

Draft Languages for Use in the UN

Draft Second Committee Resolution UNGA August 2009

- **Preambular:** Recognizing that many economies and hundreds of millions of people, in particular the poor, depend on animals for food, a living and social status and that animal welfare promotes food security, the reduction of poverty¹ and disease and fosters environmental protection.
- **Operative:** (new text) Encourages² member states³, the UN system⁴ and civil society⁵ to share and develop best practices⁶ related to animal welfare, as a component of development, environment and disaster reduction activities towards sustainable development.

Text was drafted by Larry Roeder, then UN Affairs Director, WSPA, based on work conducted at the World Conference on Disaster Reduction with the Department of State, and generally agreed by Brazil, Sudan, Seychelles, Chile (for consensus), Colombia, Czech Republic Sweden (for EC), Tanzania, August 26th, 2009 for inclusion in UNGA Second Committee Resolution. Argentina agreed not to object. This effort died in October 2009 when China objected on procedural grounds. China felt that since animal welfare had not been a topic of discussion in the Rio Summit, it could not be included in language intended to implement sustainable development as described by the Summit. While this position was not universally held, it prevented a consensus and the resolution died in October 2009 when WSPA dropped the initiative and moved on to other priorities.

¹ We have used the term “livelihood protection” in the past, a UN term; but Colombia and others have proposed being more direct in our language and saying “poverty reduction.”

² “Encourages” is considered easier to gain than “requests.” “Requests” could be used after UDAW text negotiations are complete.

³ “Member states” makes it clear we are engaging the UN.

⁴ “UN system” is used instead of “International Organizations” so that the resolution won’t advantage the EC or OIE. Only bodies like FAO, UNHCR, UN Departments and funds, etc are directly impacted.

⁵ The term “NGO” can be problematic. “Civil Society,” is less so and includes academia. The risk of course is that it also includes industry.

⁶ The term “best practices” is common in UN parlance and appropriate here, as we are calling for a dialogue, not a new beurocracy.

Draft Language for use with IASC

Working with Ambassador Jim Bishop, then Vice President of InterAction, we developed similar text for submission as a separate effort to OCHA for inclusion in the 2009/2010 agenda of IASC (Interagency Standing Committee), and by Secretariat of ISDR. The World Bank recommended that for it to consider the language it needed to be brought to its Global Civil Society team, led by John Garrison.

Typically a statement is limited to one page or less. Some preliminary discussion will set the stage, indicating the link between animal welfare and response/recovery, perhaps noting that of the one billion poorest people in the world, over 850 million totally depend on animals. This would be followed by a short recommendation, which we propose read as follows:

- *Recognizing that many economies and hundreds of millions of people, in particular the poor, depend on animals for food, their livelihood and social status, and that animal welfare promotes disaster recovery, sustainable development, food security, disease reduction, livelihood and environmental protection, the IASC calls on its members to integrate animal welfare into their disaster response and recovery activities.*

(Roeder, 2009, August)

Works Cited

Roeder, L. (2009, August). *Draft Second Committee Resolution UNGA*. New York: Informal Committee.