

# Agriculture in the ADP & Beyond

## **Take Action Now:**

**Improve** the welfare of animals

**Enhance** food security

**Address** climate change



## Farm Animal Welfare Recommendations



**BrighterGreen**  
Equity. Sustainability. Rights.™



**HUMANE SOCIETY**  
INTERNATIONAL

**United Nations Climate Change Conference**  
**Lima, Peru • COP 20/SBSTA 41**

**1-12 December, 2014**

# Animal Agriculture and the Global Climate Crisis

Climate change poses significant threats to ecosystems<sup>1</sup> and human health, especially in low-income nations,<sup>2</sup> and it endangers animals around the globe.<sup>3,4</sup> Yet, the animal agriculture sector, which raised over 75 billion land animals in 2012, is one of the largest contributors to greenhouse gas emissions<sup>5</sup> worldwide, responsible for an estimated 14.5% of human-induced emissions and projected to grow substantially by 2050.<sup>6</sup> Establishing a food secure, sustainable and welfare-friendly future requires immediate changes in farm animal production and consumption patterns.

Farm animals' welfare involves both their physical and psychological well-being. How farm animals are raised and treated can have important repercussions, not just for animal welfare, but for environmental sustainability, food security, and the economic well-being of farmers. ***Animal welfare can support livelihoods and food security, and therefore adaptation, and is an important element to evaluate and safeguard when considering climate change solutions in agriculture.***<sup>7</sup>

## ACTION

- 1. The ADP, SBSTA, and Beyond: COP decisions and SBSTA work should encourage Parties to evaluate, enhance, and safeguard animal welfare, as well as achieve other social and environmental goals.** For example, if the land sector is addressed in the ADP, particularly in Workstream 2, it should require maximization of co-benefits and avoidance of trade-offs. Further, supporting work of the SBSTA (e.g. upcoming workshops and submissions, FCCC/SBSTA/2014/L.14) should lead toward policy and finance that improves food security and sustainability, enhances the ability of farmers and farming systems to adapt to climate change, mitigates emissions, and improves animal welfare. Specific SBSTA opportunities lie in filling research and knowledge gaps, particularly on the impacts of climate change solutions on animal welfare and other sustainable development goals, as well as possible co-benefits of good animal welfare practices on environmental goals.
- 2. Finance: Parties should provide finance for sustainable, animal-welfare-friendly agriculture adaptation and mitigation—capacity building, research and extension, knowledge and tech transfer.** To enable implementation of animal-welfare-friendly practices that support livelihoods and food security, this finance and related programs should incorporate veterinary care and animal welfare assessments and improvements.
- 3. National, Regional, and Local Strategies: Governments at all levels must specifically include equitable, animal-welfare friendly solutions for farm animal production when designing climate change mitigation and adaptation plans.** Although climate change is a global problem, requiring global solutions, there is also a need for national and sub-national solutions. Such solutions should address agriculture in an equitable manner that promotes resilient landscapes, food security, animal welfare, and the ability to adapt to climate change.
- 4. Sustainable Consumption: Governments and civil society must address drivers of agricultural emissions by raising awareness about the health, climate, and environmental benefits of reducing meat, egg, and milk consumption, particularly in developed nations and amongst higher income urban consumers in mid-income nations, and implementing policies to encourage such a reduction.** A shift toward plant-based diets will reduce GHG emissions.<sup>8,9,10,11,12</sup> Leading public health and nutrition experts have confirmed that such a shift can be achieved without compromising nutrition,<sup>13,14</sup> and that a reduction in the consumption of animal products will likely lead to health benefits,<sup>15</sup> as well as other environmental benefits.<sup>16</sup>

## ENDNOTES

1. Fischlin A, Midgley GF, Price JT, et al. 2007. Ecosystems, their properties, goods, and services. In: Parry ML, Canziani OF, Palutikof JP, van der Linden PJ, and Hanson CE (eds.), *Climate change 2007: impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, pp. 241-245, Table 4.1).
2. Confalonieri U, Menne B, Akhtar R, et al. 2007. Human health. In: Parry ML, Canziani OF, Palutikof JP, van der Linden PJ, and Hanson CE (eds.), *Climate change 2007: impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, p. 393).
3. Bates BC, Kundzewicz ZW, Wu S, and Palutikof JP (eds.). 2008. *Climate change and water: Technical paper of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (Geneva: IPCC Secretariat, p. 62 § 4.2.3.2).
4. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007. *Climate change 2007: climate change impacts, adaptation and vulnerability; summary for policymakers. Working Group II Contribution to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Fourth Assessment Report, Chapter 5: food, fibre, and forest products*, pp. 275 and 277-278.
5. Gerber PJ, Steinfeld H, and Henderson B, et al. 2013. *Tackling climate change through livestock – a global assessment of emissions and mitigation opportunities*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Rome, p. xii.
6. Pelletier N and Tyedmers P. 2010. Forecasting potential global environmental cost of livestock production 2000-2050. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 107(43):18371-18374.
7. Humane Society International, Brighter Green, and World Society for the Protection of Animals. 2013. *Submissions to SBSTA: recommendations for animal-friendly and sustainable agriculture*. <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2013/smsn/ngo/399.pdf>.
8. Baroni L, Cenci L, Tettamanti M, Berati M. 2007. Evaluating the environmental impact of various dietary patterns combined with different food production systems. *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 61: 279-286.
9. McMichael A, Powles J, Butler C, and Uauy R. 2007. Food, livestock production, energy, climate change, and health. *The Lancet* 370:1253-1263.
10. Pelletier N and Tyedmers P. 2010. Forecasting potential global environmental costs of livestock production 2000-2050. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 107(43):18371-18374.
11. Pathak H, Jain N, Bhatia A, Patel J, and Aggarwal PK. 2010. Carbon footprints of Indian food items. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment* 139:66-73.
12. Weber CL and Matthews HS. 2008. Food-miles and the relative climate impacts of food choices in the United States. *Environmental Science & Technology* 42(10):3508-3513.
13. Position of the American Dietetic Association. 2009. *Vegetarian Diets*. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association* 109(7):1266-1282.
14. United States Department of Agriculture. 2009. *Vegetarian Diets*. [http://www.mypyramid.gov/tips\\_resources/vegetarian\\_diets.html](http://www.mypyramid.gov/tips_resources/vegetarian_diets.html). Accessed on November 17, 2009.
15. Position of the American Dietetic Association. 2009. *Vegetarian Diets*. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association* 109(7):1266-1282.
16. Leitzman C. Nutrition ecology: the contribution of vegetarian diets. 2003. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 78:657S-659S.

Photo courtesy of Sangamithra Iyer.