

Bsb119 global business

Business



Global Business a) Stakeholders According to Willingham & Allard the Australian animal rights activists expressed concern and anger for the unfair treatment of cattle by the Indonesian abattoirs. The nongovernmental organization RSPCA which champions for animals rights also expressed dissatisfaction by raising their concern. The organization develops policies that prevent cruelty of cattle as well as other animals. The general public were also affected by the barbaric handling of the Australian cattle. The Australian citizens despite being local producers also expressed anger from the unpleasant act. The media also felt affected from the inhuman act which led them to air the documentary. The media highlighted the cruelty so as relevant stakeholders could intervene. Animals Australia which is an animal lobby group, demonstrated on the fundamental rights of the cattle. The group fights for the welfare of animals. The government was also affected through the loss of taxes. During the time of the ban, the government lost \$320 million dollars from the entire six months period.

b) The transfer risk is the most interfered from the ban of live cattle trade. Transfer risk refer to the government's interference with a company's ability to exchange funds to and from a country. The live cattle trade involves the international trade between Australia and Indonesia. The Australian farmers benefited through foreign exchange. The government also benefitted greatly through the realization of income and tax duties. Based on Christopher (2015) the government lost a total of three hundred and twenty million US dollars from the ban. Further, the ban also led to loss of employment, which provided income to the workers. A maximum of 300 jobs were lost leading to loss of income in subsequent departments. The Indonesian cattle importers also lost income from the ban.

c) The cattle industry stakeholders could have had joint international consultations prior to the regrettable decision. The concerned parties could have had international talks to address the issue. The talks could have ended the issue peacefully without affecting the farmers and the consumers. The move promotes international trade and integration. The cattle importers and exporters could have used their respective Animal Councils to ensure that they operated within the accepted ethical framework. The Australian and the Indonesian Animal Councils formulate the accepted codes of practice for better outcomes. The Indonesian government through its Animal councils could have played their oversight role in ensuring fair play of its stakeholders. The ban led to loss of revenue to both countries, as well as reduction of their integration (Coface, 2015). Formulation of a strategic plan from the respective Councils could have resulted in ethical performance prohibiting animal cruelty. The plan enhances long term sustainability within the cattle industry. It further promotes animal welfare in the production of red-meat.

References:

- Willingham, R. & Allard, T., (2011). Ban on live cattle trade to Indonesia. Retrieved on 10th Apr 2015 from: <http://www.smh.com.au/national/ban-on-live-cattle-trade-to-indonesia-20110607-1frdg.html>
- Christopher, R., (2015). Indonesias Ascent: Power, Leadership, and the Regional Order. Hampshire, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Coface, (2015). Panorama Country Risk Outlook. Retrieved on 10th Apr 2015 from: <http://www.coface-usa.com/cofaweb/search/Indonesia%20political%20risk>.
- <https://assignbuster.com/bsb119-global-business/>