International Journal Of Advances In
ENGINEERING, SCIENCE, COMMERCE, MANAGEMENT AND LAW
(IJAESCML)

ISSN (Online)
3048-8427
Vol. 3 | Issue 4
2026

www.ijaescml.com | internationaljournal1234@gmail.com | Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal

"The Role of Agribusiness in Self-Regulating Farm Animal Welfare: Ethical Responsibilities and Regulatory Challenges"

Mr. Vijay Nirgude
(M.Sc. SET, Zoology.)

ABSTRACT

Farm animal welfare has emerged as an important ethical, economic, social, and regulatory concern within modern agribusiness. The increasing commercialisation and industrialisation of livestock production have created opportunities for improving productivity and food security, but they have also raised concerns regarding animal housing, nutrition, health, transportation, handling, and slaughter. In this context, self-regulation by agribusiness refers to voluntary codes of conduct, internal welfare policies, third-party certification, supplier standards, employee training, monitoring systems, and public reporting adopted by businesses to improve animal welfare beyond minimum legal requirements. This paper examines the role of agribusiness in developing and implementing self-regulatory mechanisms for farm animal welfare, with particular emphasis on ethical responsibilities, supply-chain governance, transparency, and accountability. It also analyses challenges associated with voluntary compliance, conflicts between profit maximisation and animal welfare, inconsistent standards, limited independent verification, and unequal regulatory capacities. The study adopts a qualitative, descriptive, and analytical methodology based on secondary sources, including international animal welfare standards, policy documents, and relevant academic literature. The analysis suggests that self-regulation can contribute to improved welfare when it is supported by measurable performance indicators, independent audits, traceability, stakeholder participation, and effective public enforcement. However, voluntary initiatives cannot substitute for legally enforceable minimum standards. The paper proposes a co-regulatory framework integrating corporate responsibility, scientific assessment, government supervision, and consumer accountability. It concludes that credible self-regulation should be understood as a complementary mechanism within a broader system of animal welfare governance.

KEYWORDS: Agribusiness, farm animal welfare, self-regulation, business ethics, corporate social responsibility, animal welfare standards, supply-chain governance, regulatory challenges.

Received	Accepted	Published	Article Type
10/10/2026	05/11/2026	16/11/2026	Research Paper

© 2026 IJAESCML | All Rights Reserved
www.ijaescml.com

Vol. 3, Issue 4, October-December 2026
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24288502

International Journal Of Advances In
ENGINEERING, SCIENCE, COMMERCE, MANAGEMENT AND LAW
(IJAESCML)

ISSN (Online)
3048-8427
Vol. 3 | Issue 4
2026

www.ijaescml.com | internationaljournal1234@gmail.com | Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal

1. Introduction

Agribusiness represents a broad network of economic activities associated with agricultural production, livestock farming, animal feed, veterinary services, animal transportation, processing, distribution, and the marketing of animal-derived products. Within this system, farm animals are not only biological beings requiring appropriate care but also a central component of commercial production and rural livelihoods. Consequently, decisions made by agribusiness enterprises directly influence the living conditions, health, behaviour, and treatment of animals throughout their production and supply chains.

The expansion of commercial livestock farming has increased the importance of efficient production, cost control, disease prevention, and consistent product quality. However, intensive production systems may also create welfare risks when stocking density, housing, handling, transportation, or slaughter practices are determined primarily by economic considerations. Animal welfare therefore represents an important dimension of responsible agribusiness management.

The World Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH) defines animal welfare in terms of the physical and mental state of an animal in relation to the conditions in which it lives and dies. Its international standards provide guidance on welfare across different production systems and stages of animal use. These standards emphasise that welfare should be addressed through scientific evidence, stakeholder engagement, and appropriate implementation mechanisms.

Traditional approaches to animal welfare rely substantially on government legislation, inspections, licensing, and penalties for non-compliance. Although these mechanisms remain essential, governments may face practical limitations in inspecting geographically dispersed farms, monitoring complex supply chains, and ensuring consistent enforcement. Agribusiness enterprises can potentially address some of these limitations by establishing internal welfare policies and extending welfare requirements to suppliers and business partners.

Self-regulation is particularly relevant when companies adopt welfare standards that exceed statutory minimum requirements, monitor performance continuously, and disclose their results. Nevertheless, self-regulation also presents a fundamental governance problem: businesses may have financial incentives to present themselves as ethically responsible without making equivalent improvements in animal welfare outcomes.

The central issue is therefore not whether agribusiness should participate in animal welfare governance, but how its participation can be made credible, measurable, transparent, and accountable.

2. Statement of the Problem

The increasing role of private enterprises in livestock production has created a need to examine whether voluntary corporate initiatives can effectively protect farm animal welfare. Agribusiness organisations possess operational knowledge, financial resources, supply-chain influence, and the capacity to introduce new production technologies. At the same time, commercial pressures may encourage cost reduction at the expense of animal welfare.

Voluntary codes and corporate commitments can remain ineffective when they lack independent verification, clear performance indicators, transparent reporting, or meaningful consequences for non-compliance. Differences in business size, production systems, market access, and technical capacity further complicate the implementation of consistent standards.

The research problem concerns the conditions under which self-regulation can produce genuine welfare improvements rather than merely improve corporate reputation. It also concerns the appropriate relationship between voluntary business initiatives and legally enforceable public regulation.

3. Objectives of the Study

The main objectives of this research are:

1. To examine the concept and significance of self-regulation in farm animal welfare.
2. To analyse the ethical responsibilities of agribusiness enterprises towards farm animals.
3. To identify the principal mechanisms through which businesses can implement animal welfare standards.

© 2026 IJAESCML | All Rights Reserved
www.ijaescml.com

Vol. 3, Issue 4, October-December 2026
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24288502

International Journal Of Advances In
ENGINEERING, SCIENCE, COMMERCE, MANAGEMENT AND LAW
(IJAESCML)

ISSN (Online)
3048-8427
Vol. 3 | Issue 4
2026

www.ijaescml.com | internationaljournal1234@gmail.com | Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal

4. To examine the economic, institutional, and regulatory challenges associated with voluntary welfare initiatives.
5. To evaluate the role of government, consumers, farmers, veterinarians, and civil society in strengthening animal welfare accountability.
6. To propose a practical framework for integrating corporate self-regulation with public regulation.

4. Research Questions

The study addresses the following questions:

1. How can agribusiness enterprises contribute to improved farm animal welfare through self-regulation?
2. What ethical responsibilities should businesses accept beyond minimum legal compliance?
3. What factors limit the effectiveness of voluntary animal welfare standards?
4. How can independent monitoring and public oversight prevent misleading welfare claims?
5. What institutional framework can balance commercial viability with the welfare needs of animals?

5. Research Methodology

The study follows a qualitative, descriptive, and analytical research design. It is based on secondary data drawn from international animal welfare standards, policy publications, legal and regulatory materials, and relevant academic literature.

The principal analytical sources include the WOAH Terrestrial Animal Health Code, particularly its general recommendations on animal welfare and its species-specific chapters on beef cattle, dairy cattle, broiler chickens, and pigs. The study also draws on established approaches to corporate social responsibility, business ethics, supply-chain management, and regulatory governance.

The collected material is examined thematically under the following categories: ethical responsibility, self-regulatory mechanisms, commercial incentives, accountability, regulatory limitations, and institutional coordination.

The study does not claim to present original survey findings or empirical measurements. Its conclusions are analytical and conceptual. Future empirical research could test the proposed framework through interviews, farm-level observations, corporate policy analysis, and comparative case studies.

6. Conceptual Understanding of Self-Regulation in Agribusiness

Self-regulation refers to arrangements through which organisations voluntarily establish, implement, monitor, and improve standards governing their own activities. In farm animal welfare, these arrangements may include internal codes of conduct, farm management protocols, supplier contracts, staff training, animal health programmes, third-party certification, and public disclosure of welfare performance.

Self-regulation can operate at three interconnected levels.

6.1 Internal corporate self-regulation

Internal self-regulation involves the adoption of formal welfare policies, the assignment of management responsibilities, regular risk assessments, employee training, incident reporting, and corrective action procedures. Such measures integrate animal welfare into routine business operations.

6.2 Supply-chain self-regulation

Supply-chain self-regulation extends welfare requirements beyond a company's own farms to breeders, contract farmers, feed suppliers, transport operators, livestock traders, slaughterhouses, and processors. Businesses can incorporate welfare requirements into procurement contracts and supplier evaluation systems.

6.3 Collective and industry-led self-regulation

Industry associations may establish common standards, develop training resources, facilitate independent assessment, and encourage the adoption of consistent welfare practices. Collective initiatives can reduce duplication and make compliance more accessible to smaller businesses.

© 2026 IJAESCML | All Rights Reserved
www.ijaescml.com

Vol. 3, Issue 4, October-December 2026
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24288502

International Journal Of Advances In
ENGINEERING, SCIENCE, COMMERCE, MANAGEMENT AND LAW
(IJAESCML)

ISSN (Online)
3048-8427
Vol. 3 | Issue 4
2026

www.ijaescml.com | internationaljournal1234@gmail.com | Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal

However, industry-wide standards are credible only when they are sufficiently demanding, transparent, and independently evaluated. Standards developed exclusively by commercial participants may reflect business convenience rather than the full range of animal welfare concerns.

7. Ethical Responsibilities of Agribusiness Enterprises

7.1 Recognition of animal sentience

A fundamental ethical responsibility is to recognise that farm animals can experience pain, fear, discomfort, and other positive or negative states. Animals should not be treated exclusively as units of production.

Businesses should incorporate scientifically informed welfare assessments into decisions concerning breeding, housing, feeding, handling, transport, treatment, and slaughter. Productivity indicators alone cannot establish whether animals experience acceptable living conditions.

7.2 Provision of appropriate housing and environmental conditions

Agribusiness enterprises should provide suitable housing, sufficient space, adequate ventilation, appropriate flooring, access to clean water, and protection from extreme weather. Housing systems should accommodate species-specific behavioural and physiological needs.

For example, dairy cattle require appropriate resting areas, while poultry production requires attention to stocking density, litter quality, ventilation, and access to suitable environmental conditions. Welfare standards should be adapted to species, age, health, and production circumstances.

7.3 Nutrition, health, and veterinary care

Businesses have an ethical responsibility to ensure that animals receive adequate nutrition and water and obtain timely veterinary treatment. Preventive healthcare, vaccination where appropriate, disease surveillance, and effective biosecurity can reduce avoidable suffering.

Antimicrobial use should be guided by veterinary oversight and responsible-use principles. Commercial pressure must not encourage the neglect of sick animals or the routine use of medicines as a substitute for appropriate husbandry.

7.4 Responsible breeding and production practices

Breeding programmes should consider health, functional capacity, and welfare alongside productivity. Selection solely for rapid growth, high milk yield, or other extreme production traits may create welfare concerns when biological demands exceed the animal's capacity to maintain health.

Businesses should periodically review production practices and modify those associated with preventable injury, chronic discomfort, impaired mobility, or other adverse outcomes.

7.5 Humane handling, transportation, and slaughter

Animal welfare responsibilities extend beyond the farm. Loading, unloading, transportation, mixing unfamiliar animals, exposure to extreme temperatures, and prolonged journeys can produce stress and injury.

Agribusiness enterprises should train workers in species-appropriate handling and establish procedures for fitness-for-transport assessment, journey planning, emergency care, and humane slaughter. Where applicable, stunning and slaughter procedures should comply with relevant legal requirements and recognised welfare standards.

7.6 Ethical leadership and corporate accountability

Senior management should treat animal welfare as a governance responsibility rather than merely a marketing activity. Clear accountability, adequate budgets, designated welfare officers, employee protection when reporting concerns, and documented corrective actions are important elements of ethical leadership.

Corporate commitments should be supported by operational decisions and verifiable results. A company should not claim that its products meet a higher welfare standard unless the relevant production practices have been adequately assessed.

8. Mechanisms for Self-Regulation in Farm Animal Welfare

© 2026 IJAESCML | All Rights Reserved
www.ijaescml.com

Vol. 3, Issue 4, October-December 2026
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24288502

International Journal Of Advances In
ENGINEERING, SCIENCE, COMMERCE, MANAGEMENT AND LAW
(IJAESCML)

ISSN (Online)
3048-8427
Vol. 3 | Issue 4
2026

www.ijaescml.com | internationaljournal1234@gmail.com | Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal

8.1 Corporate animal welfare policies

A written policy provides a foundation for internal accountability. It should identify the species covered, the activities and suppliers within its scope, minimum requirements, management responsibilities, monitoring procedures, and mechanisms for corrective action.

Policies should specify measurable commitments rather than rely solely on general statements about humane treatment.

8.2 Codes of conduct and standard operating procedures

Standard operating procedures translate ethical commitments into practical requirements. These may cover feeding, watering, housing, treatment of injured animals, emergency response, transport, and slaughter.

Procedures should be accessible to workers, appropriate to local conditions, and reviewed when scientific evidence or production practices change.

8.3 Internal audits and welfare indicators

Regular audits can help identify non-compliance and emerging welfare risks. However, assessments should not depend exclusively on the presence of written policies or equipment.

Useful indicators include:

- Injury, lameness, and mortality rates.
- Disease occurrence and treatment records.
- Body condition and evidence of poor nutrition.
- Access to water, feed, and suitable resting conditions.
- Behavioural indicators and responses to handling.
- Transport-related injuries and mortality.
- Corrective actions and the time taken to resolve problems.

These indicators should be interpreted in species-specific contexts. No single measure can fully capture animal welfare.

8.4 Independent certification and external verification

Third-party assessment can improve credibility by reducing reliance on corporate self-reporting. Certification systems may examine farm practices, records, staff competence, and animal-based outcomes.

Effective certification requires transparent criteria, competent auditors, suitable sampling, conflict-of-interest safeguards, and consequences for serious or repeated violations. Certification should not be presented as proof of superior welfare unless its scope and requirements substantiate that claim.

8.5 Supplier standards and contractual accountability

Large processors, retailers, and food-service companies can influence welfare practices through procurement requirements. Supplier contracts may require compliance with specified welfare standards, recordkeeping, audit access, staff training, and prompt reporting of serious incidents.

Such arrangements should be accompanied by reasonable transition periods and technical assistance for smaller suppliers. Otherwise, strict contractual requirements may transfer costs to farmers without providing the resources necessary for compliance.

8.6 Traceability and digital monitoring

Digital recordkeeping can improve the traceability of animals and animal-derived products. Farm management systems may record health events, treatments, transport details, mortality, and audit findings.

Sensors and automated systems can assist in identifying environmental risks or abnormal behaviour. Nevertheless, technology should support, rather than replace, professional observation and veterinary judgement. Data collection must also be proportionate, reliable, secure, and accessible to authorised oversight bodies.

8.7 Transparency and public reporting

© 2026 IJAESCML | All Rights Reserved
www.ijaescml.com

Vol. 3, Issue 4, October-December 2026
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24288502

International Journal Of Advances In
ENGINEERING, SCIENCE, COMMERCE, MANAGEMENT AND LAW
(IJAESCML)

ISSN (Online)
3048-8427
Vol. 3 | Issue 4
2026

www.ijaescml.com | internationaljournal1234@gmail.com | Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal

Companies should disclose their welfare commitments, coverage, performance indicators, audit processes, and material shortcomings. Reporting should explain whether targets have been achieved and what corrective measures are being taken when they have not.

Transparent reporting helps consumers, investors, regulators, and civil society distinguish substantive welfare improvements from unsupported ethical claims.

9. Regulatory Challenges in Self-Regulating Agribusiness

9.1 Conflict between profit maximisation and animal welfare

One of the principal challenges is the tension between commercial profitability and welfare expenditure. Improved housing, veterinary care, staff training, and transportation facilities may require substantial investment. Businesses operating under competitive price pressures may be reluctant to adopt measures that increase short-term production costs.

However, the economic assessment should also consider potential costs associated with poor animal health, mortality, reduced productivity, reputational damage, and regulatory penalties. The appropriate objective is to integrate welfare into long-term business planning rather than treat it as an optional expense.

9.2 Voluntary compliance and weak enforcement

Voluntary codes may lack binding legal force. Companies can adopt ambitious commitments but fail to implement them consistently, particularly when monitoring is limited or non-compliance carries few consequences.

Self-regulation becomes especially problematic when companies control the standards, assess their own performance, and communicate the results without independent scrutiny. Public authorities must therefore retain the power to investigate violations and enforce applicable legal requirements.

9.3 Inconsistent standards across supply chains

Different companies may apply different definitions of acceptable welfare. One enterprise may emphasise mortality reduction, while another may focus on housing conditions or the elimination of particular production practices.

Such differences complicate comparisons and can create confusion among consumers. Internationally recognised scientific standards, harmonised terminology, and transparent assessment criteria can improve consistency while allowing reasonable adaptation to species and local production conditions.

9.4 Limited resources among small and medium-sized enterprises

Large agribusiness companies may possess the financial and technical capacity to implement sophisticated monitoring and certification systems. Smallholder farmers and small enterprises may face difficulties associated with infrastructure, veterinary access, recordkeeping, and certification costs.

A regulatory framework that ignores these differences risks excluding small producers from formal markets. Training, extension services, cooperative certification, financial support, and phased implementation can improve accessibility without abandoning minimum welfare protections.

9.5 Information asymmetry and misleading welfare claims

Consumers generally cannot observe the conditions in which animals were raised. This creates information asymmetry between producers and buyers.

Terms such as “humane,” “ethical,” and “animal-friendly” may be difficult to evaluate when they are not supported by clear definitions or verifiable evidence. Misleading claims can undermine consumer confidence and disadvantage businesses that invest in genuine improvements.

Claims about animal welfare should therefore be specific, evidence-based, and consistent with the actual scope of verification.

9.6 Cross-border trade and regulatory differences

International agribusiness operates across jurisdictions with different legal requirements, enforcement capacities, and consumer expectations. A company may face stricter welfare requirements in one market than in another.

© 2026 IJAESCML | All Rights Reserved
www.ijaescml.com

Vol. 3, Issue 4, October-December 2026
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24288502

International Journal Of Advances In
ENGINEERING, SCIENCE, COMMERCE, MANAGEMENT AND LAW
(IJAESCML)

ISSN (Online)
3048-8427
Vol. 3 | Issue 4
2026

www.ijaescml.com | internationaljournal1234@gmail.com | Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal

The WOAH develops internationally recognised, science-based standards for animal welfare, including recommendations addressing particular production systems. Nevertheless, differences in national implementation and enforcement remain important practical considerations.

International businesses should establish a credible baseline for their global operations while complying with the laws of each jurisdiction and responding to legitimate species-specific and regional welfare requirements.

9.7 Independent monitoring and conflicts of interest

Certification bodies and auditors may face financial or institutional pressure when their income depends on the businesses they assess. Inadequate sampling, predictable inspections, incomplete records, or weak follow-up can reduce the effectiveness of external verification.

Safeguards should include auditor competence requirements, conflict-of-interest policies, risk-based inspections, periodic unannounced assessments where legally permissible, and independent review of serious findings.

9.8 Animal welfare washing

Animal welfare washing occurs when businesses communicate an image of responsible animal care without providing adequate evidence of corresponding welfare improvements.

The risk increases when marketing claims are more ambitious than the standards actually implemented. Businesses may publicise isolated improvements while failing to disclose problems elsewhere in their supply chains.

Preventing welfare washing requires measurable claims, independent verification, accessible reporting, and meaningful consequences for deceptive representations.

10. The Role of Government and Public Regulation

Self-regulation should operate within a legally established framework. Governments are responsible for defining minimum requirements, establishing institutional responsibilities, conducting inspections, addressing complaints, and imposing proportionate penalties for violations.

Public regulation can support private initiatives in several ways:

1. **Minimum legal standards:** Establish enforceable requirements for appropriate care, handling, transport, and slaughter, as applicable.
2. **Risk-based inspections:** Direct inspection resources towards activities and establishments presenting higher welfare risks.
3. **Accreditation and verification:** Establish appropriate requirements for welfare certification schemes and independent assessors.
4. **Disclosure requirements:** Address misleading welfare claims and require substantiation where relevant laws provide for it.
5. **Grievance mechanisms:** Provide accessible channels through which workers, farmers, veterinarians, and members of the public can report concerns.
6. **Capacity building:** Support veterinary services, farmer education, technical assistance, and appropriate infrastructure.
7. **Enforcement and corrective action:** Ensure that serious violations are investigated and that remedies are implemented and verified.

International guidance can inform national policies, but its legal status should be distinguished from domestic legislation. WOAH standards provide internationally recognised technical guidance; they do not automatically operate as directly enforceable domestic laws in every country.

11. The Indian Context

© 2026 IJAESCML | All Rights Reserved
www.ijaescml.com

Vol. 3, Issue 4, October-December 2026
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24288502

International Journal Of Advances In
ENGINEERING, SCIENCE, COMMERCE, MANAGEMENT AND LAW
(IJAESCML)

ISSN (Online)
3048-8427
Vol. 3 | Issue 4
2026

www.ijaescml.com | internationaljournal1234@gmail.com | Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal

In India, farm animal welfare is influenced by animal protection legislation, veterinary and livestock administration, agricultural markets, food processing, and the structure of livestock production. The sector includes large commercial operations as well as smallholder and household-based livestock systems.

The Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960, provides an important statutory foundation for preventing unnecessary pain and suffering to animals. Other applicable laws, rules, and judicial decisions may govern particular activities, including transport, slaughter, food safety, and animal disease control.

The practical challenge is to ensure that welfare standards are appropriately implemented across diverse production systems. Small producers may lack access to adequate housing, veterinary services, training, and formal markets. Large buyers and processors can help address these limitations by providing training, clear supplier requirements, technical assistance, and fair transition arrangements.

Agribusiness enterprises operating in India can adopt voluntary welfare policies that complement applicable legal requirements. These policies may include veterinary supervision, improved housing and feeding, responsible animal handling, disease prevention, traceability, and transparent supplier monitoring.

Corporate initiatives should also account for the diversity of livestock species and regional production practices. A uniform management approach may not be appropriate for cattle, buffaloes, goats, sheep, poultry, and other farmed animals.

A practical Indian framework should combine statutory compliance, scientifically informed welfare standards, farmer education, accessible veterinary services, independent assessment, and coordination between government institutions and private enterprises.

12. Findings and Discussion

The conceptual analysis produces the following principal findings.

12.1 Self-regulation can extend welfare protection

Corporate policies and supplier standards can address operational details that may be difficult to monitor continuously through government inspections alone. Their contribution depends on implementation quality rather than the mere existence of written commitments.

12.2 Ethical responsibility must extend across the supply chain

A company cannot adequately evaluate its welfare performance by examining only the farms it directly owns. Breeding, transportation, contract farming, processing, and slaughter may all affect animal welfare. Responsibility should therefore be assessed in relation to the company's activities, influence, contractual relationships, and applicable obligations.

12.3 Outcome-based assessment is essential

Written policies, training records, and infrastructure improvements are useful indicators of management effort. However, these should be supplemented with animal-based measures such as injury, lameness, disease, mortality, and behavioural responses.

12.4 Independent verification improves credibility

External assessment can reduce the limitations associated with self-reporting, provided auditors are competent and sufficiently independent. Verification should include both documented procedures and evidence of actual welfare outcomes.

12.5 Voluntary standards require public oversight

Self-regulation is most credible when it operates above an enforceable legal baseline. Without public oversight, voluntary systems may produce inconsistent standards, weak remedies, and incentives for misleading claims.

12.6 Small producers require practical support

Welfare improvements may be difficult to implement where financial resources, veterinary access, and infrastructure are limited. Technical assistance and cooperative approaches can improve compliance while reducing unnecessary exclusion from supply chains.

12.7 Transparency should include failures

© 2026 IJAESCML | All Rights Reserved

International Journal Of Advances In
ENGINEERING, SCIENCE, COMMERCE, MANAGEMENT AND LAW
(IJAESCML)
ISSN (Online)
3048-8427
Vol. 3 | Issue 4
2026
www.ijaescml.com | internationaljournal1234@gmail.com | Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal

Responsible reporting should disclose shortcomings as well as achievements. Information about unresolved problems, corrective actions, and progress towards measurable targets can strengthen public confidence.

These findings support a co-regulatory approach in which corporate self-regulation complements, rather than replaces, public regulation.

13. Proposed Framework for Effective Self-Regulation

The study proposes a seven-component framework for strengthening animal welfare governance in agribusiness.

Component	Proposed mechanism	Expected contribution
Ethical commitment	Board-approved animal welfare policy	Clear corporate responsibility
Operational standards	Species-specific procedures and training	Consistent welfare practices
Supply-chain accountability	Supplier requirements and traceability	Wider coverage of welfare risks
Performance monitoring	Animal-based and management indicators	Measurable improvement
Independent verification	External audits and follow-up	Greater credibility
Transparency	Public reporting and substantiated claims	Consumer and stakeholder confidence
Public oversight	Legal enforcement and accessible complaints	Accountability and protection against abuse

The framework should be implemented through a continuous improvement cycle:

Establish standards → Assess risks → Implement measures → Monitor outcomes → Verify performance → Disclose results → Correct deficiencies.

The cycle should be reviewed periodically in light of scientific evidence, changes in production systems, audit findings, and stakeholder feedback.

13.1 Suggested performance indicators

Agribusiness enterprises can develop a practical scorecard using indicators such as:

- Percentage of relevant suppliers covered by the welfare policy.
- Percentage of farms assessed against applicable standards.
- Frequency and severity of welfare incidents.
- Animal injury, lameness, and mortality rates.
- Percentage of workers receiving welfare training.
- Time taken to resolve serious non-compliance.
- Percentage of corrective actions independently verified.
- Accuracy and completeness of public welfare disclosures.

Targets should be species-specific, based on credible baselines, and reviewed regularly. Comparisons between businesses should account for differences in species, production systems, and operating conditions.

14. Recommendations

Based on the analysis, the following recommendations are proposed.

First, establish a clear minimum standard. Agribusiness enterprises should comply with applicable laws and adopt additional, scientifically justified welfare commitments where appropriate.

Second, make senior management accountable. Animal welfare should be included in corporate governance, risk management, supplier oversight, and operational planning.

Third, develop measurable and species-specific standards. General ethical declarations should be translated into practical requirements covering housing, nutrition, health, handling, transportation, and slaughter.

Fourth, strengthen independent verification. Auditing systems should use credible assessment criteria, appropriate sampling, conflict-of-interest safeguards, and documented corrective action.

© 2026 IJAESCML | All Rights Reserved
www.ijaescml.com

Vol. 3, Issue 4, October-December 2026
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24288502

International Journal Of Advances In
ENGINEERING, SCIENCE, COMMERCE, MANAGEMENT AND LAW
(IJAESCML)

ISSN (Online)
3048-8427
Vol. 3 | Issue 4
2026

www.ijaescml.com | internationaljournal1234@gmail.com | Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal

Fifth, improve supply-chain transparency. Businesses should identify the scope of their welfare commitments and disclose meaningful performance information without making unsupported claims.

Sixth, support small and medium-sized producers. Training, veterinary support, technical assistance, cooperative systems, and phased implementation can improve compliance and reduce disproportionate burdens.

Seventh, integrate welfare with disease prevention. Good husbandry, biosecurity, early disease detection, and responsible veterinary care should be incorporated into welfare management.

Eighth, establish effective grievance mechanisms. Workers, farmers, veterinarians, and other relevant stakeholders should be able to report welfare concerns without unreasonable barriers or retaliation.

Ninth, strengthen public-private coordination. Government agencies, veterinary professionals, industry associations, research institutions, and civil society should cooperate in developing and reviewing welfare standards.

Tenth, evaluate actual outcomes. The effectiveness of self-regulation should be judged by verifiable improvements in animal welfare rather than by the number of policies adopted or certifications obtained.

15. Conclusion

Agribusiness enterprises occupy a significant position in determining the welfare of farm animals because they influence production methods, purchasing decisions, working practices, transportation, processing, and market access. Their participation in animal welfare governance can contribute to better standards through internal policies, supplier requirements, employee training, monitoring, independent certification, and transparent reporting.

Nevertheless, self-regulation presents important limitations. Commercial pressures may conflict with ethical commitments, voluntary standards may differ considerably, and corporate reporting may not always reflect actual welfare conditions. Smaller producers may also face substantial barriers when implementing costly requirements.

These limitations demonstrate that self-regulation should not be treated as a substitute for government regulation. Instead, it should form part of a co-regulatory system in which legally enforceable minimum standards establish the baseline, businesses pursue continuous improvement, independent bodies verify performance, and public authorities retain effective enforcement powers.

The central principle is that responsible agribusiness must move beyond reputation-oriented commitments towards demonstrable improvements in the conditions experienced by animals. Ethical leadership, measurable outcomes, transparent disclosure, and independent accountability are essential to this transition.

Ultimately, the credibility of self-regulation depends not on what a company promises, but on whether its practices consistently reduce preventable suffering and protect animal welfare throughout the supply chain.

© 2026 IJAESCML | All Rights Reserved
www.ijaescml.com

Vol. 3, Issue 4, October-December 2026
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24288502

International Journal Of Advances In
ENGINEERING, SCIENCE, COMMERCE, MANAGEMENT AND LAW
(IJAESCML)

ISSN (Online)
3048-8427
Vol. 3 | Issue 4
2026

www.ijaescml.com | internationaljournal1234@gmail.com | Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal

References

1. Broom, D. M. (2014). *Sentience and Animal Welfare*. CABI.
2. Fraser, D. (2008). *Understanding Animal Welfare: The Science in Its Cultural Context*. Wiley-Blackwell.
3. Fraser, D., Weary, D. M., Pajor, E. A., & Milligan, B. N. (1997). A scientific conception of animal welfare that reflects ethical concerns. *Animal Welfare, 6*(3), 187–205.
4. Grandin, T. (2015). *Improving Animal Welfare: A Practical Approach* (2nd ed.). CABI.
5. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2011). *OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises on Responsible Business Conduct*. OECD Publishing.
6. World Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH). (2024). *Terrestrial Animal Health Code*. WOAH. https://www.woah.org/fileadmin/Home/eng/Health_standards/tahc/2024/en_index.htm
7. World Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH). (n.d.). *Animal Welfare*. https://www.woah.org/en/what-we-do/animal-health-and-welfare/animal-welfare/
8. World Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH). (n.d.). *Development of Animal Welfare Standards*. https://www.woah.org/en/what-we-do/animal-health-and-welfare/animal-welfare/development-of-animal-welfare-standards/
9. India. (1960). *The Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960*. Government of India.
10. United Nations. (2011). *Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations "Protect, Respect and Remedy" Framework*. United Nations.
11. World Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH). (2025). *Terrestrial Animal Health Code: Previous Editions and Adopted Amendments*. https://www.woah.org/en/what-we-do/standards/codes-and-manuals/previous-editions-of-the-terrestrial-code/

© 2026 IJAESCML | All Rights Reserved
www.ijaescml.com

Vol. 3, Issue 4, October-December 2026
doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24288502