

Chapter 2

International Funding for Animal Protection

2.1 Ethics

Money saves animals and all nonprofits are facing financial pressure, whether animal protection, development, environment, or humanitarian. Unfortunately, the global financial crisis in 2010–2011 has meant a decline in personal giving, shifting the targets, and perhaps some policy influence to government agencies and International Organizations, as well as foundations and corporations, though they too have pressures and increasingly demand accountability and accurate progress reports. There are other books that deal with fund-raising from private citizens, especially in this climate. The context here is government money and that of the international donor system. Is it acceptable to accept their money, and if so, how does an organization go about attracting the attention of bodies such as the UN and its International Organizations, the Red Cross Movement, the World Bank, the European Commission, or government agencies such as USAID? They are all potential sources for funding. Properly used, they could significantly bring the protection of animals to a new level.

In the survey conducted for this book, the primary choice for sources of funding was private individuals (about 87%), followed by international NGOs, local governments, national authorities, academia, industry, and foundations.

Governments certainly have money in healthy economies. The survey study showed that 18% of respondents were willing to receive funds from local governments and 12% from national authorities. As an example, in the USA, the Navajo Indians receive money from the Tribal Government, but also private citizens and major NGOs. In contrast, experts we consulted indicated that in the USA, national animal advocacy NGOs generally do not accept funds from either local or state governments, except perhaps for shelters. WSPA, one of my former animal welfare employers, has considered developing a written policy on this, but sources informed me that as of 2010 the NGO had not yet been decided. In fairness, it is a complex issue. While the potential of great funding offers hope of great results, there are also ethical and political questions to be answered. A valid

question is will collaboration inhibit or enhance “effective change.” Each NGO must develop a fund-raising strategy that suits its own mandate and backers and, in other words, do not simply change goals because money might be available. Despite the potential significant gains that are possible with government funding in particular, the criterion for success cannot be the graph that shows income gains and losses. It has to be a graph that shows real change in the lives of animals.

In my survey, experts in the United States said that local American humane societies do accept funding to provide animal control services, but do not usually take corporate funding, although there are exceptions, the view being that it is very hard to find a company not involved in practices that at some level exploit animals. Still, 9% of survey respondents around the globe did just that and 35% accepted funds from foundations, themselves often managed by corporate leaders. They also engage in corporate sponsorships and “corporate responsibility programs.” According to American experts, a contributing factor for Western NGOs in the decision-making process may often be whether or not the organization is an advocate for vegan or vegetarian policies, or can accept omnivore policies, also whether or not it can accept policies supporting the use of working animals as humane. In other words, if using the corporate donor might cause them to violate NGO moral policies, accepting their money was not acceptable for many (Jones 2010, Sep 28).

There are funds available around the world from local and national governments for conservation and animal welfare. In the USA, this is mainly available from the departments of Agriculture and Interior. In addition, US Agency for International Development (USAID), an element of the US Department of State, sponsors development projects in agriculture, which could be used in some cases to advance humane practices. Canada, the UK, Germany, the Scandinavian governments, Japan, and many other governments have similar agencies that focus on external funding. In the US State of Virginia and some other states, funds are available for training wildlife rehabilitators. In Australia, farming industry levies are matched by the Australian federal government. Indications are that such money is then often used by the industry representative body to try to prove no welfare impact of contentious practices with animals, e.g., keeping cows in stalls and live export of cattle and sheep. Worse still, if “independent” researchers are employed to conduct the work, the industry body often retains and uses the right to veto publication of results that are not favorable (Phillips 2011). In Australia, in 2010, the Minister for Local Government in the Northern Territory, Malarndirri McCarthy, provided grants of \$190,000 to four animal welfare NGOs in order to improve animal well-being and good animal management practice, with RSPCA Darwin getting \$46,713 for their animal shelter and an additional \$75,000 went to indigenous populations for dog control (Northern Territory Government 2010). In May of the same year, New Zealand Government – Agriculture Minister David Carter – announced his government would provide national funds of \$8.2 million over 4 years to boost animal welfare activities (Walters 2010). Any one of these governments probably at some point will violate NGO ethical standards, if only to purchase meat from inhumane sources. How then can their funds be accepted?

The answer is in the contract. If the contract asks an NGO to do something that violates its ethical foundation, it should not do it. Otherwise, perhaps accept the monies in order to accomplish a great good that otherwise would be unattainable. The same logic holds for International Organizations.

2.1.1 Sustainable Funding

Sustainable donations were a problem for recipients, with one surveyed NGO saying:

The biggest issue is financial instability, to be able to regularly pay for certain stuff. Sometimes it is possible to get grants from International NGOs or Foundations for short projects. But when they end then it is not possible to keep the stuff so the organization is not very sustainable and the impact is smaller. National Government is supporting us first time at all and this is for the year 2010 only (International Farm Rescue 2010, October).

While sustainable funding is an aim, the sign that an animal protection NGO is making an impact should be the effectiveness of its programs, not its bank account's balance. One inevitably leads to the other. In my opinion, an NGO can be true to its ethical core and receive funds from governments and International Organizations without fear of moral compromise so long as the details of the contract are read and understood. In addition, my other advice is not to rely on a sole source of funds for a project or the entire budget. That is too much vulnerability. Some NGOs such as GOAL Ireland rely on governments for a lot of their income. On the other hand, as YouthBuild USA discovered, it does not make sense to have the majority of funding from one agency or government, for the simple reason that if they pull their funds – perhaps just for fiduciary reasons, not politics, the economic viability of the NGO can be in doubt. Just as private persons should diversify investments, NGOs should diversify donors and donor types. One little NGO on Saba in the Caribbean does not have enough staff to do professional fund-raising. As they put it, they can barely keep up with the work of saving animals, but if an NGO can build a large diversified donor portfolio, such as the Heritage Foundation, it can also afford to turn down donations that have strings attached and focus on fulfilling its mission at the same time.

To keep a major program alive, one NGO accepted funding from a single private donor who unfortunately reneged and put the NGO into a financial crisis; based on the promise of inputs, the NGO's HQ made capital investments. The gentleman in question originally made a 3-year pledge, but was unable to fulfill it after the first year. There is nothing a charity can do in that case in most countries because a gift is a voluntary transfer of property – not an obligation. Though charities should have a letter of agreement or MOU, which outlines the charity's responsibilities to the donor and the terms of the multiyear pledge, such an agreement cannot be enforced. It is, of course, difficult for the charity who was counting on that money and it means that another funder must be found or the program must be modified or delayed in the humanitarian and development communities as well, just because

a donor makes a pledge does not mean the pledge will be honored. As is seen by studying UN and OECD records of government pledges, governments have often been slow on delivery, and accounting can be surprising. Sometimes a government also double counts its development and disaster assistance donations, according to Stoddard Ahmad of OECD, who has expressed some pessimism over development aid funds (money which might in some cases help animals), money pledged by Italy, Japan, and France in 2010 (Bryant 2010).

2.1.2 Political Taint

Being politically tainted is also an issue that cannot be ignored. There are governments with questionable policies who need the support of reliable, well-known Western NGOs in order to burnish their political identity. Sudan would be one such because its government, like that of Myanmar, North Korea, and Zimbabwe, is under huge international pressure to correct humanitarian practices that run counter to international norms. Local NGOs in such countries must be careful not to anger the government or they might be forced to do things they otherwise might not wish to, perhaps even be shut down. But an NGO not headquartered in one of those countries could lobby such governments for changes in policies regarding animals and even negotiate new rules. Some feel this creates a perception of a conflict of interest to advocate humane policies while working in partnership with “inhumane” governments, even accepting funds from their agencies. That perception can be modified with a good public diplomacy campaign. Humanitarian NGOs do the same thing every day in order to save millions of lives and death privation. The truth is the lands with greatest animal welfare needs are not in Europe. They are often in lands with the worst governments. The animals did not ask to live there, which is why when the opportunity presented itself, WSPA led efforts to save animals in Myanmar during Cyclone Nargis, at great personal risk to the veterinarians. This work was also done in partnership with the FAO (a UN agency) and US military aircraft flew the supplies in coordination with USAID. WSPA stayed politically neutral, feeling that saving the animals in a neutral manner in no way supported inhumane policies by the Myanmar government. The mission ended up saving thousands of animals from abject cruelty.

2.1.3 Donor Rules Are Not to Be Feared

When discussing receipt of funds from the UN, the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) often comes up. It has practices and programs often supportive of animal welfare, but not all of its policies comport. It also has serious funding limitations. A number of NGOs do work with it, but as already noted, there are some which fear any relationship with the UN. What is true is that the FAO and every other international donor have rules that must be followed, but working

with them is strictly voluntary. No NGO is asked to do what it does not to do (Hoffman 2010).

Registration is a common rule, especially for major donors such as WFP, FAO, and USAID. To receive money from the USAID, NGOs must be registered, have audits, prove they are a nonprofit, and are spending their money wisely. That is a common rule for any donor. There are also restrictions, areas in which money cannot be spent, such as advancing a specific religion or supporting listed terrorist organizations. If the UN Security Council restricts dealing with certain countries or entities, member states of the UN are also obligated to restrict their donor funds. UN agencies operate in much the same way as do European donors, but then so do private donors. Those rules are simply a way to make sure that transactions are honest, transparent, and meaningful. It is possible that in some countries, governments may put political pressure on NGOs, but in the West, while governments do fund “political initiatives,” all work is done by contract, and no NGO is forced to sign a contract. Neither the UN, the European Union, nor the Red Cross movement pressure contracts. Right now, there is not a single database showing how all of the major donors could interact with animal protection NGOs. This is something which should be rectified for the benefit of the entire industry.

2.2 Reverse the Axiom: Consider Giving to Governments?

Many governments do not have enough resources to do what the animal protection community wants. Why do not we help them help us? If we want nations such as Somaliland or Bolivia to invest in reducing risk to animals, especially livestock, to build veterinary clinics and conservation programs, to install humane slaughter program, etc., they will need help from the World Bank, foundations, and traditional donor nations. While NGOs must consider their own bottom line, if we want government policies to be truly transformational very often the disposable income of local and provincial governments in particular also must increase, especially in weaker economies. One approach to helping governments is to use international conferences to develop mandates to fund animal protection or use them as important networking opportunities with private and institutional donors. Development needs in infrastructure, low tax revenues, and debt servicing all work against adding animal protection as a new priority; therefore, as several UN missions told me in my research, external funding will be required. Conference reports and resolutions can be a means of attracting international donor institutions, a way to propose fresh funding mechanisms.

Grants from NGOs can be a useful tool to change policies on a micro level. For that logic, I refer to the research of Muhammad Yunis, winner of the Nobel Prize for Economics in 2006. Often call banker to the poor, Yunis cited in his book *Building Social Business* the 1989 *Grameen Fisheries and Livestock Foundation* as a precedent. The project was set up to administer 1,000 fish ponds in northern and western Bangladesh that were not working anymore, due to poor government

management. By 2009, Yunis and his people had brought together over 3,000 people into a group that produced 2,000 ton of fish per year. “For many in Bangladesh, livestock was the only hope,” with 75% of the 150 million people in 2008 Bangladesh depending on that source of income to some extent. “In 2002, a livestock program was added providing training, vaccination, veterinary care and support services for poor women to become dairy farmers” (Yunis 2010; Bari 2008). Projects like this start small and can totally change the way a microculture handles animals. If an animal protection NGO or coalition was to fund such a project through local governments, not only would that create a political ally, but also save animals and build a cultural support for humane policies.

In addition to trying to change the philosophy of existing funding mechanisms and mandates, animal protection NGOs further advance our industry by tying high priority animal welfare programs to funded humanitarian-oriented projects related to disaster recovery, development, drought resistance, flood sustainable agriculture, and hunger management. The International Animal Protection Center (IAPC) proposed in Sect. 1.10 might be perfect for such a concept because its success is not tied to any one project, as is the case with many NGOs. Not tied to bolstering a specific project, the IAPC could look at funding opportunities on a global scale and then propose entry points for animal protection projects where the larger project serves both people and animals. If an NGO wanted to bid on the contract, but had a small staff, the IAPC could help with advice, though it would have to be careful not to give clients an unfair commercial advantage. In countries such as Pakistan, which was hit by terrible floods in 2010, farmers depending on livestock for a living had no financial flexibility, certainly not from the national authority. They and their provincial governments were generally cash poor. At the same time, World Health Organization, UNDP, and other international bodies are funded to foster risk-resistant structures and societies. Using international funding to invest in earthquake-resistant veterinary clinics could be done under humanitarian risk reduction programs without changing the basic mandate of the program and thus help both animals and people. The IAPC, acting for the industry as a whole, could effectively make the proper arguments to the international funding bodies to consider funding animal protection priorities out of their budgets. At that point, the IAPC would simply advertise the opportunity to any animal protection NGO, which might care to bid, and provide advice so that the bidding is effective.

During the World Conference on Disaster Reduction (WCDR) in 2004, participating governments came to realize that poor farmers and businessmen are also impatient. If a shanty town on the coast of South Africa is washed away, it will be rebuilt just as shabbily as before unless external donors invest in disaster-resilient shelters. Local NGOs, especially shelters and local advocacy groups, can quickly identify the needs. As an example, a Central Animal Emergency Response Fund managed by the IAPC could pay to facilitate a coordinated negotiation between animal protection NGOs, the local government, and international donors, with the aim of integrating the construction of sustainable farms and structures for animals into the overall development–recovery plan being organized by the UN. There is no reason why enhancing farms, veterinary centers, and slaughter houses

cannot be integrated with humanitarian development projects, but funds will be required. Obtaining such funds could be a major mandate for the IAPC, and since the work will need to be done by NGOs, they too will benefit, but the IAPC would not do this work. It should simply facilitate funding so that other NGOs could bid. It could also train NGOs on how to bid. There is no NGO today that can do this job, due to a conflict of interest with funding its own projects.

2.3 Red Flags Regarding Money

2.3.1 Program Budget Implications

One way to pay for a fresh initiative is by changing program budgets, but this can be a serious problem if the program is funded by core UN budget monies. In the UN and many other International Organizations, this is called Program Budget Implications or PBIs. No UN resolution will be considered in either ECOSOC or the UNGA if PBIs are not considered. Similarly donors to international bodies will demand that their secretariats flag increases in core budgets. Every organization has methodologies for handling budgets; and in the UN system (which uses a biennium) governments cover them, and major powers such as the USA and the UK cover a percentage of that budget, often making them enemies of PBIs. Any increase in the core budget increases their financial exposure. Initiatives with a potential PBI are reviewed by UNGA's Fifth Committee and then by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ). Unless the UN's major donors feel that the initiative is worthy of changing the budget, it will die if it negatively impacts the budget. *Recommendation:* Avoid supporting any PBI when negotiating an agreement with UN, even if the supporting governments like the idea.

The way around the PBI problem is to have the resolution endorse a project's value while requiring that it be managed through *extrabudgetary funds*. The same governments that do not support PBIs often provide extra budgetary support to programs. One is ReliefWeb, the UN's most successful disaster information project. It has always been funded from extrabudgetary sources; yet it has grown from a project requiring a few hundred thousand dollars US a year to several million a year and three offices. Perhaps a resolution could propose an external fund for office of a "disaster/development veterinarians" in OCHA or ISDR that advises the UN on humane treatment of animals. If enough traditional donors agreed to the concept and it had the support of influential members of the G77 coalition of nations, such a project could be endorsed and effectively funded.

2.3.2 Global Public Goods

The Global Public Goods (GPGs) concept could be considered as a tool for funding regional or global animal protection projects. This has been advanced in particular

by developing countries and the UNDP (UN Development Program) as an alternative to PBIs. A local public good is a lighthouse, which protects ships entering a harbor from sea or a satellite early warning system that warns livestock owners across the Africa of impending drought conditions. The beneficiaries of these public goods do not pay for the service, but someone must; yet there is no internationally agreed definition of GPGs or payment methods. Usually, it comes from a coalition of governments or even foundations. From an animal protection point of view, GPGs might apply to cross-border concepts such as fighting diseases that can be spread by vectors such as insects, rodents, farm animals, and pets, or by promoting humane treatment of pastoral herds, or cross-border water supply systems that could help livestock. An example of how to finance such a GPG could be a carbon tax proportional to a country's level of carbon emissions. Since 1 ton of coal gives off approximately 5,700 pounds of carbon dioxide; it is possible to calculate pollution by measuring consumption. Anything that can be measured can be taxed, so this is an emerging environmental idea for both reducing carbon emissions and funding public goods. This is popular in some quarters, though controversial in the USA where goods such as health care are provided by both the state and the private sector, whereas there is an international movement for all health care to be a GPG.

Recommendation: Offer no recommendation on the value of the GPG concept, except that as animal health and welfare standards regionalize, questions will be asked in the developing world about how to raise sufficient funds to pay for them. Poor countries will want to spread the costs, so NGOs developing such standards of care need to be ready to deal with the GPG issue, even though the service itself might not only be about "animal protection." Perhaps before going down that route, have in place a donor package – *in other words, pledges*. I do offer a caution. This is a very controversial route, and since some services may require significant funding, this means coming from traditional donors. Many have not yet embraced this concept as a valid tool.

2.3.3 *International Taxation*

This concept is similar to the GPG minefield and emerges rather regularly in negotiations, but NGOs are wise to be wary of it as a method of paying for initiatives; like PBIs, it is not voluntary. Even if some supporting government proposes international taxation for covering implementation of animal welfare standards in a poor region, the taxes will probably be geared toward taxing the wealthy and governments who will have to pay the tax will likely oppose it and therefore the initiative. Also remember that some nations have laws that prohibit making voluntary contributions to the UN if it imposes taxation. There is an exception. The burden of international taxation normally is intended to fall on wealthy donor nations, but if the impacted nations were willing to set up some kind of "voluntary regional scheme," this might be an achievable proposition. In that case, all of the impacted governments have agreed in advance, but this is a major ask.

2.3.4 General Things to Avoid or Keep in Mind

When approaching governments in particular for grants, it is very important to have the NGO's tax papers and audits in order, usually for the preceding 3 years. In addition, donors will want to know what percentage of funds is used for fund-raising and administrative matters, versus actual services. A charity that spends only 33% of its revenue on services is very inefficient. Donors will want to see 70% or better of revenue spent on services. As for raising funds, a charity should spend 10 cents (US), a dime, or less to raise a dollar of revenue. Salaries do not matter much so long as they are in line with industry norms for the size and type of organization. In fact, the US government frequently restricts their funds from going to salaries or anything other than a bit of administration and a lot of services. ReliefWeb.int is a good example. This was initially funded in the US government out of reprogrammed money. In other words, the Department of State went to Congress and asked permission to reallocate authorized money for the project. Congress never had a problem with that so long as none of the money went to salaries. The money provided by governments is in turn usually based on some formula, for example, reimbursing X amount of dollars to the NGO multiplied by the number of animals served. Most of the time, grants are competitive; an NGO competes for project grants. In that situation, the request for proposal (RFP) will establish a service, criteria to be used to compete, and perhaps a maximum budget. Depending on the rules, grants can be more flexible as to the way the funds are spent so long as the service is delivered on time and within budget. The key thing to remember is that they are competitive, so evidence must be presented as the ability of an NGO to perform a task like humane slaughter education. Keep in mind that most of the projects that an animal protection NGO might compete for are not animal protection projects. They have some other function, perhaps sustainable agriculture or rabies prevention, slaughter of infected poultry, etc. The NGO should abide by humane standards when conducting the service, but the provider's goals are different.

2.4 Approaching the European Commission for Funds

Within the EC, the Humanitarian Aid Department (ECHO) is definitely a body that NGOs should consider for funding opportunities. It is the service of the European Commission responsible for humanitarian assistance. Various Directorates in the EC are likely potential sources as well, especially for development opportunities. Probably the best approach is to ask for targeted project funds. Project funds related to appeals are also a good approach with ECHO; it provided in 2009 nearly a billion dollars in assistance in a wide range of emergencies, a lot of it directly to NGOs. The range of projects can vary topically as well, not just disaster assistance but also risk reduction. In Somaliland, for example, they funded in 2010 a project to provide

disincentives to youths to turn to radical programs. ECHO also funds capacity building in International Organizations by partnering in projects. In 2010, the Foreign Affairs Council of the European Union asked ECHO to build a food security program to help the more than one billion poor people who are food insecure. This is quite likely a potential area of cooperation with animal welfare (ECHO 2010).

2.5 Approaching an International Organization

For engaging an International Organization, the rules are essentially the same as for Ministries, Missions, and Embassies. Many NGOs like writing to the CEO in order to short circuit the process and to speed up a reply, whether to ask for funds or political support. This definitely can work if the NGO has excellent personal connections, but without such an advantage, it almost never works. It is usually best to first find out who in the organization has primary responsibility for the topic of focus and build a relationship from the bottom up. Doing that makes writing to the head of the agency unnecessary. As an example, when writing about animal welfare to the US Department of Agriculture, instead of communicating with the Secretary of Agriculture, it is better to write to the Deputy Director, Animal Care.

Once the right officer is found, build a relationship and ask questions about the organization's mission, how NGOs interact with it, and whether funding for projects is possible. If the subject matter office is convinced of the value of an NGO's proposals, then it has a permanent supporter at the working level for that and other topics. Another good example would be UNHCR (the High Commissioner for Refugees). Instead of going to the Commissioner in Geneva, I found an officer who developed food security and livelihood protection schemes involving livestock. He became my advocate for integrating animal welfare into relief operations. Now if I need the support of the Commissioner for a UN resolution, I have a trusted subject expert on his own staff to support my proposals. Another reason to do this is that staff officers last longer. CEOs move on rapidly.

In addition to finding out which office might cover an NGO's areas of focus, check the website out for information on collaboration with NGOs (civil society). Most IOs have a special section on interaction and in some cases, like the World Food Program (WFP), have developed brochures that cover both cooperation and opportunities for funding. Also, fully review the many areas of interest by the IO before making the first appointment. Doing that due diligence will say to the new contact that the NGO is serious about working with his agency.

It is also important to know that IOs are organized like commercial corporations, except that instead of a Board of Directors made up of important private investors and talented corporate leaders, each IO has a governing body made up of government representatives. Governments are the primary donors, the keepers of the charter. It is therefore important to know who belongs and understands their point of view. A Secretariat runs the organization on a day-to-day basis. Its job is

to follow the political guidance of the governing body and manage the IO. The bottom line is that IOs are not just technical bodies. They are political. Sometimes the Secretaries General (Chief Executive Officers) give personality to their organizations, like Achim Steiner of UNEP or Kofi Annan, who used to be the UN's Secretary General. The IO is a living organism, so it is important before engaging it that its mission and daily pulse be understood.

If interested in collaborating with the IO on emergency management response or prevention issues, also go to ReliefWeb and PreventionWeb (<http://www.reliefweb.int> or <http://www.preventionweb.net>). Both are excellent resources managed by OCHA and portals that will explain what NGOs are already doing, as well as target IOs. ReliefWeb operates under a UN General Assembly of a UN General Assembly resolution. That kind of research will be invaluable when making a first appointment.

2.6 Operational Funding for Disasters and Risk Reduction

In July and August, 2006, after serious discussions with OCHA's Geneva office, Gerhard Putman-Cramer, the then Director for Disaster Response, agreed in principle that animal welfare NGOs could join in assessment exercises, meaning that animal welfare experts could go into a disaster and right alongside the regular UN personnel, determine what the animal welfare needs were. They could then also arrange to have those needs woven into the larger UN appeals process. This was not a check for unlimited funds, but the potential for funding and operational success from such an arrangement is enormous. These evaluations, which are conducted by OCHA and other UN emergency agencies in the UN, are part of the foundation of the UN Appeals Process and form the data upon which to ask for help from donors.

The UN appeals process sets out the needs in a disaster in a common format, making it easy for donors to understand not only what is needed, but how much it will take to meet those needs. The following were the agreed points of cooperation with OCHA, which will do well in supporting animal protection schemes in other agencies.

- Professional animal care as a humanitarian issue in disasters (a) can protect human livelihoods and improve food security, and (b) protecting animals reduces psychological stress on refugees and the internally displaced persons (IDP's), reducing the potential for humans staying in danger in order to protect their property.
- Professional animal welfare staff, especially veterinarians, are especially well placed to collaborate on assessment teams and on practical standards for animal care in disasters.
- Humanitarian relief workers are rarely trained to recognize animals in stress or how to handle them in a crisis mode.
- Information gathered by animal welfare teams on roads, potable water, and shelters could be enormous value to UN disaster teams.

2.7 Can an IAPC Facilitate Funding for Everyone?

The question emerges of how to identify and coordinate the availability of reliable funding across the entire international donor community in support of the entire animal protection community. In *“Uniting the Orchestra,”* I suggest creating a specialized NGO as one answer. Instead of competing with other NGOs by having disaster and development projects of its own, its mandate would be to help animal protection NGOs with their diplomatic efforts; to track political opportunities and problems going on throughout the UN and Red Cross communities of organizations and governments; coordinate sharing of this information in a way that avoids missed opportunities; to advance protecting animals, and perhaps draft resolutions, conferences, reports, projects, etc. This diplomatic effort could also be used to identify funding opportunities and projects needing support from the animal protection community of NGOs. Using information garnering by the IAPC, all animal protection NGOs, regardless of size or geographic location, will be better informed and therefore better able to influence how rules are changed to protect animals. Coordinating such an information gathering and sharing task is typical of any government mission to the UN. That is exactly what the US Mission to the UN does for all US federal agencies. The efforts of the US Mission create enormous efficiencies for each agency since they do not need to do their own investigations. Further, they can work in harmony, which in turns makes US efforts as a whole more effective. Why not use that same synergy to identify and garner funding for the thousands of NGOs who protect animals?

This “facilitating role” is a major undertaking and not something any current NGO like WSPA, IFAW, or HIS could do, simply because of a conflict of interest. They are all operational or advocacy NGOs with a need to use that same information to advance their particular projects, like the prevention of bear farming or the seal hunt, or any of conservation programs. Identifying funding sources has the same problem. Every NGO needs its own donors, but any funds it acquires will mainly be used for its own ends – which is entirely appropriate. An IAPC, on the other hand, can create a consolidated approach benefiting the broader community. Right now wherever there is a UN emergency, the NGOs, governments, and International Organizations involved do surveys to assess resource needs and funding requirements. These consolidated statements are then placed into one public database called the Consolidated Appeals Process (CAP), managed by the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). The IAPC could replicate this process for all animal protection NGOs, making the identification of animal needs and resource requirements easier, also avoiding duplication and waste.

After a crisis occurs, emergency managers from the host government, as well as from the UN, USAID, and other agencies, send out assessment teams, who develop statements of need and proposed budgets. From an animal welfare perspective, it might be that a village needs a veterinary clinic or perhaps refugees need a cattle shelter – though those needs are not now tracked by CAP. Donors pledge against

these consolidated needs statements; e.g., France might pledge €5 million toward a road project and then NGOs can make proposals for those funds to be applied to them in order to accomplish the stated need. Without the CAP, NGOs might not even be aware of the potential funds. A version of CAP for animal protection, in full partnership with OCHA, could be an essential tool for any NGO wanting to plan animal protection operations, especially when combined with the information on ReliefWeb, to know who is in need, who is pledging, and who is conducting work. This can open doors for becoming an implementing partner and obtaining funds or other shared resources. Since 1992, well over 100 donor countries have provided more than \$42 billion for 330 appeals through CAP to address the needs of people in more than 50 countries and regions. Think what we in the animal protection business could be if we had more effective access to the same donors.

Related to this system are a number of websites designed for the humanitarian development and relief community that could also be replicated by the IAPC to advance animal protection.

Financial Tracking Service: This UN site can be found on ReliefWeb.int and explains how well appeals are being funded and whether or not pledges are being fulfilled. No one does this now for animal protection. Veterinary clinics, villages with livestock, zoos, Ministries, and other organizations need help both before an emergency to reduce their risks and just be financially sustainable and after a disaster strikes in order to effectively respond and build for a more sustainable future. When all of that information is gathered, the totality of the needs will certainly be too much for any one NGO to handle. Therefore, a database is needed to track individual needs, who pledges to help, progress made, and if the pledges for financial assistance were met. This is what FTS does for the humanitarian community. “The FTS is a global, real-time database that records all reported international humanitarian aid (including that for NGOs and the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement, bilateral aid, in-kind aid, and private donations)” (UN_OCHA 2010b). We also need such a service. It will help animal protection NGOs conduct a professional triage and, in other words, prioritize assistance so that efforts are truly effective, not simply emotionally decided. Because the FTS deals with huge needs across entire nations and regions, it is managed by the UN OCHA, which then shares all data provided by donors or recipient organizations. It would not be a major challenge to blend animal welfare and humanitarian reporting, have the IAPC collect animal protection information, and produce an integrated database of value to everyone. We would gain total transparency and more effective donating.

Good Humanitarian Donorship Initiative (GHD): In the mid-1990s, NGOs, the Red Cross, and United Nations agencies involved in humanitarian assistance decided to create their own specific guidelines, define their responsibilities and rights under international law, and set standards against which they could be accountable. An outcome of this work was the Sphere Project. The point was that donors would be more likely to provide funds to NGOs which operate in an open, transparent manner that also increased professionalism. What I suggest is animal protection NGOs develop a parallel initiative, drawing on the experiences of the humanitarian community. Such an initiative could be a powerful framework to

guide effective animal welfare during development times, as well as after natural disasters and conflicts. It will also encourage greater donor accountability (GHD Initiative 2010).

Online Projects System (OPS): The United Nations asks humanitarian NGOs to use the OPS to bid on a project or propose their own project. Some animal protection projects will be so specific that OPS would not list them, so I propose to have a parallel system for animal welfare needs projects, which is linked to the OPS, sort of a portal. This way, donors in the humanitarian community who only look there will see animal protection bids on humanitarian projects and understand their relevance, but donors who want to fund animal projects will also have a database tailored for their needs as well.

Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF): This is primarily a cash-flow mechanism allowing UN agencies to access funds rapidly while waiting for donor pledges to be transferred, important since pledges often are often slow, being tied to fiscal years than actual needs. CERF has not always worked well for animals. FAO has requested CERF funds to support livestock in emergencies, only to have those requests rejected. The CERF also does not directly fund NGOs (UN_OCHA 2010a). What I propose is that the IAPC approach major private donors and governments known to support animal protection and create our own Central Animal Emergency Response Fund that can direct funds to NGOs based on industry-agreed criteria. Industry representatives will be required and perhaps even an elected board in order to maintain trust that funds are being distributed fairly, something no existing NGO could do, in fairness. This could be a real boon for small shelters in hurricane-ravaged islands, for example, helping to reestablish shelters and supply lines, while major NGOs begin to enter an emergency.



<http://www.springer.com/978-3-642-21273-4>

Diplomacy, Funding and Animal Welfare

Roeder, L.W.

2011, XXXVI, 232 p., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-642-21273-4