Patents on animals?
Preparing for Interlaken

by Ilse Köhler-Rollfson

Will farmers soon need permission to breed their sheep and cattle? Will they have to pay a license fee for every new calf or lamb born in their stables?

Far-fetched? Not if a key international conference decides to allow patents to apply to *animal genetic resources* – a term that covers everything from individual genes to whole animal breeds.

The First International Technical Conference on Animal Genetic Resources will be held in Interlaken, Switzerland, in the first week of September 2007. Sponsored by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the Swiss government, this conference will discuss how to go about managing animal genetic resources in a long-term sustainable manner.

FAO is aware of the patenting issue, but two studies it commissioned failed to analyse its implications for the sustainable use of animal genetic resources. One study in 2005 concluded that intellectual property rights (IPR) “are not a major concern, at present, in maintaining farm animal diversity. In the animal sector, technological resources and contractual practices, rather than formal IPR strategies have been the norm”.

The Draft Interlaken Declaration, a document that will form the basis for discussions at the Interlaken conference, changes all this. Paragraph 12 of the draft states: “We recognize that access to and the sharing of both, animal genetic resources and technologies, are essential for meeting world food security and the needs of the growing world population and must be facilitated… Such access and transfer shall be provided on terms that recognize and are consistent with the *adequate and efficient protection of intellectual property rights*” (emphasis added).

This phrasing will be hugely controversial. Many developing countries, along with various non-government organizations, have so far rejected any types of intellectual property rights on living organisms. Their slogan is “no patents on life”. Just recently, Greenpeace and several other NGOs have highlighted patent applications on pig-breeding by Monsanto, a multinational agricultural firm. The German Veterinary Council has sharply criticized a patent granted by the European Patent Office for cows that have been genetically engineered to produce more milk. The Council fears that high-performing cows have already been pushed to their physiological lim-
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its, and that any further attempt to raise milk yields will amount to cruelty. Animal welfare organizations concerned about cloning and genetic engineering are also joining the fray.

At a LPP-organized conference in Bellagio, Italy, experts from 17 countries expressed alarm that patenting on genes may restrict community-based breeding by farmers and pastoralists, and thereby negatively affect not only livelihoods, but also development of genetic diversity. In the run-up to the Interlaken conference, LPP and the LIFE Network have therefore campaigned intensively for “Livestock Keepers’ Rights”. Developed over a series of workshops with pastoralists and other livestock keepers, these are a bundle of rights and principles that would ensure that farmers and pastoralists remain active stakeholders in livestock breeding, even in the face of overpowering competition by livestock industries.

So developing countries, NGOs and animal welfare organizations are lining up on one side, and developed countries and big business on the other. With such powerful fronts building up, one might predict deadlock at Interlaken.

Types of intellectual property rights
Unfortunately the debate is not always very informed – so it is helpful to explain a little. First of all, it is not correct to equate IPRs just with patents. There are other types of IPRs too, and some of them have the potential to strengthen and support small-scale producers and rural development. The different types of IPRs relevant to animal genetic resources include trade secrets, patents, trademarks, and geographical indications.

- **Trade secrets** are very common in industrial poultry breeding, and in pig production too. By keeping tight control over their original lines and distributing only hybrid animals, a small number of transnational companies closely guard the progress of more than 20 years of scientific breeding.

- **Patents** are quite new to the farm animal sector. The rationale for patents is to encourage innovation, research and development. But are they really useful for animal breeding? They also establish “a significant body of exclusive rights with substantial impact on the use of [animal genetic resources] by researchers, breeders, and farmers”.2 Plus, how much research that is patentable (such as cloning and genetic engineering) actually supports the sustainable management of animal genetic resources and is in line with animal welfare needs? On the other hand, there may be instances where smallholders see selection by means of genetic markers (a patentable invention) as positive. One example is the possibility to weed out sheep with the scrapie gene – testing for which has become mandatory in the European Union.

- **Trademarks** are signs that distinguish the goods or services of one undertaking from those of others. They are the most commonly used type of IPR with respect to livestock products. Well-known examples are Angus certified beef, Kentucky Fried Chicken or McDonald hamburgers.

- **Geographical indications** identify the specific geographical origin of a product, along with its associated qualities, reputation or other characteristics. They usually include a place name – such as Parmesan cheese, Feta cheese and Bresse chicken. Cheese or chick-
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ens with these labels must be produced in these places, following specific practices. Already common in Europe, geographical indications are now beginning to be used in developing countries. The process of applying for this form of protection can be very empowering for rural communities. Examples are Karoo lamb from South Africa, and Chos Malal Chivito (goat kid meat) from Patagonia.

The choices

If they form a united block, developing countries can determine the outcome of the Interlaken Conference. They basically have three choices:

1. **Reject the idea of intellectual property rights** on animal genetic resources – at least for the time being, until their potential impact is sufficiently analysed. They could refuse to sign the Interlaken Declaration unless the phrase is deleted from the text. Developed countries, led by the United States, are unlikely to accept such a deal.

2. **Accept the concept of intellectual property rights** on animal genetic resources, but negotiate for substantial support to protect and safeguard the traditional knowledge of their livestock-keeping communities against misappropriation, as well as to build the capacity of these usually marginalized people. It is currently the poorest people in the world that carry out the conservation of livestock genetic diversity. There is ample rationale for rewarding and compensating this service to humanity at large.

3. Insist on the development of an **international sui-generis regime** for animal genetic resources. Such a system would be tailor-made to the specific requirements of animal genetic resources, and it could include rules and regulations that would benefit all stakeholders.

Which of these three options will developing countries choose?
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International lobbying and advocacy

In 2006, LPP intensified its efforts to draw attention to the role of pastoralists and farmers as creators of breeds and custodians of genetic diversity. The League organized two international meetings, in Bellagio and Bonn, and circulated a call “Join the Livestock Keepers’ Rights Movement” in English, French and Spanish.

**Livestock keepers, livestock biodiversity, indigenous knowledge and intellectual property rights: Opportunities and threats**

*Bellagio, Italy, 27 March–2 April 2006*

This meeting discussed the following questions:

- How to endorse and acknowledge the role of livestock keepers in conserving diversity, and ensure that their contribution to the sustainable use of animal genetic resources is rewarded and supported?

- What are the legal options for protecting animal-breeding-related indigenous knowledge in the context of existing legal frameworks and emerging opportunities and new models? What are the respective advantages and disadvantages?

The 21 participants from 17 countries represented civil society, government and inter-governmental organizations, researchers, livestock keepers and the private sector. They concluded that in the (near) future, the patenting of
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More on Interlaken

The First International Technical Conference on Animal Genetic Resources will be held on 1–7 September 2007 in Interlaken, Switzerland.


---

Advocating Livestock Keepers’ Rights

- How to support livestock keepers to conserve diversity?
- What are the legal options?
breeding processes and individual genes may restrict the rights of the communities and individuals to breed, manage and use their own livestock as they choose. Besides impacting rural livelihoods in a negative way, this would also pose a threat to the viability and continued development of the breeds. For example, a broad patent claim recently filed in 160 countries would, if approved, restrict the rights of breeders to use commonly practised breeding techniques for pigs.

The meeting participants unanimously recommended the legal recognition of livestock keepers' inherent rights to continue to use and develop their own breeding stock and breeding practices. They issued the Bellagio Brief summarizing the foregoing issues and calling on national governments to recognize these rights, acknowledge livestock keepers' contribution to national economies, and adapt their policies and legal frameworks accordingly (see the box on the Bellagio Brief on page 1). Participants regarded this as an important step in preventing the current intellectual property system from being exploited for obtaining control over animal resources and breeding processes that deliver a vital part of the world's food supply.

The papers presented at the meeting can be downloaded from www.pastoralpeoples.org/bellagio/. The Bellagio Brief has been circulated widely.

The Rockefeller Foundation kindly made the Bellagio conference facilities available for this meeting, and supported the participants' air travel. Additional funding came from Misereor and SwedBio.

International workshop on the future of animal genetic resources: Under corporate control or in the hands of farmers and pastoralists?
Bonn, 16–18 October 2006
Organized by Susanne Gura together with other LPP members and the LIFE Network, the workshop was held in preparation of the International Technical Conference on Animal Genetic Resources that will be held in Interlaken, Switzerland, in September 2007.

While concentration in the livestock breeding industry is fast increasing and exotic breeds are transferred to the South in large quantities, local small-holder livestock keepers are losing access to grazing lands. The growth of large-scale agrofuel plantations may add to these pressures. Workshop participants ranging from livestock keepers to government representatives emphasized the importance of livestock keepers' rights to their breeds as well as to the productive resources (e.g., grazing land, water, animal health services and credit) needed for their production. Local breed development should become a priority in poverty alleviation programmes.

The workshop was funded by Bread for the World, Swissaid, the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, and the Dutch Biodiversity Fund.

Meetings attended
The League and other LIFE Network members also raised the issue of Livestock Keepers' Rights in practically all relevant international forums, often through special side-events. Brief descriptions of the major events follow.

Working Group on Article 8(J) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (Traditional Knowledge)
Granada, Spain, 23–27 January 2006
Susanne Gura (LPP), Tom Loquang (Kisup Ateker, Uganda) and Perumal Vivekanandam (SEVA, India) conducted a side-event on livestock keepers’
rights during this meeting. They presented case studies of pastoral communities from India and Uganda. This side-event was attended by some 15 representatives from Bhutan, Ethiopia, Kenya, Mali, Mongolia, Russia, Tanzania and Uganda, as well as FAO, the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) and the Africa Group of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).

Important points emerging from the discussion included:

- Pastoralists throughout the world face common problems relating to access to natural resources, in-situ conservation of indigenous animal breeds, life style and pastoral culture.
- The issue of pastoralists’ rights needs to be discussed specifically in the CBD. At its Fourth Conference of Parties, CBD had delegated agricultural issues to FAO.
- While Farmers’ Rights are supported by the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, the rights of pastoralists are not mentioned anywhere. This is although they possess valuable knowledge and breeds. Pastoral communities are not recognized for their role they play in the society, and their knowledge and the biodiversity they maintain are being eroded.

Conference of Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity

*Curitiba, Brazil, 20–31 March 2006*

Susanne Gura and Perumal Vivekanandan participated on behalf of the LIFE Network. They organized a side-event where they gave presentations on Livestock Keepers’ Rights. Further presentations were given by Maryam Rahmanian of the Iranian environmental organization CENESTA, and Cha-chu Ganya from Tanzania. About 50 people attended, including staff of FAO, the International Livestock Research Institute and Bioversity International, as well as country delegates and representatives of NGOs and indigenous peoples. In one of the conference’s plenary session on agrobiodiversity, P. Vivekanandan presented a statement highlighting the importance of Livestock Keepers’ Rights. He reminded the audience that Brazil’s livestock sector was built on Indian cattle breeds and would probably not have developed so well if patenting had been applied to cattle.

International conference on livestock services enhancing rural development

*Beijing, China, 16–22 April 2006*

This conference was organized by the Department of International Cooperation, Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences and the Chinese Academy of Engineering. Ilse Köhler-Rollefson presented a paper entitled *Supporting livestock keepers through organizational strengthening: Why services are not enough and we need a “rights-based approach” to livestock development*. Co-authored with Hanwant Singh from the League’s partner organization Lokhit Pashu-Palak Sansthan, this paper was well received by the several hundred participants from China and elsewhere. The conference revealed the huge interest in Canada and other countries to export germplasm to China. The environmental consequences of setting up intensive dairy units in marginal areas such as Inner Mongolia was also highlighted. The dairy units are held partly responsible for dust storms in Beijing.

9th session of the WIPO Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore

*Geneva, 24–28 April 2006*
Susanne Gura of LPP presented a statement focusing on Livestock Keepers’ Rights and patents. The World Intellectual Property Organization is eager for the subject of animal genetic resources to be raised during the sessions of this committee. But there remains the question about whether this is the most effective forum to raise such issues.

Pastoralist gathering in Yabello rangelands

_Ethiopia, 10–19 July 2006_

This gathering brought together more than 300 pastoralists from 60 ethnic groups and 18 countries, including the Horn of Africa, West Africa, Palestine, India and Peru. Hosted by the Borana community in the Yabello rangelands of southern Ethiopia, the meeting was organized by the Pastoral Communication Initiative of the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs.

Two pastoralist representatives from India (Bagdi Ram Raika and Hanwant Singh of LPPS) attended, along with LPP’s Ilse Köhler-Rollefson.

Most of the meeting was devoted to identifying and discussing practical issues of concern to pastoralists. These included:

- What should be the relationship between government and customary institutions?
- How can pastoral organizations organize themselves to be recognized. What should be their activities?
- How can pastoralists help reduce barriers to trade in livestock and their products?
- How can local pastoral products be facilitated and local ownership be encouraged?
- How can the impact of droughts and other risks be reduced?
- How can local animal breeds be improved, and herders’ rights in the genetic resources of their animals be protected?

The results of the discussions were then discussed with policy makers, donors and United Nations officials.

Ilse Köhler-Rollefson facilitated a working group on genetic resources. This group made the following recommendations:

- The formation of breeders’ associations should be encouraged and supported through training and capacity-building.
- There should be networking and information exchange about the value of indigenous breeds and intellectual property issues.
- Pastoral organizations should document the history and length of use of their breeds.
- Pastoral advocacy groups should lobby on intellectual property issues in relevant international forums such as WIPO.
- Livestock Keepers’ Rights should be discussed at the Interlaken conference on animal genetic resources.

Two policy makers, from Kenya and Puntland, picked up the issue of patenting and vowed to fight for pastoralists’ rights in this respect.

While it was gratifying to see that the issue got so much attention, facts can be distorted easily. For example, one Kenyan parliamentarian from a pastoralist background stated (incorrectly) that Australia had patented both the acacia tree and Boran cattle.
Interlaken planning meeting of the International NGO/CSO Planning Committee (IPC)
Rome, 30 October–2 November 2006

LIFE network coordinator Perumval Vivekanandanan from India participated on behalf of LPP and LIFE. IPC is operating since the World Food Sovereignty Forum in 2002 and is the principal interlocutor between NGOs and FAO. IPC has been asked by FAO to coordinate the NGO preparations for Interlaken. A pastoralist focal point was created (Maryam Rahmanian, CENESTA, Iran), and it was decided to set up an Interlaken Steering Committee. LIFE Network and LPP are members. Susanne, who has worked with IPC since 2002, is the main liaison person.

FAO Fourth Intergovernmental Technical Working Group on Animal Genetic Resources
Rome, 13–15 December 2006

This meeting was an important negotiation step in the run-up to the Interlaken conference. It was attended by Susanne Gura, Ilse Köhler-Rollefson, and Isaac Kosgey, a professor of animal breeding from Egerton University in Kenya. The draft Interlaken documents were negotiated in the plenary. Due to many contentious issues, the Chair Harvey Blackburn, USA, decided to set up a Friends of the Chair Group to re-draft the documents for the next negotiation step in June 2007. LPP organized a side-event in which Susanne presented the results of a study on concentration in the livestock sector. In another side-event, Ilse discussed an FAO-initiated study on the exchange, use, conservation and regulation of animal genetic resources, bringing livestock keepers’ and NGO viewpoints into the discussion.

The LIFE Network

LPP is coordinating and backstopping a 2-year project supported by Hivos-Oxfam Novib Biodiversity Fund to strengthen the LIFE Network in Africa (Uganda) and Asia (India).

India activities

In 2006, the LIFE Network activities in India were coordinated by two NGOs, Lokhit Pashu-Palak Sansthan (LPPS) in Rajasthan, and SEVA in Tamil Nadu. These NGOs have been actively involved in the loosely knit LIFE Network since its very beginning in November 2000. LPPS and SEVA have different approaches. LPPS is closely associated with the Raika camel and sheep breeders of Rajasthan, and initially provided them with animal health support. Over the years, this service-based approach changed to a rights-based line of attack, in which LPPS encourages pastoralist to get organized and supports them in the fight for their rights.

SEVA has organized livestock breeders into associations around various breeds of livestock, such as the Umbalacherry, Pullikulum and Malaimadu cattle, Toda buffalo, and Kachakatty and Vembur sheep.

Both LPPS and SEVA agree that the survival of pastoralists and their breeds depend ultimately on continued access to common property resources, such as grazing land and water. Because of India’s rapid population and economic growth, pastoralists and the associated livestock biodiversity are under enormous pressure. Hence the prime thrust of the LIFE Network’s argumentation has been to emphasize the interconnectedness between the survival of breeds, livelihoods, and access to resources. The network provided inputs to the Forest Rights’ Bill and to the National Draft Policy on Farmers.
In Rajasthan, LPPS has helped the Raika Sangarsh Samiti (Raika Struggle Committee) with legal and logistical support to place an enquiry at the Supreme Court about their grazing rights in the Kumbalgarh Sanctuary.

A LIFE Network meeting took place in Delhi on 8–10 December. A large delegation of pastoralists went to the Prime Minister’s office and handed over a petition. Besides visiting several other ministries, the group also organized a session at the India International Centre.

Africa activities

In Africa, LIFE Network activities are focused on Uganda and coordinated by Tom Loquang, a member of Kisup Ataker, a community-based organization in northern Uganda founded in 2003. Activities consisted of community-driven breed documentation and improvement in the area served by Kisup Ataker. Such activities can form the basis for the conservation of local breeds and breed diversity, and at the same time are useful tools for empowering communities. In collaboration with Evelyn Mathias of LPP and other Kisup Ataker staff, Tom organized a training course on international animal genetic resource conservation efforts, Livestock Keepers’ Rights and community-based breed documentation. The one-week training took place in November 2006 with some 40 pastoralists and other stakeholders from Karamoja attending.

People and Livestock newsletter

The August 2006 issue of the People and Livestock newsletter focuses on avian influenza. This was the last issue published by the LIFE Network. Future issues will be published by the Endogenous Livestock Development Network, of which LPP is a founder member. All issues of the newsletter are available at www.pastoralpeoples.org.

More information: www.lifeinitiative.net

Endogenous Livestock Development Network

The League is a founding member of this network, which brings together individuals and organizations involved in bottom-up livestock development throughout the world. As co-coordinator of the Network, Evelyn Mathias co-moderated the ELDDev mailing list and oversaw its technical aspects. She also co-organized endogenous livestock development activities during the international Tropentag (“tropical day”) in Bonn.

The ELD Network has taken over the production of the People and Livestock newsletter (from the LIFE Network).

More information: www.eldev.net

Other activities

Film and publication on “Keepers of Genes”

LPP is cooperating with Moving Images, an Indian documentary maker, to produce a film showing the role of Indian pastoralists in conserving breeds. The project is supported by the FAO-Netherlands Support Programme.
Livestock Keepers’ Rights booklets

LPP’s booklets on Livestock Keepers’ Rights: Conserving breeds, supporting livelihoods (downloadable from www.pastoralpeoples.org) have proved so popular that it was necessary to print another 1500 copies. The booklets were distributed during the workshops and meetings listed above, as well as at an workshop on avian flu in Berlin on 18–20 October in Berlin, and a symposium on innovations in Uganda in November. LPP staff attended both these events.

Supported by the Hivos-Oxfam Novib Biodiversity Fund, the Livestock Keepers’ Rights booklet has been translated into the Karamojong language as Ngapedorosyo nguna a ngikeyokok a ngibaren: Ekipitune ngibaren, ka akitogogong eyare angitunga.

Press releases and journal articles

The League prepared various press releases and scientific articles during 2006. These are available at www.pastoralpeoples.org; the articles are listed below under Publications.

Networks and working groups

The League or individual members are a member of the following:

- **Genet** (European NGO Network on Genetic Engineering) (Anita Idel)
- **Endogenous Livestock Development Network** (Ellen Geerlings, Sabine Homann, Ilse Köhler-Rollefson, Evelyn Mathias)
- **German NGO Forum for Environment and Development, working group on desertification** (Ilse-Köhler-Rollefson, Christiane Herweg)
- **German NGO Forum for Environment and Development, working group on agriculture and environment** (Evelyn Mathias)
- **LIFE** (Local Livestock for Empowerment) Network (Ilse Köhler-Rollefson, Evelyn Mathias)
- **WAMIP** (World Association of Mobile Indigenous Peoples) (Ilse Köhler-Rollefson, Evelyn Mathias)
- **WISP** (World Initiative on Sustainable Pastoralism) (Susanne Gura, Ilse Köhler-Rollefson)

Activities of LPP members

This section describes activities of LPP members relevant to the work of the League but not mentioned elsewhere in the report.

Susanne Gura

The World Initiative for Sustainable Pastoralism (WISP) issued a call for country studies on the economics of pastoralism around the world. LPP won an assignment, and Susanne, with support from Ilse, prepared comprehensive country studies for Afghanistan, India, Pakistan, Syria, Jordan, Israel, and Turkey.

A word of thanks

The following have kindly supported LPP’s work in 2006:

- Brot für die Welt
- Misereor e.V.
- Deutscher Naturschutzring/Forum Umwelt und Entwicklung
- DEZA/SDC, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
- FAO, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
- GTZ, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit GmbH
- Hivos-Oxfam Novib Biodiversity Fund
- Rockefeller Foundation
- Swedbio
- Swissaid

The following individuals have provided generous donations and in-kind support to LPP:

- Bettina Haas
- Bruno Haas
- Günther Bock
- The Stürz family, Wembach
- Dr Ilse Köhler-Rollefson
- Peter Laufmann
- Jutta Habedank und Dieter Philberg

We would also like to thank

- Dr Paul Mundy for taking care of the LPP website and editorial support.
- Jutta Habedank and Brigitte Köhler for checking LPP’s financial records.
Susanne became coordinator of the Working Group on Biological Diversity of the German NGO Forum on Environment and Development. Since the German government has invited the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity to hold its next biannual conference in Bonn (May 2008), the German NGOs started preparations with a national workshop held at the end of October 2006. Attended by some 60 participants, activities were planned with regard to lobbying, networking and local action. This work includes lobbying the German ministries of the environment, agriculture and development, the City of Bonn and many others.

**Christiane Herweg**

Christiane represented LPP at a conference of NGOs on desertification in Montpellier in October 2006. The conference issued the Montpellier Declaration, calling for bottom-up implementation of UN-sponsored activities to combat desertification, and closer involvement by NGOs in these activities.

While in Montpellier, she also attended the first organizational meeting of the European Union-sponsored Dry-Net project. This project coordinates the activities of 17 NGOs from Asia, Africa, Latin America and Europe. It is coordinated by Both Ends NL, a Dutch NGO.

**Ilse Köhler-Rollefson**

On 22–30 April, Ilse worked with a project in Mongolia on the “Conservation and Sustainable Management of Natural Resources – Gobi component” for the New Zealand Nature Institute. She helped identify ways to support camel herders in the Gobi in livestock management, animal genetic resources conservation, product development, and marketing.

She also is consultant to a project managed by LPP partner Lokhit Pashu-Palak Sansthan on camel husbandry in India. This project, “Revitalizing camel pastoralism for sustainable livelihoods and land utilization”, is funded by the Ford Foundation. Ilse’s responsibilities include project design, communication and backstopping.

Together with Evelyn Mathias, she provided inputs for GTZ to a German government conference on avian flu in Berlin in October.

She also undertook a consultancy for the World Bank in Malawi on “How communities learn from each other”.

**Evelyn Mathias**

Together with Tom Loquang, Evelyn participated in the Innovation Africa Symposium on 20–23 November in Kampala, Uganda.

On 12–15 December, she attended the African Regional Workshop on Sustainable Use in Nairobi, Kenya, as an observer for FAO.

Together with Ilse Köhler-Rollefson and Paul Mundy, Evelyn contributed a chapter on “Flows of animal genetic resources” to FAO’s State of the World Report on Animal Genetic Resources.

**Paul Mundy**

Paul facilitated LPP’s conference at Bellagio in Italy, managed websites for LPP, Lokhit Pashu-Palak Sansthan and the LIFE Network, and edited various publications for the League.
Publications

This section includes outputs of LPP projects as well as documents by LPP members relevant to the League’s objectives and focus.


Papers presented


About the League

Mission
LPP provides technical support, advisory services and advocacy for pastoral societies and other small-scale livestock keepers to help them pursue their own vision of development and to stand their ground in the face of unfavourable policy environments and alienation of their pasture grounds. LPP is also a resource organization for holistic and people-centred livestock development and promotes the concept of endogenous livestock development relying on indigenous knowledge and institutions, local animal genetic resources and feed. The well-being of domesticated animals is a secondary but important focus of its work.

Background
LPP was established in 1992 by a small group of veterinary and other concerned professionals confronted with the crisis situation of camel pastoralists in Rajasthan. Efforts to alleviate their situation set into motion a mutual learning process and a series of measures such as action research, projects related to animal health (including ethnoveterinary approaches) and marketing, as well as training and capacity-building. This has resulted in the establishment of the independent local organization Lokhit Pashu-Palak Sansthan (LPPS) which now represents a key partner and provides infrastructural support for activities in India.

Philosophy
Taking our cues from pastoralists, we believe in the interconnectedness between the well-being of people and their domesticated animals. By conceptualizing animals as machines, industrialized animal production systems sever one of the few remaining links between humans and the natural world. We regard animals as fellow creatures on this planet and not as subjects. The ultimate goal of our effort is human well-being.