

To Whom It May Concern:

Supplementary email submission by World Animal Protection to Inquiry into Natural Disaster Funding

World Animal Protection believes that there are compelling grounds to integrate animals into disaster policy and planning in order to improve animal welfare and build community resilience by safeguarding human welfare and safety. Our initial submission was structured around the following points:

- We argued that animals are part of our lives and in addition to minimising their suffering in disasters, there are compelling reasons to fully integrate animals into disaster planning. We provided a brief introduction to World Animal Protection's work with the National Advisory Committee for Animals in Emergencies and progress towards endorsement of the National Planning Principles for Animals in Disasters by government authorities with responsibility for emergency management and animal welfare.
- We outlined the evidence base that supports the business case for managing animals in disasters. This included an outline of both financial and non-financial costs relevant for the purposes of the inquiry into the efficacy of natural disaster funding arrangements, especially with respect to the priority of effective natural disaster mitigation and the reduction of impact of disasters on communities.
- We provided some comments on additional themes identified in the Productivity Commission issues paper including emergency management capability, governance arrangements between the jurisdictions, and the balance between mitigation, resilience and recovery. Our specific comments were in relation to institutional arrangements and policy to ensure community/individual decision making processes support appropriate risk management practices. We commented on progress to date in promoting behavioural change and building emergency management capability with respect to some emerging research findings on these topics.

We provide this supplementary email submission in relation to the second dot point: to expand on the financial and non-financial costs relevant for the purposes of the inquiry into the efficacy of natural disaster funding arrangements.

This does not detract from our argument that on the basis of animal welfare principles alone, efforts should be made to protect animals from disasters.

This supplementary email submission elaborates on how animal welfare might fit into the non-market costs' dimension of any cost-benefit analysis with respect to natural disasters, alongside psychological and social costs.

Because animal welfare is a "public good" and poor animal welfare is a "negative externality", ordinary price signals do not take into account the social costs of addressing the externalities.

This will result in non-optimal animal welfare from society's point of view. Because human perceptions of animal welfare can impact directly on human welfare, this means that human welfare is lower than it could be.

The Economists at Large paper, *The economics of animal welfare: Paper number 1 / Thinking like an economist*, 2012, and the Farm Animal Welfare Committee paper, *Economics and Farm Animal Welfare*, 2011, elaborate on these concepts. Both these papers are attached to this email.

In natural disasters, the loss of or injury to animals is a negative externality in terms of human welfare (in addition to animal welfare). In terms of farm animals the value of the negative externality can be estimated in terms of lost production. For wild animals and companion animals it would be much more difficult to estimate its value.

But to the extent that government action can reduce the negative externality by encouraging and facilitating the inclusion of all animals in disaster planning, it would be a worthwhile investment not only in economic terms but also in terms of social resilience.

Regards,
Jacqui

Jacqueline Mills
Campaign Manager, Disaster Management
World Animal Protection
Level 1, 39 Chandos St, St Leonards, NSW, 2065, Australia