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What is LEGS?

• A set of international standards for improving the quality of livestock programmes in humanitarian disasters based on rights

• Focused on regions prone to disasters – rapid onset, slow onset, complex

• Enables humanitarian actors to design and implement projects which help to protect and/or rebuild livestock assets
Links to Sphere

• LEGS is based on the format and process used to develop the Sphere handbook - the *Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Disaster Response*

• Sphere is underpinned by international humanitarian and human rights laws and conventions and is one of a number of ‘Quality and Accountability’ initiatives in the humanitarian sector

• The LEGS Project’s application to become a companion module to Sphere is due to be finalised at the next Sphere Board meeting in May 2011
Rationale for LEGS

• Repeated cycles of inappropriate and badly implemented livestock relief projects:
  - Poor analysis
  - Local capacities and services overlooked or undermined
  - Urgency and timing often the excuse but ...
  - Assistance often late, even in slow-onset droughts

• Very limited impact assessment

• Weak coordination between development and emergency ...
Example: Veterinary Services in Ethiopia

**Development approach**

Privatization of clinical veterinary services supported by government policy since 1993

Numerous programmes to assist rural private practitioners (degree and diploma holders) to set up private clinics and pharmacies, funded by EC, World Bank, DFID, USAID and others

Enabling legislation for private para-veterinary professionals

**Emergency interventions**

Designed without involvement of local private sector

‘Truck and chuck’ - dumping of large quantities of free veterinary medicines

Limited epidemiological basis for intervention e.g. vaccination programmes targeting 20% of population

Funded by the same donors who fund development

Undermines local private practitioners i.e. the services needed for recovery
The Development of LEGS

- Process overseen by a **Steering Group** – to review the scope, content and style
- **Focal Point** authors developed technical chapters
- **Consultation** with a global e-mail network of 1700 organisations and individuals
  - 1\(^{st}\) draft widely disseminated for feedback and posted on website
  - 2\(^{nd}\) draft subject to practitioner review and simulation workshops
- **LEGS Handbook** published in April 2009 with a CD-ROM
- Also available free-of-charge as a download pdf file on the LEGS website: http://www.livestock-emergency.net
- **Translated** into French, Arabic and Spanish (pdf files available on the website)
- **Training materials** developed and TOT programme being rolled out worldwide
The Aim of LEGS

To support the saving of lives and the saving of livelihoods through two key strategies:

1. Assist in the identification of most appropriate livestock-related technical interventions in emergencies.

2. Provide standards, indicators and guidance notes for these interventions based on good practice.
Who is LEGS for?

Those involved in emergency interventions in areas where livelihoods are derived in part or in full from livestock

• Practitioners:
  – Livestock experts with little experience of emergency response
  – Humanitarian experts with little experience of livestock

• Decision makers:
  – Donors - funding and implementation decisions
  – Government – policy and practice
LEGS Objectives

• To *provide rapid assistance* to crisis-affected communities through livestock-based interventions.

• To *protect the key livestock-related assets* of crisis affected communities.

• To *rebuild the key livestock-related assets* of crisis affected communities
The LEGS Approach

LEGs is founded on a rights-based approach. There are four stages to the LEGS assessment and design process:

1. Preliminary assessment
2. Response identification
3. Analysis of technical interventions and options
4. Monitoring and evaluation
The LEGS Approach

Stage 1: Preliminary assessment
[Checklists]

Stage 2: Response Identification
[PRIM]

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

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

Key
[Checklists] = LEGS tools for each stage
The LEGS Approach: outputs for each stage

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

Response Identification
- one or more technical interventions prioritised

Analysis of technical interventions and options
- options selected
  - response programme designed

Monitoring & Evaluation

Key
- info on livestock roles = expected outputs from each stage of the Approach
What is the PRIM?

The PRIM is:
a tool that uses the findings of the preliminary assessments to facilitate discussions with local stakeholders

In order to:
identify which interventions are most appropriate, feasible and timely
Why use the PRIM for planning?

The PRIM:

– promotes a participatory approach between stakeholders

– focuses on *livelihoods objectives* of potential interventions
  *considers phases of emergency*
  *roots interventions in their impact on livelihoods*

– gives a visual summary of most effective interventions to protect livelihoods
How to use the PRIM

The PRIM is best used:

– As a planning tool
– In a participatory workshop
– To bring together information:
  • Preliminary assessment findings
  • Existing baseline information
  • Government reports
  • Experiences and knowledge of the workshop participants
## Slow Onset PRIM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical interventions</th>
<th>Livelihoods Objectives</th>
<th>Emergency Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rapid assistance</td>
<td>Alert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protect assets</td>
<td>Alarm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rebuild assets</td>
<td>Emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destocking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of livestock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scoring against LEGS objectives:

- **downarrow**: significant benefits/highly appropriate
- ****: benefits/appropriate
- ***: some benefits
- **: a few benefits
- *: very little benefit/not very appropriate
- n/a: not appropriate

### Emergency Phases:

- ➔ appropriate timing for the intervention

---

**LEGS Handbook**

*page 38*

---

**LEGS Briefing: DFID, 2nd December 2010**
# Rapid Onset PRIM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical interventions</th>
<th>Livelihoods Objectives</th>
<th>Emergency Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rapid assistance</td>
<td>Immediate aftermath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protect assets</td>
<td>Early recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rebuild assets</td>
<td>Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destocking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of livestock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring against LEGS objectives:**

- ***** significant benefits/highly appropriate
- **** benefits/appropriate
- *** some benefits
- ** a few benefits
- * very little benefit/not very appropriate
- n/a not appropriate

**Emergency Phases:**

- ➔ appropriate timing for the intervention

---

*LEGS Briefing: DFID, 2nd December 2010*
## Example of Rapid Onset Emergency in Asia: Earthquake

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical interventions</th>
<th>Livelihoods Objectives</th>
<th>Emergency Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rapid assistance</td>
<td>Protect assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destocking</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet services</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of livestock</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGs Briefing: DFID, 2nd December 2010
## Completed PRIM

### Example of Slow Onset Drought in Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical interventions</th>
<th>Livelihoods Objectives</th>
<th>Emergency Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rapid assistance</td>
<td>Protect assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destocking</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Services</td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed</td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>(*)</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of livestock</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*LEGs Briefing: DFID, 2nd December 2010*
The LEGS Approach

Stage 1: Preliminary assessment
[Checklists]

Stage 2: Response Identification
[PRIM]

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

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

Key
[Checklists] = LEGS tools for each stage
### Example: Advantages and disadvantages table

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Rapid Onset</th>
<th>Slow Onset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immediate Aftermath</td>
<td>Early Recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation of livestock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency feeding: in situ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency feeding: feed camps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*LEGs Handbook page 120*
Example: Decision Tree

Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards

Is there a shortage of livestock feed?

- Do indigenous relocation strategies exist?
  - Are they being used?
    - Would externally supported relocation be unaffected by the reasons that indigenous strategies are not being used?
      - Do suitable areas with sufficient resources for supported relocation exist, that are likely to remain unaffected by the current emergency?
        - Can stock needs (water, shelter, veterinary care) be met there?
          - Can the stock be moved easily and are they strong enough?
            - Is the disease risk reduced or at least the same as at the current location?
              - Can stock be supervised without a negative effect on other livelihood activities?
                - Can potential conflict with the inhabitants of the relocation area be avoided

No action

See also next page for supplementary feeding

Key: → = ‘yes’  ← = ‘no’

Note: The result ‘No action (unless outstanding questions can be addressed)’ may simply mean that further training or capacity building is required in order to be able to answer ‘yes’ to the key questions, rather than that no intervention should take place.
Ensuring Feed Supplies General Standard 1: Assessment and planning
The options for ensuring supplies of feed resources are assessed based on local needs, practices and opportunities.

Key indicators
- Feed provision activities are only initiated where there is a significant chance that the beneficiaries will continue to be able to keep and manage livestock after the emergency has ended.

Guidance notes
1. **Beneficiaries can keep and manage livestock in the future:** ... Before engaging in interventions that help to keep livestock alive in the short-term, agencies should be reasonably confident that beneficiary families will be able to keep and manage the livestock in the longer term, using community decision-making processes to target the most appropriate beneficiaries.
LEGS Training Programme

Completed TOTs:
• Horn and East Africa: Addis Ababa, April 2010
• SE Asia: Phnom Penh, May 2010
• Horn and East Africa II: Nairobi, July 2010
• S Asia: Kathmandu, August 2010
• W Africa (francophone): Dakar, September 2010
• Southern Africa: Johannesburg, October 2010
• Pakistan/Afghanistan: Islamabad, November 2010

Total LEGS Trainers trained to date: 129 (106 male, 23 female)
LEGS Southern Africa Regional TOT: Johannesburg, October 2010
SATISFACTION

trois

moyenne
LEGS West Africa Regional TOT: Dakar, Sept 2010
Uptake and Spread of LEGS

LEGS Trainings (3-day module):

• 19 Training Courses carried out to-date, in:
  • Kenya
  • Ethiopia
  • Sudan
  • Thailand
  • Bhutan
  • Myanmar
  • Nepal
  • India

• More planned for the coming months
• Fourteen accredited LEGS Trainers
Uptake and Spread of LEGS (cont.)

- Hard copy sales of LEGS Handbook: Practical Action report that 2440 copies of the handbook have been sold up to June 2010, in addition to the initial bulk purchase of 1500
- Soft copy downloads:
  - LEGS pdf: 3500 (averaging over 200 per month)
  - LEGS pdf in French: 227 (since posting in June)
  - LEGS pdf in Arabic: 51 in September
  - LEGS electronic tool: 30-40 most month
- FAO Ethiopia and Kenya using as standard reference internally and with partners
- ECHO uptake in East Africa region (plus linkages in W Africa, SE Asia, and Brussels)
- WSPA in SE Asia uptake
What next for LEGS? Future Training Plans

- Continued roll-out of regional Training of Trainers (TOT) programme:
  - Central Africa
  - North Africa
  - Middle East
  - Latin America
  - China/Mongolia
  - Caribbean
  - Anglophone West Africa
  - North America
  - Europe

- Further roll out of half-day module for donors/decision makers
- Development of one-day module for practitioners
- Refresher Training
What next for LEGS? Other Activities

- **LEGS core functions**: website, mailings, expanded communications and awareness raising, technical support including rapid response planning, fundraising
- **Publications**: additional translations; completion of Sphere companionship
- **Evaluation and impact assessment** using LEGS tools and indicators
- Review of **emerging approaches** and tools
- **Revision** and updating of LEGS Handbook
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