
Manila 1001  
PHILIPPINES  
Tel.: (632) 735 1533  
Fax: (632) 735 1533  
E-mail:  
abagulto@yahoo.com

**Dr Joy Mench**  
Department of Animal Science  
One Shields Avenue  
University of California  
Davis, CA 95616  
Professor University of California  
UNITED STATES  
Tel: (530) 7527125  
Fax: (530) 7520175  
E-mail: jamench@ucdavis.edu

**Dr Kerapetse Sehularo**  
Chief Veterinary Officer  
Department of Animal Health and  
Production, Division of Meat  
Hygiene and Quality Control  
Ministry of Agriculture  
P.O. BOX 1159  
Francistown  
BOTSWANA  
Tel: (267) 12 58 440  
E-mail: ksehularo@lycos.com

**OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

**Dr Alex Thiermann**  
President of the OIE Terrestrial Animal  
Health Standards Commission  
E-mail: a.thiermann@oie.int

Appendix D (contd)

Appendix I (contd)

## OIE HEADQUARTERS

---

**Dr Bernard Vallat**

Director General  
OIE  
12, rue de Prony  
75017 Paris  
FRANCE  
Tel: 33-(0)1 44 15 18 88  
Fax: 33-(0)1 42 67 09 87  
E-mail: oie@oie.int

**Dr Sarah Kahn**

Head  
International Trade Department  
OIE  
E-mail: s.kahn@oie.int

**Dr Leopoldo Stuardo**

Deputy Head  
International Trade Department  
OIE  
E-mail: l.stuardo@oie.int

**Dr Mihye Lee**

Intern  
International Trade Department  
OIE  
E-mail: m.lee@oie.int

**Dr Alice Mukakanamujire**

Intern  
International Trade Department  
OIE  
E-mail:  
a.mukakanamujire@oie.int

Appendix D (contd)

Appendix II

**MEETING OF THE OIE *AD HOC* GROUP ON  
ANIMAL WELFARE AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION SYSTEMS**

**Paris, 8–10 April 2008**

---

**Adopted agenda**

1. Welcome and introduction – Dr Jean Luc Angot
2. Confirmation of Terms of Reference and comments from Chair of the *ad hoc* Group
3. Discussion of working documents and other relevant documents provided by the *ad hoc* Group Members
4. Development of draft text for consideration by the Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission
5. Review and finalise report of meeting





Original: English  
September 2007

#### EXTRACT FROM THE REPORT OF THE FOURTH MEETING OF THE OIE WORKING GROUP ON ANIMAL WELFARE

##### 6.4. Livestock Production Systems and Animal Welfare

Professor Fraser provided background on this issue and on the Discussion Paper entitled “Terrestrial animal welfare – housing/production systems”. He noted that this will be a challenging area and emphasised that future guidelines on animal welfare livestock systems should be science-based.

Dr Olsen (IFAP) indicated that the future guidelines should be elaborated with an animal-based perspective, rather than with the idea of developing prescriptive guidelines (Appendix J).

The WG recommended that the Director General create an *ad hoc* Group to develop a framework for the OIE’s future development of animal production/management guidelines, with a report by mid February 2008. The WG also confirmed that the terms of reference of this *ad hoc* Group should be the four first dot points in the discussion paper.

##### a) *ad hoc* Group (composition, dates, TOR)

Dr Kahn noted that the criteria for the future composition of this *ad hoc* Group, should consider the issue of broad representation of all five OIE regions.

Professor Fraser asked that the criteria to select the *ad hoc* Group Members, should include their scientific experience and, in particular, their experience in adopting an ‘animal measures based’ approach to welfare.

##### b) IDF Guide to Good Animal Welfare Practice in Milk Production

Dr Kulkas, representing the industry as full member of the WG, reported on the development of animal welfare guidelines in dairy production. Dr Kulkas noted that OIE has commented on a first draft document and that the IDF agreed in principle to the OIE comments. The IDF is revising these guidelines and intends to put more emphasis on the OIE animal welfare guidelines.

Appendix D (contd)

Appendix III (contd)

Dr Kulkas indicate that this draft will be discussed at the next world IDF meeting in Ireland. Dr Stuardo suggested that the IDF take into account the proposed work of the *ad hoc* Group on production/housing.

It was agreed that the IDF Guide principal author Dr Verkerk would liaise with Professor Fraser.

The participation of the FAO in the elaboration of the IDF Guide was noted. Professor Fraser explained that FAO primarily elaborates educational material. Dr Thiermann supported this idea, indicating that the OIE is the only international standard-setting organization which develops standards that are presented and adopted by their members following the established procedures. The WG agreed that the OIE should continue supporting this development, bearing in mind the future work of the OIE in developing standards for animal production systems.

**TERMS OF REFERENCE****OIE AD HOC GROUP ON  
ANIMAL WELFARE AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION SYSTEMS**

---

**Taking into account:**

- the objectives of animal welfare guidelines and how these relate to animal health;
- the advantages and disadvantages of animal based versus design based criteria; and
- the role of science in animal welfare guidelines.

**Draft a proposed strategy for the OIE to follow in developing guidance for Members on animal welfare in livestock production systems, including :**

- how the OIE guidelines should address the objectives and the different criteria;
  - how to ensure that guidelines are clearly and transparently based on relevant science;
  - whether to approach the development of guidelines based on species (e.g. chickens) or production systems (e.g. caged layers).
-



## **DISCUSSION PAPER ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF ANIMAL WELFARE GUIDELINES FOR PRODUCTION SYSTEMS (TERRESTRIAL ANIMALS)**

*(Developed by the OIE Animal Welfare Working Group, 2006)*

### **Background**

The OIE International Committee in May 2005 endorsed the proposals of the Animal Welfare Working Group for priorities for 2005/2006. Among those priorities was the development of animal welfare guidelines for terrestrial animal production systems.

The development of global OIE animal welfare guidelines for production systems will be challenging for a number of reasons. Worldwide, animals are raised under extremely diverse conditions ranging from intensive systems with animals kept permanently indoors, to extensive systems with little or no housing. These different systems involve very different animal welfare challenges. There are also large differences from country to country in the level of priority accorded to the welfare of food animals.

Nonetheless, because of the close link between animal welfare and animal health, guidelines designed to improve animal welfare will often lead to better animal health, productivity and food safety. Especially in cases where these relationships can be clearly demonstrated, animal welfare guidelines may be broadly acceptable to member countries.

This discussion paper sets out some of the key issues that need to be considered in developing animal welfare guidelines for production systems, and suggests next steps in this area.

### **Animal based and resource based criteria**

Animal welfare guidelines may include (1) animal based criteria and (2) resource based criteria of animal welfare. Resource based criteria (also called design criteria or input criteria) indicate the resources that should be provided. These often specify space allowances and dimensions, ambient temperature range, humidity, condition of the litter, air quality, availability of feed and water, frequency of inspection, and biosecurity and sanitation measures. Animal based criteria (also called performance criteria or output criteria) are described/specified in terms of the animals' state. They often include such elements as survival rate, incidence of disease and injury, body condition scoring, the ability of animals to behave in certain ways, and the reaction of animals to their handlers.

Resource based criteria are widely used in animal welfare assurance programs because they are often easier to evaluate and score than animal based criteria. However, they have important limitations:

- Resource based criteria are generally derived from research carried out with specific species/breeds and production systems, and they may not be applicable to other breeds and other production systems. For example, a space allowance that minimizes crowding-related problems in light hybrid hens in battery cages may not apply to other breeds or to other housing systems.
- The welfare of animals is strongly influenced by the skill and attitude of animal handlers, and it is difficult to develop and implement resource based criteria to describe these elements.
- Resource based criteria are often created in response to well researched problems such as over-crowding and air quality, and they may not apply to new or emerging problems such as new diseases or genetic modifications of the animals.

Appendix D (contd)Appendix V (contd)

Perhaps because of these limitations, research shows that animal production units that conform to the same resource based criteria may still have widely varying animal welfare outcomes.

Animal based criteria are not as widely used in existing animal welfare standards but they should, in principle, be applicable to any production system. In fact animal based criteria may provide a better measure of the animal welfare outcomes because they reflect the influence of variables (e.g. experience and attitude of handlers, presence of emerging diseases) that may be missed by resource based criteria. However, many animal welfare concerns are difficult to address using animal based criteria. Examples include the capacity of the ventilation system to prevent extreme temperatures, the use of pain mitigation for surgical procedures, and the implementation of appropriate biosecurity measures.

A reasonable approach, therefore, would be for the OIE to incorporate animal based criteria in its guidelines where feasible and to supplement these with resource based criteria where there is a good scientific basis for doing so. Thus, for example, animal welfare guidelines for chickens might specify certain levels of survival and freedom from disease and injury (animal based criteria) and would also recommend requirements for ambient temperature, humidity, air quality and litter quality (resource based criteria) for birds that are kept indoors.

**Clarifying the objectives of animal welfare guidelines**

Animal welfare guidelines are generally designed to achieve one or more of three objectives:

1. to protect the basic health and normal functioning of animals, for example by preventing and alleviating disease, injury, malnutrition and similar harm;
2. to protect the psychological well-being of animals, for example by preventing and alleviating pain, fear, distress and discomfort;
3. to provide living conditions that are considered to be 'natural' for the species, for example by providing a social and physical environment where animals can perform key elements of their natural behaviour.

The three objectives overlap. For example, preventing injury is important for psychological well-being, and preventing pain and fear can be important for normal functioning. However, the overlap is not perfect. For example, environments that limit the spread of disease do not necessarily allow natural behaviour and vice versa.

The three objectives are based on somewhat different bodies of scientific research. The research relevant to objective 1 includes studies of survival rate, incidence of disease and injury, body condition scoring, and productivity measures. The research relevant to objective 2 includes studies of pain, fear and distress in animals, studies of ways to alleviate such states, and studies that determine the animals' own preferences and aversions. Research relevant to objective 3 includes studies of the normal (and abnormal) behaviour of animals, how these are influenced by the social and physical environment, and the strength of the animals' motivation to carry out elements of their natural behaviour.

In the past, confusion has sometimes occurred because different standards, which are all claimed to address animal welfare, have involved very different requirements. Often such differences arise because the different standards address different objectives and rely on different bodies of research. In order to avoid confusion, it is important that recommendations be clear as to the welfare objectives they are intended to address.

Appendix D (contd)

Appendix V (contd)

Standards based on objective 1, because they reinforce basic health and functioning of animals, tend to be the most aligned with the traditional objectives of animal producers and veterinarians. The cost/benefit ratio is often favourable because implementation often leads to measurable improvements in productivity (e.g. improved survival or reduced mortality due to stress and disease). Hence, these standards are likely to be the most acceptable to animal producers and in cultures where concern for the welfare of animals is relatively low. However, in cultures where the public is actively interested in and concerned about animal welfare, standards based on objective 1 are likely to be viewed as minimum standards that promote productivity rather than animal welfare per se.

Standards based on objective 2 (alleviating pain and distress, etc.) vary in their ease of implementation and their economic implications. Some (such as handling animals in ways that do not cause distress) should be relatively easy to implement, involve little or no cost, and may produce measurable economic benefit. Others (such as requiring anaesthesia for minor surgery) may be difficult and costly to implement. The level of acceptance by producers will likely vary accordingly. In countries which accord a high priority to animals welfare, standards based on objective 2 tend to be strongly supported by the concerned public who generally see the alleviation of pain and distress as a key element of animal welfare.

Standards based on objective 3 (providing more 'natural' living conditions) can have widely varying implications. Some requirements, such as providing more natural social grouping of animals, can be achieved in confinement production systems with only small cost implications. Others may require substantial redesign of animal environments and incur higher land and labour costs. Such standards may, however, allow producers using alternative production systems to market products to consumers who support such standards.

In proposing OIE guidelines on animal production systems, one approach would be to focus principally on objective 1 because of the clear linkage with animal health and traditional veterinary priorities of this objective, and to propose the adoption of guidelines based on objectives 2 and 3 where this is feasible and appropriate. If this approach is used, however, it should be made clear that the guidelines are intended as basic guidelines designed mainly to promote the health and functioning of animals as health is the one of the key components of welfare. In cultures that place a high priority on animal welfare, the development and implementation of guidelines that more closely address animal welfare objectives 2 and 3 would be appropriate to meet societal expectations.

### **Clarifying the underlying science**

In the past, the development of animal welfare guidelines for production systems has sometimes been hampered by a lack of clarity over the scientific literature. In some cases organizations have attempted to create guidelines without a clear review or understanding of the science. In other cases, scientific reviews are available but these lead to conflicting conclusions. Guidelines that lack a clear and transparent link to science are often criticized as reflecting the subjective views or self-interest of those (animal producers, regulators or animal welfare organizations) that produce them.

In general, then, a good first step in developing animal welfare guidelines for a given production system is to ensure that a competent review of the relevant science is in place and widely accepted. If there is no such review, or if there are significant conflicts among existing reviews, then a new review may need to be created before beginning to develop a guideline.

### **Recommended next steps**

Given the number of strategic decisions involved in the development of guidelines for terrestrial animal production systems, the Working Group on Animal Welfare recommends that the OIE proceed as follows.

Appendix D (contd)Appendix V (contd)

Appoint an *ad hoc* Group to consider the issues presented in this paper and prepare a Guidance Document on the development of animal welfare guidelines for terrestrial animal production systems. The *ad hoc* Group should, at a minimum, consider and report on the following:

- the various objectives of animal welfare guidelines, how these relate to animal health, and the role that the objectives should play in OIE guidelines;
  
- the advantages and disadvantages of animal based versus design based criteria, with examples and recommendations on how these different criteria should be addressed in developing OIE guidelines;
  
- the role of science in animal welfare guidelines, with recommendations on how the OIE should proceed to ensure that guidelines are clearly and transparently based on relevant science;
  
- a proposed strategy, including whether to approach the development of guidelines based on species (e.g. gallus gallus) or production systems (e.g. caged layers);
  
- recommendations on the composition of expert groups including the appropriate scientific expertise, regulatory experience and regional and cultural representation;
  
- priorities for development of guidelines (species, production systems).

This Guidance Document should be submitted to the Animal Welfare Working Group and, if endorsed, submitted to the OIE Code Commission and possible distribution to the OIE Delegates.

With the Guidance Document in place and endorsed by the International Committee, the OIE could proceed by appointing one or more *ad hoc* Groups to work on particular animal species or production systems. Such groups should begin with the creation of a comprehensive review of the literature where this is needed.

## ANNEX

### **Recommendations to the OIE in developing Guidelines on Animal Welfare in Livestock Production systems**

#### **Objectives of animal welfare guidelines**

In keeping with the OIE mandate, the key objective of the OIE's animal welfare guidelines is to assure and support the essential linkage between animal health and animal welfare. In the context of this paper, animal health refers not only to freedom from diseases listed by the OIE but also to freedom from other diseases (e.g. mastitis, lameness), injuries and other conditions (e.g. malnutrition) that significantly affect the biological functioning.

In this respect, considerations relating to affective states and animal behaviour may be relevant insofar as the scientific evidence shows that they are related to animal health.

Maintaining freedom from OIE listed diseases is an important element of animal welfare and the guidelines should provide for the implementation of appropriate biosecurity measures to exclude these diseases. The guidelines should also be cross referenced to appropriate chapters in the Terrestrial Code that deal with the surveillance, reporting, control and eradication of listed diseases.

#### **Existing OIE standards**

Review of relevant existing OIE standards contributing to the objective described above will be made.

#### **Animal based versus design based criteria**

Animal based criteria (also called performance or output criteria) are described in terms of the animal's state. They include such elements as survival rate, incidence of disease and injury and body condition scoring. Many problems are multifactorial and it is therefore difficult to provide specifications (resource based criteria) for all contributing factors. The most practical solution is to monitor animal based criteria to ascertain if animal welfare problems are occurring.

Resource based criteria (also called design criteria, input criteria and engineering criteria) indicate the resources that should be provided. These specify such elements as space allowances and dimensions, ambient temperature range, humidity and condition of the litter. Resource based criteria are usually based on specific research with a particular species in a particular production system. For example, heat stress is well studied in cattle. Resource based criteria to prevent thermal stress would include specifying acceptable temperature and humidity range and rates of ventilation. However, the precise recommendations would have to be tailored for the genotype, reproductive state and history of the individual animal. Animal-based criteria such as respiratory rate and rectal temperature as measures of thermal stress, on the other hand, would be applicable across animal and genotype.

Consider the example of tail-biting in fattening pigs. Investigating the incidence and severity of tail biting is best accomplished by monitoring lesions, either by examining the pigs during the fattening period or by monitoring at the abattoir. However, correcting the problem will likely require modifying resources, for example the design of housing, stocking density, provision of material for rooting, air quality, nutrition, general hygiene and the provision of veterinary attention.

Appendix D (contd)Appendix VI (contd)

Table 1 provides selected examples of animal based and resource based criteria in selected livestock production systems.

Table 1

<b>Broiler chickens</b>		
<b>Parameter</b>	<b>Animal based criteria</b>	<b>Design based criteria</b>
Animal health	Footpad contact dermatitis rate and seriousness	Litter type and depth, moisture content, frequency of changing litter, stocking density
	Respiratory disease rate and seriousness	Ammonia levels, dust levels, stocking density
Thermal environment	Behaviour, panting, body posture, distance between birds, mortality rates	Temperature ranges, humidity, ventilation,
Nutrition	Variation in weight gain between birds, behaviour at the feeder	Nutrient content of feed, space per bird at the feeder,
Water	Physical appearance, behaviour	Monitor intake (water meters), amount of space per bird at the waterer; water quality

<b>Dairy cattle</b>		
<b>Parameter</b>	<b>Animal based criteria</b>	<b>Design based criteria</b>
Animal health	Lameness: rate and seriousness,	Type of flooring/surfaces (races, barns, cubicles), stock handling, foot trimming, diet, space allowance, general hygiene, veterinary attention
	Mastitis: rate and seriousness, somatic cell count	Milking hygiene, veterinary attention, general hygiene, nutrition, stocking density, selection of stock genotype,
Nutrition	Body scoring, rate of metabolic disease,	Diet, feed allowance, space at the feeder,
Water	Physical appearance, behaviour	Availability and quality of water and space per cow

<b>Fattening pigs</b>		
<b>Parameter</b>	<b>Animal based criteria</b>	<b>Design based criteria</b>
Animal health	Tail biting rate and seriousness	Design of housing, stocking density, material for rooting, air quality, adequacy of nutrition, veterinary attention, general hygiene
	Pneumonia rate and seriousness	Design of housing, stocking density, air quality, veterinary attention, general hygiene
Nutrition	Body scoring, weight gain, behaviour at the feeder	Diet, feed allowance, space at the feeder, grouping of pigs according to size
Water	Physical appearance, behaviour	Availability and quality of water and space per pig

Appendix D (contd)Appendix VI (contd)

Parameter	Animal based criteria	Design based criteria
<b>Extensive beef cattle</b>		
Animal health	Behaviour, mortality rates, weight gain, body condition scoring, reproductive rates	Adequate feed and water, veterinary attention, protection from predators, pasture management, selection of stock genotype, stock handling
Nutrition	Mortality rates, weight gain, body condition scoring, reproductive rates	Adequate feed, pasture management, stocking density, stock handling
Water	Mortality rates, physical appearance, behaviour, reproductive rates	Availability and quality of water, stock handling

*List of advantages and disadvantages of animal based and resource based criteria*

Animal based criteria: advantages

- Provide information on the actual state of the animal, regardless of the number of variables affecting that state
- Can be used in a range of production systems, species, genotypes etc
- Can be quantitative or semi-quantitative (objective interpretation is possible)
- Can be used to get an appreciation of the impact of animal handling
- Post mortem monitoring may be less costly and is not stressful to the animal.

Animal based criteria: disadvantages

- May be costly to implement and stressful to the animal if based on direct intervention with individual live animals
- Can be difficult to interpret behaviour (e.g. response to chronic pain or stress)
- Range of 'normal' values and acceptable variation from normal may be difficult to establish
- Quantification may be technically difficult and require specialized training
- Identify the problem but do not indicate what corrective measures are appropriate.

Resource based criteria: advantages

- Can be easier and less costly to implement and interpret as to whether the value is within the established tolerance
- Required corrective action is evident
- Easier to calculate the cost of modifying these criteria
- Can be quantitative or semi-quantitative (objective interpretation is possible)
- Can be used in a preventative mode (e.g. biosecurity measures)

Resource based criteria: disadvantages

- Difficult to develop and implement criteria relating to handling of animals
- Criteria may not be generally applicable (they are developed on the basis of research in particular species, breeds and production systems)
- May not be available in regard to new problems (as are mainly based on research to address known problems)
- Provide only partial information on the impact on animal welfare (as many variables contribute)
- May not be well validated with respect to the overall impact on animal welfare

Appendix D (contd)Appendix VI (contd)

The criteria for use by the OIE must be devised in a manner that provides for them to be adapted and used in a wide range of environments and circumstances, in order to be widely applicable to OIE Members.

In keeping with the OIE's proposed definition of animal welfare, the OIE guidelines should focus on animal based criteria. Animal based criteria should be supplemented with resource based criteria where these criteria are well validated scientifically as these provide some practical advantages.

The incorporation of resource based criteria is more likely to be useful when dealing with livestock production systems and livestock that are very similar, regardless of the country/region of production.

**The role of science in animal welfare guidelines**

The guidelines should be based on scientific information and, to the extent that is possible, on peer-reviewed literature. However, there is a major shortage of scientific studies and publications on animal welfare from some regions, including Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Middle East, with the majority of scientific information reflecting work in the European Union, North America and Australia/New Zealand.

OIE should support the conduct of studies to generate information relevant to other regions.

Informed judgement of veterinarians and other relevant professionals is also a valid input to the development of OIE guidelines. This may be particularly relevant in addressing guidelines for livestock production systems where there is a shortage of published scientific studies.

The OIE should make clear the source and basis of its guidelines, whether this relates to professional judgement or published studies.

The OIE should undertake a review of published scientific information on

- 1) animal based and resource based criteria relevant to each guideline proposed for development (e.g. beef cattle and broiler chickens); and
- 2) the relationship of affective states (e.g. chronic fear) and animal behaviour (e.g. nesting) to animal health.

The results of these reviews should be provided to OIE Delegates and animal welfare focal points to improve the transparency of the OIE guidelines' scientific basis.

When establishing national animal welfare policies, societal value judgements may play a large part. While science can provide useful information, ethical and social considerations may be more influential. The OIE should avoid making recommendations based on value judgements that lack a scientific basis.

**Recommended strategy for the OIE***The development of guidelines based on species or sector*

It is proposed that the OIE develop guidelines based on species, with specific production sectors to be considered separately as set out below. The OIE should focus on commercial scale production and particularly of products traded internationally. The guidelines for a particular species should address all currently used production systems (e.g. extensive, intensive and mixed) and management procedures (e.g. beak trimming, dehorning). It is recommended that all guidelines produced by the OIE address, as a minimum, the elements listed in Annex 1. Additional elements should be added as appropriate to the species/sector.

The establishment of guidelines on a species by species basis is appropriate in view of the adoption of animal-based welfare criteria. Regardless of the production system, it is possible to establish animal health and welfare principles that are generally relevant to individuals of the same species.

Appendix D (contd)Appendix VI (contd)**List of guidelines to be developed by the OIE (not in priority order)**

## Camelids

- fibre/meat

## Cattle

- dairy (including veal)
- beef production

Chickens (*Gallus gallus*)

- broilers
- laying hens

## Ducks

- eggs and meat

Farmed game species (e.g. deer, large and small antelopes).

## Pigs

## Rabbits

## Ratites

## Sheep and goats

- dairy
- meat/wool

Species used to produce fur (e.g. mink)

## Turkeys

Appropriate criteria for establishing the priority species/sectors include:

- Products that are extensively traded internationally
- Products that are internationally traded and the subject of actual or proposed animal welfare standards, measures or restrictions (government or private)
- Availability of relevant scientific information
- Likely positive impact on animal welfare of introducing standards
- Input from OIE Members and Regions regarding issues and concerns
- Relevance of one guideline for others (e.g. the OIE guideline on chickens could be used as a model to develop guidelines on ducks and turkeys).

## Proposed priorities

Beef cattle (extensive, intensive and mixed production systems) and broiler chickens (intensive production) are proposed as the first priorities on the basis that these are produced in all regions, are traded extensively internationally and can serve as models for some other species and sectors.

Appendix D (contd)

Appendix VI (contd)

### **Annex 1**

#### **Elements to be addressed in OIE guidelines for animal welfare in livestock production systems, as appropriate to species and production systems.**

In the development of the guidelines, animal based criteria relevant to each of the following elements should be provided, where possible.

##### Animal Health

- Biosecurity/disease prevention
- Animal health management/preventative medicine/veterinary treatment

##### Environmental aspects

- Thermal environment
- Lighting
- Air quality
- Acoustic environment
- Nutrition (food/water)
- Flooring/bedding/resting surfaces
- Social environment (e.g. managing animals to minimize aggression and other harmful behaviours)
- Space/stocking density
- Pasture management
- Protection from predators

##### Management aspects

- Genetic selection of stock
- Management practices (e.g. dehorning, beak trimming, reproduction)
- General animal handling
- Personnel training
- Emergency plans

References should be made as appropriate to OIE standards, e.g. covering:

- Transport
- Humane killing
- Identification and traceability
- Disease surveillance and reporting
- Biosecurity, including animal feeding
- Use of antimicrobials
- Prevention and eradication of OIE listed diseases

Appendix D (contd)

Appendix VII

**Plan to complete the report of the OIE ad hoc Group on  
Animal Welfare and Livestock Production Systems  
April 2008 -July 2008**

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>Specific Actions</b>
1. Draft report	17 April	Central Bureau	To revise draft report
2. Draft report	2 May	<i>ad hoc</i> Group Members	Members to return the draft report with comments
3. Final report	16 May	Central Bureau	OIE to send final report to <i>ad hoc</i> Group Members
4. Final report	26 May	Central Bureau	To circulate final report to the AWWG for comment
5. Final report	August	Central Bureau	To include final report on the Code Commission agenda



## DRAFT GUIDELINES ON STRAY DOG POPULATION CONTROL

**Preamble:** Stray and feral dogs pose serious human health, socio-economic, political, religious and animal welfare problems in many countries. Whilst acknowledging human health is a priority including the prevention of zoonotic diseases notably rabies, the OIE recognises the importance of managing dog populations without causing unnecessary or avoidable animal suffering. Veterinary Services should play a lead role in preventing zoonotic diseases and ensuring animal welfare and should be involved in dog population control.

### Guiding principles

The following guidelines are based on those laid down in Section 3.7.1 of the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code*. Some additional principles are relevant to these guidelines:

1. The promotion of responsible dog ownership can significantly reduce the numbers of stray dogs and the incidence of zoonotic diseases.
2. Because dog ecology is linked with human activities, control / management of dog populations has to be accompanied by changes in human behaviour to be effective.

### Article 1

#### Definitions

**Stray dog:** means any dog not under direct control by a person or not prevented from roaming

Types of stray dog:

- a) free roaming owned dog not under direct control or restriction at a particular time;
- b) free roaming dog with no owner;
- c) feral dog: domestic dog that has reverted to the wild state and is no longer directly dependent upon humans for successful reproduction.

**Owned dog:** means a dog with a person that claims responsibility.

**Person:** this can include more than one individual, and could comprise family/household members or an organisation.

**Responsible dog ownership:** means the situation whereby a person (as defined above) accepts and commits to perform various duties according to the legislation in place and focused on the satisfaction of the psychological, environmental and physical needs of a dog—and to the prevention of *risks* (aggression, *disease* transmission or injuries) that the dog may pose to the community, other animals or the environment.

Appendix E (contd)

**Euthanasia:** means the act of inducing death in a humane manner.

**Dog population management programme:** means a programme with the aim of reducing a stray dog population to a particular level and/or maintaining it at that level and/or managing it in order to meet a predetermined objective (see Article 2).

**Carrying capacity:** is the upper limit of the dog population density that could be supported by the habitat based on the availability of resources (food, water, shelter); and human acceptance.

## Article 2

### Dog population control / management programme objectives

The objectives of a programme to manage the dog population may include the following:

1. improve health and welfare of owned and stray dog population;
2. reduce numbers of stray dogs to an acceptable level;
3. promote responsible ownership;
4. assist in the creation and maintenance of a rabies immune or rabies free dog population;
5. reduce the risk of zoonotic diseases other than rabies;
6. manage other risks to human health e.g. parasites;
7. prevent harm to the environment and other animals;
8. prevent illegal trade and trafficking.

## Article 3

### Responsibilities and competencies

1. Veterinary Authority

The *Veterinary Authority* is responsible for the implementation of animal health and animal welfare legislation. Control of endemic zoonotic diseases such as rabies and parasitic *infections* (e.g. *Echinococcus* spp.) would require technical advice from the *Veterinary Authority*, as animal health and some aspects of public health are within this Authority's competence but organising and/or supervising dog management schemes can be the responsibility of Non-Governmental Organisations and governmental agencies other than the *Veterinary Authority*.

2. Other government agencies

The responsibilities of other government agencies will depend on the risk being managed and the objective/nature of the dog population management measures employed.

The ministry or other agency responsible for public health would normally play a leadership role and may have legislative authority in dealing with zoonotic diseases. Control of stray dogs with regard to other human health risks (e.g. stray dogs on roads; dog attacks within communities) may fall within the responsibility of the public health agency but is more likely to be the responsibility of police or other agencies for public safety/security operating at the state/provincial or municipal level.

Environment protection agencies may take responsibility for control/ managing problems associated with stray dogs when they present a hazard to the environment (e.g. control of feral dogs in national parks; prevention of dog attacks on wildlife or transmission of diseases to wildlife) or where a lack of environmental controls is giving rise to stray dog populations that threaten human health or access to amenities. For example, environmental protection agencies may regulate and enforce measures to prevent dogs (and other wild animals) from accessing waste or human sewage.

### 3. Private sector veterinarians

The private sector veterinarian is responsible for providing advice to dog pet owners or handlers consulting the veterinarian for advice or treatment of a dog. The private sector veterinarian can play an important role in disease surveillance because he/she might be the first to see a dog suffering from a notifiable disease such as rabies. It is necessary that the private sector veterinarian follow the procedure established by the Veterinary Authority for responding to and reporting a suspected rabies case or a dog that is suffering from any other notifiable disease. Private sector veterinarians also play an important role (often in liaison with the police and/or local authorities) in dealing with cases of neglect that can lead to problems with stray and mismanaged dogs.

The private veterinarian has competence and will normally be involved in pet dog health programmes and population control / management measures, including health testing, and vaccination, identification, kennelling during the absence of the owner, sterilisation and euthanasia. Two-way communication between the private sector veterinarian and Veterinary Authority, often via the medium of a veterinary professional organisation, is very important and the Veterinary Authority is responsible to set up appropriate mechanisms for this action.

### 4. Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs)

Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs) are potentially important partners of the Veterinary Services in contributing to public awareness and understanding and helping to obtain resources to contribute in a practical way to the design and successful implementation of dog control / management programmes. NGOs can supply local knowledge on dog populations and features of ownership, as well as expertise in handling and kennelling dogs and the implementation of large scale vaccination and sterilisation programmes. NGOs can also contribute, together with veterinarians and the authorities in educating the public in responsible dog ownership. NGOs can help to obtain funding for control programmes, particularly in countries where governments may depend on support from NGOs for programs carried out to assist poor communities.

### 5. Local Government Authorities

Local Government Authorities are responsible for many services and programmes that relate to health, safety and public good within their jurisdiction. In many countries the legislative framework gives authority to local government agencies in regard to aspects of public health, environmental health/hygiene and inspection/compliance activities.

Appendix E (contd)

In many countries local government agencies are responsible for enforcement of legislation relating to dog ownership (e.g. microchipping, vaccination, leash laws, abandonment), the control / management of stray dogs (e.g. dog catching and shelters) and the alleviation of the problems stray dogs cause. This would normally be done with advice from a higher level (national or state/provincial) authority with specialised expertise in regard to public health and animal health. Collaboration with the private sector veterinarians (e.g. in programs to sterilise and vaccinate stray dogs) and NGOs is a common feature of dog control/ management programmes. Regardless of the legislative basis, it is essential to have the co-operation of local government authorities in the control / management of stray dogs.

6. Dog owners

When a person takes on the ownership of a dog there should be an immediate acceptance of responsibility for that dog, and for any offspring it may produce, for the duration of its life or until a subsequent owner is found. The owner must ensure that the welfare of the dog, including behavioural needs, are respected and the dog is protected, as far as possible, from infectious *diseases* (e.g. through vaccination and parasite control) and from unwanted reproduction (e.g. through surgical sterilisation). Owners should ensure that the dog's ownership is clearly identified (preferably with permanent identification such as a tattoo or microchip) and, where required by legislation, registered on a centralised database. All reasonable steps should be taken to ensure that the dog does not roam out of control in a manner that would pose a problem to the community and/or the environment. Dog owners should be 16 years or older. if someone younger is in possession of a dog a parent or guardian should be designated the responsibility of dog ownership.

**Article 4**

In the development of a dog population control / management programme it is recommended that the authorities establish an advisory group, which should include veterinarians, experts in dog ecology, dog behaviour and zoonotic diseases, and representatives of relevant stakeholders (local authorities, human health services/authorities, environmental control services/authorities, NGOs and the public). The main purpose of this advisory group would be to analyse and quantify the problem, identify the causes, obtain public opinion on dogs and propose the most effective approaches to use in the short and long term.

Important considerations are as follows:

1. Identifying the sources of stray dogs

- a) Owned animals that roam freely
- b) Dogs Animals that have been abandoned by their owner, including pups animals resulting from uncontrolled breeding of owned dogs.

c) Unowned dogs that reproduce successfully.

2. Estimating the existing number, distribution and ecology

Practical tools that are available include registers of dogs, population estimates, surveys of dogs, owners, dog shelters and associated veterinarians. The important factors relevant to the dog carrying capacity of the environment include food, shelter, water and human attitudes and behaviour.

A methodology, including generalised dog identification and centralised registration, should could be established to make an estimate of the total dog population, an overview of appropriate methodologies may be found in Annex I. The same methodology should could be used at appropriate intervals to assess population trends.

### 3. Legislation

Legislation that would help authorities establish successful dog control / management programmes should could include the following key elements:

- a) registration and identification of dogs and licensing of dog breeders;
- b) rabies vaccination against rabies and other preventative measures against zoonotic disease, as appropriate;
- c) veterinary procedures (e.g. surgical procedures);
- d) control of dog movement (national and international);
- e) control of dangerous dogs;
- f) regulations on the breeding and sale of dogs;
- g) environmental controls (e.g. *abattoirs*, rubbish dumps, dead stock facilities);
- h) regulations for dog shelters;
- i) animal welfare obligations of owners and authorities, including humane capture and killing methods.

### 4. Resources available to authorities

- a) Human resources;
- b) financial resources;
- c) technical tools;
- d) infrastructure;
- e) cooperative activities;
- f) public-private-NGO partnerships;
- g) central-state or province-local partnerships.

## Article 5

### Control measures

The following control / management measures should could be implemented according to the national context and local circumstances. Measures may be used in combination. Killing-Euthanasia of dogs, used alone, is not an effective control / management measure. If used, it should be done humanely (see Article 5.11) and in combination with other measures to achieve effective long term control / management. It is also important that authorities gain an understanding of people's attitudes towards dog ownership so that they can develop a cooperative approach to the control / management of dog populations.

Appendix E (contd)1. Education and legislation for responsible ownership

The owned dog population is a primary source of stray dogs, through the abandonment of unwanted dogs and their offspring, and through allowing owned dogs to roam unrestricted, contributing to the stray population. Encouraging dog owners to be more responsible will reduce the number of dogs allowed to roam, improve the health and welfare of dogs, and minimise the risk that dogs pose to the community. The promotion of responsible dog ownership through legislation and education is a necessary part of a dog population control / management programme. Collaboration with responsible animal welfare NGOs, kennel clubs, private veterinarians and veterinary organisations will assist Veterinary Authorities in establishing and maintaining programmes.

Education on responsible dog ownership (for the currently owned dog and any offspring it produces) should address the following elements:

- a) the importance of proper care to ensure the welfare of the dog and any offspring; this may include preparing the dog to cope with its environment through attention to socialisation and training;
- b) registration and identification of dogs (see Article 5. 2.);
- c) disease prevention, in particular zoonotic disease, e.g. through regular vaccination in rabies endemic areas;
- d) preventing negative impacts of dogs on the community, via pollution (e.g. faeces and noise), risks to human health through biting or traffic accidents and risks to wildlife, livestock and other companion animal species;
- e) control of dog reproduction.

In order to achieve a shift towards responsible ownership, a combination of legislation, public awareness, education, and promotion of these elements will be required. It may also be necessary to improve access to resources supporting responsible ownership, such as veterinary care, identification and registration services and measures for control of zoonotic diseases.

2. Registration and identification of dogs (licensing)

A core component of dog population control /management by the Competent Authorities is the registration and identification of owned dogs. This may include granting licences to owners and breeders. Registration and identification may be emphasized as part of responsible dog ownership and are often linked to animal health programs, for example, mandatory rabies vaccination and a dog traceability.

Registration of animals in a centralised database can be used to support the enforcement of legislation and the reuniting of lost animals with owners. The control of dog reproduction by sterilisation can be encouraged through financial incentives presented by differential licensing fees.

### 3. Reproductive control

Controlling reproduction in dogs prevents the birth of unwanted puppies and can help address the balance between demand for dogs and the size of the population. It is advisable to focus efforts to control reproduction on those individuals or groups in the dog population identified as the most productive and the most likely to be the sources of unwanted and stray dogs, to ensure best use of resources. Methods of controlling reproduction will require direct veterinary input to individual animals, involvement of both private and public veterinary sectors may be required to meet demand. Subsidisation of sterilisation programmes by government may be considered to encourage uptake.

The control of reproduction is essentially the responsibility of owners and can be incorporated into education on responsible ownership (section 5 a.). Methods for controlling reproduction in dogs include:

- a) surgical sterilisation;
- b) chemical sterilisation;
- c) chemical contraception;
- d) separation of female dogs during oestrus from unsterilised males.

Surgical sterilisation should be carried out in a humane manner by a veterinarian and include appropriate anaesthesia and use of pain relief.

Any chemicals or drugs used in controlling reproduction should be shown to have appropriate safety, quality and efficacy for the function required and used according to the manufacturer's and Competent Authority's regulations. In the case of chemical sterilants and contraceptives, research and field trials may need to be completed before use.

### 4. Removal and handling

The *Competent Authority* should collect dogs that are not under direct supervision and verify their ownership. Capture, transport, and holding of the animals should be done humanely. The *Competent Authority* should develop and implement appropriate legislation and training to regulate these activities. Capture should be achieved with the minimum force required and equipment should be used that supports humane handling. Snares and Uncovered wire loops should not be used for capture.

### 5. Management of captured stray dogs removed from communities

Competent authorities have the responsibility to develop minimum standards for the housing (physical facilities) and care of these dogs. There should be provision for holding the dogs for a reasonable period of time to allow for reunion with the owner and, as appropriate, for rabies observation.

- a) Minimum standards for housing should include the following provisions:
  - i) site selection: Access to drainage, water and electricity are essential and environmental factors such as noise and pollution should be taken into account;
  - ii) kennel size, design and occupancy taking exercise into account;
  - iii) *disease* control measures including isolation and quarantine facilities.

Appendix E (contd)

- b) Management should address:
- i) adequate fresh water and nutritious food;
  - ii) regular hygiene and cleaning;
  - iii) routine inspection of the dogs;
  - iv) monitoring of health and provision of required veterinary treatments;
  - v) policies and procedures for rehoming, sterilisation and euthanasia;
  - vi) Training of staff in safe and appropriate handling of dogs;
  - vii) record keeping and reporting to authorities.

Dogs that are removed from a community may be reunited with the owner or offered to new owners for adoption (rehoming). This provides an opportunity to promote responsible ownership and good animal health care (including rabies vaccination). Prior to adoption dogs should be sterilize. The suitability of new owners to adopt dogs should be assessed and owners matched with available animals. The effectiveness of this strategy i.e. offering dogs to new owners rehoming may be limited due to the suitability and number of dogs.

Dogs that are removed from a community may in some cases be provided with health care (including rabies vaccination), sterilised, and released to their local community at or near the place of capture. This method is more likely to be accepted in the situation where the presence of stray dogs is considered to be inevitable and is well tolerated by the local community.

This method is not applicable in all situations and may be illegal in countries or regions where legislation prohibits the abandonment of dogs. Problems caused by dogs, such as noise, faecal pollution and traffic accidents, would not be alleviated as dogs are returned to the local community and their movements are not restricted. If the local community has owned dogs, and sterilised dogs are released, consideration should be given to the risk that this could encourage abandonment of unwanted dogs. If the local community has owned dogs, consideration should be given to the potential encouragement of abandonment of unwanted. In the situation where many dogs are owned, a population control / management programme that focuses on neutering and responsible ownership may be more appropriate.

It is recommended that before adopting this approach, a cost-benefit analysis is conducted. Factors such as the monetary costs, impact on culture of ownership and public safety should be assessed as well as the benefits for *disease* control and animal welfare as well as any societal benefits.

- c) If this method is adopted, the following factors should be addressed:
- i) raising awareness of the programme within the local community to ensure understanding and support;
  - ii) use of humane methods for catching, transporting and holding dogs;
  - iii) correct surgical technique, anaesthesia and analgesia, followed by post-operative care;
  - iv) *disease* control may include blanket vaccination (e.g. rabies) and treatments and testing for *diseases* (e.g. leishmaniasis) followed, as appropriate by treatment or euthanasia of the dog;

- v) behavioural observation may be used to assess if dogs are suitable for release; if not suitable for release or re-homing euthanasia should be considered;
- vi) permanent marking (e.g. tattoo) to indicate that the animal has been sterilised; individual identification allows for tracking of vaccination status and treatment history; a visible identification (e.g. collar) may also be used to prevent unnecessary recapture; identification can also be taken to indicate a level of 'ownership' by the organisation/authority responsible for carrying out this intervention;
- vii) the dog should be returned to a place that is as near as possible to the place of capture;
- viii) the welfare of dogs after release should be monitored and action taken if required.

Dogs that are removed from a community may, be too numerous or may be unsuitable responsible for any rehoming scheme. If euthanasia of these unwanted animals is the only option, the procedure should be conducted in accordance with the regulations of the Competent Authority (see Article 5.11 4.k).

#### 6. Environmental controls

Steps should be taken to reduce the carrying capacity, such as excluding dogs from sources of food (e.g. rubbish dumps and *abattoirs*, and installing animal-proof rubbish containers).

This should be linked to a reduction in the animal population by other methods, to avoid animal welfare problems.

#### 7. Control of dog movement – international (export/import)

Chapter 2.2.5 of the Terrestrial Animal Health Code provides recommendations on the international movement of dogs between rabies free countries and countries considered to be infected with rabies.

#### 8. Control of dog movements – within country (e.g. leash laws, roaming restrictions)

Measures for the control of dog movement in a country are generally invoked for the following reasons:

- a) for rabies control when the *disease* is present in a country;
- b) for public safety reasons;
- c) for the safety of "owned dogs" in an area or locality when a stray dog control / management programme is in place;
- d) to protect wildlife and livestock.

It is necessary to have empowering legislation to give the necessary power is necessary and a national or local infrastructure comprising organization, administration, staff and resources to encourage the finders of a stray dog to report to the *Competent Authority*.

Appendix E (contd)9. Regulation of commercial dog dealers

Dog breeders and dealers should be encouraged to form or join an appropriate association. Such associations should encourage a commitment to the raising and selling of physically and psychologically healthy dogs, as unhealthy dogs may be more likely to be abandoned to become part of the stray population. They should encourage breeders and dealers to provide advice on proper care to all new owners of dogs. Regulations covering commercial dog breeders and dealers should include specific requirements for accommodation, provision of suitable food, drink and bedding, adequate exercise, veterinary care and disease control and may require breeders and dealers to allow regular inspection, including veterinary inspection.

Regulation is needed to ensure that dog breeders and dealers are identified by the *Competent Authority* and are committed to raising and selling physically and psychologically healthy animals, as unhealthy animals may be more likely to be abandoned to become part of the stray population. Regulations should include specific requirements for accommodation, provision of suitable food, drink and bedding, adequate exercise, veterinary care and *disease* control. Breeders and dealers establishments should be inspected at regular intervals, including veterinary inspections. Advice on proper animal care should be given to all new owners of dogs.

10. Reduction in dog bite incidence

The most effective means of reducing prevalence of dog bites are education and placing responsibility on the owner. Dog owners should be educated in principles of responsible dog pet ownership as described in Article 5.1a. Legal mechanisms that enable the competent authorities to impose penalties or otherwise deal with irresponsible owners are necessary. Mandatory registration and identification schemes will facilitate the effective application of such mechanisms. Young children are the group at highest risk for dog bites. Education programmes focussed on appropriate dog-directed behaviour have been demonstrated to be effective in reducing dog bite prevalence and these programmes should be encouraged.

11. Euthanasia

When euthanasia is practised, the general principles laid down in the Terrestrial Animal Health Code should be followed, with the emphasis on using the most practical, rapid and humane methods and ensuring operator safety.

For practical reasons, different procedures may be used in rural and urban areas.

Table 1 shows a list of methods for the euthanasia of dogs.

**Table 1: List of methods for the euthanasia of dogs**

Euthanasia method	Specific method	Animal welfare concerns/ implications	Key animal welfare requirements	Considerations relating to operator security	Advantages	Disadvantages
<b>Chemical -via injection</b>	Barbiturates	Correct restraint is needed.  IP is slow and may be irritant.  IC injection is a painful procedure.	Recommend to use IV injection.  When using IP injection, the solution may be diluted or local anaesthetic agent used in conjunction.  IC should only be performed on unconscious animal and by skilled operator.	Correct restraint is needed.  Administered under veterinary supervision and requires trained personnel.	Speed of action generally depends on the dose, concentration, route and rate of injection.  Barbiturates induce euthanasia smoothly, with minimal discomfort to the animal.  Barbiturates are less expensive than many other euthanasia agents.	<del>Mild aesthetic objection as terminal gasps may occur in unconscious animals.</del> These drugs persist in the carcass and may cause sedation or death in animals that consume the cadaver.
	Embutramide +Mebezonium +Tetracaine	Muscle paralysis may occur before lost of consciousness if injection given rapidly	Use slow IV injection with sedation to permit slow rate of injection.	Correct restraint is needed.  To be administered under veterinary supervision and by trained personnel.	Quite low cost.	Unavailable/unlicensed in some countries
<b>Chemical -via injection (contd)</b>	Anaesthetic agent overdose (thiopentone or propofenol)	Underdosing may lead to recovery	IV injection of a sufficient dose	Correct restraint is needed.  To be administered under veterinary supervision and by trained personnel.	Generally quick action and minimal discomfort to animal.	Large volume required (cost implications)
	Potassium chloride (KCl)	K <sup>+</sup> is cardiotoxic and very painful if used without anaesthetic agent.	Only use on anaesthetised animals, IV injection	Requires trained personnel.	Readily available without veterinary control.	Prior need for anaesthetic (cost and availability implications)

## Appendix E (contd)

**Table 1: List of methods for the euthanasia of dogs (contd)**

<b>Mechanical</b>	Free bullet	Can be inhumane if shot is inaccurate and dog is only wounded; dog may also escape.	Skilled operator essential.	Risk of injury to operators <u>and spectators.</u>	Not necessary to handle or capture dog.	Brain tissue may be unavailable for rabies diagnosis. Risk of injury to bystanders. Legal constraints on use of firearms.
	Penetrating captive bolt <u>followed by pithing where necessary to ensure death</u>	Can be inhumane if shot is inaccurate and dog is only wounded.	Skilled operator essential.	Animal must be restrained. Skilled operator essential.	No risk to operator (cf free bullet) <u>unless risk of dog infected with rabies, due to potential contact with brain tissue</u>	Brain tissue may be unavailable for rabies diagnosis. Legal constraints on use of firearms. May raise aesthetic objections.
	Exsanguination	Onset of hypovolaemia may cause dog to become anxious.	Only use on unconscious animal	Danger to operator through use of sharp instrument.	Material requirements minimal.	Must be done on unconscious animal. Aesthetically objectionable

**Table 1: List of methods for the euthanasia of dogs (cont d)**

<b>Euthanasia method</b>	<b>Specific method</b>	<b>Animal welfare concerns/ implications</b>	<b>Key animal welfare requirements</b>	<b>Considerations relating to operator security</b>	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
<b>Gaseous</b>	Carbon monoxide (CO)	Inadequate concentration of CO is not lethal and can cause suffering. Signs of distress (convulsions, vocalization and agitation) may occur.	Compressed CO in cylinders must be used to achieve and maintain adequate concentration, which must be monitored. Note: fumes from gasoline engines are irritant and this source of CO is not recommended.	Very hazardous for operator - gas is odourless and causes <u>toxicity at both acute high levels</u> and chronic <u>low levels toxicity</u> .	Dog dies quite rapidly if concentration of 4 to 6% used.  No odour (therefore no aversive effect). Gas is not flammable or explosive except at concentration greater than 10%.	

## Appendix E (contd)

**Table 1: List of methods for the euthanasia of dogs (contd)**

Euthanasia method	Specific method	Animal welfare concerns/ implications	Key animal welfare requirements	Considerations relating to operator security	Advantages	Disadvantages
<b>Gaseous</b>	Carbon dioxide (CO <sub>2</sub> )	Gas is <u>highly</u> aversive. Inadequate concentration of CO <sub>2</sub> is not lethal and can cause suffering. CO <sub>2</sub> is heavier than air, so when incomplete filling of the chamber occurs, dogs may raise their head and avoid exposure. Few studies on adequate concentration and animal welfare.	Compressed CO <sub>2</sub> gas chamber is the only recommended method because the concentration can be monitored and regulated.	Minimal hazard to operator when properly designed equipment used.	Gas is not flammable or explosive and causes quite rapid anaesthesia when correct concentrations used.  Low cost.  Readily available as compressed gas	<u>Unconsciousness can occur in minutes, but death may take some time. Likelihood of suffering before unconsciousness.</u> <u>Anaesthesia can be quite rapid but death may take some time.</u>
	Inert gas (nitrogen, N <sub>2</sub> argon, Ar)	Loss of consciousness is preceded by hypoxemia and ventilatory stimulation, which may be distressing to the dog.  Re-establishing a low concentration of O <sub>2</sub> (i.e. greater than or equal to 6%) in the chamber before death will allow immediate recovery.	Concentration above 98% must be achieved rapidly and maintained. Properly designed equipment must be used	Minimal hazard to operator when properly designed equipment used.	Gas is not flammable or explosive and is odourless.  Readily available as compressed gas.	High cost.  Little data on animal welfare implications in dogs.

**Table 1: List of methods for the euthanasia of dogs (cont d)**

Euthanasia method	Specific method	Animal welfare concerns/ implications	Key animal welfare requirements	Considerations relating to operator security	Advantages	Disadvantages
<b>Gaseous</b>	Anaesthetic gas overdose (halothane or enflurane)	Animal may struggle and become anxious during induction. Vapours may be irritating and can induce excitement.	Supplementation with air or O <sub>2</sub> required to avoid hypoxemia during induction phase.	Some gases may be hazardous, especially for pregnant women. General recommendation: Avoid human exposure to greater than or equal to 2ppm to avoid narcosis.	Gas is not flammable or explosive. Valuable for use with small animals (<7kgs) and animals that are already anaesthetised with gas.	High cost.  Anaesthetic and euthanasia properties of the gas used must be known.  Isoflurane has a pungent odour. Methoxyflurane's action is slow and dog may become agitated.
<b>Electrical</b>	Electrocution	Cardiac fibrillation occurs before onset of unconsciousness, causing severe pain if dog is conscious. Pain can also be caused by violent extension of the limbs, head and neck.  Method may not be effective if insufficient current applied.	Dogs must be unconscious before being electrocuted. This can be accomplished by electrical stunning (current through the brain to produce an instantaneous stun) or anaesthesia. Electrodes should span the brain in order that the current passed through the brain <u>in order to achieve an effective stun.</u> <u>Death would result from current passed through the heart of an unconscious animal.</u>  Proper equipment and trained operator is essential.	May be hazardous for operator, who should use protective equipment (boots and gloves).	Low cost.	Inhumane if performed on conscious dog. May raise aesthetic objections.

KEY to abbreviations used in Table 1:

IV: intravenous

IP: Intraperitoneal

IC: Intracardiac

Appendix E (contd)

## a) Comments on methods for the euthanasia of dogs:

## i) Restraint

When a dog needs to be restrained for any procedure, including euthanasia, this should always be done with full regard for operator security and animal welfare. Some euthanasia methods must be used in association with sedation or anaesthesia in order to be considered humane.

## ii) Special equipment

When special equipment is needed to perform euthanasia (e.g. gas chamber) the system should be designed for the purpose and regularly maintained in order to achieve operator security and animal welfare.

## iii) The following methods, procedures and practices are unacceptable on animal welfare grounds:

- Chemical methods:
  - Embutramide +Mebezonium +Tetracaine without sedation or by other than IV injection
  - Chloral hydrate
  - Nitrous oxide: may be used with other inhalants to speed the onset of anaesthesia, but alone it does not induce anaesthesia in dogs
  - Ether
  - Chloroform
  - Cyanide
  - Strychnine
  - Neuromuscular blocking agents (nicotine, magnesium sulphate, potassium chloride, all curariform agents) : when used alone, respiratory arrest occurs before lost of consciousness, so the dog may perceive pain
  - Formalin
  - Household products and solvents.
- Mechanical methods:
  - Air embolism on conscious animal
  - Burning
  - Exsanguination of conscious animal
  - Decompression: expansion of gas trapped in body cavities may be very painful
  - Drowning
  - Hypothermia, rapid freezing
  - Stunning: stunning is not a euthanasia method, it should always be followed by a method which ensures death.
  - Kill-trapping
  - Electrocutation of conscious animal.

Because neonatal animals and adults with impaired breathing or low blood pressure are resistant to hypoxia, methods that depend upon achieving a hypoxic state (e.g. CO<sub>2</sub>, CO, N<sub>2</sub>, Ar) should not be used. These methods should not be used in animals aged less than 2 months, except to produce loss of consciousness and should be followed by another method to cause death. Cervical dislocation and concussion may be used in very small neonatal dogs and only in cases of emergency. Operators must be well trained in the use of physical techniques to ensure that they are correctly and humanely carried out. The dog must be exsanguinated immediately after concussion or cervical dislocation.

iv) Confirmation of death

For all methods of euthanasia used, death must be confirmed before animals are disposed of or left unattended. If an animal is not dead, another method of euthanasia must be performed.

v) Carcass disposal

Carcasses should be disposed of in a manner that complies with legislation. Attention must be paid to the risk of residues occurring in the carcase. Incineration is generally the safest way of carcass disposal.

## Article 6

### Monitoring and evaluation of dog population control / management programmes

Monitoring and evaluation allows for comparison of important indicators against the baselines measured during initial assessment (Article 4). The three main reasons for carrying out monitoring and evaluation are:

1. to help improve performance, by highlighting both problems and successful elements of interventions;
2. for accountability, to demonstrate that the programme is achieving its aims;
3. assuming methods are standardised, to compare the success of strategies used in different locations and situations.

Monitoring is a continuous process that aims to check the programme progress against targets and allows for regular adjustments. Evaluation is a periodic assessment, usually carried out at particular milestones to check the programme is having the desired and stated impact. These procedures involve the measurement of 'indicators' that are chosen because they reflect important components of the programme at different stages. Selection of suitable indicators requires clear planning of what the programme is aiming to achieve, the best selection of indicators will be one that reflects the interest of all relevant stakeholders. Standardised methodology will facilitate comparison of data from subsequent evaluations and performance between different projects. Indicators can be direct measurements of an area targeted to change (e.g. population of free roaming dogs on public property) or indirect measures that reflect change in a targeted area (e.g. number of reported dog bites as a reflection of rabies prevalence).

4. Elements that should generally be monitored and evaluated include:

- a) dog population size, separated by into sub-populations according to ownership and restriction of movement (i.e. roaming unrestricted or restricted by an owner);

Appendix E (contd)

- b) dog welfare, in the target population (e.g. body condition score, skin conditions and injuries or lameness) and as a result of the programme (if interventions involve direct handling of dogs, the welfare of the dogs as result of this handling should be monitored);
  - c) prevalence of zoonotic diseases, such as rabies, in both the animal and human population;
  - d) responsible animal ownership, including measures of attitudes and understanding of responsible ownership and evidence that this is translating into responsible behaviour.
5. There are many sources of information for measuring indicators, including:
- a) feedback from the local community (e.g. through the use of structured questionnaires, focus groups or 'open format' consultation processes);
  - b) records and opinions obtained from relevant professionals (e.g. veterinarians, medical doctors, law enforcement agencies, educators);
  - c) animal based measurements (e.g. direct observation surveys of population size and welfare status).

The output of activities against budget should be carefully recorded in order to evaluate the effort (or cost) against the outcomes and impact (or benefit) that are reflected in the results of monitoring and evaluation.

## **Annex I:**

An overview of appropriate methodologies for estimating the size of dog populations.

Population estimates are necessary for making realistic plans for dog population management and zoonosis control, and for monitoring the success of such interventions. However, for designing effective management plans, data on population sizes alone are insufficient. Additional information is required, such as degrees of supervision of owned dogs, the origin of ownerless dogs, accessibility, etc.

The term “owned” may be restricted to a dog that is registered with licensing authorities, or it may be expanded to unregistered animals that are somewhat supervised and receive shelter and some form of care in individual households. Owned dogs may be well supervised and restrained at all times, or they may be left without control for various time periods and activities. Dogs without owners that claim responsibility may still be accepted or tolerated in the neighbourhood, and individuals may provide food and protection. Such animals are sometimes called “community owned dogs” or “neighbourhood dogs”. For an observer it is frequently impossible to decide if a free roaming dog belongs to someone or not.

The choice of methods for assessing the size of a dog population depends on the ratio of owned versus ownerless dogs, which may not always be easy to judge. For populations with a large proportion of owned dogs it may be sufficient to consult dog registration records or to conduct household surveys. These surveys should establish the number of owned dogs and the dog to human ratio in the area. In addition, questions on dog reproduction and demographics, care provided, zoonosis prevention, dog bite incidence, etc. may be asked. Sample questionnaires can be found in the “Guidelines for Dog Population Management” (WHO/WSPA 1990). Standard polling principles must be applied.

If the proportion of ownerless dogs is high or difficult to assess, then one must resort to more experimental approaches. Methods borrowed from wildlife biology can be applied. These methods are described in WHO/WSPA’s “Guidelines for Dog Population Management” (1990), and in more detail in numerous professional publications and handbooks, such as Bookhout (1994) and Sutherland (2006). Being generally diurnal and tolerant to human proximity, dogs lend themselves to direct observation and the application of mark-recapture techniques. Nevertheless, a number of caveats and limitations have to be taken into account. The methods are relatively labour intensive, they require some understanding of statistics and population biology, and most importantly, they are difficult to apply to very large areas. One must take into account that dog distribution is non-random, that their populations are not static, and that individual dogs are fairly mobile.

Counting of dogs visible in a defined area is the simplest approach to getting information on population size. One has to take into account that the visibility of dogs depends on the physical environment, but also on dog and human activity patterns. The visibility of animals changes with the time of the day and with seasons as a function of food availability, shelter (shade), disturbance, etc. Repeated standardized counting of dogs visible within defined geographical localities (e.g. wards) and specific times will provide indications of population trends. Direct counting is most reliable if it is applied to small and relatively confined dog populations, e.g. in villages, where it might be possible to recognize individual dogs based on their physical appearance.

Appendix E (contd)

Methods using mark-recapture procedures are often considered more reliable. However, they also produce trustworthy results only when a number of preconditions are met. Mortality, emigration and recruitment into the population must be minimal during the census period. One may be able to incorporate corrective factors into the calculations.

It is therefore important that the recommended census procedures are applied at times of low dispersal and that one selects study plots of shape and size that minimize the effect of dog movements in and out of the observation area. Census surveys should be completed within a few days to a maximum of two weeks in order to reduce demographic changes. In addition, all individuals in the population must have an equal chance of being counted. This is a highly improbable condition for dogs, whose visibility depends on ownership status and degrees of supervision. It is therefore recommended that the investigator determines what fraction of the total population he/she might cover with an observational method and how much this part overlaps with the owned dog segment that he/she assesses with household surveys.

There are essentially two ways to obtain a population estimate if it is possible, in a defined area and within a few days, to tag a large number of dogs with a visible mark, e.g. a distinctive collar or a paint smudge. The first method requires that the capture (marking) effort remains reasonably constant for the whole length of the study. By plotting the daily number of dogs marked against the accumulated total of marked dogs for each day one can extrapolate the value representing the total number of dogs in the area. More commonly used in wildlife studies are mark recapture methods (Peterson-Jackson, Lincoln indices). Dogs are marked (tagged) and released back into the population. The population is subsequently sampled by direct observation. The number of marked and unmarked dogs is recorded. One multiplies the number of dogs that were initially marked and released by the number of subsequently observed dogs divided by the number of dogs seen as marked during the re-observation to obtain a total population estimate. Examples for the two methods are given in WHO/WSPA's "Guidelines for Dog Population Management" (1990).

Since the dog populations of entire countries, states, provinces or even cities are much too large for complete assessment, it is necessary to apply the methods summarized above to sample areas. These should be selected (using common sense) so that results can be extrapolated to larger areas.

Bookhout TA (ed), 1994: *Research and Management Techniques for Wildlife and Habitats*, 5th ed. The Wildlife Society, Bethesda, Maryland, 740p.

Sutherland WJ (ed), 2006: *Ecological Census Techniques - A Handbook*, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 448 p.

WHO/WSPA, 1990: *Guidelines for Dog Population Management*. WHO/ZOON/90.165. WHO, Geneva, 116 p.

## International Federation of Agricultural Producers



### Statement by the farmers of the world on:

#### **ANIMAL WELFARE**

- Final -

#### **INTRODUCTION**

For centuries farmers have been raising livestock for human consumption. They are conscious of their responsibilities towards the animals that are in their care. Indeed, good animal welfare practises reward farmers with good animal productivity.

As the distance between farmers and consumers grows with increasing urbanisation, consumers know less and less about the way farm animals are raised. However, consumers do care about the way in which their food is produced, including the way farm animals are treated. Increasingly, they require assurances that the well-being of animals is being taken into account in livestock farming practices. Thus for farmers, the adoption of standards for livestock production practises that meet animal welfare requirements is necessary to maintain consumer confidence in livestock products. In a context of increasing market globalisation, animal welfare has also become a global concern.

Animal welfare is complex. Science and ethics both play a part. Science provides the body of evidence about animal behaviour that is used for judgements about animal welfare. Ethics in animal welfare provides the basis for the viewpoint that it is morally acceptable to use animals for food providing that the animals are protected from unnecessary suffering. At the same time, individual decisions about animal welfare are influenced by consumer attitudes.

Therefore, there is a need for further dialogue between the different stakeholders.

#### **MINIMUM INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR ANIMAL WELFARE**

Farmers in IFAP stress that all livestock products should be produced according to agreed minimum standards of animal welfare. Competition and market demand may, however, result in specific requests for higher animal welfare production standards taking into account the effects of production methods on the health status of the animals.

For IFAP, minimum international animal welfare standards are essential in order to:

- ? ensure that animal welfare issues do not become a barrier to trade, and
- ? raise animal welfare practises to a basic acceptable level in countries where they are lower.

Animal welfare standards should be established on the basis of internationally-agreed and science-based principles within the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE). As well as being science-based, animal welfare standards should also take into account the environmental, economic and social variations across the world. These variations reflect different farming systems (extensive/intensive), different levels of available technology and scientific knowledge, as well as different consumer attitudes.

## Appendix F (contd)

In order to ensure that animal welfare standards are 'sustainable', i.e. applied cost-effectively, they should be 'outcome based' rather than being 'prescriptive' in saying exactly how these standards should be achieved.

Animal welfare standards should not become a barrier for trade. This means that they must be harmonized internationally using a science-based system. It is not acceptable for farmers that national governments demand higher animal welfare standards of their domestic production than they do for imported product. For IFAP, the World Animal Health Organization (OIE), is the forum best suited to reach a global recognition of animal welfare to assist with guidelines and recommendations.

### **BUILDING ANIMAL WELFARE STRATEGIES**

In the building of national and international animal welfare strategies, it is important to recognise broad stakeholder and community animal welfare interests and the need to effectively communicate policies and approaches.

Consultation processes should be established in order to ensure stakeholder input into animal welfare standards and guidelines, in particular from livestock producers. Livestock producers are the first persons concerned by on-farm animal welfare, and through their cooperatives are also directly concerned by animal welfare in transport systems and slaughterhouses.

Dialogue between farmers, consumers, responsible animal welfare groups and government is critical for success. Effective communications, education and training across the whole community must be undertaken to promote an improved understanding of animal welfare.

Effective implementation of sustainable animal welfare standards requires a strong partnership between farmers, industry, all levels of government and the community. It is also important to improve consistency of codes of practice or regulations and their administration across jurisdictions, as well as the enforcement procedures of agreed standards.

### **ANIMAL WELFARE IN THE OIE**

Animal welfare has been identified as a priority in the Strategic Plan of the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE). As an inter-governmental organisation, the OIE is committed to a science-based approach to the development of animal welfare guidelines and standards and to working closely with all stakeholders. IFAP is therefore working with the OIE as the organisation best placed to provide international leadership on animal welfare.

IFAP supports the guiding principles for animal welfare that are outlined in the OIE *Terrestrial Animal Health Code*. These are:

1. That there is a critical relationship between animal health and animal welfare.

Appendix F (contd)

2. That the internationally recognised ‘five freedoms’<sup>2</sup> (freedom from hunger, thirst and malnutrition; freedom from fear and distress; freedom from physical and thermal discomfort; freedom from pain, injury and disease; and freedom to express normal patterns of behaviour) provide valuable guidance in animal welfare.
3. That the internationally recognised ‘three Rs’ (reduction in numbers of animals, refinement of experimental methods and replacement of animals with non-animal techniques) provide valuable guidance for the use of animals in science.
4. That the scientific assessment of animal welfare involves diverse elements which need to be considered together, and that selecting and weighing these elements often involves value-based assumptions which should be made as explicit as possible.
5. That the use of animals in agriculture and science, and for companionship, recreation and entertainment, makes a major contribution to the wellbeing of people.
6. That the use of animals carries with it an ethical responsibility to ensure the welfare of such animals to the greatest extent practicable.
7. That improvements in farm animal welfare can often improve productivity and food safety, and hence lead to economic benefits.
8. That equivalent outcomes (performance criteria), rather than identical systems (design criteria), be the basis for comparison of animal welfare standards and guidelines.

IFAP encourages OIE to pursue its work in the following areas:

- ? to identify animal welfare research needs and encourage collaboration among research centres, to improve awareness of animal welfare in academia, and
- ? to provide expertise on specific animal welfare issues to other international organisations, animal production sectors, industry and consumer groups.

## **ANIMAL WELFARE AND TRADE**

IFAP supports initiatives to promote at least minimum standards of animal welfare in international trade as a non-competitive issue. These standards should be based on ‘equivalent outcomes’ rather than on ‘identical systems’.

---

<sup>2</sup> **Definition of the ‘Five Freedoms’** – the Animal Welfare Council in the UK stress that these freedoms define ideal states rather than standards for acceptable welfare. They form a logical and comprehensive framework for analysis of welfare within any system together with the steps and compromises necessary to safeguard and improve welfare within the proper constraints of an effective livestock industry. IFAP supports this view.

**1. Freedom from Hunger and 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.

**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.

Appendix F (contd)**COMMUNICATIONS**

Successful implementation of a strategy on animal welfare requires a broad communications activity to keep the community, industry, government and international trading partners better informed of animal welfare achievements and approaches in each country and foster a broad understanding of animal industry practices from a welfare perspective.

A communication strategy could include enhancing education and training across the whole community to promote an improved and consistent understanding of animal welfare.

**RECOMMENDATIONS***Animal welfare on the farm*

- Animal welfare must be safeguarded in the production of farm animals: in the breeding process; when designing housing, feeding and production systems; and during transportation and slaughtering
- Advisory services, research institutes, and agricultural education establishments should include animal welfare concerns in their work

*Science-based rules*

- Scientific evidence about the biological needs of the animals must constitute the basis of the requirements of animal welfare.

*Harmonisation and enforcement of rules*

- The protection of farm animals should be based on rules and recommendations that are harmonized internationally, meeting at least the standards laid down by the OIE. 'Equivalent' enforcement of provisions is also crucial.
- Stricter rules on animal welfare than legally required may be applied by to meet demands from consumers and society, e.g. by agricultural cooperatives.
- Regulations on animal welfare in any one country must not become so excessively demanding that the production of farm animals moves from one country to another based on animal welfare requirements.
- Suitable indicators of animal welfare are important for ensuring the correct and harmonised application of animal welfare regulations.
- Impact assessment procedures should be applied to all legislative proposals relating to animal welfare, analogous to environmental protection. Another option would be to expand current procedures to assess environmental protection measures to include animal welfare.

*International trade*

- International, science-based, standards and enforcement procedures are essential in order to facilitate equal trade opportunities
- IFAP encourages all countries to adopt the standards and guiding principles on animal welfare developed by the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) as a basis for ensuring that animal welfare concerns do not become an unfair barrier to trade.

*National consultation processes*

- National consultation processes that involve key stakeholders must be established for developing and implementing animal welfare strategies. This process is critical to ensure that animal welfare strategies are written in such a way that farmers are able to live up to them and also make a living.

**CONCLUSION**

Farmers are conscious of the importance of respecting animal welfare standards and guidelines, in order to meet consumer concerns. IFAP supports the adoption of minimum standards for animal welfare that are harmonised internationally through the OIE. IFAP is pleased that there is producer representation on the OIE Animal Welfare Group, and insists that farmers' organisations be consulted on the drawing up and application of all national and international strategies on animal welfare.

---

---

© **World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE), 2008**

This document has been prepared by specialists convened by the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE). Pending adoption by the International Committee of the OIE, the views expressed herein can only be construed as those of these specialists.

All OIE publications are protected by international copyright law. Extracts may be copied, reproduced, translated, adapted or published in journals, documents, books, electronic media and any other medium destined for the public, for information, educational or commercial purposes, provided prior written permission has been granted by the OIE.

The designations and denominations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the OIE concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers and boundaries.

The views expressed in signed articles are solely the responsibility of the authors. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by the OIE in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.