



African Landscape Research Report

Author: Lynn Tan



MAY 2021

FINDINGS FROM ANIMAL ADVOCACY
ORGANISATIONS, INDIVIDUAL
ADVOCATES & EXPERTS.



ANIMAL ADVOCACY AFRICA

Landscape Research Report



Findings from animal advocacy organisations, individual advocates and experts.

This is a research report about our conversations with animal advocacy organisations, individual advocates, and experts to understand the animal advocacy landscape in Africa. Findings from our conversations with funders can be found [here](#).

For questions about the content of this research, please contact Lynn Tan at lynn@animaladvocacyafrica.org.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Jamie Harris, Calvin Solomon, and Tracy Timmins for providing feedback on our research, and to Antonia Shann, Tom Bates, Sarah Xu, and Miranda Zhang for their editing contributions. We are also grateful to the organisations, advocates, and experts who took the time to engage in our research.

Animal Advocacy Africa

AAA is a capacity-building program which aims to develop a collaborative and effective animal advocacy movement in Africa by assisting and empowering other animal advocacy organisations and advocates to be as impactful as possible in their advocacy efforts.

Team

Lynn Tan - Director of Research

Jeanna Hiscock - Director of Partnerships Development

Cameron King - Director of Operations



Advisors

Dr Calvin Solomon Onyango - Research Advisor

Catherine Jerotich Chumo - Communications Advisor

Cecil Yongo Abungu - Legal Advisor





Table of contents

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Acknowledgements | 0 |
| Animal Advocacy Africa | 0 |
| Team | 0 |
| Advisors | 0 |
| Summary/Abstract | 2 |
| Purpose | 2 |
| Methods | 2 |
| Findings | 2 |
| Interventions | 3 |
| Gauging effectiveness | 3 |
| Identifying obstacles | 3 |
| Identifying interest in receiving support | 4 |
| Implications | 4 |
| Introduction | 5 |
| Resources . | 6 |
| Disclaimer | 6 |
| Methodology | 7 |
| Selecting interviewees | 7 |
| Conducting interviews | 9 |
| Coding and analysing our findings | 10 |
| Limitations | 10 |
| Key Findings | 12 |
| Interventions | 13 |
| Types of interventions | 13 |
| Type of animals | 15 |
| Geographic reach | 16 |
| Networks and collaborations | 16 |
| Rationale for working on multiple interventions | 17 |
| Decision-making and prioritisation of interventions | 17 |
| Interventions relevant to farmed animals | 18 |
| Gauging effectiveness | 21 |
| Approaches in measuring impact and effectiveness | 21 |
| Metrics used to measure impact | 21 |
| Future success | 22 |
| Perceived effectiveness of interventions | 23 |
| Identifying obstacles | 24 |
| General obstacles | 24 |
| Organisation-specific obstacles | 26 |
| Identifying interest in receiving support | 27 |
| What the movement needs in general | 27 |
| Room for additional support | 28 |
| Interest in receiving support | 29 |
| Effective Altruism | 31 |
| Next steps | 31 |
| Conclusion | 33 |
| Appendix | 34 |



Summary/Abstract

Purpose

The purpose of this research is to inform ourselves and stakeholders who might be interested in the African animal advocacy movement about the movement's landscape. Our key questions are:

- What are African animal advocacy organisations and individual advocates doing to help animals?
- Which animals are they helping and why?
- How are they evaluating the impact of their interventions?

Our aim was to understand the challenges these organisations and individuals face in their advocacy efforts, to identify how capacity-building organisations like Animal Advocacy Africa (and other advocates) can best help African groups and advocates become more effective or impactful in their work. We included below a description of each section in this research report.

Methods

We conducted exploratory research in the form of qualitative interviews with African animal advocacy organisations, individual advocates, experts and funders. We initially looked for those working on farmed animal advocacy in Africa, but later selected for a diverse range of animal advocacy work. Simultaneously, our [prioritisation research](#) identified which group of animals looked most promising to help from our perspective. We highlight the [limitations](#) of our research here.

Findings

We contacted 107 individuals in Africa and received a response from 55, a rate of 51%. Of these 55 individuals, 15 did not appear for the interview. Ultimately, we surveyed:

- 22 animal advocacy organisations (a list of organisations we've spoken to can be found [here](#))
- 11 individual advocates, 5 of whom identified as effective altruists
- 10 experts, 7 of whom are experts based in Africa
- 8 international funders

The consensus from speaking to organisations, advocates and experts is that animal welfare is a new topic in Africa and that the effective animal advocacy movement is in its nascent stages.

Interventions

Among the 22 organisations we spoke with, 20 work on behalf of a wide range of [animal populations](#) (most commonly farmed, wild, working and companion animals) and 18 organisations employ a wide range of interventions.

The most common [intervention](#) is outreach to influence public opinion. All 22 organisations are involved in implementing education programs aimed at fostering compassion and empathy for animals, and behavioural change. These programs target a wide range of individuals, including farmers, animal



owners, students and teachers. Other common interventions include providing direct help, usually in the form of veterinary care services, and political outreach to policymakers and government officials.

In this section, we also highlight the [geographic reach](#) of the organisations, their [networks and collaborations](#), and their [decision-making](#) strategies for prioritising interventions.

As a large part of our mission is to minimise the expansion of animal agriculture in Africa and prevent future animals from coming into a life of suffering, we enquired about the state of animal agriculture on the continent and [what could be done](#) to reduce farmed animal suffering. The evidence about whether intensive animal agricultural practices can be prevented, halted or slowed in Africa is mixed. Some experts were more optimistic than others about the tractability of interventions such as political outreach, institutional outreach and public outreach to prevent these practices. Opinions also differ largely on a country to country basis.

Gauging effectiveness

We wanted to understand how animal advocacy organisations [measure](#) the impact of their work on animals. In this section, we describe our findings. Common [metrics](#) of success ranged from short-term metrics such as social recognition and number of stakeholders influenced, to long-term metrics such as number of animals saved, number of days animals are free from suffering, and policy and behavioural changes.

We also collected expert opinions about the [perceived effectiveness](#) of various interventions adopted by organisations. As the animal advocacy movement is new and growing in Africa, perceived effectiveness is limited. The consensus of experts consulted is that a combination of approaches will be more effective than any single intervention in addressing the perceived limited effectiveness of animal advocacy in Africa currently and animal welfare in the continent more generally. A one-size-fits-all solution is unlikely to work for the entire continent. Thus, interventions should be tailored to each country, specific to each jurisdiction.

Identifying obstacles

We attempted to understand the obstacles that are limiting the movement's progress.

Obstacles that seem to apply [generally](#) across the animal welfare movement in Africa include the lack of awareness or understanding of animal welfare amongst individuals which makes outreach efforts challenging, the prioritisation of other imminent issues (that are affecting the continent) over animal welfare, and the lack of optimal legislation and the enforcement of such legislation.

[Organisationally](#), a lack of funding and a lack of talent/capacity are common bottlenecks mentioned by organisations. If these obstacles are overcome, organisations will be able to scale up existing programs and expand their reach.

Identifying interest in receiving support

We gauged organisations' [room for additional support](#) to understand whether there is a gap that needs to be filled. The consensus among organisations and experts is that whilst there are some ongoing activities to overcome the above obstacles, organisations are keen to receive more support. We intend to complement capacity-building efforts that other actors have done, or are doing, by offering alternative support that will add value to African animal advocacy organisations and advocates.

Overall, 21 out of 22 organisations were interested in [receiving support](#) from an external organisation. The types of support that organisations were keen to receive include mentorship or training to build capacity, funding opportunities, research support, and networking or knowledge-sharing opportunities to facilitate communication.

Implications

We hope that the information collected regarding the African animal advocacy landscape will be useful to those who are interested in finding out more about the African animal welfare movement. In particular, we think the section about organisational [interventions](#) and [effectiveness](#) may be valuable as a starting point to funders who are looking for promising funding opportunities in Africa.

Based on the identified [bottlenecks](#) and organisational [interest in receiving support](#), we will be identifying a pilot intervention that we can trial from July 2021. We plan to evaluate potential capacity-building interventions based on metrics such as cost-effectiveness, scalability and logistical difficulty. We will also be consulting experts and directly involving African animal advocacy organisations in this decision-making process. During the implementation phase, we plan to evaluate our impact through expert interviews, cost-effectiveness analyses, surveys/focus groups, and independent operational audits to understand the counterfactual impact.





Introduction

Animal Advocacy Africa (AAA) is a capacity-building program that aims to develop a collaborative and effective animal advocacy movement in Africa. We plan to do this by engaging organisations and individual animal advocates in Africa and using this engagement to seek cost-effective opportunities to help animals. This report is part of our research phase which will inform our pilot implementation of possible capacity-building interventions in Africa.

The purpose of this research is to:

- Connect with existing African animal welfare organisations and individual advocates.
- Better understand these organisations' interventions and focus areas.
- Identify obstacles they have encountered and what they need as an organisation to become more effective.

Apart from being a decision-relevant report for AAA's strategic implementation plans, we hope that the results can be useful to:

- Funders who are interested in identifying funding opportunities in Africa.¹
- Participating organisations, who may better understand which difficulties are common and which unusual, so that they can better coordinate with other organisations and understand where it would be helpful to seek or offer advice.
- The wider animal advocacy community, who may be interested in learning more about the animal welfare landscape in Africa.

Definition of terms:

Animal Advocacy Organisations

Definition: Animal welfare, animal rights or animal protection groups, most commonly non-profits, that advocate for the welfare and moral and legal rights of animals.²

Individual Advocates

Definition: Unaffiliated advocates who do not work for an animal advocacy organisation

Experts

Definition: Those working in academic research or large intergovernmental bodies

Funders

Definition: Individuals providing funding on behalf of a grantmaking organisation with a philanthropic focus on animal advocacy

¹ We [interviewed](#) funders about their interest and biggest uncertainties in funding the African animal advocacy landscape. As much as possible, we tried to answer these uncertainties about the movement through our interviews with African animal advocacy organisations and advocates.

² We did not make a distinction between the different types of groups when we conducted this research.



Resources

Definition: Includes funding, logistics, talent/personnel

Interventions

Definition: Programs that are implemented by animal advocacy organisations to improve animal welfare/reduce animal suffering. We use interventions and programs interchangeably.

Factory farms

Definition: Though there is some contention about the appropriate term to describe animal agriculture,³ for the purposes of our report, factory farming, intensive animal agriculture, large-scale farming and industrialised livestock production mean the same thing, i.e. the strict and close confinement of animals that severely affects the welfare of animals

Is. We would like to note that intensive agriculture in Africa can appear quite different from those in the West as well as varying from region to region.

Disclaimer

- Responses included in this report are reported by interviewees and do not necessarily indicate that we agree with or endorse their opinions.
- No attempt was made to evaluate the effectiveness of their interventions, or question the validity of their claims or approaches in this report (unless otherwise stated) as the goal was to define baseline information.
- Most of the findings pertain to what African animal advocacy organisations have mentioned, as they make up the majority of our interviewees unless otherwise stated.
- Our findings for a specific section are listed in no particular order unless otherwise specified (e.g. in increasing order of frequency).
- Responses pertain to animal welfare in general, not exclusively farmed animal welfare unless otherwise stated.
- We are not aware of any other actors doing this type of research to understand the landscape of animal advocacy in Africa. However, there is ongoing research by [Brighter Green](#) and [Animal Law Reform](#) to understand the extent of industrialised animal agriculture in Africa and its likely trajectory, backed by an analysis of the legal/policy framework that governs animal agriculture in Africa.⁴ Similarly, research institutes such as the [International Livestock Research Institute](#) conducts research related to animal health and diseases in East, Southern and West Africa.⁵

³ We find that different stakeholders and animal welfare groups (locally and internationally) tend to use different terms, even when describing the same level and scale of farming.

⁴ Evaluating current and future farming systems in Africa and how closely they resemble systems in other geographic regions seems important to identify gaps and next steps to improve animal welfare.

⁵ "ILRI's research is directed to improving food and nutrition security through increased production and access to animal-source foods; stimulating economic development and poverty reduction through enhanced livestock value chains and increased productivity; improving human health through improved access to animal-source foods and a reduction in the burden of zoonotic and food-borne diseases; and managing the adaptation of livestock systems to climate change and mitigating the impact of livestock on the environment."



Methodology

We conducted exploratory research in the form of interviews to:

- Identify the specific and individual pain points faced by organisations and advocates.
- Help us personalise and identify interventions that can create the most value in addressing identified bottlenecks.

A major part of our project's intended added value is movement building. We believe having real-time conversations with organisations can help us build relationships with advocates and connect advocates to each other. This aspect would therefore be facilitated by having qualitative interviews.

We did not conduct a systematic literature search or review as we were unsure of the value that a novel, broad literature review for the entire continent would add to our decision-making process.⁶ In addition, there is extensive literature about various topics related to animal welfare in an African context (e.g. social, cultural, political, legal, economical). Conducting an in-depth review of these topics likely warrants a separate project entirely and forms part of our [research agenda](#). Therefore, any literature references that are mentioned throughout this report were found through brief Google searches or suggested by our networks.

Arguably, the downsides of relying on interviews include:

- Anecdotal information and intuition.⁷ We did not require participants to provide empirical evidence.
- Small sample size. We only spoke to 22 African organisations and 11 unaffiliated advocates.
- Not completely immune to [social desirability bias](#). Even though steps were taken to minimise this bias, it may be hard to determine and isolate the relevant factors which reflect reality, especially since the most important characteristics of effective animal advocacy might not lend themselves to a good narrative.

Selecting interviewees

As this research is exploratory and was aimed at understanding the animal advocacy landscape in Africa, we sought to interview as many individuals as possible within a time frame of three months.

Interviewees were categorised as:

- Individual advocates
- Staff members doing relevant work in animal advocacy organisations
- African effective altruists,⁸ some with an interest in animal advocacy work

⁶ We are also aware of an unpublished report prepared by the African Union Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) in 2015 that provides an overview of the animal welfare status in Africa. Thus, we did not feel the need to replicate this work. The African Union has been spearheading the animal welfare agenda in Africa through AU-IBAR. This report is currently not available publicly, we are asking for permission to post it publicly. In the meantime, our research advisor, Dr Calvin Solomon Onyango has written a brief [overview](#) about the animal welfare status in Africa.

⁷ Evidence provided by advocates in a casual or informal manner and relying heavily or entirely on personal testimony rather than hard facts.

⁸ Individuals who identify with the [effective altruism movement](#).

- African experts with expertise in animal welfare in Africa⁹

We recruit individuals based on existing connections that have been made by our staff, new connections made from conferences (e.g. Open Wing Alliance African summit), Google and LinkedIn searches, contacts from directories such as the [World Federation for Animals](#)¹⁰ and Effective Altruism [hub](#), and recommended contacts from individuals we interviewed (snowball sampling). We initially aimed to look for those working on farmed animal advocacy in Africa but soon realised:

- Intensive industry only accounts for a relatively small proportion of animal farming outside of South Africa and thus not many organisations focus (only) on farmed animal welfare. Some work in multiple areas with multiple species and have limited specialisation or focus on farmed animal welfare.
- Due to limited online information, sometimes it was not immediately clear from desk research what area of animal welfare organisations are working in.
- There was the possibility that focusing on other areas of welfare in Africa may be more cost-effective and tractable than farmed animal welfare.

As a result, we did not impose a selection filter on organisational focus or programs. We intentionally selected for a diverse range of animal advocacy work, whilst our [prioritisation research](#) was occurring simultaneously to identify which group of animals looked most promising to help from our perspective.

At the start of the interview process in December, we sent invitations to interview in a phased manner (sent in two batches). In the first stage, we interviewed organisations that were smaller or less established until we were happy with the quality of our survey questions (able to conduct the survey five times in a row without significant iterations) before moving on to larger organisations.¹¹ After this, we sent invitations to interviews for organisations in the second batch. Interviewees were contacted via direct email when possible, or via shared connections, LinkedIn, Facebook or phone when we did not have an email address.

We followed up at least once with individuals when we did not hear back after a week or two, or when interviews were not arranged. The response rate was 51% of those individuals that we reached out to (55 out of 107 individuals based in Africa). We had trouble engaging a few African animal advocacy organisations, international organisations with an African branch, and intergovernmental agencies. Engagement from organisations who are based in South Africa was also lower than expected (we only managed to interview one South African organisation). In general, the reasons for the lack of

⁹ When we speak about [experts](#), we are referring to individuals who have specialist, domain or broad expertise in various aspects of animal welfare, such as biological, legal, social, cultural, economic and historical aspects. Examples include academic researchers, veterinarians, and lecturers. We also reached out to leaders working in intergovernmental agencies such as AU-IBAR but did not manage to speak to them.

¹⁰ To our knowledge, [World Animal Net](#) which has a similar directory is merging into World Federation for Animals.

¹¹ Initially, interviewees were chosen based on our subjective judgements for cognitive interviewing - a useful approach to pretesting survey questions by examining the comprehension, recall, decisions and judgment, and response processes of respondents as they answer questions.

engagement are unclear. We speculate it could be a lack of interest or the effects of Covid-19 on slowing down work. To a smaller extent, invalid contact details from organisation websites contributed to lack of engagement.

Conducting interviews

Questions were selected with these goals and considerations in mind:

- What are current organisations and advocates doing?
- How effective are they?
- What challenges do they face in their advocacy efforts?
- What can be done to support them?

As the research was exploratory, questions were designed to be open-ended to enable interviewees to describe their experiences freely and share their views. We conducted semi-structured interviews where we used predetermined questions centred on specific themes. We stuck to a script when asking the interview questions to reduce bias¹² and inconsistencies across interviewees. The order of the questions was also fixed. We would occasionally provide prompts, cues and/or clarifications to the interviewee to allow them to provide more accurate answers when they asked for clarification, or misunderstood the question. Unscripted follow-up questions were asked when we needed more detailed answers, or when interviewees brought up interesting points worth exploring further.

Interviews were held across three months from December 2020 to March 2021. During each interview, we wrote up our findings into a spreadsheet to allow cross-comparison and analysis. As participants spoke, we sought to write down their wording as accurately as possible – with direct quotes where possible, or with summaries and paraphrasing if they spoke too quickly or were repeating their answers.

Where the Internet connection is poor, which occurred for 7 out of 22 organisations we spoke to, we opted for voice recordings through WhatsApp which may have removed the organic environment in which natural conversation flows. For example, they may have had more time to think through their answers or changed their responses, but we think the impact this had on their responses is negligible.

Towards the last month of our research, we experimented with online surveys where respondents provided written responses to our questions instead of engaging in virtual conversations. This was because we were unable to interview a participant from a Francophone country. We applied this approach only with three individuals and noticed the quality of responses was lower (e.g. responses were inadequate or unclear and required follow-up) compared to interviews. This finding was unsurprising given respondent fatigue as more effort was required on the part of the respondent to provide answers in a written form. In the future, it is likely we will stick with virtual or in-person interviews for exploratory research unless circumstances prevent us from doing so (bad internet connection, language barrier).

During the research planning stage, we aimed to interview between 50-80 organisations, individual advocates, funders, and experts over a period of 3 months or until saturation occurs (following these

¹² Interviewees could have been prompted to answer differently if questions were phrased differently each time.

[principles](#)). However, we only managed to speak to 51 individuals in total (22 organisations, 11 individual advocates, and 18 experts/funders). We suspect this is due to the low response rate mentioned earlier (51%) and high absenteeism rate (27%).

Coding and analysing our findings

We did not formally pre-register our analysis plans, as our research was exploratory. Data analysis was open-ended and qualitative. A large number of possible findings were considered.

We read the responses each interviewee gave and determined the themes they expressed. Themes were generated through a process called inductive coding where we read and interpreted the underlying conceptual meaning of the data and recurring themes we observed in the responses. We weighted organisations' responses equally to avoid giving those with more exciting and eloquent narratives (and assuming that is the central narrative) more weight than those who are less articulate.

Limitations

Although we see these findings as adding to our understanding, we would caution against putting too much weight on them. This is one study that should be put in the context of a larger picture.

Qualitative interviews provide rich data and context for understanding people's experiences in and insights on the animal welfare and advocacy landscape in Africa. However, the relatively small sample size¹³ should be kept in mind when considering generalisations and how representative our sample is to other organisations and advocates.

All attitudes and behaviours in our interviews are self-reported, which means they are subject to human error and misreporting, whether intentional or not. Self-report measures are subject to a number of limitations, including memory and social desirability biases, that may affect the accuracy of the results. Interviewees may be more likely to report an intention to implement a change or an intervention (because they think that's what we want to hear) or to exaggerate achievements (to present themselves more positively than accurately). To reduce the likelihood of these biases, we asked them about past behaviour rather than predicted future behaviour. We also tried to frame our questions such that answers cannot be "bad" or reflect badly on their organisation/person. However, bias should still be considered in interpreting the results. We also relied on interviewees being self-aware of intrinsic (such as organisational challenges, needs and potential solutions) and extrinsic factors (such as general knowledge about the animal advocacy movement), reporting things they are consciously aware of, thereby missing things that are not explicitly obvious. We didn't ask respondents to look up organisational records and calculate accurate figures, nor were they given time to do so. Thus, they may report on what they believe to be true, even though reality may reflect differently. Any figures reported (e.g. budget) should be treated as ballpark estimates rather than accurate answers.

¹³ We interviewed 22 organisations out of 476 known organisations on the World Federation for Animals directory.



Thematic analysis is often quite subjective and relies on the researcher's judgement.¹⁴ The analysis is also prone to confirmation bias as it is easier to spot data that supports our pre-existing assumptions. We tried to overcome this by locating every possible hypothetical negative case/explicitly looking for contradictory data and giving these equal attention as the mainstream storyline.¹⁵ Given that we do not provide the full dataset (in order to protect respondents' anonymity) or detail the exact steps taken in our analysis, our analysis may be difficult to replicate or be checked by independent researchers.



¹⁴ This method of analysis has been 'criticised for lacking depth, fragmenting the phenomena being studied, being subjective and lacking transparency in relation to the development of themes, which can cause difficulties when judging the rigour of our findings.' See [Attride-Stirling \(2001\)](#) and [Smith and Firth \(2011\)](#).

¹⁵ See [Morse \(1995\)](#).



Key Findings

Ultimately, we surveyed:

- 22 animal advocacy organisations (a list of organisations we've spoken to can be found [here](#))
- 11 individual advocates, 5 of whom identified as effective altruists
- 10 experts, 7 of whom are experts based in Africa
- 8 international funders

We decided not to provide the full responses, to protect the anonymity of our interviewees, though we are open to requests to conduct additional analyses.

The consensus from speaking to organisations, advocates and experts is that animal welfare is a new topic in Africa and the effective animal advocacy movement is in its nascent stages. Most organisations focus their advocacy efforts on land animals; only two organisations we spoke to were working on or had plans to work on aquatic animal welfare.

When we spoke to international funders and animal advocacy organisations, there seems to be an impression that there is a lack of advocates or organisations within the African movement. From our research, we posit that the quantity of advocates/organisations might not necessarily be an issue.¹⁶ During our research, we found the larger bottleneck seems to be with communicating or engaging with advocates/organisations. For example, we found a high rate of absenteeism amongst individuals who scheduled an interview with us. This finding was also consistent with the experience of a funder we spoke to. We found that out of the 55 individual African advocates, animal advocacy organisations, and experts that agreed to be interviewed, 15 were absent without a reschedule or cancellation. We are unsure why this is the case, though it could be due to unfamiliar scheduling methods. Similarly, it is not uncommon for organisations to not have a website, valid contact details, or an interest in engaging with us.¹⁷

¹⁶ We found 476 animal welfare organisations in Africa from the World Federation of Animals directory alone. Although we can't be certain that all organisations listed in the directory are active, there are also organisations we have come across that are not listed in the directory.

¹⁷ We would caution against making broad generalisations about this. We acknowledge that just because this was something we experienced does not necessarily imply a common trend or tendency regarding the commitment level of advocates.



Interventions

Types of interventions¹⁸

| Interventions | Number of organisations (out of 22) ¹⁹ |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Public outreach to influence public opinion | 22 |
| Direct help | 10 |
| Political outreach to policymakers and government officials | 8 |
| Capacity building | 4 |
| Institutional outreach | 4 |
| Building alliances or connecting with other social movements, communities, or influencers (e.g. artists or musicians) | 1 |
| Other (e.g. undercover investigations, tree planting to restore wildlife habitat) | 3 |

Public outreach to influence public opinion:

- Education programs aimed at fostering compassion and empathy for animals and behavioural change, including topics on
 - “One health” - the relationship between human welfare, animal welfare and the environment with a common focus on human-animal coexistence²⁰
 - Anti-poaching and anti-trading (e.g. donkey skin trade, dog meat trade, wildlife trophy trade)
 - Bushmeat
 - Veganism
 - Five freedoms of animals
 - Indigenous knowledge systems²¹ to protect animal welfare whilst optimising for economic productivity

¹⁸ Among the 22 organisations we spoke with, 20 organisations work on behalf of a wide range of animal populations and 18 organisations employ a wide range of interventions, what ACE defines as general animal advocacy. Therefore, *n* is not mutually exclusive.

¹⁹ Due to the qualitative nature of our data, we only reported frequencies of themes (i.e how many people mentioned what) for claims we were more confident were less nuanced or more binary/quantitative, as ‘we cannot assume what the absence of a certain meaning or theme in the data actually means.’ See here for further [explanation](#) of this reasoning.

²⁰ A series of [briefs](#) developed by the International Livestock Research Institute highlights the linkages between the health of livestock, people and the environment in Africa.

²¹ Experts emphasised the need to incorporate indigenous practices in agriculture to ensure sustainability of agricultural practices.



- These programs are conducted mainly via
 - School/university curriculum
 - Events/conferences e.g. world rabies day, world animal day
 - Public awareness campaigns via the internet (videos), print media (leaflets, posters) and broadcast media (radio)
- These programs target individuals who interact with animals on a daily basis (communities, farmers, owners), students (ranges from school children to university students), and teachers

Direct help:

- Providing veterinary care services such as vaccinations (often for free), rescue shelters, sanctuaries and rehabilitation
- These programs aim to help strays, abandoned, wounded or abused animals

Political outreach to policymakers and government officials²²:

- Lobbying for policy implementation or legislative change in the constitution to encode animal welfare policies into law
- Lobbying for review or update of existing legislation and law enforcement (e.g. prosecuting acts of animal cruelty)
- Campaigning to oppose labelling schemes on animal products by producers that endorse [humane washing](#) or [greenwashing](#)
- Working with governments to implement welfare and conservation projects (e.g. reporting cases of rabies, wildlife trade and conservation)

Capacity building:

- Conducting research
- Coordinating alliances, networks, clubs or societies (e.g. student associations in universities), conferences, and other events for networking and knowledge-sharing amongst animal welfare advocates/organisations (e.g. raising awareness about fish welfare amongst advocates in different countries)
- Working with farmers and/or abattoirs to implement welfare improvements by
 - providing logistical support (e.g. equipment and materials)
 - teaching better animal handling and housekeeping techniques (e.g. using sustainable, comfortable materials to improve donkey harnesses)

Institutional outreach:

- Campaigns pressuring producers of animal products to commit to adopting higher welfare standards (e.g. ending the use of battery cages for hens in the egg industry)

²² We did not come across groups that mentioned they were doing political or institutional outreach to encourage meat alternative products. This could be due to the small sample size (which may not be generalisable to the rest of the movement). However, a few experts mentioned that many communities already farm and eat a lot of plant-based staples. For example, some communities in Ethiopia are vegetarian for a large part of the year. This also presents a local opportunity to prevent an increase in meat consumption (if incomes and factory farming increase).



- Outreach to foodservice providers (e.g. hotels, supermarkets, restaurant chains, and companies providing food for hospitals or school canteens), encouraging them to source animal products from supply chains with higher animal welfare standards
- Outreach to teaching institutions to incorporate animal welfare into the training curriculum or activities

Many organisations heavily emphasise the sustainability or long-term effects of their advocacy efforts, and mentioned education and legislative change as popular methods for ensuring the sustained impact of their efforts. Some organisations engage local communities (e.g. youths, volunteers, teachers, farmers, and local authority) from an early stage in decision-making on animal welfare issues to instil a sense of ownership and unity. This is intended to ensure that if the organisations stop intervening in a specific area, awareness about animal welfare remains. Education is also seen as a way to prevent the need for more direct help, if animal welfare is taken care of in the first place by ensuring appropriate housing, feed and medication for animals. This point was emphasised by both animal advocacy organisations and experts on animal welfare in Africa.

Type of animals²³

| Type of animals | Number of organisations (out of 22) |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Farmed animals (or animals used for food consumption) | Land = 14; Aquatic = 2 |
| Wild animals ²⁴ | 9 |
| Working animals (commonly donkeys, horses, cattle) | 15 |
| Companion animals (commonly strays, pets) | 16 |
| Animals used for entertainment | 2 |
| Animals used for experiments | 1 |

²³ Among the 22 organisations we spoke with, 20 organisations work on behalf of a wide range of animal populations and 18 organisations employ a wide range of interventions, what ACE defines as general animal advocacy. Therefore, *n* is not mutually exclusive.

²⁴ Including hunted wild animals in bushmeat hunting, which refers to meat from wildlife species that are hunted for human consumption.



Geographic reach

Most organisations we interviewed work locally within targeted regions of their country. Coverage included:

| Coverage | Number of organisations (out of 22) |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| National and local organisations (e.g. Sibanye Animal Welfare and Conservancy Trust) | 17 |
| Internationally across a few countries in Africa (e.g. Coalition of Africa Animal Welfare Organisations) | 3 |
| African branches of UK/US organisations (e.g. Brooke East Africa) | 2 |

Networks and collaborations

We were interested in whether organisations were aware of other animal advocacy organisations within the region²⁵ to gauge crowdedness and cooperation between organisations.

| Awareness of other organisations | Number of organisations (out of 22) |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| None | 6 |
| Less than 5 | 7 |
| Between 5 and 10 | 3 |
| More than 10 | 6 |

Among the 16 organisations that are aware of other animal advocacy organisations, 13 mentioned some form of previous or current collaboration. Generally, the purpose of collaborating with other organisations is to:

- Share infrastructure that exists in other organisations to make advocacy and outreach easier to reach more stakeholders
- Increase the visibility and efficiency of their work
- To increase knowledge about advocacy work, receive training and mentorship

²⁵ We loosely defined region as the district or county in which organisations operate. Unfortunately, we did not provide a more specific definition when we asked organisations this question, thus organisations may have interpreted it differently.

Rationale for working on multiple interventions

We asked organisations why they were working on more than one intervention:

- Organisations tend to claim that one intervention will not work without the other. For example, treating animals without first educating communities about animal welfare is unsustainable. Similarly, some organisations claim mass education alone without direct implementation is less impactful as communities are unable to see demonstrable changes in welfare.
- If no other organisations within the region are solving the issues, existing organisations feel morally obligated to address them. Often, many animal welfare issues are observed due to the low awareness of animal welfare within communities. Therefore, many issues are highly neglected and need to be solved urgently. This results in organisations working on behalf of a wide range of animal populations. Some organisations mentioned the difficulty in choosing which animals to help most, as all animals should be given a fair chance at survival/welfare and be treated equally.
- An expert noted that current events such as technological innovation and changes in local by-laws contribute to poor animal welfare and result in the need to implement multiple interventions.²⁶

Decision-making and prioritisation of interventions

We then asked how organisations decide which interventions to work on, how they prioritised between different interventions and how they split resources between different interventions. This decision also influences the scale of each program organisations implement:

- **Needs-based assessment.** Some organisations mentioned conducting decision-relevant research via field and desk work to inform their choice of intervention. Evidence-based interventions that fill a neglected gap and are effective, tractable (likely to succeed), measurable are prioritised. For example, it was reported that 95% of animals within The Gambia are owned by individuals living in communities, so public outreach is chosen to target a large number of people. There is also some emphasis on behavioural change programs, as this is measurable. Organisations seem open to changing their minds about the interventions they implement upon seeing additional evidence about tractability.
- **Resource dependent.** Sometimes interventions are chosen depending on resources that are available. For example,
 - the nature of the grant or funding organisations receive, including the amount of funding
 - the availability, background or expertise of relevant staff and volunteers - interventions are usually split between staff members and volunteers
 - the nature of expertise or resources offered by collaborating partners
 - whether organisations receive governmental approval for a specific intervention
 - deferring to the decisions and strategies of [Regional Economic Communities](#) or regional bodies²⁷

²⁶ For example, by-laws requiring the movement of dogs to be restricted and controlled by owners. This has led to inhumane housing structures for dogs. Similarly, introducing zero grazing systems without clear guidance has led to poor welfare of dairy animals.

²⁷ See [AWSA](#) for the role of Regional Economic Communities as ‘important actors with interest and/or impact in animal welfare through their various intervention areas: ranging from pastoral areas development, transhumance/pastoralism, and disaster risk, to commodity-based trading’



- **Opportunistic timing.** For example, aquaculture is seen as a growing sector in South Africa to tackle food insecurity and employment. This provides a prime opportunity for animal advocacy organisations to engage with the government and policymakers in the ongoing development of the Aquaculture Development Bill. Another organisation mentioned focusing on educating stakeholders about animal transportation and handling when the rate of animal transportation increases during the holiday season for food consumption. The COVID-19 pandemic has also motivated some organisations to focus on animal welfare issues that link to public health, such as vaccinating and deworming animals to reduce the prevalence of zoonotic diseases.

We asked how organisations decide which group of animals to help:

- Similar to how organisations prioritise interventions, many rely on
 - **Assessment** of what issues are particularly prevalent and neglected in the region (e.g. if no one else is helping a particular group of animals, a particular wildlife species is facing imminent extinction).
 - **Opportunistic interventions.** For example, events pertaining to economic growth and trends in the country. The rise in wealth and income means that more individuals may start owning companion animals and consume more meat. Therefore, there is a shift of focus towards helping farmed animals and companion animals.
 - **Cultural and local factors.** An advocate we spoke to mentioned the emphasis on wild animals as they are significant to the heritage, economy and population of Africa compared to other animals. Often, helping wild animals is seen as a gateway or catalyst to advocating for other animals.

Interventions relevant to farmed animals

As our focus is on [farmed animals](#), we asked experts about animal agriculture and what can be done to reduce farmed animal suffering.

All experts we interviewed agreed that intensive animal agriculture is growing in African countries and will likely be a problem in future years if it isn't already (such as in South Africa). A rough heuristic provided by an African expert we spoke to indicates that factory farming accounts for 20% of the entire livestock production in Africa, with free-range systems and subsistence farming comprising the remaining 80%.²⁸ Africa is often seen as an alternative for markets that fell out of favour in developed countries but are yet to face as much backlash or criticism in most developing countries in Africa. This is evident from the tobacco industry²⁹ and the same is likely to occur in animal agriculture, such as the shipment of battery cages from European markets to Africa³⁰ after the EU directive was [issued](#) to phase out battery cages.

²⁸ This claim is based on an expert opinion that we feel comfortable relying on. Overall, we are fairly confident with the claim that farming systems in Africa are still largely dominated by smallholder farmers but industrial animal agriculture may increase to meet the increasing demand of animal products.

²⁹ See these news articles [\(1\)](#) [\(2\)](#) as proxies.

³⁰ This example was brought up by several experts, both locally and internationally. We also came across an [example](#) where European companies were marketing the use of barren battery cages and broiler cages in countries outside the EU.

Academic researchers do also occasionally mention or hint at the undesirability of developing large factory farms, albeit not directly critiquing these developments.³¹ It is worth noting that poor animal welfare is also not limited to large factory farms.³²

The evidence is mixed when asked *whether* intensive animal agricultural practices can be prevented, halted or slowed in Africa. Slightly more than half of the experts we interviewed were of the opinion that intensive agricultural practices were inevitable and approaches to prevent intensive practices are highly unlikely to succeed given large influential players and foreign investments incentivising these practices³³ for economic gains, and that the best thing the animal welfare movement could do is advocate for welfarist practices in the industry, and build local capacity and grassroots support as much as possible. The rest were more optimistic about the potential of preventing intensive agricultural practices. This also largely differs on a nation-by-nation basis.

When asked *how* they think factory farming could be prevented, halted or slowed:

- Political outreach (towards governments and intergovernmental organisations)
 - Lobbying the government to impose high taxes on producers and retailers involved in production
 - Lobbying the government to develop policies that govern the operations of producers, retailers and corporations in line with international standards from the outset
 - Some country governments are responsible for providing subsidies towards factory farming practices, however, there may be potential to lobby for alternative practices such that subsidies for industrialised farming are repurposed towards more sustainable and high-welfare systems.
 - Using policies in adjacent areas to promote animal welfare and counter government programs that encourage intensive production.³⁴
 - Lobbying for better enforcement of existing legislation that monitors the production and supply of animal products.
 - When interacting with authorities, it is crucial to link animal welfare with other social issues such as climate change, public health and economic development. It is recommended to frame the movement as individuals who are interested in improving the lives of animals, rather than advocating for total abolition of intensive animal agriculture as this may contradict other priorities such as job creation, food security and economic productivity. Government officials may be less interested to engage otherwise.
- Public outreach

³¹ See [Synder et al \(2019\)](#) which “cautions against a shift in emphasis to large-scale farming as a strategy for national development. It suggests instead that increased investment in supporting smallholder farming is critical for addressing poverty and rural well-being.” in Tanzania.

³² See [Sibongiseni et al \(2016\)](#) which reported that very few pig farmers in rural South Africa “have been exposed to training in pig rearing”, resulting in a lack of disease control measures, such as vaccination against preventable diseases.

³³ According to an expert we spoke to, the marked population increase, coupled with limited land resources and unpredictable weather patterns, is becoming the driving force for African governments to adopt factory farming practices to meet the nutritional needs of people.

³⁴ For example, deferring to environmental regulations which prevented growth of industrial animal agriculture. This was reportedly successful in India in the industrial dairy sector.



- Raising awareness amongst farmers of animal welfare and the relationship between animal welfare and other social issues affecting human welfare. Subsequently, empowering small-scale farmers to invest or partake in alternative systems or sustainable practices.³⁵
- Educating the general public through public awareness campaigns, events, conferences.³⁶
- Institutional outreach
 - Starting conversations with institutions and corporations around welfare improvements, meat alternatives, etc.
 - Pressuring corporations to commit and comply with international standards early on.³⁷
 - Outreach to financial institutions to restrict funding only to higher-welfare farming systems when farmers approach banks for loans.
- Capacity building
 - Building talent and capacity in existing organisations as well as amongst individual advocates to work in or start new organisations.
 - Local research to influence policy.³⁸
 - Networking or building alliances with potential allies in other countries and other movements (e.g. engaging with faith-based organisations as they have a large following).³⁹

³⁵ Other ideas include running a pilot to demonstrate the potential of alternative farming without the need for intensive agricultural practices.

³⁶ It is unclear, however, which outreach method would be most promising e.g. social media, leafleting, undercover investigations, documentaries. However, an expert mentioned avoiding negative messaging, guilt or shaming techniques seems sensible.

³⁷ There is uncertainty regarding the short-term impact of this intervention as most individuals in Africa consume food that is being produced locally rather than through corporate retailers. Similarly, it is unclear whether it is necessary to introduce meat alternative products to the market, particularly in countries where meat consumption is low.

³⁸ For example, research demonstrating the risks of intensifying farming practices at the cost of climate change and public health; or deriving lessons from social science or historical evidence from other movements (e.g. what the animal advocacy movement was like in other countries, investigating the impact of industrial agriculture on self-sustaining practices of the communities in other regions of the world). We are aware of an ongoing study that seeks to calculate the amount of profit loss due to inadequate animal welfare standards in hog farms.

³⁹ Experts seem to agree that there is value in forming more partnerships within and beyond the movement to increase cost-effectiveness.



Gauging effectiveness

Approaches in measuring impact and effectiveness

We were interested in how organisations measure the impact and effectiveness of their work on animal welfare. Exact metrics often vary depending on specific interventions. Generally, organisations mentioned:

- **Cost-effectiveness analyses and standard impact evaluation frameworks.**⁴⁰ Some do not have a formal evaluation framework and either sought external evaluation by a third party or mentioned the need to develop one in-house
- **Feedback** received from communities and the government about the organisation's added value or impact. Often, feedback is anecdotal and mentioned in passing rather than through deliberate measurements such as in-person interviews, questionnaires, surveys, and social media responses.
- **Independent operational audits** to assess behaviour (animal handling/housekeeping/ feeding techniques, dietary change) and attitude change (willingness to engage in conversations regarding animal welfare, willingness to switch from caged to cage-free, broiler etc) amongst communities, corporations, farmers towards animals and advocates.

Metrics used to measure impact

*We further asked what organisations would describe as an organisational achievement or success.*⁴¹ Some commonly cited measurements of success/impact include:

- **Social recognition** by the local community, government, media and other African and international animal advocacy organisations, evidenced by the continued support and/or funding to continue program implementation. Sometimes, organisations are invited to advise the government on legislation, or advise other organisations on program implementation in other regions or countries.
- **Geographic reach** of intervention. Many organisations measure the number of stakeholders influenced, including the number of followers, supporters, or African groups registered under the organisation (e.g. coalitions).
- **Number of animals saved (from slaughter), treated, or vaccinated**, including biological indicators such as number of wounds, injuries and diseases sustained, cortisol levels.
- **Number of days animals are free from suffering.**
- **Number of partnerships** or collaborations (with government, intergovernmental organisations, or other animal advocacy organisations).
- **Policy changes** such as the inclusion of animal welfare in the constitution and implementation of new legislation (e.g. legal prosecution of animal cruelty, humane slaughter on farmed animals, ban on slaughters and closure of slaughterhouses such as that for donkeys in Kenya, ban on the export of international wildlife trade, integration of animal welfare in the training curriculum).

⁴⁰ This generally involved identifying the baseline, setting target indicators and measuring those indicators through monthly reports from staff and volunteers before and after implementation of an intervention, including periodic follow-ups.

⁴¹ We think some of the measurements mentioned may not objectively equate to effectiveness. Arguably, the lack of elaborate and objective animal welfare and behavioural change measurement tools results in organisations relying on subjective narratives to define success.



- **Behavioural changes** related to the consumption of animal products as well as handling and housekeeping techniques.
- **Years of continued operation and experience**, despite the lack of funding and cultural and/or political receptivity.
- **Lack of perceived competition** or groups working in a similar space.⁴²
- **Number of research publications.**
- Metrics that are not objectively set by the organisation and instead depend on funder/donor requirements⁴³



Future success

We also asked why organisations think they are likely to succeed in the future⁴⁴:

- **Social factors.** Local organisations understand the social, political and cultural norms, speak the language and have built trust and connection with communities. Local organisations are more likely to understand the root cause of the problem that impacts animal welfare and the

⁴² Many organisations claim to be the only group working on a particular intervention to improve animal welfare within the region/country. We have come across instances when this isn't an accurate reflection of the space after speaking to multiple organisations. This perhaps points to the broader problem that the space is generally siloed and there is a lack of connection between organisations.

⁴³ We did not further enquire whether metrics set by funders or donors are any different from the rest of the metrics reported in this section.

⁴⁴ Note the propensity for heavy social desirability bias here. To overcome this as much as possible, organisations were asked to provide evidence and describe past successes.



obstacles communities face. This enables them to tailor their interventions and strategies to the local context.

- **Organisational track record, leadership, culture and values.** Some organisations have the necessary intellectual diversity, relevant expertise and strong values.⁴⁵ Through several years of operation and experience, some organisations have set up the necessary structures and networks to conduct their work successfully.
- **Government approval.** Some organisations are recognised and authorised by the government, which may be necessary for doing any animal advocacy work in the region. To a smaller extent, some organisations may also receive support from the government.
- **Growth and momentum** gained by the movement. Organisational work will become easier as the movement grows and animal welfare becomes more widely acknowledged.

Perceived effectiveness of interventions

There is a consensus among organisations, experts and funders that the movement is new and growing, therefore perceived effectiveness is limited:

- **Public outreach.** Experts agree that public outreach is a common intervention as animal welfare tends to be a new concept. A good starting point, therefore, is mass education to increase public awareness. This finding is consistent with the interventions that most animal advocacy organisations we've spoken to implement. However, despite ongoing efforts by organisations and intergovernmental agencies such as AU-IBAR, animal advocacy has not reached a self-sustaining level. Other social issues receive more attention amongst the general public, particularly those pertaining to human welfare. Similarly, some experts and animal advocacy organisations think there is a need to understand the underlying factors that influence the way individuals are treating animals (e.g. is it merely ignorance/lack of understanding or are there social factors that drive hostility towards animals?). Once this is understood, a more tailored approach can be implemented during public outreach to greater success.
- **Corporate campaigns.** We have not gathered much evidence about the success of animal advocacy organisations in campaigning for welfare improvements among producers of animal products or food service providers. Some experts and funders we spoke to were less optimistic about the effectiveness of corporate campaigns. We suspect this is because most organisations working on corporate outreach have just begun work on this and thus progress is limited. In addition, national governments, international development organisations and funding agencies are more influential in shaping the agriculture landscape of a country in Africa compared to corporations. There is a smaller number of corporations to target compared to other regions such as Europe or North America where corporate outreach has seen more success. Admittedly, experts thought that the value of corporate campaigning is expected to be high in general, particularly in countries where there is a huge monopoly by corporations, or where an animal agriculture industry such as caged chickens is growing. These situations tend to occur in more developed countries, such as South Africa.
- **Political outreach.** Among experts, there is an impression that political outreach has achieved limited success and that there is scope for more strategic collaboration among stakeholders advocating for policy changes in animal welfare. It is recommended that when approaching governments, linking animal welfare with other imminent social issues such as climate change,

⁴⁵ Examples of cited values include strong work ethic such as financial integrity by holding themselves accountable to finances by conducting internal audits/reporting.



public health, employment, and food security will be crucial to ensure animal welfare does not get de-prioritised.

- **Meat reduction efforts.** It is worth noting that some experts are sceptical about meat reduction efforts in Africa, either at the individual or institutional levels, such as the Meatless Monday or Green Monday Pledges, given the lower level of meat consumption in most African countries. Similarly, displacing meat products with alternative products may not necessarily increase overall welfare or reduce the number of animals slaughtered/raised for food due to lower demand. Producers may merely shift their consumer market to other countries.

Generally, there is consensus that interventions that target a large number of stakeholders through political or institutional outreach are more effective than interventions that involve individual outreach. However, there is an impression that it is harder to achieve first victory in the short term with institutional outreach than individual outreach. For this reason, some experts are more bearish on corporate and political advocacy due to the early stages of the movement.

Experts mentioned that it is likely that a combination of approaches needs to be taken to address this problem and improve general animal welfare. A one-size-fits-all solution is unlikely to work for the entire continent. Thus, interventions should be tailored to each country, specific to each jurisdiction. However, it is unclear which interventions to prioritise or what the order of interventions should be. It seems logical to start off with mass education and public outreach, followed by building relationships with governments and pressing for legislative change with grassroots support.⁴⁶

Identifying obstacles

General obstacles

Obstacles mentioned by organisations and advocates that seem to apply generally across the animal welfare movement in Africa:

- **Lack of awareness or understanding of animal welfare.** It was reported that many individuals are brought up with unfavourable or neutral attitudes and behaviours towards animals. This stems from a misunderstanding that animals are unable to experience positive or negative experiences. Due to religious and cultural norms and traditions, animals are commonly regarded as food, tools or commodities. Therefore, animal welfare is not worthy of moral consideration if animals will be slaughtered anyway. Advocating for dietary changes and abstinence of meat consumption seems like a big 'ask' and does not fit with communities' inherent way of life, thereby painting the movement in an unfavourable light and dampening the advocacy efforts of the general movement. As a result, some individuals question the purpose of animal advocacy organisations and may not want to engage in conversations about animal welfare. Many stakeholders that organisations reach out to, such as governments, corporations and farmers, are unaware of animal welfare as an issue, the importance of addressing it or what can be done about it. Nonetheless, we expect that engaging communities about animal welfare in some

⁴⁶ To reiterate, we did not conduct extensive research to validate which strategy will be effective in Africa and are purely noting the views of experts. Thus, this does not imply that we think all animal advocacy organisations should start off with public outreach. It may make sense to split interventions according to organisational fit and local circumstances, where the movement as a whole is implementing multiple interventions simultaneously. See [here](#) for recommended interventions where the animal advocacy movement is small or new (however, African countries were not included in the research).



countries⁴⁷ will be more welcoming and accepted than others due to cultural and religious differences.

- **Other imminent issues affecting humans.** A common bottleneck in the advocacy movement in Africa is that animal welfare gets de-prioritised amongst communities and governments when they struggle with other issues such as poverty, infectious diseases, and food insecurity. Animal welfare is perceived as a eurocentric concept - that only wealthy individuals in developed nations can afford to care about. Therefore, African advocates find that it is difficult to advocate for animal welfare alone. For example, one organisation mentioned that organising meetings within communities to solely discuss animal welfare will yield low attendance rate, so meetings will usually have to focus on other topics of interest, integrating animal welfare as an agenda item. Most governments are also influenced by big businesses who are incentivised by profits, and concerned with maximising economic productivity.⁴⁸ There is also a misunderstanding that issues such as food insecurity and unemployment cannot be reconciled with animal welfare.⁴⁹ One advocate mentioned the government of their country emphasising on food security and pushing for intensive agriculture without understanding the negative impact of such an agenda on the environment, public health and animal welfare.
- **Non-optimal legislation and lack of law enforcement.** Animals do not have legal protection in some countries.⁵⁰ In countries where there may be legislation, some are unfavourable or lack enforcement.⁵¹ Relatedly, an expert mentioned there is a lack of policy advocacy at the national level, some at the regional level, but progress is usually slow.
- **Obstacles imposed by the government.** Working with the government is sometimes challenging. There is a lack of cooperation from the government across many countries. The bureaucracy involved in gaining governmental approval for programs hinders the progress or public acknowledgement of organisations and advocates. Some communities look to the government for guidance so advocacy efforts may be ignored by the public when they are not acknowledged by the government. The government faces competing priorities for its agenda - lack of acknowledgement by the government signals that animal welfare is not a priority, making animal advocacy organisations appear weak or less credible to communities. Corruption or political instability may also impair the public outreach and political outreach programs implemented by organisations. Civil societies championing animal welfare may be suppressed by the government in many African countries. Consequently, actions such as peaceful protests and picketing are not feasible in certain countries as individuals could be incarcerated or lose citizenship.
- **Burnout, threats or compassion fatigue** from advocacy work. An advocate mentioned it is sometimes taxing to be an advocate as individuals are hostile and may behave aggressively. Alarming, a few organisations have reported receiving external threats about incarceration or assassination if their campaigning were to continue.

⁴⁷ Kenya and Malawi as quoted examples from an African expert.

⁴⁸ As a result, compliance with animal welfare standards is low, as compliance is seen as an inconvenience.

⁴⁹ According to an academic researcher, it is not unusual to see government funding being directed to industrial agriculture as a solution to food insecurity in Africa.

⁵⁰ In Zimbabwe where there are no policies to govern animal care, handling, feeding, management and slaughter practices. Therefore, farmers do not have adequate knowledge of housekeeping and handling techniques.

⁵¹ For example, stray dogs are poisoned to death to achieve population control in Uganda.



- **COVID-19.** A few organisations mentioned the COVID-19 pandemic impeding their progress, creating missed opportunities to engage with communities directly and form meaningful relationships and networks.
- **Siloed movement.** Funders, experts and organisations perceive the movement as disconnected: organisations and advocates are not working as collaboratively as possible, interests between advocates seem varied, and there seems to be a small number of people working on a variety of projects.⁵²

Organisation-specific obstacles

Obstacles that affect organisational progress:

- **Funding.** Organisational budget varies hugely between organisations, ranging as low as \$800 and as high as \$150,000. Most organisations' budgets were in the range of tens of thousands. Organisations mentioned a variety of obstacles to funding:
 - **Inaccessibility.** The intervention pursued by organisations may not be within the scope of funders' preferences. Organisations mentioned that some applications are lengthy, only allow one application per organisation, or have a long grace period for reapplication.
 - **Quality of applications.** African organisations may not understand how to approach international funders or write a proposal. Organisations may not have the most polished proposals compared to international organisations that have access to fundraising experts and staff.
 - **Limited.** Organisations mentioned relying on international funding, which is more competitive, as funding from Africa towards animal welfare is limited. Most organisations currently receive support from international sources and rarely locally, such as from the government.
 - **Awareness:** Some organisations were unaware of available grants.
 - **Non-monetary donations.** Sometimes donations are received as in-kind contributions, such as pet food, rather than cash.
 - **Inadequate infrastructure.** Organisations may lack the necessary financial services to receive funding. For example, Paypal does not exist in certain African countries and may require organisations to be registered internationally to receive funding.
- **Talent/capacity.** Recruiting and retaining talented individuals is a common challenge for organisations. Some organisations have a small staff, and some rely entirely on volunteers which creates a problem of task continuity when volunteers leave after a short period of time.⁵³ Lack

⁵² Other obstacles worth noting but not mentioned as frequently:

- Cultural, social, political, and legal differences across countries make it difficult to scale operations internationally or use the same method of advocacy across different regions.
- Sometimes collaborations and discussions with stakeholders drag out longer than necessary. Incessant back-and-forths lead to delays and little implementation.
- An expert mentioned that advocacy efforts to encourage farmers to implement higher welfare standards in Uganda are not completely sustainable. It was found that farmers return to prior behaviour of ignoring livestock welfare for a variety of reasons (influenced by other farmers who are acting similarly; prioritising profit over animal welfare).

⁵³ For organisations that work on multiple programs, some mentioned splitting interventions across different members of staff but also mentioned lack of talent/personnel as a bottleneck. We are unsure whether they have considered working on fewer interventions given the lack of capacity.



of training and continuous professional development of technical and soft skills is also a challenge that was mentioned.

- **Resources** (other than funding and talent). For example, transport (particularly for travelling to rural areas), office equipment, office space, program supplies, open space (for those providing shelter and rehabilitation).⁵⁴
- **Hardware**. Certain regions face power outages and Internet connectivity issues.
- **Publicity**. Non-existent or infrequently updated websites and social media lead to low organisational visibility online.

We asked what organisations would be able to achieve if obstacles were overcome to understand whether more support will lead to more animals being helped:

- **Maintain existing programs**. Sometimes projects are stalled or halted due to a lack of resources. Overcoming this obstacle can ensure the continuation of programming.
- **Increase organisational and program efficiency**. For example, ensure the sustainability of interventions, increase the number of staff/grassroots support, cover bureaucratic costs to gain governmental approval or review policies, increase speed of implementation, increase outreach (radio, television, newspaper, online messaging)
- **Increase scale of existing programs**. Increase the geographic reach in their own countries and other African countries
- **Increase the number of programs/interventions** to help more animals. There will be more room for exploratory work such as micropilot programs to determine the efficacy of different interventions.

Identifying interest in receiving support

What the movement needs in general

We asked what organisations would like to see more of in the movement so it is more impactful and effective in reducing animal suffering.⁵⁵ In many ways, the points mentioned by organisations are highly related to identified bottlenecks discussed above:

⁵⁴ Sometimes, it is unclear what the true limiting factor is - whether a mentioned bottleneck can be solved by another bottleneck. For example, program supplies, hardware, and talent can be acquired with more funding.

⁵⁵ *This section*

- *Does not include interventions that have been discussed in the '[Interventions](#)' section. It is assumed that organisations would naturally like to see more of the interventions/programs they are implementing.*
- *Is intended to delineate approaches that are not part of their programs.*
- *Is separate from the support they'd like to receive discussed in the 'identifying interest in receiving support' section*

However, it is worth noting that people may not be aware of solutions (maybe because it does not exist yet).



- **Prevalence of anti-speciesist values.** Generally speaking, wild and companion animals are valued more than other animals, such as farmed or working animals. Therefore, the former tends to receive more funding and attention than the latter.⁵⁶
- **Interconnectedness.** Inclusion of other social issues such as human welfare,⁵⁷ economic productivity, the environment and issues that may not be directly linked to animal welfare (e.g. gender and racial equality) to avoid the risk of alienating communities who are potential allies.
- More **talented or experienced** staff or volunteers working within animal advocacy organisations or in government, including continuous training and professional development for existing staff and volunteers
- **World standards / streamlined standards and legislation** in the African context with regards to animal welfare. For example, the Farm Assured Namibian Meat (FAN Meat) Scheme, unique to Namibia, sets clear and measurable quality criteria for the Namibian livestock and meat sector.⁵⁸ When such legislation does exist, there is a need to ensure legal enforcement, and that the laws are updated and all-encompassing.⁵⁹
- A movement that thinks about **defending the status quo**, e.g. preventing the growth of factory farms while it still represents a small (but growing) proportion of African farming, rather than overturning it.
- More **support** towards corporations or farmers who are implementing welfare improvements
- More **understanding and empathy** from international organisations towards circumstances in Africa (e.g. lack of internet access and poor road conditions can delay impact and progress of organisations)

Room for additional support

We asked organisations and advocates whether anything is being done to overcome the above obstacles to gauge room for receiving support. We also tried to identify whether any other African or international groups are doing capacity-building work.

Internally:

- Fundraising: Self-funding from other work e.g. social enterprise, income derived from performing specific services
- Strategy: Understanding local traditions and norms before performing outreach - handing off interventions to African leaders
- Communication: Increasing outreach and engagement with beneficiaries and donors via social media, events, investigative journalism/documentaries; increasing frequency and intensity of engagement with governments, advocacy organisations

Externally:

- Reliance on individual partners and/or organisations for funding, capacity, and other resources

⁵⁶ See prioritisation report/spreadsheet.

⁵⁷ An expert mentioned the lack of collaboration between animal welfare and humanitarian organisations is a gap that has hindered progress in animal advocacy and in rescuing animals during disasters.

⁵⁸ See (1) and (2). Under this scheme, agricultural practices must comply with international standards of animal welfare as their largest export market is in Europe.

⁵⁹ We are fairly confident with the claim that there is a need for policy support to improve animal welfare standards based on conversations with various experts.



- Political environment may improve if there is a change in government
- Research focused on the African context being conducted by local academic researchers and nonprofit organisations (e.g. Brighter Green)
- Capacity building by external organisations⁶⁰
 - The [Open Wing Alliance](#) supports African member organisations in cage-free corporate outreach by sharing campaign strategies, tactics and resources
 - We are aware of an incubation program set to launch in June 2021 by [ProVeg Grants Program](#) to train advocates on institutional outreach. The program will also vet promising organisations for donor funding.
 - [World Animal Net](#) (WAN)⁶¹ developed a Strategic Advocacy course a few years ago which was delivered as a pilot course for African animal advocates. The one-year pilot focused on animal advocacy work and included full mentorship. The course was subsequently made available [online](#), so it could be more widely used by advocates (e.g. in organisational training) and at their own pace. Content included general background on the animal welfare movement and social change, strategic planning, research, campaigning/lobbying, media and communications, networking and alliances, monitoring and evaluation, and a full advocacy toolkit.
 - The [Coalition of African Animal Welfare Organisations](#) supports smaller organisations within their coalition by providing one-off training, e.g. in fundraising.

The consensus among organisations and experts is that despite ongoing efforts to overcome these challenges, organisations are keen for more support. We intend to complement capacity-building efforts that others have done or are doing by offering alternative support that will add value to African animal advocacy organisations.

Interest in receiving support

Overall, 21 out of 22 organisations were interested in receiving support from an external organisation.⁶²

Types of support:

- **Funding** (to employ competent staff, arrange program logistics e.g. vehicles), particularly channelled towards isolated communities where animals are completely neglected
- **Alliances and platforms** to network, build connections, and facilitate communication
 - To share knowledge and resources about the movement, interventions, challenges, mistakes, successes
 - To form collaborations between similar organisations, to present a more unified front as a movement and avoid duplicating efforts

⁶⁰ Where we have been given permission to do so, we have named the organisations we are aware of that are doing capacity-building interventions. However, the list is not exhaustive and there is at least another international organisation (who has not provided consent to be mentioned in this report) that has upcoming plans to mentor or train African animal advocates.

⁶¹ WAN has now merged into the [World Federation for Animals](#) (WFA).

⁶² As part of our decision-making process in choosing a capacity building intervention we want to pilot, we are doing a more quantitative survey to identify the nature of support that organisations are keen to receive to assess tractability and cost-effectiveness of a certain intervention.



- To involve the government in programs being implemented by organisations or generally in the animal advocacy movement, especially when there are government officials interested in animal welfare issues
- To increase grassroots support and involve civil societies
- To build talent, recruit volunteers
- To aid fundraising efforts
- **Mentorship or training** in broad and specific knowledge about animal welfare, technical and soft skills in running an animal advocacy organisation (e.g. accounting, EA concepts, advocacy, behavioural change communication, social media management/outreach, fundraising, project and people management, strategic decision-making)
- **Local research.** Technical and social research in the African context to inform strategic decision-making, identify sustainable and effective interventions, influence policy, and identify where resources should be channelled.
 - Examples of social research:
 - Social and cultural drivers that underlie people's indifference towards animal welfare, consumption of animal products, and feasible alternatives as a source of income, instead of, or before advocating for meat reduction and veganism alone
 - Relationship between poverty and animal welfare
 - Examples of technical research:
 - Transportation methods
 - Slaughter methods
 - Population control of stray animals

Broadly, the experts we interviewed agree with most capacity building interventions to improve animal advocacy in Africa such as local research, building the talent pool and building alliances with governments, corporations and media.

Some organisations showed interest in receiving support, dependent on

- Whether the support can ultimately benefit animals on a large scale.
- Whether there is value, mission and culture⁶³ alignment between the organisations. Other factors include the supporting organisation's track record, partners, and stakeholders.
- Their context and needs. Some organisations prefer being able to choose the support they receive as they are closer to the problem and have a better understanding. Nonetheless, many are open to receiving support that is different from the ones they had in mind.
- The expected outcome or value of collaboration, including expectations from the organisation receiving support. Organisations would decline support if repayment of funding is expected, the support compromises their core work or more work is needed from their end than the expected value gained

We are aware that there may be a tendency for organisations to overexpress interest in receiving support.⁶⁴ In practice, there may be more constraints or a higher likelihood that support will be

⁶³ For example, emphasis on social equality, non-discrimination, and apolitical.

⁶⁴ This could be due to politeness, social desirability bias or reporting bias. We have seen evidence of this where interviewees respond positively to initial contact but are absent from the actual interview.



declined.⁶⁵ There may also be a discrepancy in the predicted nature of support (what they think they want vs what they actually need). For these reasons, our pilot phase will be crucial in testing out these assumptions and logistical difficulty of implementation before scaling up.

Effective Altruism

| Awareness of effective altruism | Number (out of 22 organisations and 11 individual advocates ⁶⁶) |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Have not heard of effective altruism | 21 |
| Limited understanding of effective altruism or able to make out its literal meaning | 5 |
| High knowledge of understanding of effective altruism and able to explain concepts | 7 |

Most individual advocates and individuals working in animal advocacy organisations have not heard of effective altruism. We found that those with a higher level of knowledge are based in South Africa and Kenya. Amongst this group, their perception of the EA landscape is that it is new. If the concept of EA were to grow in Africa, advocates recommend using a tailored approach, considering local circumstances and issues.

Next steps

Given the lack of capacity building organisations dedicated to improving the effectiveness of animal welfare organisations or advocates in Africa,⁶⁷ we acknowledge that many early decisions we make could have path-dependent effects on the field's long-term success. We are cautious about accidentally causing harm or setting the movement back. To mitigate these risks, we plan to seek external feedback from mentors and African experts before implementing our pilot plan. We also intend to hire a program manager from Africa to help us with research, strategy and implementation.

Our plan moving forwards is to build a list of potential capacity-building interventions we could pilot. Interventions will be decided based on the bottlenecks mentioned by organisations and our evaluation

⁶⁵ For example, support may sound valuable in theory but interviewees may not have thought through the various associated costs (e.g. time) when initially expressing interest. Intuitively, organisations do not have any incentive to express disinterest at this stage and may be keen to keep their options open.

⁶⁶ This includes the five individual advocates who already identified as effective altruists when we reached out, all of whom are involved in local EA groups.

⁶⁷ At the time of writing, we are aware of five other organisations (ranging from research to mentorship/training) building the capacity of African organisations and/or advocates (or have plans to do so in the future). However, none have a primary focus on capacity building in Africa (e.g. they are working on other interventions and/or in other regions of the world).



of metrics such as cost-effectiveness, scalability and logistical difficulty.⁶⁸ We think it would be effective to start with the organisations that are interested in being supported and involving them directly in this decision-making process. We believe it may be more beneficial to empower and provide the tools for activists in Africa to do more effective work themselves, than to use them to implement interventions that we have determined to be impactful ourselves (unless organisations are explicitly open to this suggestion).

There is existing [interest and work](#) from international animal advocacy organisations and funders to do capacity building in the form of mentorship or skill-building of African organisations and advocates. Interventions being implemented by these organisations will be taken into account to ensure we are still adding value and that our intervention sufficiently addresses an existing gap.

Some organisations have reported that they defer to the decisions of Regional Economic Communities or regional bodies when planning and making decisions. Thus, we plan to look for synergies with existing strategies of African governments and intergovernmental agencies such as the Animal Welfare Strategy for Africa.⁶⁹ For tractability reasons, institutional and political efforts should focus on regional authorities, intergovernmental agencies and/or veterinary associations who have jurisdiction over a few regions in Africa. This ensures a large number of stakeholders are targeted at once. Similarly, approaching civil societies may be useful as they have more influence on the ground.

We initially also wrote up a section that illustrates the status of animal welfare by country as described by respondents. However, as the number of interviewees was low for each country and we did not ask country-specific questions, we felt it did not provide reliable detail on countries and regions, but instead, it captured general information based on anecdotes from advocates. This section was therefore removed as the information provided could be based on the interviewees' preferred issues rather than something that was especially important, neglected, or tractable in that country. This is a case where we felt reviewing some well-researched articles or books would probably be a better indicator of the situation for animals, including data on the number of animals farmed or trophy hunted, etc. We may decide to create in-depth country-specific profiles depending on need and capacity. In the meantime, we are happy to share these findings with those who are interested in any particular countries where the [organisations](#) we interviewed are based/active in.

⁶⁸ See our [pilot plan](#) and [decision-making spreadsheet](#).

⁶⁹ See [here](#) for an executive summary of AWSA.



Conclusion

Overall, the effective animal advocacy landscape in Africa is nascent and growing. The majority of organisations and advocates we interviewed engage in a wide range of interventions and tend to advocate for more than one group of animal populations. There appears to be significant challenges that are holding the movement back in general as well as specific challenges faced by organisations. Subsequently, we think there is room for more resources and support to be channelled towards the animal advocacy movement. Furthermore, organisations we have engaged with have expressed interest in receiving external support.

As noted in our disclaimer, we are uncertain about making substantive claims about which of these organisations' interventions look most effective or promising, particularly as this will likely vary across regions and countries. Similarly, we are uncertain about the tractability of preventing, slowing, or stopping the growth of intensive animal agriculture practices and the strategies that will be most promising in achieving that.⁷⁰

Nonetheless, as animal agriculture continues to grow in the continent (e.g. in countries with low but growing animal production rates), we think now is an important time to help existing organisations and advocates grow the movement as much as possible through movement building and capacity building interventions.

We encourage readers who are interested in providing feedback, comments, or questions to [reach out](#) to us.



⁷⁰ Our remaining open questions can be found in our [research agenda](#).



Appendix

| Organisation | Contact | Interventions | Animals | Headquarters | Active in |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|-----------|
| AFRICAN ORGANISATIONS | | | | | |
| North Africa | | | | | |
| Society for the Protection of Animal Rights in Egypt (SPARE) | Amina Abaza, Founder & President | <p>Direct help (providing shelter, veterinary care and rehabilitation)</p> <p>Public outreach (school and community education programs aimed at fostering compassion and empathy for animals)</p> <p>Undercover investigations</p> | <p>Companion animals</p> <p>Farmed animals</p> <p>Animals used for entertainment</p> | Cairo, Egypt | Egypt |
| East Africa | | | | | |
| Africa Network for Animal Welfare (ANAW) | Catherine Chumo, Senior Communications Officer | <p>Corporate outreach (ongoing plans to conduct cage-free campaigns)</p> <p>Direct help (providing rescue such as de-snaring and veterinary care)</p> <p>Public outreach (school and community education programs aimed at fostering compassion and empathy for animals, campaigns against animals used in experiments)</p> | <p>Companion animals (dogs, cats)</p> <p>Working animals (donkeys)</p> <p>Wild animals (monkeys, baboons)</p> <p>Animals used in laboratories for experiments</p> | Nairobi, Kenya | Kenya |
| Lilongwe Society for the Protection and Care of Animals (LSPCA) | Eveline Sibindi van Dam, CEO | <p>Direct help (providing shelter and veterinary care)</p> <p>Political outreach</p> <p>Public outreach (school and community education programs aimed at fostering compassion and empathy for animals; public awareness campaigns; practical training for veterinary students)</p> | <p>Working animals (donkeys)</p> <p>Companion animals (stray dogs)</p> <p>Farmed animals (chickens, goats, cattle, rabbits)</p> | Lilongwe, Malawi | Malawi |
| Meru Animal Welfare Organization | Johnson Lyimo, Executive Director | Public outreach (school and community education programs aimed at fostering compassion and empathy for animals) | Working animals (donkeys, horses) | Arusha, Tanzania | Tanzania |



| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|----------|
| | | Direct help (providing veterinary care) | Companion animals (dogs, cats) | | |
| Nurture Imvelo Trust | Sanele Ndlovu , Founder | Direct help (providing rescue and veterinary care) Public outreach (school and community education programs aimed at fostering compassion and empathy for animals) | Working animals (donkeys, cattle) Companion animals (stray dogs) Wild animals | Bulawayo, Zimbabwe | Zimbabwe |
| Tikobane Trust | Ndlele Ncube , Co-founder | Public outreach (community education programs aimed at fostering compassion and empathy for animals) | Working animals (donkeys, cattle, goats) Companion animals (dogs, cats, strays in communities) | Dete, Zimbabwe | Zimbabwe |
| Lupane Youth for Development | Tawanda Mazango , Team leader & Program Coordinator | Direct help (veterinary care) Public outreach (community education programs aimed at fostering compassion and empathy for animals) | Working animals (donkeys) Farmed animals (goats, chickens) Wild animals | Lupane, Zimbabwe | Zimbabwe |
| Sibanve Animal Welfare and Conservancy Trust | Alfred Sihwa , Director | Public outreach (community education programs aimed at fostering compassion and empathy for animals) Wildlife conservation (campaigning against trophy hunt and trade of wild animals) Institutional outreach (encouraging universities to incorporate animal welfare into the curriculum) Political outreach (lobbying government to revise animal welfare policies) | Wild animals (lions, elephants, birds, hippos, crocodiles) Farmed animals (chickens, pigs, fish, crabs) Working animals (donkeys, horses, cattle) | Lupane, Zimbabwe | Zimbabwe |
| Humane Africa Trust | Linda Ncube , Founder | Direct help (providing veterinary care) Public outreach (school and community education programs aimed at fostering compassion and empathy for animals) | Companion animals (cats, dogs) Working animals (donkeys) | Lupane, Zimbabwe | Zimbabwe |
| Help Initiatives for People | Happison Chikova , Director | Political outreach (Lobbying government to introduce bans on wild animal export) | Farmed animals (chickens, pigs, cattle) | Masvingo, Zimbabwe | Zimbabwe |



| Organisation (HIPO) | | Influencing industry (outreach to farmers about animal welfare) | Companion animals (dogs, cats) | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|------------|
| West Africa | | | | | |
| Animal Welfare Advocates Association | Dr. Kebba Daffeh, Advisor | <p>Public outreach (school and community education programs aimed at fostering compassion and empathy for animals)</p> <p>Influencing industry (outreach to farmers about animal welfare)</p> <p>Political outreach (lobbying government to introduce animal welfare policies)</p> <p>Building alliances (lobbying key influencers such as artists/musicians)</p> <p>Direct help (providing veterinary care)</p> | <p>Farmed animals</p> <p>Working animals (equines)</p> <p>Companion animals</p> | Bakau, The Gambia | The Gambia |
| Animal Welfare Concern | Momodou Camara, Founder & President | Public outreach (community education programs aimed at fostering compassion and empathy for animals) | Working animals (donkeys, horses, cattle) | Kombo, The Gambia | The Gambia |
| Eco-friends Gambia | Ousman Sanneh , Co-founder & Program Manager | Influencing industry (outreach to farmers and working animal owners about animal welfare) | <p>Farmed animals (cows, goats, sheep)</p> <p>Working animals (donkeys)</p> | Soma, The Gambia | The Gambia |
| GYG project | Augustine Addo, President | Public outreach (school and community education programs aimed at fostering compassion and empathy for animals) | <p>Farmed animals (cows, goats)</p> <p>Companion animals</p> | Accra, Ghana | Ghana |
| West Africa Center for the Protection of Animal Welfare (WACPAW) | Abdul Rahman Safian, Executive Director & Co-founder | <p>Public outreach (school and community education programs aimed at fostering compassion and empathy for animals)</p> <p>Influencing industry (provide operational / logistics support to farmers to implement higher welfare standards)</p> | Farmed animals (goats, sheep, cattle) | Tamale, Ghana | Ghana |
| Liberia Animal Welfare & Conservation Society | Morris Darbo, Founder Haja Talawallay, | Public outreach (school and community education programs aimed at fostering compassion and empathy for animals) | <p>Wild animals</p> <p>Farmed animals</p> | Lofa County, Liberia | Liberia |



| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Administrative Manager | Political outreach (lobbying government to introduce animal protection policies) Direct help (providing veterinary care) | Companion animals (dogs and cats) | | |
| Araf Plateau Dogon | Issiaka Konate, President | Public outreach (public awareness campaigns about donkey skin trade) Corporate outreach (campaigns pressuring restaurants and hotels to disrupt the dog meat trade) | Working animals (donkeys) Farmed animals (goats, sheep) Companion animals (dogs) | Dogon, Mali | Mali |
| Humane Global Network | Chiemeka Chiedozie , Executive Director | Public outreach (school and community education programs aimed at fostering compassion and empathy for animals) | All animals | Lagos, Nigeria | Nigeria |
| Saint Mark's Animal Hospital | Ofua Mark , Director | Direct help (providing shelter, veterinary care, and wildlife rehabilitation and release) Public outreach (school education programs aimed at fostering compassion and empathy for animals) | Companion animals (cats, dogs) Wild animals (snakes, pangolins) | Lagos, Nigeria | Nigeria |
| Southern Africa | | | | | |
| Coalition of African Animal Welfare Organisations (CAAWO) | Mandla Gqamlana, Programme Director | Political outreach (lobbying government to introduce fish welfare policies) Corporate outreach (outreach to food service providers (e.g., supermarkets, restaurant chains, and hotels) encouraging them to source animal products from supply chains with higher animal welfare standards, cage-free campaigns) Public outreach (school and community education programs aimed at fostering compassion and empathy for animals) Capacity building (providing a networking platform for member organisations) | Companion animals Farmed animals (chickens, fish) Wild animals | Cape Town, South Africa | South Africa Tanzania Zimbabwe |
| INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS WITH AFRICAN BRANCH | | | | | |
| Internatioal Organisation for Animal Protection | Che Gilbert Ayunwi, Country Director | Direct help (providing veterinary care) Public outreach (school and community education programs aimed at fostering | All animals | Bamenda, Cameroon | Cameroon |



| | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|
| (OIPA) | | <p>compassion and empathy for animals)</p> <p>Political outreach (lobbying government to introduce animal welfare policies)</p> | | | |
| Brooke Hospital for Animals in East Africa (BEA) | Lyne lyadi , Information and Communications Officer | <p>Public outreach (community education programs aimed at fostering compassion and empathy for equines through social behavioural change communication initiatives)</p> <p>Political outreach (lobbying government to implement animal welfare policies)</p> | Working animals (donkeys, horses) | Nairobi, Kenya | Egypt Ethiopia Kenya Senegal |

Footer

Animal Advocacy Africa (AAA) is a program of Credence Institute, operating through a fiscal sponsorship with Players Philanthropy Fund (Federal Tax ID: 27-6601178), a Maryland charitable trust with federal tax-exempt status as a public charity under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. Contributions to AAA are tax-deductible to the fullest extent of the law.