

Viewpoint of animal welfare organisations on the long distance transportation of farm animals

Leah Garcés, Victoria Cussen & Hugh Wirth

Summary

The World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA) describes the viewpoint of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) involved in the welfare of farm animals undergoing long distance transportation. The guiding principle is that the potential for poor animal welfare increases with the distance and duration of travel. Thus, farm animals should be slaughtered as close to their farm of origin as possible and trade in live animals for slaughter should be replaced with a trade in meat only. The challenge for reform in long distance transportation of animals is to raise community awareness about the issue without invoking the psychological phenomenon of cognitive dissonance, which has the paradoxical effect of reinforcing adverse behaviour. NGO activity in long distance transportation of animals is described for Australia, the United States and the European Union and aspirations elsewhere in the world are discussed. Importantly, animal welfare NGOs are now recognised by and have a voice in the forums of international bodies such as the World Organisation for Animal Health (Office International des Épizooties: OIE) and the International Finance Corporation. Challenges for the future include the development of partnerships in global markets to replace the trade in live animals with a meat-only trade.

Keywords

Animals, Animal welfare, Farm animals, Non-governmental organisation, Sentience, Transportation, Welfare.

Il punto di vista delle organizzazioni a tutela del benessere animale sui trasporti a lunga distanza degli animali d'allevamento

Riassunto

La Società Mondiale per la Protezione degli Animali (WSPA) presenta il punto di vista delle organizzazioni non governative (ONG) impegnate nella tutela del benessere degli animali d'allevamento sottoposti a trasporto a lunga distanza. Il principio guida a cui ci si riferisce è che il benessere degli animali è inversamente proporzionale all'incremento della distanza e della durata del viaggio. Per questo gli animali andrebbero macellati il più vicino possibile all'allevamento d'origine e sarebbe opportuno sostituire al mercato di animali da macello quello della carne. La sfida da affrontare per rivedere il trasporto a lunga distanza di animali consiste nel sensibilizzare la comunità sul tema senza provocare il fenomeno psicologico della dissonanza cognitiva il cui effetto paradossale è rinforzare il comportamento opposto. Le attività e le aspirazioni delle organizzazioni non governative sul trasporto a lunga distanza in Australia, Stati Uniti ed Unione Europea sono studiate in tutto il resto del mondo. È importante constatare che le ONG che si occupano di benessere animale sono riconosciute e hanno voce nei forum degli organismi internazionali come World Organisation for Animal Health (Office International des Épizooties: OIE) e International Finance Corporation. Gli obiettivi

World Society for the Protection of Animals, 89 Albert Embankment, London SE1 7TP, United Kingdom
leahgarcés@wspa-international.org, victoriacussen@wspa-international.org, hughwirth@rspca.org.au

futuri prevedono un'espansione della partecipazione nei mercati globali con l'intento di rimpiazzare il commercio di animali vivi con quello della carne.

Parole chiave

Animali, Animali d'allevamento, Benessere, Benessere animale, Organizzazioni non governative, Sensibilità, Trasporto.

Introduction

Concern for the welfare of farm animals during long distance transportation is the primary rationale for engagement by non-governmental organisations (NGOs) with this issue and with the many other stakeholders involved: governments, industries, the media and the public. Each stakeholder may have a different perspective but the welfare of animals is the foundation for dialogue and interaction. With this in mind, the World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA) explores the viewpoint of animal welfare organisations on the long distance transportation of farm animals and examines aspirations, achievements and possible impediments to progress.

Welfare expectancy and the long distance transportation of animals

Welfare is defined by Broom (10) as follows: 'the term "welfare" refers to the state of an individual in relation to its environment, and this can be measured. Both failure to cope with the environment and difficulty in coping are indicators of poor welfare.'

Dawkins (12) defines welfare by asking the two following questions:

- Are the animals healthy?
- Do they have what they want?

Pinning down one definition for animal welfare can be difficult. However, all definitions inherently accept the concept that animal welfare should apply to sentient animals. Sentience has been defined in the Australian Animal Welfare Strategy (8) as a 'capacity to have feelings and experience pain and pleasure. Sentience implies a level of

conscious awareness'. This definition is useful because it implies that science can be used to determine which animals are sentient. Current knowledge indicates that vertebrates and cephalopods can be considered sentient (13). Farm animals can certainly be classed as sentient animals. Accordingly, their welfare deserves consideration (30).

The concern of animal welfare NGOs for animals in relation to transport is not necessarily because of opposition to transportation itself or to the necessity of getting animals from 'farm to fork'. Rather, the concern is for the extremes of transportation and for long distances, *per se*. This important distinction sets the rationale for engagement by NGOs.

The long distance aspect of transportation of farm animals is of concern because the welfare potential for animals during long journeys is likely to be far lower than the welfare potential for animals during short journeys. In essence, as the duration of a journey increases, the time of exposure to welfare hazards increases and the welfare potential of an animal decreases. The conclusion, therefore, for most animal welfare NGOs is that farm animals should be slaughtered at the first slaughterhouse available, i.e. as close to farm as possible, to ensure the highest welfare potential for the animals during their journey to slaughter.

The term 'welfare potential' is derived from the welfare definition of Dawkins and expresses the degree to which animals remain healthy and whether or not they have what they need. The notion of welfare potential is central to the present account of the way animal welfare organisations view the long distance transport of animals.

Farm animal sentience and cognitive dissonance

Historically, a focus on the welfare of farm animals during long distance transportation has helped the public to recognise that farm animals are sentient without requiring consumer behavioural change. Unlike other issues, such as battery-caged chickens, the

issue of animal welfare during long distance transportation allows for engagement without requiring the public to behave in a radically different manner (e.g. by buying organic or free-range products rather than factory farmed products).

One of the major challenges to public engagement on farm animal welfare is 'cognitive dissonance', a well-known psychological concept. Ackerlof *et al.* (2) applied this concept to repercussions on the economy and it can equally extend to consequences to animal welfare. Rabin (21) describes cognitive dissonance in relation to the process of ethical decision-making as follows: 'when people behave immorally according to their own standards, they feel bad. Rational people may therefore engage in less of an immoral activity than would be in their material self-interest... [However] increasing people's distaste for being immoral can *increase* the level of immoral activities. This can happen because of the psychological phenomenon of *cognitive dissonance*: people will feel pressure to convince themselves that immoral activities are in fact moral; if each person's beliefs affect the beliefs of others, then increasing the pain from being immoral may cause members of society to convince each other that immoral activities are morally okay, and society will engage in more of such activities'.

Focal groups conducted in Australia, Brazil, Hong Kong, the United Kingdom and United States by the WSPA have found that the public generally accept that farm animals are sentient. However, translating that understanding into consumer behaviour (i.e. supporting welfare-focused rearing systems by purchasing free-range or other products accredited for welfare) is often not seen. Many 'self-convincing' arguments can be advanced, such as cost, convenience, trust in the system, etc., to rationalise why that understanding does not translate into consumer behaviour. These arguments or rationalisations can be seen as cognitive dissonance where knowledge that farm animals are sentient does not translate into action. The outcome may be detrimental impacts on progress towards better farm animal welfare and the upshot may be

reminiscent of that described by Rabin (21) for ethics in general. It is critical, therefore, to find pathways for engaging the public that increase the recognition of farm animal welfare but which do not result in cognitive dissonance.

Long distance transport of animals can be an issue in which the public are not asked to change their consumption behaviour or purchasing habits. Instead, the public is asked to engage in and make judgements for decision-making. Therefore, long distance transport can act as an important 'curtain raiser' for changing the public frame of mind about the implications that accompany acceptance that farm animals are sentient. It can allow for public engagement without provoking a 'wall of cognitive dissonance'. For this reason, animal welfare NGOs may find the issue of long distance transportation to be an important tool for raising general awareness about the sentience of farm animals and for leading the public towards other forms of engagement with animal welfare.

Regional activities and viewpoints

Over the last 30 years, NGO activity in long distance transportation has primarily occurred in Australia, North America and Europe. The explanation for why these, as opposed to other regions, have developed activity is clear. The largest and most developed network of animal welfare NGOs exist in these regions. These networks, and their financial and political stability, have developed sufficiently to allow attention to a wide range of issues, including the welfare of farm animals.

Australia: activities of non-governmental organisations

NGO activity on the issue of long distance transportation of farm animals has primarily focused on the transport of animals by sea to the Middle East. Many NGOs have been active or have policies on the matter, including the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA) Australia, Animals Australia, World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA), Compassion in World

Farming (CIWF), Voiceless, The Fund for Animals, Live Export Shame, People Against Cruelty in Animal Transport, People Against Live Exports and Intensive Farming, People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), and Animals' Angels (17).

RSPCA Australia, the most long standing animal protection organisation in Australia, states its policy as follows: 'RSPCA Australia is opposed to the export of live food animals for immediate slaughter or further fattening and advocates the adoption of a chilled and frozen meat-only trade. RSPCA Australia will work to pressure government to achieve the conversion of the live export trade to a chilled and frozen meat-only trade' (24). Animals Australia, another organisation that is active on the issue states that 'live animal export is immoral, cruel and indefensible' (4).

Over the last 30 years, some 140 million cattle and sheep have been transported live from Australia mostly to the Middle East and South-East Asia (4). Journeys at sea last for up to

three weeks and up to 100 000 animals are loaded onto a single vessel. Prior to sea journeys, animals will have, in most cases, already travelled vast distances by land before boarding the sea vessel (17). In this region, NGO activity has primarily focused on banning the live export by sea of farm animals for slaughter and replacing it with a meat-only trade.

RSPCA Australia (25) provides a useful summary of the high profile inhumane journeys that NGOs in the region have been persuaded by to arrive at the above positions on long distance transportation (Table I).

RSCPA Australia states that these mortality figures can be an indication of the cruelty of the trade. However, they also warn that actual death tolls are rarely reported at the time of such disasters and public reports are often initially underestimated and are reported later in annual export mortality reports (25).

Recent NGO activity regarding the trade in live sheep to Egypt has adhered to the same

Table I
Examples of serious incidents in live animal exports from Australia, 1996-2006

Date	Incident
1996	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over 67 000 sheep were left to die on board the <i>Uniceb</i> after it caught fire and sank in the Indian Ocean north-east of the Seychelles
1998	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50% of the cattle carried by the <i>Charolais Express</i> either suffocated during transport or were too ill to land at their destination and were slaughtered at sea (a total of 570 animals died)
1999	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 83% of the cattle aboard the <i>Temberong</i> died under similar circumstances to those aboard the <i>Charolais Express</i> (another 839 deaths)
2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50% of the cattle carried by the <i>Becrux</i> died as a result of overheating when they were shipped from the cool of the Victorian winter to the extreme heat of a Middle Eastern summer The final death toll from the journey was 880 In the case of the <i>Becrux</i>, it was 14 days before the true extent of the disaster was revealed: the death rate was five times that quoted in the original reports In addition to the 880 cattle that died on the <i>Becrux</i>, early reports failed to mention the 1 400 sheep that also perished at sea During July and August 2002 a further four shipments resulted in the deaths of another 14 500 sheep
2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arguably the worst incident involved the <i>Cormo Express</i> where 57 000 sheep were rejected by the Saudi Arabian importer on the basis of an unsubstantiated claim that the sheep were infected with scabby mouth When an alternative buyer could not be found, the Australian government intervened and donated the sheep to Eritrea The sheep were finally offloaded after an arduous journey of 81 days (almost three months) costing the lives of at least 5 500 sheep
2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The <i>MV Maysora</i> offloaded Australian cattle in Israel High mortalities occurred both on the voyage and while the animals were still in the quarantine facility in southern Israel The cattle were said to be suffering from a lung disease and had serious breathing difficulties

policy, namely, that live export should be replaced with a meat-only trade. In 2006, trade was suspended after *Animals Australia* aired footage showing the cruel treatment of animals upon arrival and during slaughter in Egypt. Following this temporary suspension, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was signed which required Egypt to implement measures consistent with international animal welfare standards established by the World Animal Health Organisation (*Office International des Épizooties*: OIE). Despite this bilateral agreement, December 2006 footage from *Animals Australia* showed slaughter of animals sent from Australia to Egypt for the Eid-Al-Adha festival that breached the MoU (5, 26). NGOs, along with the Australian Veterinary Association, have called for an end to this trade (5). Egypt accounts for 4% of the live export trade from Australia (26).

According to a report commissioned by the Australian meat-processing industry, live export trade could be costing Australia some AUS\$1.5 billion in lost gross domestic product (GDP), AUS\$270 million in household income and 10 500 lost jobs (S.G. Heilbron and T. Larkin, unpublished report, 2000). Furthermore, the profitability of the live export trade is supported by market distortions and incentives that are created by government and industry policies. According to the economists who wrote this report, if these factors were removed, demand for meat in importing countries would have been met by exports of chilled and frozen meat. NGOs use this argument to explain why ending the live export trade would not only be good for the welfare of Australia farm animals, but also for the Australian economy.

United States: activities of non-governmental organisations

Activity by NGOs in the United States has a much shorter history than that of both Australia and, particularly, the European Union (EU). This is perhaps because the farm animal welfare movement in the region is less established. However, over the past 10 years, activities in farm animal welfare have increased dramatically resulting in legislative,

corporate and public awareness changes. For example, in 2003, sow stalls were banned in the state of Florida and, in 2006, sow stall and veal crates were banned in Arizona. These changes were achieved through voter referendums. In addition, advancements in corporate policy on farm animal welfare have been increased rapidly. In early 2007, Smithfield Food Inc, a Virginia-based pig rearing and processing company stated that it would phase out gestation stalls or crates at all 187 sow farms it owns in eight states and replace them with group housing pens over the next decade. Smithfield, one of the largest pig-rearing companies in the world, is said to have made this decision following public pressure in the United States to do so (29). As a direct result of this increased attention to farm animal welfare, attention to long distance transportation of farm animals has also increased in recent years.

The most active organisations in the United States involved with long distance transportation include the Humane Society for the United States (HSUS), Compassion over Killing (CoK), Animals' Angels, Compassion in World Farming, the World Society of the Protection of Animals, Farm Sanctuary and the Animal Protection Institute (API). The majority of activity focuses on the transport of animals across long land distances throughout North America (Canada, United States and Mexico).

The API has recommended the following with regard to long distance transport: 'we are calling upon the United States government to effectively regulate the transport of farmed animals and adopt a maximum journey time of eight hours. We are also calling upon the United States to adopt internationally recognised standards, such as those put forward by the OIE, a body with 164 member countries recognised by the World Trade Organization as the leading authority on animal health' (3).

The HSUS policy states that their organisation 'pursues the reduction of animal suffering in the raising, housing, care, transportation and slaughter of animals raised or caught for food. Furthermore, we seek to ensure that animal

production systems are humane, sustainable and environmentally sensitive' (18).

Data on livestock movements in the United States, Canada and Mexico are highly fragmented and limited in scope. This has made it difficult to determine the exact numbers of farm animals transported over long distances. Equally, the distances travelled are difficult to pin down. Engebretson argues that the primary reason for this is lack of accurate record keeping at the state, province and country levels (15). In this region, NGOs are primarily focused on achieving some form of federal legislation to limit long distance transportation of farm animals across the domestic border lines.

While organisations such as API continue to argue for an eight hour limit, organisations have collaborated in 2005 and 2006 to first correct any loopholes in existing legislation, particularly the 28-hour law. Amended in 1994, the 28-hour law of 1906 covers the interstate transport of animals for sale or slaughter. Generally, it requires that livestock being transported across state lines be humanely unloaded into pens for food, water and at least five hours of rest every 28 hours. The law does not apply to animals transported in a vehicle in which the animals have food, water, space and an opportunity to rest. Until recently, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) had also decided that the law did not apply to trucks. The law only applied to rail transportation, which is very rarely used in modern transport but was the common method of transportation when the law was first enforced in 1906. In October 2005, several animal welfare organisations filed a federal rulemaking petition seeking to ensure that the law apply to trucks. The USDA apparently changed its position in 2003 but did not make the decision public until September 2006, as a result of the legal petition (18). NGOs, however, continue to argue that enforcement of this law is problematic.

Because of the fragmented nature of information on transport of farm animals in the United States, NGOs have played a role in collecting information on the welfare of animals during transport. The recent

investigations by CIWF, API, CoK and Animals' Angels have all contributed in this respect. These and other NGOs have highlighted concerns for the long distances that farm animals are transported across the country, and have drawn attention to the inability of the United States government to properly monitor animal welfare due to a lack of both proper records and monitoring.

European Union: activities of non-governmental organisations

The EU has a long history of not only farm animal welfare concern generally, but also concern for animal welfare during long distance transportation specifically.

As far back as 1970, organisations were expressing concern for long distance transportation of farm animals in the EU (11). There are many organisations, including CIWF, RSPCA, International League for the Protection of Horses, the Scottish SPCA, the Danish Society for the Protection of Animals, WSPA, Animals' Angels, the European Coalition for Farm Animals (ECFA) which consists of over 20 European animal protection NGOs, Eurogroup for Animals which consists of one representative animal protection organisations per each EU member state, and many others.

Policies on long distance transportation of farm animals of various NGOs in the EU are shown in Table II.

Organisations in the EU have been active on matters pertaining to long distance transportation since the 1970s. In 1995, CIWF and the International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW) took a legal case to the European Court to persuade the United Kingdom government to ban the export of calves to be reared in veal crates in other countries. In 1996, following the outbreak of bovine spongiform encephalopathy, all bovine exports from the United Kingdom were banned (11). However, this ban has been recently lifted and calves are being exported again.

In recent years, organisations have focused on EU-wide time and distance limitations. The European Parliament has consistently voted to impose an overall limit on journey times for

Table II
Policies on long distance transportation of European Union non-governmental organisations

Organisation	Policy
Compassion in World Farming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Believes that it is vital that measures are introduced to ban the long distance transportation of live animals that should be replaced by trade in meat and carcasses ▪ New European Union rules must be based on the principle of slaughter as near as possible to the farm of rearing (11)
International League for the Protection of Horses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Totally opposes the long distance transportation of horses for slaughter and believes that horses should be slaughtered as near as possible to the premises where they live (20)
Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improve enforcement of existing rules and conditions regarding journey times and vehicles used ▪ In particular, implement an eight-hour maximum journey time (23)
Eurogroup for Animals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Calling for an early review of live animal transport regulations, including limiting journey times (previously Eurogroup lobbied for an 8 h/500 km limit) (16)
Scottish Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposes extended transport of food animals for slaughter and advocates slaughter as close as possible to the point of rearing ▪ Ultimately, this should lead to a 'meat only' trade over long distances (28)

animals being transported across Europe with the most recent being in March 2004. However, in November 2004 the EU Agriculture Council (the EU agriculture ministers), voted to defer a decision on new rules regarding journey times, rest periods and stocking densities until 2011. Instead, the Council adopted a modest package of reforms that offers greater training, certification and enforcement of the rules, including the use of satellite navigation systems to monitor journeys on all vehicles by 2009 (11). Organisations in the EU continue to seek adoption of time/distance limitations.

In addition to the above, organisations within the EU have focused on the long distance transportation of animals to the Middle East. Policy changes sought are similar to those lobbied for in Australia, i.e. a ban on live exports to be replaced by 'meat-only' trade.

Summary of regional activities and viewpoints

Animal welfare organisations from the most active regions of the world on long distance transportation share very similar viewpoints. Their goals can be summarised to include one or all of the following:

- have legislation and enforcement in place to limit the distances/time that animals are transported

- ban long distance transportation to slaughter and replace it with a meat-only trade
- limit the duration of transportation of farm animals to eight hours
- slaughter animals as close as possible to the farm of origin.

All organisations are motivated by a concern for the welfare of sentient farm animals during long distance transportation.

Who trusts non-governmental organisations?

In recent decades, NGOs have not only grown in size and influence but they also play an increasingly important role in global issues. According to research carried out by the Comparative Non-profit Sector Project at The John Hopkins University, NGO expenditures in the 35 countries studied totalled US\$1.6 trillion and employed a workforce of the equivalent of 39.5 million full-time staff (21.8 million paid, 12.6 million voluntary) (27).

Multilateral organisations recognise the influence and contributions NGOs can make and have developed frameworks for working with them. For example, the Marrakesh Agreement that founded the World Trade Organisation (WTO), explicitly addresses consultation and collaboration with NGOs (34). The United Nations (UN) has a

framework for conferring 'consultative status' on NGOs with specialised knowledge (31). Indeed, a 2005 UN report stated (32): '...there can be no doubt that the challenges facing humankind cannot be met, or at least not as effectively, by individual governments and the community of States alone, without the active involvement of civil society, nongovernmental organizations, the private sector, and other committed players. So their active participation and, where needed, critical dialogue, are welcome.'

The general trend for increasing involvement of NGOs in resolving global challenges is reflected by animal welfare NGOs. For example, the WSPA holds consultative status to the United Nations – a status achieved because WSPA meets the necessary standards of transparency, credibility and knowledge that can advance UN goals as outlined in UN Resolution 1996/31 (31). In documents presented at the 2002 general session of the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE), the animal welfare scoping group recommended, among other things, that: 'the [animal welfare] working group and its ad hoc groups should consult with non-governmental organisations (NGOs)...' (9). The recommendations of the group were ratified by all OIE member countries. The OIE currently has 172 member countries.

Growing awareness of the importance of animal welfare in multilateral policy bodies has also resulted in an uptake of knowledge and expertise from animal welfare NGOs in the private sector. A recent International Finance Corporation (IFC, part of the World Bank Group) policy note on animal welfare referenced reports from groups, such as the RSPCA and Eurogroup for Animals, and explicitly stated that international animal welfare NGOs, in addition to organisations such as the OIE and FAO, guide their animal welfare decisions (19).

This trend towards increasing NGO influence is likely to continue. The 2006 results of an annual survey conducted by the world's largest independent public relations firm found that NGOs in general were 'the most trusted institution' and, according to every

market survey but two, were trusted more than governments or businesses (14). This public trust is now being mirrored by government and businesses, as animal welfare NGOs provide direct input into policy and funding bodies (e.g. the IFC) and indirect input through multilateral organisations such as the OIE and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) which advise these policy and funding bodies.

Discussion

NGOs will continue to be important stakeholders in farm animal welfare and long distance transportation. According to recent research (6), three general areas are emerging as new frontiers for consideration and are discussed below.

Practical partnerships in a global market: the need to address importing countries

In February 2007, the Australian Minister for Agriculture is reported to have said that a ban on trade with Egypt would result in another country taking up the trade in Australia's place (7). A recent study into the Middle East (22) confirmed the idea that simply banning trade would not create an overall improvement in the welfare of farm animals if the importing country had not implemented change. For example, if Australia were to ban trade to Jordan, without addressing the Jordanian side of the trade, the result could be that China continues the trade and that no overall improvements are made for farm animal welfare. China is currently exporting animals to Jordan. In this study, Rahman states the following 'it is inevitable that with the growing economy of the Middle East and with an increase in the demand for meat and meat products, there will be large-scale movement of animals across the Middle East. Unless measures are introduced to have animal welfare legislation, movement of live transport of animals, cruelty to animals will continue at the expense of animal welfare. It is therefore imperative that long-term measures are initiated to see that this cruelty does not occur'.

This is an important distinction to make. With the expansion of free trade, NGOs will find it difficult in the future to improve the overall situation for animals without addressing the situation in countries that import animals. Cooperation between governments, NGOs, industry, farmers and other stakeholders will be necessary at a global rather than national level if overall improvements in farm animal welfare are to be achieved.

To attain a meat-only trade, stakeholders will need to cooperate with importing countries to encourage the development of policies and infrastructure and to ensure that the needs of the importing country are met. Currently, two major obstacles usually prevent importing countries from accepting carcasses instead of live animals and both obstacles can be overcome. The first is a lack of refrigeration facilities to store the meat. Some governments, such as that of Taiwan, are working to install refrigerating facilities in markets to help convert the so-called 'wet markets' where animals are sold live, to 'meat-only' markets. NGOs and exporting countries could be of assistance in facilitating the development of import markets to receive meat in this way. The second obstacle is a cultural and religious one. In many countries, live animals are preferred to carcasses. However, some interesting developments are occurring in the Middle East that may be of assistance in establishing mutually beneficial solutions. A study reviewing the economics of long distance transportation (1) found that 'with respect to the animals sacrificed as part of the *Hajj* it is our understanding that traditionally the pilgrim slaughtered the animal himself or oversaw the slaughtering, while today many pilgrims buy a sacrifice voucher in Mecca before the greater *Hajj* begins. This allows an animal to be slaughtered in their name without the pilgrim being physically present. Given that this already occurs in relation to animals which are then presumably slaughtered locally it would seem entirely logical that in order to avoid the animal welfare risks associated with shipping large numbers of animals such great distances, to enable such a voucher system to be extended to enable the sheep to be

slaughtered in Australia with the meat then distributed to those in need in poorer Islamic countries'.

Innovative cooperation and partnerships will be required to convert live animal trade into a meat-only trade and will need to consider challenges in both exporting and importing countries.

Work in Asia, Latin America and Africa

As stated at the beginning of this chapter, the main focus on farm animal welfare and long distance transportation has been in Australia, North America and Europe. However, farm animals are transported across vast distances in Latin America, Asia and Africa. In these regions, animal may be transported in trucks, by rail, ship, in lorries or by trekking. Animals can travel thousands of kilometres with little or no provision for welfare (6). The increased presence of and assistance by NGOs can have a positive influence in improving these situations. Currently, NGO networks and knowledge of farm animal welfare needs are growing within these regions, but NGO assistance in improving farm animal welfare during long distance transportation is generally weak and needs to be strengthened.

Implementation of standards of the World Organisation for Animal Health

One step that may go a long way to improving the situation in the regions just discussed and, indeed, globally would be the implementation of the OIE standards on animal transportation. In March 2005, the OIE ratified a set of standards on animal welfare, which included the welfare of animals during land and sea transportation. Although the OIE standards are currently voluntary and, as such, are not legally enforceable, they are important as a basis of legislation within countries where there are currently no farm animal welfare laws (33). While the OIE standards alone will not achieve the ultimate goal of replacing long distance transportation with a meat-only trade, they help towards improving farm animal welfare during transportation.

Conclusion

In conclusion, animal welfare NGOs, motivated by a concern for the welfare of farm animals, continue to strive to replace long distance transportation of farm animals with a meat-only trade. While this goal is challenging, it is not insurmountable. It requires a working partnership with governments and industry

and a clear focus on the circumstance in countries that either export or import live farm animals.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Bidda Jones, Michael Appleby and Melina Tensen for their useful contributions to this paper.

References

1. Agra CEAS Consulting Ltd 2008. Economic aspects of global live animal transport. *In* Long distance transport and welfare of farm animals (M.C. Appleby, V. Cussen, L. Garcés, L.A. Lambert & J. Turner, eds). CAB International, Wallingford (in press).
2. Akerlof G.A. & Dickens W.T. 1982. The economic consequences of cognitive dissonance *Amer Econ Rev*, **72**, 307-319.
3. Animal Protection Institute (API) 2007. Stop the driving pain. The long-distance transport of US farmed animals. API, Sacramento, California (www.api4animals.org/a6a_transport.php accessed on 29 November 2007).
4. Animals Australia 2007. Live animal export: indefensible. Live animal exports: what you need to know. Animals Australia, the voice for animals, Melbourne, 6 pp (www.liveexport-indefensible.com/factsheets/factsheet_issues.pdf accessed on 29 November 2007).
5. Animals Australia 2008. Australia's live export trade – the facts. Animals Australia, the voice for animals, Melbourne (www.liveexport-indefensible.com/facts/ accessed on 21 February 2008).
6. Appleby M.C., Cussen V., Garcés L., Lambert L.A. & Turner J. 2008. Long distance transport and welfare of farm animals. CAB International, Wallingford (in press).
7. Australian Broadcasting Corporation 2007. Live sheep exports to stay says Minister (www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2007/02/13/1846157.htm accessed on 21 February 2008).
8. Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (DAFF) 2005. Australian animal welfare strategy – AAWS (www.daff.gov.au/animal-plant-health/welfare/aaws accessed on 29 November 2007).
9. Bayvel A.C.D. 2006. The OIE animal welfare strategic initiative – progress, priorities and prognosis. *In* Proc. Global conference on animal welfare: an OIE initiative, 23-25 February 2004, Paris. OIE, Paris, 13-17 (www.oie.int/eng/Welfare_2004/proceedings.pdf accessed on 29 November 2007).
10. Broom D.M. 1991. Animal welfare: concepts and measurement. *J Anim Sci*, **69**, 4167-4175.
11. Compassion in World Farming (CIWF) Trust 2004. Factsheet. Long distance transport of live farm animals. CIWF, Petersfield, Hampshire, 4 pp (www.ciwf.org.uk/publications/Factsheets/Factsheet%20-%20Live%20Transport.pdf accessed on 29 November 2007).
12. Dawkins M.S. 2004. Using behaviour to assess animal welfare. *Anim Welfare*, **13**, S3-S7.
13. Duncan I.J. 2006. The changing concept of animal sentience. *Appl Anim Behav Sci*, **100**, 11-19.
14. Edelman News 2006. Press release 'A person like me' now most credible spokesperson for companies; trust in employees significantly higher than in CEOs, Edelman Trust Barometer finds survey shows Microsoft as most trusted global company and technology most trusted sector; television, not newspapers, loses ground to internet as trusted source (www.edelman.com/news/ShowOne.asp?ID=102 accessed on 29 November 2007).
15. Engebretson M. 2008. North America. *In* Long distance transport and welfare of farm animals (M.C. Appleby, V. Cussen, L. Garcés, L.A. Lambert & J. Turner, eds). CAB International, Wallingford (in press).
16. Eurogroup for Animals 2007. EU animal welfare action plan. Eurogroup for Animals, Brussels (eurogroupforanimals.org/policy/policy.htm accessed on 29 November 2007).
17. Fisher M. & Jones B. 2008. Australia and New Zealand. *In* Long distance transport and welfare of farm animals (M.C. Appleby, V. Cussen, L. Garcés, L.A. Lambert & J. Turner, eds). CAB International, Wallingford (in press).

18. Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) (2007). Statement on farm animals and eating with conscience (www.hsus.org/about_us/statements/statement_on_farm_animals_eating.html accessed on 29 November 2007).
19. International Finance Corporation (IFC) 2006. Good practice note: animal welfare in livestock operations. IFC, Washington, DC (www.ifc.org/ifcext/enviro.nsf/Content/Publications_Good_Practice_AnimalWelfare accessed on 29 November 2007).
20. International League for the Protection of Horses (ILPH) 2007. Transportation Q&A. ILPH, Snetterton, Norwich, 3 pp (www.ilph.org/downloadfile.asp?download=Transportation-Q-and-A.pdf accessed on 30 November 2007).
21. Rabin M. 1994. Cognitive dissonance and social change. *J Econ Behav Organ*, **23**, 177-194.
22. Rahman A. 2008. Middle East. *In* Long Long distance transport and welfare of farm animals (M.C. Appleby, V. Cussen, L. Garcés, L.A. Lambert & J. Turner, eds). CAB International, Wallingford (in press).
23. Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA) 2007. International – Live transport. RSPCA, Horsham, Sussex (www.rspca.org.uk/servlet/Satellite?pagename=RSPCA/RSPCARedirect&pg=InternationalCampaigns&marker=1&articleId=999516092272 accessed on 29 November 2007).
24. Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA) Australia 2006. Long distance transport. Policies and position papers. RSPCA, Deakin, West Australian Capital Territory, 126 pp (www.rspca.org.au/policy/F.pdf accessed on 29 November 2007).
25. Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA) Australia. 2007. A history of disaster. Live export. RSPCA, Deakin, West Australian Capital Territory (www.rspca.org.au/campaign/liveexport_history.asp accessed on 29 November 2007).
26. Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA) Australia 2007. How can they say they care? Live trade must end now: RSPCA. Media release, 13 February 2007 (www.rspca.org.au/mediareleases/MRShow.asp?ID=105 accessed on 29 November 2007).
27. Salamon L.M., Sokolowski S.W. & List R. 2003. Global civil society: an overview. The Johns Hopkins Nonprofit Sector Project, The Johns Hopkins University, Institute for Policy Studies, Center for Civil Society Studies, Baltimore, Maryland, 64 pp (www.jhu.edu/ccss/publications/pdf/globalciv.pdf accessed on 29 November 2007).
28. Scottish Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA) 2007. Live animal transport. Scottish SPCA, Edinburgh (www.scottishspca.org/Liveanimaltransport.aspx accessed on 29 November 2007).
29. Smithfield Foods Inc. 2007. Environmental press releases. Smithfield foods makes landmark decision regarding animal management. Smithfield Foods, Inc., Smithfield, Virginia (www.smithfieldfoods.com/Enviro/Press/press_view.asp?ID=394 accessed on 29 November 2007).
30. United Kingdom Home Office 1986. Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986 (www.archive.official-documents.co.uk/document/hoc/321/321-xa.htm accessed on 29 November 2007).
31. United Nations (UN) 1996. Resolution 1996/31: Consultative relationship between the United Nations and non-governmental organizations. UN, New York (www.un.org/documents/ecosoc/res/1996/eres1996-31.htm accessed on 29 November 2007).
32. United Nations Non-Governmental Liaison Service 2005. UN system engagement with NGOs, civil society, the private sector, and other actors: a compendium. United Nations Non-Governmental Liaison Service/German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, New York, 255 pp (www.un-ngls.org/compendium-2005-withCOVER.pdf accessed on 29 November 2007).
33. World Organisation for Animal Health (Office International des Épizooties: OIE) 2006. Terrestrial Animal Health Code, 15th Ed. OIE, Paris (www.oie.int/eng/normes/mcode/en_sommaire.htm accessed on 29 November 2007).
34. World Trade Organization (WTO). 1996. Guidelines for arrangements on relations with non-governmental organizations. WTO, Geneva (www.wto.org/english/forums_e/ngo_e/guide_e.htm accessed 29 November 2007).