THE LIVESTOCK EMERGENCY GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS (LEGS)



Halit Cinar
Agricultural Livelihoods/Livestock Specialist
FAO Türkiye



LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION



Ponii	lation	arowth
	lation	growth



Increasing demand



Growing sector



Different production systems







LEGS, DEFINITION

Focused on Regions Prone to Disasters



BACKGROUND





LEGS is based on the Minimum Standards in Disaster Response

Sphere is one of a number of 'Quality and Accountabili ty' initiatives

A companion standard to Sphere (2011)



Repeated inappropriate and badly implemented livestock projects

- Poor Analysis
- Overlooked or undermined Urgency and timing often the excuse but ...
- Assistance often late



Very limited impact assessment



Weak Coordination

LOGIC BEHIND LEGS



THE DEVELOPMENT OF LEGS



- Steering Group
- Focal Point authors
- Consultation
 - 1st draft

- 2nd draft
- LEGS Handbook with a CD-ROM
- Also available on the LEGS website: http://www.livestock-emergency.net











GOAL OF LEGS



Two Key Strategies

- 1.Identification of most appropriate interventions
- 2.Provide standards, indicators and guidance



LEGS' TARGET GROUP



Practitioner:

- Livestock Experts
- Humanitarian Experts

Decision Makers:

- Donors
- Government





LEGS OBJECTIVES





To provide rapid assistance



To **protect**



To rebuild

THE LEGS APPROACH



Preliminary Assessment	60 ■
Response identification	
Analysis	
Monitoring and Evaluation	

THE LEGS APPROACH



Stage 1: Preliminary assessment -Checklists

Stage 2: Response Identification [PRIM]

Stage 3: Analysis of technical interventions and options Implications; Decision Trees; Advantages and Disadvantages; Timing; Standards & Guidelines

Stage 4:
Monitoring &
Evaluation
Standards &
Guidelines; M&E
Checklists

THE LEGS APPROACH: OUTPUTS FOR EACH STAGE



Preliminary
assessment
> info on:
livestock roles
impact of
emergency
situation analysis

Response
Identification
> one or more
technical
interventions
prioritized

Analysis of technical interventions and options
-> options selected
-> response program designed

Monitoring & Evaluation

PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT



Preliminary assessment 2: The nature and impact of the emergency

Objective of the assessment: to determine whether an emergency response is necessary; understand the initial impact of the disaster on the affected populations; and identify what further information is needed.

Key Questions:

- 2.1 What type of emergency is it: rapid onset, slow onset or complex?
- 2.2 What is the cause of the emergency (drought, flood, war etc)?
- 2.3 What is the history of this type of emergency in this context?
- 2.4 Which stage has the emergency reached (alert/alarm/emergency/ immediate aftermath/recovery etc)?
- 2.5 What is the area affected?
- 2.6 What has been the impact of the disaster on the affected population:
 - 2.6.1 What is the nutritional status of the affected population?
 - 2.6.2 What is the prevalence of disease?
 - 2.6.3 What is the mortality rate?
 - 2.6.4 What has been the impact on vulnerable groups (for example women, children, people living with HIV/AIDS, particular ethnic groups) (see Appendix 2.4 for references on vulnerability analysis)?
 - 2.6.5 Are there signs that the coping strategies/'difficult times' indicators from question 1.7 are being implemented?
 - 2.6.6 Has there been significant migration or displacement of (parts of) the affected populations? If so, who is affected and have they taken their livestock with them? What is the impact on the host community?
- 2.7 What has been the impact of the emergency on livestock management strategies:
 - 2.7.1 What is the impact on access to grazing?
 - 2.7.2 What is the impact on access to water resources for livestock?
 - 2.7.3 What is the impact on daily and seasonal movements?
 - 2.7.4 What is the impact on livestock traders and key livestock markets?
 - 2.7.5 What is the impact on livestock services?
 - 2.7.6 What has been the impact on natural resources?
 - 2.7.7 What has been the impact on the gender division of labour?
 - 2.7.8 What plans do the affected population have for their livestock in the future?
- 2.8 What has been the impact of the emergency on livestock (differentiate by species if necessary):
 - 2.8.1 What is the impact on livestock sales?
 - 2.8.2 What is the impact on livestock prices?
 - 2.8.3 Have the terms of trade between livestock and cereal prices changed?
 - 2.8.4 How has livestock condition deteriorated?
 - 2.8.5 Has livestock productivity fallen (off-take of milk, blood, eggs etc)?
 - 2.8.6 Has livestock morbidity increased?

WHAT IS THE PRIM?



The PRIM is:

• a tool to facilitate discussions with local stakeholders

In order to:

identify which interventions

WHY USE THE PRIM FOR PLANNING?



The PRIM:

- Promotes a participatory approach
- Focuses on livelihoods objectives
 - considers phases of emergency
 - roots interventions in their impact on livelihoods
- Gives a visual summary

HOW TO USE THE PRIM



Best used:

- As a planning tool
- In a participatory workshop
- To bring together information:
 - Preliminary assessment findings
 - Existing baseline information
 - Government reports
 - Experiences and knowledge of the workshop participants

THE WAY PRIM WORKS



- PRIM considers the three livelihood objectives against the interventions
 - Emphasizes the importance of all three objectives
 - Addresses how the different interventions can fit in and overlap
- The right-hand side of the matrix help to plan the timing of interventions
- Rapid-onset (earthquake) and slow-onset (drought) disasters.

LIVELIHOODS OBJECTIVES AND TECHNICAL TOOLS



- Provide rapid assistance
 - Destocking (accelerated off-take)
 - Destocking (slaughter destocking)
- Protect the key livestock assets
 - Veterinary Services
 - Provision of feed
 - Provision of water
 - Livestock shelter
- Rebuild key livestock assets among crisis affected communities
 - Provision of livestock
 - Veterinary services, water, feed, shelter

SLOW ONSET PRIM



Scoring against LEGS objectives:

**** significant benefits/highly appropriate

**** benefits/appropriate

*** some benefits ** a few benefits

* very little benefit/not very appropriate

n/a not appropriate

Technical interventions	Livelihoods Objectives			Emergency Phases				
	Rapid	Protect	Rebuild	Alert	Alarm	Emergency	Recovery	
	assistance	assets	assets				ŕ	
Destocking								
Vet Services								
Feed								
Water								
Shelter								
Provision of livestock								

Emergency Phases:

→ appropriate timing for the intervention

RAPID ONSET PRIM



Scoring against LEGS objectives:

***** significant benefits/highly appropriate
**** benefits/appropriate
*** some benefits
** a few benefits

* very little benefit/not very appropriate

n/a not appropriate

Technical interventions	Livelihoods Objectives			Emergency Phases			
	Rapid assistance	Protect assets	Rebuild assets	Immediate aftermath	Early recovery	Recovery	
Destocking							
Vet services							
Feed							
Water							
Shelter							
Provision of livestock							

Emergency Phases:

→ appropriate timing for the intervention

COMPLETED PRIM EXAMPLE OF RAPID ONSET EMERGENCY IN ASIA: EARTHQUAKE



Technical interventions	Livelihoods Objectives			Eme	Emergency Phases			
	Rapid assistance	Protect assets	Rebuild assets	Immediate aftermath	Early recovery	Recovery		
Destocking	n/a	n/a	n/a					
Vet services	**	****	****					
Feed	*	****	****					
Water	*	*	*	-				
Shelter	***	***	***					
Provision of livestock	n/a	n/a	****			→		

THE LEGS APPROACH



Stage 1: Preliminary assessment [Checklists]

Stage 2: Response Identification [PRIM]

Stage 3: Analysis of technical interventions and options [Implications; Decision Trees; Advantages and Disadvantages; Timing; Standards & Guidelines]

Stage 4: Monitoring & Evaluation [Standards & Guidelines; M&E Checklists]

EXAMPLE: ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES TABLE



Option	Advantages	Disadvantages
Relocation of livestock	 Can build on indigenous practices, for example using drought reserves May also avoid other risks, such as infection, predation or theft Can simplify the logistics of providing supplementary feed and water when required 	 Requires sufficient resources within suitable distance for livestock to reach Livestock need to be healthy enough to travel Potential competition with sedentary populations along migration routes In conflict situations, moving stock may increase risk to livestock owners
Emergency feeding: in situ	 Rapid response to keep animals at risk alive Can exploit fodder banks established previously as part of emergency preparedness May generate knock-on benefits in the local economy where opportunities for local sourcing exist 	 Input-intensive and expensive Needs to be able to continue for the duration of the emergency Not sustainable in the longer-term Requires safe facilities for storage and transport Risk of importing diseases, pests and vectors from outside

EXAMPLE: TIMING TABLE



Options	Rapid Onset			Slow Onset			
	Immediate Aftermath	Early Recovery	Recovery	Alert	Alarm	Emergency	Recovery
Relocation of livestock		-		_			—
Emergency feeding: in situ	→				_	•	
Emergency feeding: feed camps							

EXAMPLE: DECISION TREE





