

# Part 6. Possible recommendations.

## 6. ON THE QUESTION OF WAYS TO SOLVE PROBLEMS

The level of real animal protection directly depends on the effectiveness of the fight against homelessness and neglect, since it is homeless animals that suffer the most, but they are also the cause of many conflicts. It is necessary to combat homelessness in order to eradicate this phenomenon as completely as possible in all its forms as inconsistent with humanity, the norms of modern urban civilization and even the national traditions of Russia. Now consider the second fundamental point concerning the ways to achieve such an ideal in historical perspective. It's about what basic strategy to choose and specific methods of working with animals. How to ensure the implementation of this strategy with appropriate regulations, a management and control system and infrastructure. The latter condition is very important, because the lack of functioning specialized institutions – first of all, an effective system of shelters and humane animal collection services – in the vast majority of Russian cities is a stumbling block for solving most problems.

The choice of strategies in Russia is also determined by the very structure of the population of urban dogs and cats, the vast majority of which are possessive. Overproduction, low culture of keeping and discarding of animals are links in the same chain, and their consequence is homeless subpopulations, the most conflicting of which is dog. It is necessary to implement the strategy at once at all levels of state power, but practical work with animals, of course, will still be carried out directly on the ground.

6.1 . The system of regulation and control is the legislative and management components. Apparently, such a system should be based on federal legislation – preferably, on a special law on companion animals, which would determine the general policy of the state in this area and outline the powers, rights and duties of both authorities at all levels and animal owners. Such a law should be supplemented by relevant laws at the level of subjects, which also develop regulations on specific work with animals (registration, identification, capture, maintenance, shelters, etc.). By the way, the regulations on working with homeless animals have already been adopted several years ago in Moscow (its content varies quite noticeably depending on the rather whimsical history of the Moscow approach to the problem). On the ground – in local self-government bodies – the coordinating and controlling elements of the system, apparently, could be specialized departments for monitoring the number of urban animals as part of local self-government bodies (the so-called fauna departments).

By the way, from the experience of my work within the framework of the city animal protection organization, a disappointing conclusion follows - in many conflict and situations, situations where the life of an animal or the well-being of people is under threat - citizens simply have nowhere to turn. A cat stuck at the top of a tree; a dog that has fallen into a well or wandered into someone else's entrance; stray animals hit by cars are situations that put people who care about them in a dead end. No municipal department can respond – and is sent to public figures whose opportunities and resources are limited. That shouldn't be the case.

On the ground, therefore, there is a need for clear policies and corresponding work programmes on urban pets. Programs should be comprehensive – cover all areas of the problem, both owned and already existing stray animals, and take into account local realities.

Although the most general requirements should be established in the federal law, regional and local jurisdiction also includes the rules for keeping urban animals and monitoring their implementation (by the way, this should be enshrined in the federal legislation on local self-government - so far there is no such right there). Nevertheless, the rules of detention with certain restrictions can be introduced (and they are actually being introduced) right now – especially if there is a corresponding law on the maintenance of animals adopted at the level of the subject of the federation, and the code of administrative offenses of the subject provides for liability for their violations.

On the ground, in accordance with the adopted programs, it is necessary to create an infrastructure - a registration service, trapping services, detention centers and shelters.

So, the general scheme is as follows:

a) Federal level – the adoption of the Law on Companion Animals, defining the general powers and duties of authorities – as well as the rights and obligations of animal owners. It should include fundamental requirements in the field of keeping, circulation, registration, identification of owning animals; issues of protection of animals and the rights of their owners; general requirements for work on homeless and stray animals, necessarily carried out by local governments - the introduction of rules for keeping, regulation of trapping, the creation of detention points and shelters, issues of the fate of captured animals, and general regulation of euthanasia.

b) The level of the subjects of the federation - the adoption of more detailed laws on animals that comply with the federal law, but detail its requirements (for example, in the field of keeping dogs and cats), the development of a general policy in solving problems at the regional level; mandatory creation and introduction into practice of detailed regulations for work on animals as part of a general policy for solving problems with the description of requirements for the capture, transportation, identification, maintenance and veterinary services in shelters, attachment and euthanasia of animals.

c) The level of local self-government bodies, as well as the state veterinary service of the regions - here the activity consists in fulfilling the requirements of regional and federal legislation. It is at this level that local integrated programmes are designed and implemented and practical work is carried out. It is advisable to conduct it within the framework of three functional blocks:

- management and control, these are fauna departments or fauna specialists within the administrations, they are engaged in planning and general organization of activities, and coordinate it with all interested structures and organizations - from the state veterinary service to public organizations for the protection of animals and breeding clubs, a database on all animals is maintained; and the situation is monitored - it is important, for example, to at least estimate the number and origin of stray animals on the streets;

- work with the population - carried out by local authorities (primarily fauna departments), together with other authorized bodies (state veterinary service), tasks - registration and identification of animals, control over the implementation of the rules of detention and sanitary and veterinary standards, education (in the field of maintenance, sterilization, etc.) and information support of the population (for example, reports on found or captured animals);
- work with homeless, neglected and abandoned animals; for which the appropriate infrastructure is being created (modernized): 1. trapping service, 2. overexposure point (quarantine) for short-term maintenance of animals, 3. a multifunctional shelter for long-term keeping, veterinary care and attachment of animals (see also Annex).

6.2. Work with the population. It is necessary to follow the path of improving the culture of keeping animals - about which a clear state policy has not yet been built.

Among the specific measures needed are the registration and identification system of animals. The state registration of dogs and cats is now actually in the hands of the state veterinary service (this is the issuance of veterinary passports when vaccinating against rabies - such passports are usually needed by ordinary owners when transporting animals over a long distance in transport, or for exporting animals abroad). But this system is not functional by and large and does not help to solve the problem of homelessness - it does not provide for the creation of local databases by which it would be possible to find a missing animal or the owner of an animal captured by the municipality; does not provide for the mandatory identification of registered animals - the owner can only privately provide his animal with a microchip. There is no clear system of registration fees for owners (in other countries with mandatory registration, an annual fee from dog owners is usually required). Owners of purebred animals register them (and put identification tags) in clubs - but again this does not cover all animals at all. In this regard, a much more effective mechanism is needed, which can only be introduced by federal law (only it can ensure the introduction of mandatory registration, since, according to the Civil Code of the Russian Federation, animals are equated with property, and issues of registration and taxation of property are under the jurisdiction of the central government). Within the framework of the law, it will be possible either to expand the powers and tasks of the current veterinary registration, linking it with local animal work programs (primarily with regard to a single database on registered dogs and cats), or to introduce registration as a function of local self-government bodies (as in most developed countries of the world). The issue of identification marks is still acute, since the most reliable and promising microchipping technology is still quite expensive for many Russian citizens - although it is it that makes it easiest to create databases. Nevertheless, it is necessary to consider preferential schemes for identification by microchips, for example, for the poor.

The rules for keeping animals should not only require compliance with the standards of cleanliness and safety (and without bringing these requirements to the point of absurdity - however, I will not dwell on this here, this topic requires separate consideration), but should also contribute to the fight against homelessness and neglect. In the case of dogs, it is possible to require the presence of an identification sign when walking (if the animal is not microchipped). A citywide database would make it possible to search for the owners of the animals found and quickly return them to the owners (now these functions in some cities are performed by volunteer

social activists from spontaneously emerging animal attachment networks, coordinating their actions via the Internet).

Compulsory state registration of cats is relatively uncommon in the world (it can exist in certain conditions in several European countries, in some cities of the United States, etc.), this is apparently due to the difficulty of control. Nevertheless, encouraging voluntary registration and especially the identification of cats is quite possible (for example, by reducing veterinary services, preferential insurance schemes for sterilized animals). Despite the impossibility of introducing mandatory registration even for dogs now - due to the lack of a federal law - it is quite possible to create a voluntary registration system with appropriate databases.

Perhaps we should think about the need to create economic mechanisms to combat excessive (not in demand) breeding of dogs and cats – perhaps at the level of regional laws. It is precisely such mechanisms, in the form of differentiated fees and taxes, that are used in some developed countries.

Mass sterilization of animals from poor owners should be introduced – both for charitable funds, and, possibly, for funds collected as registration fees. Now these are engaged (in limited volumes) also by public organizations and veterinarians-enthusiasts. Within the framework of this direction, it is possible to coordinate assistance to shelters at home, contributing at least to the sterilization of animals located there.

6.3. Infrastructure for the control of stray and stray animals. Separately, the question arises of what to do with the already existing masses of stray dogs and the flow of abandoned animals. In the West, there is an extensive network of shelters of various parameters to accommodate and relocate these animals – including analogues of our spontaneously emerging "foster homes". We should follow a similar path. Public and private shelters are desperately needed. But in the conditions of poverty of public organizations in Russia and a lack of sponsors, they are likely to play an important, but, apparently, additional role. Therefore, at the municipal level, professional urban pet control services (somewhat similar to the American Animal Control services) should be created, in charge of trapping and municipal shelters, the creation of which instead of the current Russian urban primitive "holding points" seems to be extremely necessary.

The trapping service should remain under municipal jurisdiction. Moreover, the capture of stray dogs in public places is the task of municipal authorities in accordance with most local rules of detention, which is quite consistent with world practice. The capture of animals must occur without injury. The use of remote immobilization (using flying syringes) can only be limited to dogs that avoid close contact. The scale of application of this method, by the way, depends on the specific structure of the subpopulation of stray dogs in a given locality - if the situation is not started, most of the dogs will be (former) owners, close to themselves, which will give more opportunities for the use of non-drug means (nets, soft loops, nets). When using flying syringes, instead of dithylin, which is dangerous in case of an overdose, mixtures based on low-hazard xylasin (rometar) can be used.

The holding point serves as a quarantine for captured animals. He must be constantly ready to report all the animals in it - in order to simplify the return to their owners if dogs or cats are lost. From there, unclaimed animals can go to the municipal shelter for long-term maintenance (first of all, these are animals that are promising for attachment). The establishment of detention centres

and shelters to ensure unrestricted reception of animals should be imputed as an obligation for local authorities. And both components are mandatory, and the holding point can be an integral part of the shelter. Creating conditions for keeping at least a few dozen animals is quite a solvable task, even for meager budgets. Moreover, part of the burden of maintaining the shelter can be assumed by sponsors, or part of its functions will be assumed by public or private shelters and voluntary animal welfare networks.

The shelter should not only keep animals – it should actively distribute them among the new owners, be sure to sterilize them before transfer, provide treatment, etc. (see Appendix). For sterilization operations, it is necessary to have an equipped veterinary unit or a mini-clinic in the municipal shelter (following the example of Western shelters) - by the way, this is also necessary for the sterilization of shelter animals intended for transfer to new owners, and will be useful for sterilizing possessive animals as an addition to existing veterinary institutions.

6. 4. Control strategies. Now there is a second very difficult question about specific methods. First of all, there is no need to arbitrarily abandon any method used in developed countries. Municipal policy should have at its disposal the entire possible set of mechanisms recognized in the world as humane and acceptable – including because the situation can change and it is necessary to maintain the possibility of maneuver (for example, Moscow, where it was necessary to move from an unsuccessful CNVR strategy to a system of shelters).

I believe, based on my own research, the research of colleagues and the experience of developed countries, that the main method of working with stray and stray dogs should be recognized as irreversible capture, that is, the removal of animals from the urban environment - as it is done in Western countries. Irreversible seizure as the only way is preserved in most Russian cities, but it must be brought into a civilized form - both the methods of capture and the conditions of keeping captured animals. Now both usually do not meet the standards adopted abroad.

The strategy of professional capture of stray dogs should provide not so much for the periodic departure of catchers already after the existence of huge packs, but for the systematic prevention of the formation of packs - the regular capture of animals discarded or migrating, it is highly desirable before they went wild and (or) began to multiply. In this way, it is possible to avoid a partial restoration of the number, which often occurs with the usual for us haphazard periodic trapping of already formed flocks. It does not constitute an insurmountable obstacle in systematic and integrated work. Unlike wildlife, the city has all the conditions for purposeful human control, especially the control of large animals such as dogs. In addition, prompt removal does not allow the food base of stray dogs to grow due to complementary foods by individual residents (according to the principle: "the more dogs - the more handouts"). This will also protect the guardians from moral suffering - since they simply will not have time to develop the habit of feeding "their" flock, the capture of which is perceived as painful.

By the way, when catching already formed packs, if possible, it is necessary to assist guardians in visiting "their" dogs in the shelter - such a role could be assumed by public and private shelters (not burdened with the need to maintain rotation for municipal trapping), as well as fenced pens organized by enthusiasts on the territory of enterprises (the method of catching-sterilization-movement), etc. But guardians and social activists should understand that

there will still be catching from public areas. therefore, it is both in their interest and in the interests of dogs to promote the early removal of dogs from the streets and their attachment (even better ahead of municipal trapping), rather than feeding dogs "on the spot". It is this policy of explaining more promising ways to help animals that should be actively used by the authorities and animal rights activists in educational work.

Following the example of developed countries, it is necessary to catch those stray owner dogs, especially large and "problematic" ones, who freely walk around the city, being completely out of sight of the owner. Their subsequent return to the owner should be accompanied by the payment of a certain amount for the maintenance of the animal, which will have an important educational value for the prevention of neglect and homelessness, that is, reducing the number of representatives of the first environmental category of street dogs. As already mentioned, in order to facilitate the search for the owner, it is necessary to register animals and (or) supply them with carriers of identification information (tokens, tattoos, chips).

It was also pointed out that in order to overexpose captured animals, it is necessary to create municipal holding points and municipal (or fulfilling municipal contracts) shelters of "unlimited reception", which, in addition to placing captured animals, would centrally accept abandoned animals from the owners, thereby partially stopping the influx of animals into the streets. Healthy animals should be overexposed for a certain minimum period (see below).

The CNVR method in relation to dogs should be secondary (given its limitations and high ability to disorient public opinion). It can be applied exclusively to dogs that represent the so-called ecological type of "conditionally supervised" in the territories of enterprises and organizations (there it is already often spontaneously used by workers and watchmen). At the same time, it should be remembered that the use of CNVR does not exempt these organizations from fulfilling the requirements of the rules for keeping dogs - that is, there should be no free "self-walking" of dogs behind fenced areas, normal conditions for the residence of dogs are needed - kennels and aviaries, as well as a person caring for them; dogs are registered as the property of the organization in whose territory they live. At the same time, it is possible to demand that part of the costs of the operation be covered by the organization itself.

The use of CNVR to conditionally supervised dogs in residential areas should be avoided in every possible way, and, of course, not legalized in regulatory enactments. Perhaps individual individuals who have long lived in the yards can be returned back for further residence - but here we are actually talking about a violation of the generally accepted rules for walking dogs (the requirement to be under supervision). Therefore, a legal way out could be (with the consent of all tenants) the construction of a closed enclosure for such dogs in the yard, with walking outside it on a leash (under supervision) - and better, gradual "domestication" and transfer to the apartment of one of the guardians. If this condition is not met, such dogs will actually always be on the verge of legalized irretrievable capture.

As for such a relatively low-conflict and little-attracting attention of the authorities species as cats, in their case it is possible (and will have to) more widely use the resources of citizens – for example, for local CNVR programs. CNVR for stray cats, as in developed countries, can be used more widely than CNVR for dogs. A colony of cats in the basement of a house or an enterprise - if it does not cause complaints from residents or does not contradict sanitary standards - can be sterilized "all at once". The use of CNVR is also facilitated by the fact that the rules for walking cats

are usually much more "liberal" than the rules for walking dogs; requirements for walking cats under mandatory supervision or on a leash are usually not put forward, just as their mandatory capture is not forced for the safety of citizens and their pets (the irretrievable capture of cats, rather, should be carried out for the sake of the cats themselves, for example, recently discarded - in order to prevent their wildness or death on the street, try to find a new owner).

A few words about the fact that CNVR should be correctly positioned as the exception, rather than the rule – in order to combat homelessness. CNVR in Russia as the main method is often accompanied by ideological accompaniment in the form of statements about the alleged inevitability and necessity, "normality and humanity" of the homeless status of domestic animals in a modern city. Such propaganda disorients public opinion and creates a situation where for a part of people who love animals, the initially abnormal situation begins to seem right. However, unfortunately for them, the urban environment and citizens do not want to provide a "normal" life for homeless animals, and animals, in turn, do not want to provide a "normal" life for the city and citizens. This causes an endless chain of objectively inevitable suffering and conflict. The reason is that objective reality does not obey spells. On the contrary, such indoctrination can provoke an even greater aggravation of problems. After all, if homelessness is "good", then, in fact, there is nothing shameful in the fact that someone threw a dog or cat on the street or turns a blind eye to stray dogs that breed and accumulate on the territory of his enterprise. This is the psychological mechanism of the pattern, which can be simply and quite logically presented as follows: the justification of homelessness increases homelessness. To prevent this, it is not necessary to justify homelessness, but to orient public opinion something like this: homelessness is evil, anomaly, abnormality, trouble; it needs to be fought.

To increase the flow of animals from the streets to homes, it is necessary to encourage people to be interested in animals without pedigree, as opposed to the pursuit of fashionable breeds.

6.5. Euthanasia and timing of retention. When implementing programs, there is a need for euthanasia. It is clear that municipal shelters are of limited size, and the influx of dogs and cats does not stop if there are many of them on the streets, and a lot is rented by the owners (if the proportion of sterilized owners is small). It is still completely impossible to distribute everyone in conditions of overproduction and limited need. In addition, a semi-feral adult animal is very difficult to tame for transfer to the owner. To ensure the implementation of municipal programs, the shelter must accept all applicants, ensuring appropriate rotation of animals. Consequently, after a period of minimum overexposure or in the course of further detention, there is a need to euthanize animals that are not claimed either by new owners or by other (public, private) shelters. In Russian conditions, a peculiar situation has developed in which euthanasia (or as it is commonly called recently, euthanasia) is completely unacceptable to a significant proportion of the already few animal rights activists. At the same time, in the West, despite the fact that the need to euthanize unclaimed animals in shelters of limited capacity does not cause delight to anyone, the largest and most influential animal protection organizations (such as the American PETA and HSUS) believe that euthanasia is a sad but necessary, and its arbitrary declarative termination will lead to even more tragic consequences.

Russia's opposition to euthanasia appears to have a number of reasons. This is also the information aspect - the ignorance of many activists about the ways to solve problems abroad, and, consequently, the naïve belief in what is achievable at any moment, one only has to want, a state where "you can not kill" and everything will be "in order" at once. This is also a

socio-psychological aspect - widespread sentimentality and inertia or, conversely, excessive expansive emotionality, which in practice turn into a "doctrine of non-interference" - let everything go as it goes, animals should only be loved and fed, and in no case "touched". Proponents of this position often reject not only euthanasia, but even sterilization, as unjustified violence against the privacy of animals. (Interestingly, as some Western activists have pointed out, such views are fairly common in developing-country populations.) At the same time, the monstrous suffering of animals in the meat grinder of the street "law of the jungle" passes by attention or is justified – as supposedly natural processes. Needless to say, in the city – an artificial ecosystem – there can be no "natural processes", especially in relation to animal species that have undergone domestication. The extremes, as you know, converge – and the "non-interference" built on emotions is inevitably accompanied by mass street mortality and periodic no less emotional lynchings of dogs. The problems of homeless animals - especially dogs - in Russia are usually accompanied by storms of emotions - both "against" animals and "for". Common sense and sober analysis are still not enough – which does not contribute to solving these problems at all. Finally, the third reason also seems to be related to some features of the mentality of many domestic intellectuals. As has long been known, and noted by many thinkers, for example, Berdyaev, the Russian public consciousness often adopts foreign ideas with an amazing willingness, often taking them to the extreme and trying to immediately implement them. At the same time, as usual, so much wood is broken that the original idea completely dissolves into costs and you have to spend a lot of effort to gradually correct the situation. There is no doubt that large-scale examples from our history are known to everyone. This seems to be the case in local ideological cases as well. Some Russian animal rights activists have taken to heart the ideas of radical Western thinkers working in the field of bioethics, biocentrism, the fight against "anthropological chauvinism" and other "discourses" quite fashionable in Western left-wing intellectual circles. At the same time, our adherents of such views did not take into account the fact that Western preachers of these views are not specialists in the field of urban fauna management in specific conditions peculiar to certain countries. They only set a certain ethical mood, from a rather abstract point of view, proposing to give animals rights by analogy with humans. However, how exactly human recognition of these rights should actually be implemented is rarely explained, except for the most obvious issues, such as the rejection of meat, the wearing of furs and experiments on animals. Hence the wide freedom of interpretation, which in Russia usually finds its expression in the demand to immediately ban euthanasia, regardless of the consequences, as allegedly inconsistent with the principles of animal protection (I have already explained that this is not the case at all). Yes, in the West there are also very numerous opponents of euthanasia, but at the same time, they usually do not arbitrarily impose their will on entire cities and countries, but are engaged in real activities - they maintain shelters "without euthanasia" (no-kill), that is, shelters of "limited reception", promote the sterilization of possessive animals and the search for new owners for abandoned pets kept in shelters. The use and propaganda of the CNVR strategy by opponents of euthanasia – mainly for stray cats – is limited by certain conditions.

It is clear that the path to a society "without euthanasia" – more precisely, without the mass premature death of animals – is much more difficult than it seems at a superficial glance.

And while there is a refusal to even talk about the need for euthanasia, in Russia the mass death of animals continues (perhaps on a scale of up to tens of millions per year per country) on the streets in the conditions of the "law of the jungle" and with the inevitable legal and semi-legal

trapping and shooting, millions of newborn "unnecessary" kittens and puppies are drowned and buried alive by their owners. Again, we have to repeat the old truth about converging extremes. In the conditions of Russia, there will be no choice – to euthanize or not to euthanize, to die or to live. For many animals, there will only be a choice between two types of death – as painless and fast as possible – or excruciating and long. That is why our country is in dire need of developing and implementing civilized criteria and methods of euthanasia for urban control services. After all, even the use of barbiturates common for these purposes in the West in Russia is extremely difficult because of the (quite arbitrary) restrictions associated with the fight against the spread of drugs. Unfortunately, we have to admit that the historically determined (the entire 20th century was not before that) lack of a professional core of municipal services for the management of urban fauna, which have the appropriate veterinary support, allows amateurs from different departments to create arbitrariness. Nevertheless, euthanasia methods are already quite available, which do not require the use of barbiturates, but are nevertheless quite humane, allowing the animal to be injected with permitted drugs (for example, zoletyl and xylazine) into anesthesia before killing.

Euthanasia, alas, will be necessary for some of the animals handed over by the owners if the shelter is overcrowded, however, it seems that in Russia its volumes will be less than in a similar situation in the West, since according to available data, we still have fewer dogs per capita than, for example, in the United States. By the way, the reception and legal euthanasia of newborn offspring of dogs and cats in municipal shelters would reduce the scale of such a cruel phenomenon as drowning or burying alive unnecessary puppies and kittens by owners (and this is a painful death from asphyxia) - until the majority of possessive animals are sterilized.

The question of the duration of overexposure of captured animals also needs to be resolved. According to the current requirements of the Civil Code of the Russian Federation, the found pet must be kept for at least 6 months in anticipation of the appearance of its former owner. However, such a long period of minimum overexposure is not used in any developed country (the threat in its use is the need to create too large shelters, which is impossible with the limited resources of local authorities; unnecessary multi-month suffering of obviously inhospitable animals in overcrowded shelters). The way out may be, for example, the legislative definition of the status of knowingly homeless-ownerless animals as the property of municipalities (in this area, preliminary monitoring of the situation in the city would help a lot). And the mandatory six-month maintenance (before the transfer to the ownership of the municipality) is subject to animals that have signs of belonging to the owner (collar, tags demonstrating appropriate behavior (not feral), etc.)

The fate of each captured animal in the detention center is decided individually. First of all, they are examined by a veterinarian, who is obliged to be on staff. All healthy and non-aggressive (that is, not fatally ill, injured or with uncorrected aggressiveness) animals are kept for at least the period that is defined by law as the minimum period of overexposure (apparently, 2 weeks should be recognized as optimal for the time being). Before the expiration of this period, healthy animals are not euthanized. During this period, animals can be transferred to their owners (if they are found) or to new owners (if quarantine is not needed and the animal is guaranteed to no longer have an owner - for example, refused or born on the street). After the expiration of the period of detention - not euthanasia, but transfer to a municipal shelter for long-term maintenance are subject to those unclaimed animals that are more promising for subsequent attachment - for example, more socialized to a person. However, if private or public shelters want to take any

animal from a municipal detention center or a municipal shelter to themselves, then there should be no obstacles to this. The activities of municipal shelters should be monitored by commissions involving representatives of public organizations (for example, within the framework of advisory councils under the "fauna department"). Municipal shelters should allow everyone who wants to get a dog or cat, but at the same time check its further fate after transfer to the new owner (on the basis of concluding an agreement with him).

Thus, in the normal course of events, a transitional situation will naturally arise, when for some time a certain number of stray dogs will remain in the cities, and a little more – cats. But the goal must always be clearly understood – a constant, unceasing, decrease in the number of homeless animals. The effectiveness of any activity should first of all be checked by whether it contributes to the achievement of this goal or not.

The prospects for scientific and technological progress should also not be discounted. Perhaps new identification systems (chips with advanced functions) are on the way, allowing you to find lost animals at a distance; or safe and effective means of suppressing the reproductive cycle, at the choice of the host, allowing to do without surgical intervention (medication, new physical technologies), etc.

As very important additional measures, full support and encouragement of private and public shelters are needed. Even shelters of limited admission can greatly alleviate the situation by accepting abandoned animals, some unclaimed animals from municipal services and engaged in active attachment. Such shelters are an excellent means to attract the resource of benefactors. The great prospects of shelters of various forms of organization are that they can accumulate funds and efforts of people, now squandered on feeding dogs on the streets - that is, these funds will go to solve the problem, and not to aggravate it, often. Also the already existing local "animal attachment networks" consisting of enthusiasts; volunteer information services "Poteryashka", which operate in some cities; Home overexposures - all this should be constructively involved.

This, of course, is far from an exhaustive list of recommendations for solving the problem - but the main directions are defined.

A possible question is: is the task of creating a comprehensive professional system for regulating the number and maintenance of urban animals too difficult for Russia, which is economically lagging behind the developed countries? But the fact is that the nature of the detention of the vast majority of urban animals in Russian cities is the same as in the West, the structures of urban populations are similar (most dogs and cats are possessive companion animals) and the problems that arise are the same, although they have a different scale. For Russia, "simple and cheap" surrogates suitable for solving specific problems of local pariah dogs in southern countries are not suitable. They just won't work for us. If we want to truly solve problems, we need to move towards developed countries of a temperate climate, of course, taking into account some of the peculiarities inherent in our country. Now the main thing is to at least start moving in the right direction.

*Application.*

## **Concept of a system for monitoring the number and maintenance of dogs and cats for the city of Petrozavodsk (2007).**

It was used in the development of the long-term municipal target program "Urban Animals".

### Activities

1) Coordination and control. It is carried out by the city administration and a specialist (specialists) on the maintenance and control of the number of domestic animals ("fauna specialist") - a person specially authorized by the city administration, as part of a municipal shelter, in coordination with the bodies of the state veterinary service. Main functions:

- general coordination and planning of activities to streamline the maintenance of pets, the implementation of the rules of detention, legislation in the field of animal protection, participation in monitoring the implementation of other regulatory legal acts in this area, as well as the prevention of uncontrolled breeding;
- general coordination and planning of activities within the framework of programs and projects to reduce the number of homeless and stray animals; planning and coordination of measures for their irrevocable removal (trapping) from the urban environment; planning measures to prevent the reproduction of homeless animals without removal from the urban environment (limited use of the CNVR method in relation to some conditionally supervised animals - trapping, sterilization and return to the habitat under the supervision of guardians in compliance with the rules of detention, or other (medical) methods of preventing reproduction);
- Control of the work of the trapping service and the holding point;
- Providing information to the population about captured animals;
- Maintenance of a citywide database of pets - registered, caught, handed over to the shelter, transferred from the shelter, etc.;
- collection and analysis of information about the situation in the city, organization of citywide registration of stray dogs and monitoring of their number, monitoring of conflict situations involving animals;
- coordination of activities with state veterinary and sanitary-epidemiological services, with private and public animal shelters, public organizations; establishment of an advisory body (council) of representatives of all interested organizations to coordinate efforts and exchange information;
- centralized involvement of public resources and potential benefactors in solving the problem of homeless animals and financing the work of the shelter.

2) Work with the population. It is carried out by a specialist in the fauna of the municipal shelter and the city administration with the support of other interested services: institutions of the state

veterinary service, internal affairs, sanitary and epidemiological, as well as public and commercial organizations.

Functions:

- development and planning of measures for voluntary registration of domestic dogs;
- participation in monitoring the implementation of the Rules for keeping animals, collecting information about their violations;
- stimulation and promotion of responsible attitude to animals and prevention of their uncontrolled breeding, promotion of sterilization of domestic animals;
- Identification of owners of captured stray pets;
- identification of cases of cruelty to animals and conflict situations involving animals;
- providing the population and receiving information from the population about captured and lost animals, placing information in the citywide database;
- protection of the rights of animal owners, assistance to poor owners;
- raising charitable funds to support the program;
- involvement in the implementation of the program the management of organizations and enterprises on the territory of which dogs are located
- attracting benefactors and volunteer volunteers to support the work of the shelter.

3) Execution. It is carried out by services and structures that perform work directly with animals. These include: a) a trapping service and a short-term holding facility, b) a shelter for long-term detention, and c) a veterinary shelter unit.

Functions of the trapping service:

- Capture of stray animals;
- Capture of stray animals;
- collection of animals from owners who refuse to keep them;
- collection and provision of information on kept animals (to the population and to the citywide database)
- transportation of animals to the holding point,
- transportation of animals within the framework of the CNVR program,
- Transportation of euthanized animals for burial.

#### Functions of the Short-Term Trapping Service Point:

- Reception of animals from the trapping service and the population;
- mandatory short-term overexposure of animals (up to 14 days);
- veterinary examination of incoming animals;
- transfer of animals to old or new owners;
- Transfer of animals to a shelter for long-term detention;
- Euthanasia of animals (sick, injured, and unclaimed by owners and shelter(s) after a period of brief overexposure).

Trapping is carried out by methods that prevent injuries and death of animals (nets, traps, remote immobilization - only with the use of safe drugs and dosages). Information about captured animals should be available to the public.

#### Functions of the shelter:

- reception of animals at the trapping service and the short-term detention center (unclaimed owners and socialized or subject to socialization to human stray animals are subject to transfer to the shelter in the first place);
- centralized reception of lost, discarded, seized by court decision and abandoned owning dogs and cats;
- maintenance of incoming animals (up to 6 months, if necessary - and a longer period in the public and charitable division of the shelter);
- Organization of a centralized information and search service for animals kept in the detention center and shelter, including those wanted by the owners of lost animals;
- if necessary, socialization (social adaptation for the transfer to new owners) of incoming semi-feral animals (primarily young ones) - in the public and charitable division of the shelter;
- transfer of kept animals to old and new owners;
- Registration of kept and transferred animals, manufacture or affixing of identification marks (or introduction of microchips), creation of a database on animals passing through the shelter, which is included in the citywide database of domestic animals;

- creation of a database on the owners of the transferred animals, control of the conditions of keeping these animals (including on the condition of contracts);

- subject to availability – hotel services (overexposure of pets)

#### Functions of the veterinary unit of the shelter

- Veterinary services, vaccination of animals kept in the shelter;

- Sterilization of kept animals (before transfer to the owners);

- veterinary services and sterilization of possessive animals (service at the expense of owners or at the expense of charitable funds, preferential for poor owners);

- rehabilitation of seriously ill and injured animals (for the public and charitable division of the shelter);

- sterilization and postoperative retention of conditionally supervised animals within the framework of the CNVR program before returning them back (for example, to the territory of enterprises) under the supervision of guardians (in agreement with the municipal trapping service, the management of enterprises and the population of the district) in compliance with the requirements of the rules of detention, applying identification marks on such animals;

- Transfer of seriously ill, injured and unclaimed for a long time (not suitable for transfer to new owners) animals for euthanasia to veterinary specialists (in coordination with the city administration and the municipal trapping service, for veterinary indications and, if necessary, to avoid overflow of the shelter) - the function of the municipal unit of the shelter;

- other veterinary services for the population.

Note: practical control of the number of stray and stray dogs is carried out using a differentiated approach, taking into account the belonging of the animal to one of the socio-ecological types (see Socio-ecological types of stray dogs):

(a) Stray dogs - main methods: owner's warning; bringing the owner to justice without catching the dog; with an unidentified owner – 1. trapping, 2. overexposure at the holding point or then at the shelter, 3. transfer to the owner;

b) Lost, discarded, abandoned dogs - 1. capture or reception, 2. overexposure, 3. transfer to the previous owner, or transfer to a shelter to find a new owner;

c) Conditionally supervised stray dogs (3 subtypes) - 1. trapping, 2. overexposure, 3. euthanasia, or transfer to a shelter to find a new owner, or the CNVR method.

d) Semi-feral ("stray") and feral stray dogs – 1. trapping, 2. overexposure, 3. euthanasia, or transfer to a shelter for socialization and the search for a new owner, or transfer to the category of conditional supervision for CNVR.

Determination of the belonging of the animal to a certain type and identification is carried out:

- based on the results of accounting and monitoring,
- according to information from the population,
- On the database of dogs (including lost ones))
- by identification marks, collar, etc.,
- breed affiliation, morphotype,
- behavioral characteristics.

With appropriate coordination, part of the functions are transferred to public and commercial organizations that are members of the advisory body (council) under the administration. Involved:

- Private shelters (if any) - for long-term overexposure of part of the captured animals.
- Specialized public and other organizations (society for the protection of animals, kennel clubs):
  - for registration according to citywide standards of dogs with owners belonging to these organizations;
  - to control the breeding and sale of animals;
  - for dog training courses,
  - to collect information on violations of the Rules of Improvement;
  - For information and educational work with the population.

### 3. Veterinary clinics and practicing veterinarians:

- to provide services to pet owners, including sterilization of animals.

### 4. Universities and other scientific institutions:

- to monitor the number of stray dogs.

Financial and material support for the activities of the municipal shelter is carried out by:

- at the expense of targeted budget financing;
- at the expense of charitable funds (including the charity account "Help to Animals") and direct assistance of the population.

It also seems to be considered as an appropriate combination in the shelter of two divisions - municipal and public charity. The distribution of the shelter's resources among them is established on a contractual basis based on the needs of the implementation of the municipal program.