The Global Zoo Community takes up Global Zoo Standards through WAZA.

Working Groups in Bern*, Gonube, Halle, Leipzi*g, Saigon, & Pretoria – October 2006 featuring the WAZA Initiative.

WAZA Presentation which, along with report on Japanese Bear Parks, generated the Substandard Zoo issue which became the Zoos needing Improvement issue which became the Zoos Global Standards issue is attached as All Zoos Contributing to Wildlife conservation.

WAZA
Bern. Switzerland

WAZA Discussion on Lowest Acceptable Practices for Zoos (rev.1)
(Result of the meeting of a WAZA Drafting Group, April 11, 206 in Berne (Switz.)

Crux of the Issue:
The negative impacts of a “substandard zoo” are or can be the following:
1. Negative conservation impact through substandard keeping conditions (poor survival rate; loss of potential genetic material; frequent perceived need for re-stocking)
2. Negative impact on wild populations (indiscriminate capture depletes wild populations; indiscriminate release of over-bred surplus animals damages wild populations; disturbance of wild population behavior leads to stress, panic and fatal accidents; disturbance of wild population behavior leads to short and long-lasting effect on social behavior and disturbance of wild population dynamics)
3. Negative impact on wild habitats (indiscriminate capture and/or poorly researched release of surplus animals can impact habitat; irresponsible releases can wreck a niche or fragile ecosystem)
4. Negative impact on visitor education (difficult to convey an effective conservation message in a substandard zoo; a bad zoo conveys unfortunate subliminal messages such as “wildlife is cheap”, “authorities don’t seem to care therefore wildlife is plentiful”; wild animals are pathetic and not valued)
5. Negative impact on the zoo industry image (“zoo” is the same word applied to a broad range of institutions of varying quality; animal rights/anti-zoo.radical animal welfare groups do not differentiate between “zoos”; the organized zoo community is lumped with the “other” zoo world by most of the public; the best zoos share the same “bed” - - public and the press -- with the worst zoos.
6. Negative impact on the animal welfare (unsuitable living environments for animals; lack of husbandry and veterinary care and expertise such as sanitation, nutrition,
preventative medicine, etc.; visitor misbehavior such as feeding, teasing, violence, stress, etc.)

7. Negative impact on the safety for the animals, public and staff (inadequate barriers and enclosures; inadequate sanitation which could cause the spread of diseases; public liability)

**WAZA – Basis for the Discussion**
- 2005 Council Mid-Year Meeting, Action 22 (Ed Mc Alister to develop policy for dealing with the problem of substandard zoos)

**Terms of Reference for the Drafting Group:**
- Develop ideas, how WAZA should deal with substandard zoos
- Provide guidance to regional associations on how to deal with the issue
- Clarify the tasks of WAZA and regional associations in this issue

*************

**Structure of the Discussion**

1. Policy statement – WAZA will assist those national associations or institutions that request assistance.
2. What is a substandard zoo?
3. What can WAZA do about it?
4. Issues that need more work

1. **Policy statement:**

   We as a community of organized zoos have a moral, ethical and professional responsibility to engage with needy institutions in order to help them improve their standards, achieve conservation goals, and benefit the animals they hold. This assumes that the body of WAZA members is interested in helping substandard zoos.

2. **What is a “substandard zoo”?**

   - “Those that don’t know how”
   - “Those that don’t care” (“deliberately substandard”)
   - “Those that cannot afford it”
   - Those that have been affected by forces beyond their control (war, natural calamity a.o.)

A “substandard zoo” is to be characterized through “substandard practices”, i.e. “not acceptable” practices. This makes necessary the definition of an exemplary zoo (i.e. “best practices”) first:

**Definition of a 21st century zoo (“best practices”):**

- Permanent sited legal establishment,
- Primarily open to and administered for the visiting public, in which living organisms are maintained in accordance with animal welfare and scientific management principles and in general ethical conditions,
- And under predominantly ex situ circumstances,
- For the foremost and demonstrable purpose of conservation
- Through exhibition, education and research and
- Where the principal business rationale is not the commercial trade in living organisms or their products.
The scope of this definition specifically excludes nature reserves, game farms, botanical gardens, plant nurseries, research laboratories, circuses, pet shops, animal dealerships/brokers and commercial breeding operations that are not open to the public, animal rehabilitation facilities and sanctuaries.

From the fact that not all zoos comply – as yet – with these best practices, but cannot be considered “substandard” it follows that there is a continuum, with different standards. This means that it must be decided what is “acceptable”, “barely good enough”, “adequate” and/or “minimum”.

Breaking down the “best practices” listed above in “7 principles of best practice” makes possible to define what are the “lowest acceptable practices”.

7 principles of best practices in zoos.

- Permanent site (implies continuity)***
- Supportive environment for the animals, personnel and public (duty of care)***
- Active involvement in the maintenance of biodiversity
- Management for the wider benefit of the community (greater good)
- Healing the relationship between man and animal (promotion of an emotive value system)
- Provision of education opportunities for learning about animals and their environments
- Meet applicable legal requirements***

*** Those that are the lowest acceptable practices

NB: Education can only be done if the three lowest acceptable practices are met.

Substandard to Best Practice Zoo Continuum

3 lowest acceptable practices

3. What can WAZA do about it?

If an institution wants help:

- Develop/provide assessment tools -- inspection tools and provide assistance based on the assessment report (help should be appropriate to the need of the zoo)
- Establish brother/sister zoo relationship (help should be appropriate and institution receiving assistance should maximize it)
- Offer training/mentoring/consultation
- Work with the local authorities *
- Provide basic information such as WAZA CS and the Code of Professional Ethics
- Warn of loss of membership in WAZA
- Look for/organize help from outside the region **

* When there is no zoo legislation or no strong zoo/aquarium legislation, then WAZA can help “fill the gaps”. WAZA can be helpful providing its consultative expertise on local legislation as an aid to the country.

** E. g.: When zoos send people overseas for field conservation work, they should visit the local zoo with an idea of offering assistance and – if wanted and appropriate - assist with general advice.
If an institution doesn’t want help:

- Get the authorities (local, national) involved *

* It would perhaps be more appropriate that the institution would be closed, but then what should be done with the animals?

**Specific types of help:**

**Short-term Assistance for Zoos not meeting Lowest Acceptable Practices:**

- One-off capacity building
- One-off facility improvement
- One-off veterinary assistance
- One-off personnel provision
- One-off material supply
- One-off engagement with authority
- Temporary housing of animals
- Emergency relief
- Monetary support
- General skills Transfer

**Long-term Assistance for Zoos not meeting Lowest Acceptable Practices:**

- Capacity building
- Skills transfer
- “Twinning” /Monitoring
- Long-term mentoring
- Engage licensing authority

**Non-compliance flowchart**

4. **Issues that need more work:**

- Who or what is meant by “WAZA” in this context (WAZA office, CIRCC, Council, members ?) ?
- WAZA Complaint Procedure
- Assessment form to differentiate a “substandard zoo” from a “standard zoo”
- Mentoring Guidelines
South Africa
PAAZAB

Report of the Working Group on Substandard Zoos  PAAZAB Annual Conference, Gonube, South Africa

Facilitator : Sally Walker. Group members : Louise Gordon,; Johannesburg Zoo, Mr. Thompson Phakalane, National Zoological Gardens; Rynette Coetze, Nature Conservation; Esther van der Westhuizen, Butterfly World; Andrew Seguya, Uganda Wildlife Education Centre; Bernard Harrison, Bernard Harrison and Friends.

Note : aka Zoo Improvement Project ZIP

As members of this group as well as other groups have raised objections to the term "substandard zoos”, it is proposed to call this document and subsequent efforts as the Zoo Improvement Project.

Background: The topic of Standard Zoos and the need for improvement of zoos has been on the radar of zoo personnel for some time. In an invited presentation in a thematic session of the PAAZAB conference, Sally Walker reviewed some of the efforts made by regional and national associations over the relatively recent past. Although the presence of zoos lacking adequate standards to keep animals well, is well known, there has been a tendency by many zoos and zoo associations to sideline this issue. Walker also reviewed the ways that substandard zoos not only do they not live up to the essential conservation purpose as defined by IUCN, nor do they perform any of the integrated or indirect conservation functions, they actually may be actively contributing to extinctions by their bad habits and surely give zoos at large a bad name.

As members of this group as well as other groups have raised objections to the term “substandard zoos”, it is proposed to call this document and subsequent efforts as the Zoo Improvement Project.

Background: The topic of Standard Zoos and the need for improvement of zoos has been on the radar of zoo personnel for some time. In an invited presentation in a thematic session of the PAAZAB conference, Sally Walker reviewed some of the efforts made by regional and national associations over the relatively recent past. Although the presence of zoos lacking adequate standards to keep animals well, is well known, there has been a tendency by many zoos and zoo associations to sideline this issue. Walker also reviewed the ways that substandard zoos not only do they not live up to the essential conservation purpose as defined by IUCN, nor do they perform any of the integrated or indirect conservation functions, they actually may be actively contributing to extinctions by their bad habits and surely give zoos at large a bad name.

A working group on Substandard Zoos with special reference to South Africa had been scheduled in two sessions. For Participants of the working group the names, designation, workplace and email are listed below.

Louise Gordo, Educator, Johannesburg Zoo – louise@jhbzoo.org.za
Thompson Phakalane, Conservation Officer, National Zoo thompson@zoo.ac.za, Rynette Coetze, Nature Conservation, Rynette.Coetzee@gauteng.gov.za, Esther van der Westhuizen, Owner and Operator, Butterfly World Tropical Garden esther@yebo.co.za
Andrew Seguya, Uganda Wildlife Education Centre, director@uweczoo.org, www.uweczoo.org.
Bernard Harrison, Zoo Designer and Landscape Architect, bernard@bernardharrisonandfriends.com
Sally Walker, Director, South Asian Zoo Association, sallyrwalker@aol.com

The Working Group began by introductions in which participants told their name and enough about themselves so that all could know what they did. Then the group was polled for their objectives and needs or expectations for the group.

- Esther van der Westhuizen and Matty Pretorius of Butterfly World Tropical Garden were uncomfortable with the conflict between law enforcement and zoos; they wanted suggestions or a via media for talking to law enforcement agencies.
- Andrew Seguya, Uganda Wildlife Education Centre, wanted a sharing of experience relating to the development of a mechanism for preventing the mushrooming of animal facilities. He wanted to know all issues so that environment problems, bad facilities could be pre-empted where possible. (Gave example of a facility coming up which had made no systematic plan, didn't know what water, essential elements the staff, etc. would require, etc.
- Thompson Phakalane, Conservation Officer, National Zoo wanted to utilize and be utilized in the meeting and after. His job description is to coordinate the zoos of Africa for conservation. He wanted to know what is really happening vis a vis what we say about zoos and conservation.
- Bernard Harrison of Bernard Harrison and Friends picked up on Thompson’s remarks and remarked that he thought zoos didn’t do much for in situ conservation and the push should be towards Environmental Conservation Education. Zoos should be pushed also to survey visitors and see if their messages are getting across. He commented that zoos only get 10% of the leisure population of the world so were not making that much of an impact.
- Rynette Coetzee, Nature Conservation wanted “ammunition” for changing attitudes of the legislative authorities so that they are not so hostile to any zoo. She has been asked to develop a policy for closing bad zoos and was looking for fodder for this policy.
- Louise Gordon, Manager of Education, Johannesburg Zoo My main aim with the workshop was to get guidelines as to what we / WASA consider to be a substandard/needy zoo, how to educate the public and zoo staff members about it and how to assist.
- Sally Walker, ZOO/SAZARC, wanted to hear what Africans though of the substandard zoo initiative and to have them go through the Draft document developed in Bern. Also to share her experience in working on this issue.

This was a very diverse group of people, mostly from South Africa consisting of several directors of institutions including a butterfly park, an education oriented zoo ne rescue center, a Conservation Coordinator, an Education Officer, a zoo person who works well with governmental agencies and has been asked to write a policy pertaining to bad zoos, and from other regions, a zoo architect/ former director with experience with inspection and improvement of substandard zoos and the Convenor of the working group, who wears many zoo hats.

Working Group members objectives or expectations ranging from simple interest, to knowing what not to do to avoid being substandard zoo, to creating policy for wildlife legislative authorities and others as well.

The Group was given a choice between having some advice from members who had experience in dealing with substandard zoos, with legislation, etc. and of working with the Draft Document created by a WAZA working party in Bern the previous month which were a sort of guidelines for helping Substandard Zoos. They opted to working on the document first and afterwards, getting advice and information from experienced participants.

There were very good comments contributed over two sessions with everyone contributing. The bullet points below are only some highlights as it is not appropriate to publish the Draft WAZA document here in its entirety.
The Group felt that Substandard Zoo topic would get better support if it were called something less noxious than Substandard Zoo Issue...perhaps “less than acceptable”. Some other comments were
- A request for an assessment form to differentiate a substandard zoo from a “standard” zoo
- Suggestion that the WAZA Code of Welfare and Ethics laid out much of the parameters required for an assessment form
- Internal politics were discussed as problem issues in trying to solve this problem.
- It was requested to define the difference between a “needy institutions” and a “substandard zoos” --
- In defining the different types of substandard zoos, another suggestion of those affected by forces beyond their control (war, natural calamity, etc.) which required some form of temporary help
- The definitions or points of best practice of a 21st century zoo were discussed. There was a question about the scope of the definition in that it excluded commercial breeding operations not open to the public.

The 7 principles of best practices in zoos in the draft were also discussed with some group members having the view that education should be among the practices without which one could not consider a zoo acceptable. The opinion expressed in the draft was that education could not be done unless certain characters were expressed in the zoo but the group did not go along with that view, stating that a zoo could still educate even if they didn’t have a supportive environment.

The Draft included suggestions for how WAZA could help zoos such as assessment tools or inspection tools, mentoring relationships, working with local authorities, provision of the WAZA documents and threat of loss of membership in WAZA. Group members suggested a WAZA Directory which would include both affiliated and non-affiliated zoos that would be web based and other suggestions.

Of the types of help a zoo might need the WAZA document suggested
- engagement, information and training and mentoring
- help in engage a local or national authority or government
- emergency help or monetary support
- help to be closed

Group members suggested that the zoo may need also
- help to be convinced, informed that they need help
- financial help and technical support
- help with a business plan, marketing, etc.

There was also a useful comment that monetary support is not sufficient; a donor should insure that there is a plan, continuity, self-sufficiency plan and provide expertise or budget to insure these aspects are covered.

In the document there were issues that needed more work one of which the group wanted to tackle (mentoring guidelines) but as time was short it was decided to move on to the information held by group members more experienced with substandard zoo issues.

Bernard Harrison, former President of the South East Asian Zoo Association described the process their association has adopted to help zoos that need improvement in South East Asia through SEAZA. SEAZA has a Code of Ethics and Standards which provide a guidelines for the zoos and those who come and inspect the zoos from the Association. The process is that the zoo should invite the Association to come and inspect their facility, point out the areas where the zoo is deficient, and then suggest improvements. Normally the process is a friendly one and the fact that the zoo has invited the association Inspection Committee combined with the friendly and good natured style of the committee usually prevents bad feelings. Many of the zoos inspected have made a very respectable effort to repair or modify the areas which were felt to be not correct by the committee. Bernard said the biggest obstacle is getting the zoos to invite you to come in. Once that hurdle is overcome, the rest is not difficult.

Sally Walker, Founder / Director of Zoo Outreach Organisation and Director, South Asian Zoo Association, described the strategy she used when working to get zoos acknowledged in India
(the government figure was 44 and the actual number was far greater [over 300] – all government run zoos). She lobbied intensively with individual bureaucrats and legislators using carefully selected government documents and reports which had been published to “remind” government that it had, several times, decided to take action to improve zoos. The resulting action – legislation, norms & standards, inspections, granting of funds for improvement, policy, etc has resulted in the evaluating of 347 zoos, granting of recognition to 164 zoos, the refusal to recognize 183 zoos, closing of 92 zoos and ongoing processing of the 91 remaining zoos. The animals have been place adequately.

Sally described several references, websites, etc. which could be accessed for guidance on some of the issues, including a web module on Asian zoo legislation at the Zoo Outreach Website, model legislation and forms for assessment on the Indian Central Zoo Authority website, etc. and agreed to send these to participants by email after returning to India.

Participants reaction to the Working Group was excellent. Once some doubts were clarified, all were supportive and interested in contributing to the ongoing process of WAZA.

The following day, Walker gave the presentation on substandard zoos which she had given at WAZA with some alterations to make the presentation more meaningful to African participants. Walker also gave a report on the working group in Plenary.

---

**CBSG**

**2006 CBSG Annual Meeting: Halle, Germany, August 2006. Global Standards / Zoo Improvement Project Working Group.**

**Working Group participants**: Hang Lee, Seoul National University; Danny de Man, EAZA executive office; Jansen Manansang, CBSG – Indonesia; Sherman Wong (recorder), CBSG – Indonesia; Amy Camacho (acilitator), CBSG – Mexico; Mike Jordan (Reporter) Chester Zoo; Sally Walker (WG Convenor), ZOO, CBSG South Asia & SAZARC; Laura Van der Meer, International Elephant Foundation; Kenichi.kitamura, JAZA; Kanako Tomisawa, JAZA Interpreter; Hiroko Ogawa, Taman Zoological Park; Hiroko Somura, Asian Wildlife Research Center Foundation; Etsuo Narushima, Tama Zoological Park; Ed Asper (Timekeeper), African Safari Wildlife Park; H. Jorg Adler Allwetterzoo, Munster; Brij Raj Sharma, Central Zoo Authority, India; Kathy Holtzer, CBSG; Juan Lornejo, CBSG, Mexico; Reuben Ngwenya, National Zoo, South Africa; Antoinette Kotze, National Zoo, South Africa; Harry Schram, EAZA; Kazuyoshi Itoh, Ueno Zoo; Hiroshi Hori, CBSG – Japan

After reviewing the work done by a CBSG working group in the 2005 Annual Meeting and its result of WAZA addressing the issue of substandard zoos as a WAZA project, the Working Group was tasked by the WGp convenor with considering the following questions, among others they wished to contribute:

- “Other than zoos, who can assist sub-standard zoos meaningfully, effectively and constructively ?”
- if people are taught how to identify what a good zoo is, will this help adjust their perspective towards zoos.
- If people are better informed about what a good zoo is, can they be involved in improving sub-standard zoos?
If a visitor can identify a bad zoo, can they help? If so, we need to educate visitors on how to do this without creating more problems than they help to solve.

Is there a potential for creating a situation in which a substandard zoo with some good programs was made to close “good” zoo with not so good programs staying open?

SWalker WGp Convenor requested feedback from the group on a zoo education packet she had created for distribution during Wildlife Week in India. She had also drafted another educational packet which included a basic evaluation form designed for visitors to help them understand what is expected of a zoo. Feedback was requested on the latter also.

**General Approach of the Working Session was to**

a) Brainstorm if public can be useful,
b) Create pros and cons list and
c) how do we inform them and how to say it

In the brainstorming session some ideas put forward were:

**Zoo legislation (mentioned in the introduction to the WGp**

- Regarding zoo legislation over-regulation could stifle zoos. Depending on the country, legislation could be used for good or ill.

**Concerns regarding involvement of the public in evaluation or**

- Public involvement could also affect self-regulation by national or regional associations.
- Again ref. public involvement, it is possible that the public could begin over-criticizing (even good zoos) unnecessarily.
- Causing public focus on quality of zoos could distract them from paying attention to conservation efforts and shift emphasis from conservation to welfare.
- Negativity generated by this topic could push people to police zoos rather than have them support well-managed zoos and their programmes.
- An evaluation form could possibly be used as a weapon by anti-zoo groups against good zoos,
- Strong reactions from the public pressurizing the government could lead to massive zoo closures resulting in relocation of animals, creating a burden on “good” zoos.
- Moreover it was feared that If good zoos did not support the task of relocating animals by taking them in, this would be perceived by the public in a very negative way.

*Despite all of the above, it was felt by all the group that public education on the topic of needy zoos and zoo standards is critical.*

**Concerns over regional and national zoo associations involvement in the issue**:  

- Re regional and national zoo associations involvement in this issue, it was felt that a zoo which was subjected to criticism could turn against relationships with the associations (e.g. WAZA, their regional assn.) that support zoo evaluations. Zoos may perceive associations involvement merely as a source of negative publicity and lead to isolation of the zoo from the global and regional zoo community.

**Positive comments ref. involving the public in zoo improvement**:  

- The public could create societies in support of zoos to help them improve; there are many good examples of that.
- Public could also be guided to contact regional and national zoo associations who may not even be aware of the zoo but could help mentor bad zoos to improvement; good communications is important.
- Giving the public information on *how* to help to improve zoos and not just identify bad zoos was crucial. Tell them where to go and what to do.
- Give tools for positive public engagement. Have the public join associations related to zoos that need improvement as a way to invoke change.
- In implementing the WAZA initiative, the benefits of taking a positive approach by trying to help zoos improve should be communicated to policy makers and other government bodies as well as the public.

Public Education with reference to zoo improvement
• Through education the public can be taught what is good and bad, helping them realize that what may appear to be a “bad” zoo may be doing many positive things.
• Public education should encourage improvement over censure, criticism and closure.
• Intent of programme is not to categorize zoos in black-and-white, but rather to define minimal standards below which zoos should not be permitted to go. The public could play a productive role in pointing these out to associations and/ or authorities.

• Other criteria are good but not critical; the difference between these is important in making the public sophisticated and helpful with regard to zoos.
• Any zoo may have aspects which are not “good” but it must taken in perspective and understood that standards may vary from region to region.

Public reading material
• Should initially convey criteria in black-and-white, identifying how problems develop so that the tendency to cut corners by zoos can be monitored for their own good.
• Materials should be explicit that zoos may have both positive and negative aspects which should be considered.
• Materials should educate the public that zoo management is a very subtle and delicate exercise, very different from keeping domestic animals or raising children. What may look like cruelty or wrong practice in a domestic or human situation may be the best practice in a zoo.
• Public should be encouraged to contact an appropriate organization to invoke change rather than create a crisis.
• Public should be educated how irresponsible or fanatical criticism can do more harm than good in an institution that is struggling to take care of its animals.
• Sally related her aunt’s Riverbanks Zoo critique, (e.g. the new Riverbanks Zoo was bad because Aunt Francis could no longer see the animals up close and reach through bars and touch them!). This inspired Sally Walker’s aphorism “one man’s good zoo is another man’s bad zoo” and Sally Walker’s maxim “Don’t go to zoos with relatives.”

Zoo community and zoo improvement
• As a zoo community we should be able to influence positive improvements in legislation.
• Zoo legislation and its impact will vary from country to country.
  o For example AZA is trying to avoid legislation which may inhibit creative and constructive development, which is promoted by the association’s high criteria and standards for its membership.
  o Another example is India, which has very strict zoo legislation which zoos dislike at times but do not deny that it has drastically improved aspects of Indian zoos.
• Involve governments in considering promotion of zoo legislation which includes developing evaluation programs
• Give zoos that are not in associations and zoos from localities without associations a chance to understand the benefit of keeping good standards as opposed to poor standards. Educate them how to improve as some do not know how.

Literature – aspects of educational packets, etc.
• Sally’s evaluation packet is currently oriented towards WAZA to which zoos in India are positive as Central Zoo Authority, the nodal authority over all zoos in the country, is a member of WAZA. The packet demonstrates that WAZA is trying to help zoos.
• Evaluation packet might be way to show public that zoos generally aim to improve. It can also be used to introduce zoo animal welfare to the public.

• People learn a great deal from the FAQ section in the packet. Many of the FAQs will differ in different parts of the world.
• Packet is targeted towards junior-high level students.

Packet Feedback by Team
• First part of booklet talks about good/bad practices but does it give enough details to be useful, bearing in mind that informal educational material has to be brief.
• Good overall format. Page 8 is good, as well as pages 14-16.
Concern about page 13’s use of word “bad”. Need to be truthful that bad things do happen. Rephrase criteria positively as to not influence the reader, e.g., “good zoos should have clean exhibits” rather than “bad zoos have dirty exhibits”. Keep in mind that people who want to criticize will always find something bad.

Might be good to include WAZA’s Code of Ethics which shows the zoo community’s expectations of itself, but in an adult version of the material or a guidelines for teachers.

Depending on region, material may be too long especially for kids.

Term “wildlife conservation” should be used cautiously as not everyone may understand.

Possibly improve effectiveness of packet’s distribution by establishing a special international “launch day” to emphasize the zoo improvement effort.

Get WAZA endorsement for such an event to put the day/effort on calendars globally.

Some zoos in India celebrate “Indian Zoo Week” established in 1988 by Indian Zoo Directors’ Association, but is not an official “day” on the government calendar.

JAZA (Japanese Association of Zoos and Aquaria) already has material that its distributes through elementary and junior high schools.

Distribute material to animal welfare groups to better educate them but must be cautious that recipient groups have a policy of positive and constructive action.

**How to inform the public?**

- Emphasis on positive and constructive action and comment, and on the improvement focus.
- Distribute material at a special day/event, such as World Environment Day, etc.
  - Approach WAZA to designate a day or week as International Zoo Day or International Zoo Week
- In some regions information already exists in curricula, but may not be sufficient
- Raise awareness amongst animal welfare/rights groups
  - to be more responsible in evaluating zoo practices (to be sure they know what is good zoo practice)
  - to be aware of the damage irresponsible criticism can cause

**Animal exchange and substandard zoo issue**

- Overall issue of whether animal exchange approvals should be given to/from zoos which are not considered “good”, are not part of an association, or does not have a desire to belong to an association. Regional organizations should be consulted because they may be aware of such zoos and their quality.
- How stringent standards are established/adhered to will vary by region so does not necessarily guarantee association approval for animal exchanges despite overall reputation of zoo. Also depends on what type of animal is being exchanged.
- Dealers sometimes create a small zoo to obtain validation for inclusion into associations and these zoos often are not model facilities.
- Even established zoos may breed animals for commercial rather than conservation purposes, a practice which cannot be easily identified or proven.
- Need recent validation of zoos before exchanges can be approved to avoid bad zoos getting additional animals.

**Problems In Identifying Respectable Zoos (for animal exchange)?**

- Difficult even between zoos to identify respectable zoos for exchange.
- Problems in validating zoos, even with some national/regional associations. Assessment of appropriate enclosures and expertise can be difficult.
  - Request to WAZA to consider a mechanism for appraising

**How WAZA can help zoos:**

- Zoo inspection tools
- Facilitating brother-sister zoo mentoring relationships
- Work with local authorities
- Provide basic info such as professional ethics
- Threat of exclusion from WAZA membership
- Help from outside of the region

**Zoo Improvement around the World as discussed in the working group**
European Association of Zoos and Aquaria

- EAZA has a technical assistance committee or working group helping sub-standard zoos in Eastern Europe to raise their standards to the point of becoming eligible for EAZA membership.
- Also interested in helping zoos located in South America, Asia and Africa.
- They have categorized these zoos as follows
  (a) zoos that do not have the resources to implement changes,
  (b) zoos that are supported/managed by governments, and
  (c) zoos that are being operated for tourism and utilize consultants.

Central Zoo Authority (India)

- When India’s Central Zoo Authority was started, it was desired to be all-inclusive to get input from all areas, and possibly educate in the process.
- Most zoos are controlled by the government.
- In 1992, government established CZA for over-arching management and coordination. Also requires approval of supreme court for approval.
- 508 membership applications received; 446 zoos recognized for evaluation; 206 zoos preliminarily recommended contingent on addressing identified issues within 3 years.
- Even circuses need validation by CZA.
- No zoos are fully approved even up to now. There are 51 standards and norms that must be met, e.g. management, housing, curators, etc.
- CZA provides technical and financial assistance.
- Planned new enclosures for endangered animals must be approved before by CZA before construction can begin.
- Animal exchanges also need CZA approval.
- Animals that CZA prohibits circuses from keeping: lions, tigers, leopards, bears, monkeys.
- Publicity for wildlife conservation generated the creation of many zoos which could not be well maintained subsequently. In eliminating bad zoos, it will require the regulation of good zoos in the process.
- Note : Displaced animals such as those from circuses need to be cared for such as in the creation of rescue centers as has been done in India.

Africa and South Africa

- Significant challenge in this region due to the broad number of countries covered.
- Not known exactly what zoos are in existence so need to establish an inventory and classify them.
- As first step, need to determine what zoos need to improve so that resources and expertise can be generated ; want to avoid closures.
- Seeking partnerships with other organizations to use their existing work in this area as a template for their own.

Indonesia

- Assessments have been made of zoos in the South East Asia region and feedback provided.
- Return trips done 3-5 years after assessments to determine progress.
- All zoos want to improve, but need training. Those located in distant areas are not able to send all those need training to organized training workshops. It has been requested to hold such sessions closer to parks needing the training.

Pro’s and Con’s of Zoo Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Forces improvement or closure.</td>
<td>Can visitors identify a poor zoo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Could place a burden on good zoo if zoos close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strong influencing force</td>
<td>Affect attendance and finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Could enact positive legislation</td>
<td>Dangerous to over-simplify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Could enable self-regulation</td>
<td>Can over-influence legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Guard against anti-zoo publicity</td>
<td>Over-critical of “good” zoos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Creation of a support group could result</td>
<td>Shift conservation focus to welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Help public interact with local zoo</td>
<td>Could be influenced by anti-zoo publicity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Pro’s and Con’s of Zoo Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public education gives tools for positive action</td>
<td>Could break links to formal zoo support groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Improve public perception of animals in general with positive conservation impact</td>
<td>Focus on negative aspects of zoo’s work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Positive Action(s) to Address ‘Con’ Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Con” Ref #</th>
<th>Proposed Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9</td>
<td>Identify the key points of both good and bad practices regionally that you want the public to recognize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 3, 6</td>
<td>Clearly identify the action you want the public to take, e.g. form a support group, contact an appropriate organization; support efforts to improve; have the public write letters to the government to provide funding for government-operated zoos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Depending on the region, zoo associations should work with legislative authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 8</td>
<td>Campaign of positive zoo practices involving zoo associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Focus on positive support and improvement rather than closure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**WAZA**

**Workshop on Global Zoo Standards – Substandard Zoos.**

*Leipzig, Germany;* Wednesday 30th August 2006, 13.00 - 14.30,

*Chair: Sally Walter. Rapporteur: Thomas Althaus; Participants” David Jones, North Carolina Zoo; Dave Morgan, PAAZAB; Brad Andrews, Busch Gardens Ocean Park; Mary Healy, Sacramento Zoo; Maria Ordinario, Parconaturaviva; Jansen Manansang, President SEAZA; Felix Weber, Tierpark; Kris Vehrs, Director, AZA; Jenny Gray, Johannesburg Zoo.*

Referring to document Com. 61 10 the Chair states that she thinks that this document is of such importance and urgency that it should be adopted at this meeting. If therefore somebody would indicate that they have major problems with the general content of the document and/or this workgroup would start making amendments to the distributed paper, there would be a great risk that the matter would be postponed at least until next year. If however the group would come to a conclusion that everybody agrees with the document – or at least can live with it as it is – the one could safely assume that it would be adopted this time and that therefore one could centre the discussion around the question on how to proceed from here.

The group supports this position and favours strongly to accept the document as it is (this would not exclude to make modifications or add differentiations at a later date).

Consequently the group discussed and proposed ways and means to carry the matter forward after the adoption of Com. 61.11. Referring to the recommendations contained on p. 4 of the document, two major points are raised:

- Development of an assessment form to differentiate a “substandard zoo” from a “standard zoo” and Development of a WAZA complaint procedure.

- Development of an assessment form to differentiate a “substandard zoo” from a “standard zoo”: Based on the 7 principles of best practise a set of criteria will have to be developed. This would then also allow to prioritise, which institution(s) should be looked at first. These criteria would also have to take into consideration financial implications in regard to the 7 principles. The group was of the opinion that the already existing drafting group could be mandated to do this. The task would involve the gathering of existing types of
evaluation/assessment forms, the designing of a self-assessment, the collection of existing minimums in animal welfare legislation.

Development of a WAZA complaint procedure
The issue is how to engage and involve the responsible people. The group was of the opinion that in cases where the matter could not be solved on a regional level, the WAZA office should serve as a “relay station”, coordinating the communication in cases where e.g. a complaint against a particular institution would be filed with the WAZA office (Call WAZA”). WAZA then would involve the local zoo association (“WAZA call region”). The local zoo organisation then would contact the director of that particular zoo. In cases however that the zoo would not be a member (of WAZA or the regional association) the authorities responsible for licensing would have to be involved. It was pointed out that WAZA and WAZA member institutions have no police-rights and that therefore legal implications must always be taken into consideration. This procedure as outlined would imply that the WAZA office would know which institutions are members of the regional associations as well as which are the licensing authorities. Regional associations are to send this information to the WAZA office.

The group then tried to identify as complement to the reactive pathway also a pro-active pathway. Two main elements were agreed upon, namely the importance of active Information and Education (in particular the appeal to the regional associations to add welfare issue tools at their Meetings and the creation of an emergency deployment team (or person) on a regional basis and/or considering funding a full time welfare officer based at the WAZA Office.

This activity of WAZA in the context of animal welfare (“WAZA welfare team”, “WAZA welfare officer”) could serve to increase the public interest in raising resources and make available of funds. A cooperation with sympathetic, reasonable – and not fundamentally fanatic – other NGOs might even be envisaged.

**SEAZA**

**Report of the Working Group to discuss WAZA’s initiative to assist zoos needing improvement, 11 September 06, SEAZA 15 Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam, Chair: Sally Walker, Recorder : Pat Irwin**

Participant list is currently missing! Here are who I remember: Sally Walker, Pat Irving, Sophon Dummai, Chris West, Mike Jordan, Abdul Razzaque, R. K. Sahu, Jayanthi Alahakoon, Douglas formerly of ZSL, and 30 more.

The working group consisted of about 40 people from many different countries, not only from South and South East Asia but also from Australia, England, and USA. The issue of substandard zoos had been discussed in South East Asia when it was mooted as an initiative by WAZA and the South East Asians had mixed feelings about it. Many of them might have thought it was a way for western zoos to label zoos from developing countries. The Chair of the working group had been scheduled for a presentation about the issue but unfortunately the presentation was to be on the following day. Chair attempted to explain in a very short
introduction some of the aspects of the issue and how it applied to all countries, not just poor countries or those in certain parts of the world.

The Chair explained, in the that the World Association of Zoos and Aquariums (WAZA) very recently announced a decision to assist zoos needing improvement as an official WAZA initiative. WAZA’s visionary World Zoo and Aquarium Conservation Strategy opines that ALL zoos should contribute to conservation, but according to IUCN (and WAZA) definition of conservation, this is not possible for all zoos. Moreover, many zoos in different parts of the world are not only not able to contribute to conservation, but are actively contributing to extinction. Poorly maintained zoos do not keep animals well and suffer high death rates, poor birth rates, breeding anomalies, creation of negative attitudes and behaviours in visitors. Buying animals caught from the wild by trappers and dealers and releasing surplus animals without proper care or planning all depletes and depresses wild populations. Hence poorly maintained zoos are both a conservation and an animal welfare problem.

The Chairperson referred to an article by Ms Pat Irvin which had appeared in the last issue of SEAZA newsletter about such zoos stating that it was a balanced and thoughtful article and also reassuring the 40 participants that it was not the intention of WAZA to start trying to judge zoos with the idea of closure. The idea is to use various types of expertise to help zoos with problems to improve.

In discussion it was generally agreed that a better term than “sub-standard” zoos was needed, as this had embarrassing and negative connotations and could slow and/or come in the way of progress on the issue. Zoos are concerned and do not want to be “labeled” as “bad” or sub-standard. Maybe “wanting to improve”, “needing improvement”, “well-meaning but poorly resourced” would be more descriptive and thus productive.

It was agreed that zoos which need improvement and are associated with poor animal welfare have a negative conservation impact (EG taking from the wild) do detract from overall/global activities, values and benefits of “better” zoos.

It was agreed that Zoos need to benefit and support their animals, visitors and staff; and well resourced zoos should help those that need/want to improve (IE Adopt-a-Zoo, zoo twinning, or helping zoos nearby in situ projects as outlined in WAZACS). It was also pointed out that it was possible to have good and bad zoos; but also good and bad practices most probably existed in all zoos.

Some participants with experience helping zoos stressed the importance of developing appropriate relationships and approaches. Staff knowledge/training is important. It was pointed out that the bar can be set too high when trying to improve a zoo and lead to zoo staff becoming discouraged. It was felt that it is better to work on existing facilities (at least initially) than aiming for very costly proposals that may not be appropriate for the zoo concerned. This is a frequent error committed by western zoos trying to help zoos in developing parts of the world.

Other experienced participants pointed out how very important it is to spend time getting to know the people and issues and in a series of return visits to build positive relationships based on trust and mutual respect. This does not mean always teaching something but often socializing over a beer, exchanging notes about lifestyles, families, in short, becoming friends.

It was felt to be very important for a zoo from a developed region (or a “good” zoo) which was working on an in situ conservation project, then they should contact local zoo (and its regional association if there was one) as there are benefits for both.

Animal welfare organizations were discussed. It was suggested they needed to be more involved and work with zoos to address welfare issues in zoos, rather than only focusing on criticism. It was noted however that there were a range of views within the animal welfare sector, some of which were extreme and that WAZA was cautious about working with animal welfare groups.

The Philippines experience and the Zookeepers Association of the Philippines was noted and felt to be an excellent case study and effective method of making improvements in zoos.
It was noted that lack of money not always the problem: often it is lack of awareness/interest/commitment, hence the importance of developing and learning together was stressed. The RIO convention calls for transfer/sharing of information and technology. It was also noted that husbandry manuals are often in the members only section of regional association websites, but should be freely available to everyone. Similarly, there should be free access to education and interpretive material. There are zoo associations which are rectifying this currently however.

There are different reasons for zoos to be bad. Either their owners don’t care; don’t know how to do thing; or want to save money. Also they may know the reasons which contribute to sub-standard conditions and want to improve, but can’t afford it. Also some zoos are affected by forces outside their control, such as war or have unsupportive/negative politics and bureaucracy, including transferring higher level staff as a practice, hence constant change preventing the growth of knowledge.

Many zoo staff are proceeding on the basis of partial knowledge and, therefore the desirability of translating important documents such as IUCN reintroduction guidelines into national and regional languages. It was noted that zoo personnel who go to different countries with the intention of helping should be mindful of the importance of understanding different cultures and behaving accordingly.

The Chair undertook to pass all these points on to the WAZA draft working group on sub-standard zoos and also enumerated the principles of best practice in zoos as defined by that group:

1. Have a permanent base (continuity).
2. Supportive environment for animals, staff and visitors (duty of care).
3. Meet applicable legal requirements.
4. Active involvement in maintenance of biodiversity.
5. Management for wider benefit (or greater good) of the community.
6. Healing relationship between man and animal (emotive value systems)
7. Provision of educational opportunities for learning about animals.

The first three were considered essential, while the remainder were “like to” issues (IE ones to work towards). Possibly a further point would be “willingness to learn and share.”

Before the end of this meeting a brief overview of the Reintroduction Specialist Group’s desire to draw up guidelines for release of rehabilitated animals. These are to be separate from the reintroduction guidelines; there would be a series of regional workshops to consider these and the one for South East Asia would be conducted in the same venue the following day. They included a risk-management approach. The issue was not just one that concerned zoos.

The following day the Chair gave a presentation designed to review what many of the different regions face in regard to this issue and also what they have done about it so far.

IZE

Report of the WAZA project on Improving Global Zoo Standards as introduced to the International Zoo Educator’s Association IZE.

Sally Walker

Participants Rachel Lowry, Zoo Victoria, Australia; Annie Graham, Edinburgh Zoo, Scotland; Jackie Ogden, Disney’s Animal Programs; Gawsia Chowdhury, Wildlife Trust of Bangladesh, Bangladesh; Vicki Searles, Cleveland Zoo, Cleveland; Barbara Revard, Columbus Zoo, Ohio, USA; Lawrence M. Tshokgohle, Johannesburg Zoo, S. Africa; Kim Intino, HSUS, USA; Renaud Fulcounts, Awley Wildlife and People, France; R. Marimuthu, Zoo Outreach Organisation, Coimbatore, India.
On 11-14 October 2006 at Pretoria, South Africa and a nearby resort hotel, the Zoo Standards issue was introduced to IZE member. First there was a presentation by Sally Walker, essentially the same presentation which is given at every such event to explain how substandard zoos affect conservation of wildlife and virtually all aspects of the good that zoos mean to do. In every instant, however, there changes have been made to the presentation to suit the audience and the theme within the issue that was to be highlighted in each case.

In this instant the theme within the global standards theme was how the International Zoo Educator Association could help. Problems were introduced by relating what educational material on the issue had been attempted so far in India and questions whether it would be effective. Do we dare introduce some components of the issue to the public? Reviewing a CBSG Working group on this same topic from several zoo directors’ perspective, some of the fears and reservations of upper level staff were explained.

The slides which were used for the educator version of the presentation are appended.

The material aimed at IZE summed up by introducing a Working Group session which was to be held soon after the presentation:

Working group on these issues from educator’s perspective.
- Review CBSG working group concerns ref. educating the public on this issue
- Approaches
- Evaluation of material …methodology
- Discuss how to advise a zoo with problems how to educate without misleading the public
- Should we advise a really bad zoo NOT to try and educate the public?
- Other ideas welcome ….

The main working group was conducted and the output of their discussions is below as item 1.

In addition to the Working Groups as such, IZE had two sessions of what is called “Open Space” sessions, in which anyone interested can schedule a one hour workshop on any topic of interest to conservation educators. The presentation on zoo standards and education generated two Open Space sessions, one on the topic of evaluating the impact of substandard zoos on public attitudes and the other simply carrying the topic of what IZE’s role could be farther. These are items 2. and 3. respectively, below.

It was clear by the response to the presentation by many individuals, and the attendance at the working group (1) and the creation of 2 Open Space sessions, that the participants and members of IZE were quite interested in the topic. Sally Walker

### 1. Zoos That Need Improvement: Working Group following opening session

**Presentation entitled "Improving Global Zoo Standards – Does education have a Role?**
**Convened by Sally Walker**

Facilitator : Barbara Renard, Recorder :

**Agenda items (in priority order):**
- **Approaches to education re: zoo quality (role of conservation educators)** (including mentoring zoos for education, and addressing different levels/standards)
- **Implications of having zoos that need improvement as IZE members** (implications on image of IZE)
- Assessment of the impact of zoos that need improvement (ZTNI) on visitors’ attitudes
• Different levels/standards (included above)
• Mentoring zoos for education (*)
• Partnerships with welfare and other organizations (*)

Approaches to conservation education

I. Audiences:
   a. “Zoos that need improvement” staff
   b. General public
   c. “Zoos that need improvement” visitors
   d. WAZA zoo/aquarium visitors

II. Audience: “Zoos that need improvement” staff
   a. WAZA’s approach:
      i. WAZA will be developing a list of zoos that will be prioritized by:
         1. first, underresourced but interested in improving
         2. second, not interested in improving
         3. The first group will be focused on
   b. IZE responsibility:
      i. Ensure resources are provided by IZE regarding educational standards for WAZA mentorship
      ii. Ensure WAZA mentors are educated on the importance of education as a critical component of the mentoring process
         1. IZE could develop needs assessment for WAZA mentors
         2. IZE could provide laundry list of items mentors might consider sharing or focusing on from an education perspective
      iii. Could provide guidelines/suggestions for promoting/encouraging community involvement (e.g., bear exhibit idea mentioned below)
      iv. In each case need to ensure that the institutions themselves are responsible for the work, that mentors are not doing for them
      v. IZE could send out an invitation to “Zoos that need improvement” ZTNI folks in the first tier re: guidelines to improve their approach to education
      vi. IZE could provide education training to staff (utilizing existing training programs)
      vii. Guidelines/training could include the “Five Ws”:
         1. **Where:** how to utilize existing space (e.g., in front of enclosures, under a tree, log seating, rocks)
         2. **Who:** Who is doing the education (keepers, ticket sellers, veterinarians, volunteers)
         3. **How/What** do you use:
            a. Signs – ensure accuracy and clear messaging
            b. Self-guided tours/maps/suggested routes, itineraries/brochures/leaflets
         4. **What:** What messages do you share:
            a. Respecting animals – do not abuse/tease/feed
            b. Identifying animals
            c. Conservation status
            d. Animals are cool
   c. Discussed taking a three tiered approach to education (all of which should be tied to school curriculum)
      i. Learning to love/building the connection
      ii. Building a deeper understanding
      iii. Taking action

III. Audience: General Public: Building awareness and action
   a. Objective: To develop civic responsibility
   b. Message: We like good zoos that care about animals
   c. Suggestions:
      i. Encourage partnerships between regional zoo associations and national/international welfare organizations to promote that “good
zoos do good”

IV. Audience: “Zoos that need improvement” ZTNI visitors
   a. Discussed potential of developing signage that admits that “we are in the process”
   b. “We care about our animals so we are working to improve their conditions”
   c. Sign in front of worst exhibit: “Please help us move this bear” – received donations and public support that led to building of new exhibit

Implications of having zoos that need improvement as IZE members (implications on image of IZE)

I. Currently encourage membership by all in IZE
II. Agreed that if a zoo/aquarium is interested in IZE membership, that that means they are interested in improving
III. Membership encourages building of capacity
IV. We should encourage sponsored institutions to then become mentors for other ZTNI “Zoos that need improvement”
V. Can encourage free regional IZE organizations (e.g., India’s (SAN-IZE approach) to encourage best practices

2. One hour “Open Space workshop”
   Session Title: Assessing the impact of zoos that need improvement on perceptions of animals and of zoos in general
   Session Facilitators: Chris Kuhar and Jackie Ogden. Working group participants: Ruth Rosenburg, Joyce Kwok, May Lok, Chris Kuhar, Anneleise Smillie, John Gardner, Ulla Broderson, Kim Intino, Tom Naiman, Bill Street, Jackie Ogden, Renald Fulconis, Russell Stevens, Rendalo Niebles

Three categories of facilities:
   Facilities are OK
   Facilities under resourced but want to improve
   Facilities under resourced that don’t want to improve

WAZA is focusing on moving facilities up the chain from lowest to top levels with the least potential of controversy and negative impact

Definition of a Zoo that Needs Improvement
   • No conservation education or wrong messaging
   • Animal welfare is compromised
   • Under financed (lack of funds, qualified staff, infrastructure)
   • Safety for visitors or staff
   • Appropriate acquisition/disposition policies

Research Questions:

1. Impact of animal welfare on zoo visitors
   a. Age differences? Is the perception of animal facilities age related? Does the perceptual and cognitive ability of a child play into their take-away message?
   b. Cultural differences? How do the cultural differences impact this perception? (Hindu cultures have different perceptions than English cultures).
   c. How might we test this? Surveys of zoo visitors to each of these types of facilities. Pictures of these three institutions to non-zoo visitors. First impressions of a zoo and how it relates to perception.

2. What is the public’s definition of a zoo? What is the professional definition of a zoo? Are the perceptions of zoos negatively impacted by zoos that need improvement? Impact of safety concerns?

3. What is the effect that education/interpretation has on the perception of zoos/exhibits? Can good interpretation overcome a bad exhibit? Can bad interpretation turn an exhibit bad?

4. What is the impact of shows with different messages?
5. How does the acquisition/disposition of animals impact perception of the zoo? Does the public know how zoos operate? Do they care about game ranch/private disposal?

Action Items:
1. Who are the zoos? How many are there? What kind of zoo are they?
2. Literature search to develop benchmarks on perception of animals.
3. Goals and feasibility of the research questions (outcome)?
4. Chris, Tom, Russell and Renaldo will lead the work group.

3. One hour “Open Space workshop” : Session Title: Education for Zoos that need improvement: How can we contribute?
   Session Leader: Renaud Fulconis. Workshop participants: Renaud Fulconis, Muna Al Dhahari, Zahava Carmeli, Chris Kuhar, Lawrence, Armstrong Mashakiri, James Musinguzi, Dave Naish, Reinaldo Niebles Jackie Ogden

Headlines: those items in bold

I. What is a zoo that needs improvement?
   a. animal welfare standards are compromised (need to address whose standards)
   b. zoos without conservation education or with really conflicting messages
   c. zoos without appropriate infrastructure
   d. lack of staff or lack of well-trained staff
   e. finance (underresourced)
   f. lack of knowledge

II. Can we assist these sorts of zoos with education? What about zoos that don’t meet these standards but still provide education? How can situations with compromised animal welfare educate?
   a. if they provide enrichment to compensate for poor spaces?
   b. if they provide communication that says “we care about animals and we know this lion needs a better home. Help provide me a better home.”?

III. General consensus that you must first address welfare issues before education can be successful
   a. First step is changing mindset of management – Recognition that WAZA is working on this, but an interest on the part of participations that IZE extend an offer to assist in influencing management of zoos/aquariums that need improvement (some zoos have sufficient resources, but are not being managed appropriately)
      i. could contact these zoos to share information; communicate available resources, existing associations etc.
      ii. suggest that IZE provide their expertise in communication strategies to assist WAZA as they are working to improve animal welfare
         1. Can IZE assist in training staff? Can they help to train staff to be empowered? Can they provide natural history training to animal staff? Can these animal staff also be provided with some basic training in interpretation so that they provide appropriate messages?
   b. Second step is providing training to change habits and practices to influence animal husbandry practices before education is focused on
      i. IZE could assist with helping to develop this animal husbandry training (realizing that educators are not necessarily subject matter experts in husbandry, but do have expertise in developing training programs)
      ii. IZE could assist in providing tools that promote this training
         1. Videos that could include training
2. Email list serves to connect people
3. Improve IZE website to provide resources
4. Provide training on use of program animals
5. Could IZE regional representative promote these efforts? (challenges: these representatives have other jobs)
6. IZE, WAZA and regional associations could promote development of formal, positive relationships with governments, and encourage increased role in developing standards by regional associations, etc.

c. **IZE can provide tools, ideas to encourage community involvement, volunteer support to assist in improving the zoo**

d. **After animal welfare needs are addressed, we can then work to promote education, including resources from IZE**
   i. communicate what is available
   ii. IZE website can improve to provide interpretive tools
   iii. Etc.

IV. Need to also address challenges facing zoos that need improvement (and are working to improve)
a. how can you feed chimpanzees well when people in the area are starving?

V. **Next steps**
a. **Have IZE extend offer to WAZA to assist in providing communications expertise to promote improvements in animal husbandry**
   i. Creating training modules and workshops for staff
   ii. Improving website
   iii. Developing videos, other training media
b. **Develop task force to assist with this, including increasing communication with directors, promote leadership training, work with regional associations etc.**
c. **Develop communications system amongst IZE – email list serve (several possibilities: Could IZE administer such a listserve? If not, AZA is a possibility, as is Fulconis’ organization**

WAZA Presentation which, along with report on Japanese Bear Parks, generated the Substandard Zoo issue which became the Zoos needing Improvement issue which became the Zoos Global Standards issue is attached as All Zoos Contributing to Wildlife conservation.