



IGAD
Livestock
Policy
Initiative

Fifth Meeting of the Steering Committee for IGAD's Livestock Policy Initiative

Djibouti, 19 - 20 January, 2010



■ Meeting Report

CONTENTS

Acronyms	4
Cocktail	5
Opening session	5
IGAD LPI: Activities 2009	6
Overview of the Project (Dr Peeling)	6
What is on our minds (Dr Peeling).....	8
Annual Report (Dr Peeling).....	9
IGAD LPI: Results 1 and 3 (Dr Jama).....	10
IGAD LPI: Results 2 and 4 (Dr Mtula)	13
Discussion on the 2009 Report.....	15
Report on the 4TH SCM	18
Presentations on workplan 2010	19
Introductory notes for workplan 2010 (Dr Peeling)	19
Work plan for Result 1 and 3 (Dr Jama)	20
Work plan for Result 2 and 4 (Dr Mtula).....	21
Discussion on the 2010 work plan	24
Presentation on 2010 budget	25
Presentation on 2010 budget (Dr Peeling).....	25
Discussions on the 2010 budget proposal.....	26
Presentations on communication strategy & working papers	27
Presentation of Project's Communication Strategy (Mr Abebe).....	27
Presentation of project's working papers - introduction.....	28
Working paper 1: Livestock and Livelihood (Dr Ashley).....	28
Working paper 2: Livestock Exports from Pastoralist Areas (Mr Aklilu)	29
Discussion on the presentations of the two working papers.....	30
Close of meeting	31
ANNEX A: Summary of discussions and recommendations of the 5TH SCM	32
ANNEX B: Agenda	34
ANNEX C: Logical Framework	36
Annex D: Indicative costing of the workplan 2010	39
ANNEX E: List of participants of the 5TH IGAD LPI SCM	40
Annex F: EC/FAO Visibility Campaign	42

ACRONYMS

AfDB	African Development Bank
ALive	The Partnership for Africa Livestock Development
AU-IBAR	African Union - Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources
CPA	Comprehensive Peace Agreement
EC	European Commission
ECHO	European Community Humanitarian Office
ES	Executive Secretary
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
EVA	Ethiopian Veterinary Association
FTA	Free Trade Area
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
INC	Interim National Constitution
JAM	Joint Assessment Mission
LEGS	Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards
LPI	Livestock Policy Initiative
NEPAD	The New Partnership for Africa's Development
NINCs	National Information Node Coordinators
NPESCN	National Poverty Eradication Strategy Concept Note
NTFP	National Technical Focal Point
PATTEC	Pan African Tsetse and Trypanosomiasis Eradication Campaign
PEAP	Poverty Eradication Action Plan
PESP	National Poverty Eradication Strategy Paper
PHs	National Policy Hubs
PPLPI	Pro Poor Livestock Policy Initiative
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers
RDD	Regional Support Programme for Coordination and Capacity Strengthening for Disaster/Drought Preparedness in the Horn of Africa
RPF	Regional Policy Framework on Animal Health in the Context of Trade and Vulnerability
SC	Steering Committee
SCM	Steering Committee Meeting
SOLICEP	Somali Livestock Certification Project
TFG	Transitional Federal Government's
ToRs	Terms of references
TWGs	Technical Working Groups

Monday 18, January 2010

COCKTAIL

On the occasion of the opening of the 5th Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) Livestock Policy Initiative (LPI) Steering Committee Meeting (SCM), the Republic of Djibouti, the host country, invited participants to a cocktail reception held on Monday the 18th January 2010 at Djibouti Palace Kempinski in Djibouti. The cocktail was attended by the SC members, IGAD LPI staff and invited observers from the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nation. IGAD LPI Chief Technical Advisor, Dr Dil Peeling and the representative of the host country and member of the Steering Committee Meeting Dr Ahmed Darar Djibril welcomed all the guests to the cocktail reception.

Tuesday 20, January 2010

OPENING SESSION

The 5th Steering Committee Meeting (SCM) of IGAD LPI was formally opened and chaired by Dr Samuel Zziwa, Programme Manager for Agriculture, Livestock and Food Security at IGAD Secretariat and IGAD officer in-charge of liaison with the IGAD LPI. Dr Samuel Zziwa, started the opening session by welcoming all present to the meeting. He apologised to the meeting for the absence of Eng Mahboub Mohammed Maalim, Executive Secretary (ES), IGAD Secretariat, who was prevented from attending due to a meeting of the IGAD Council of Ministers being held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, at the same time. Dr. Zziwa informed the Meeting that he was asked by the ES to chair the Meeting on his behalf and noted that it was a great honour for him to chair this important Meeting and confirmed that he would deliver the recommendations of the SCM to the ES.

He then invited each participant to introduce himself to the Meeting. Following the introduction, Dr Zziwa recognized the presence of Dr Ahmed Darar Djibril, SC member for Djibouti, Dr Abdulahi O. Ismeal, Representing Dr Julius Kiptarus, SC member for Kenya, Dr Abdirahman Nur Qeyliye, SC member for Somalia, Dr Kamal Tagelsir Elsheikh, Representing Dr Suleiman Gabir Agib, SC Member for the Sudan, and confirmed that a quorum was present to allow the meeting to proceed. He informed the meeting that the SC members of Ethiopia and Uganda were prevented from attending due to logistical reasons. Eritrea continued to suspend its involvement with IGAD. He further noted the presence of three representatives from FAO Headquarters, Dr. Samuel Jutzi, Director of FAO's Animal Production and Health Division, Dr. Joachim Otte, Coordinator of the Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Initiative (PPLPI), and Dr. Tim Robinson, IGAD LPI Budget Holder. He also recognized the presence of Dr. Simplicie Nouala, African Union - Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) also representing the Partnership for Africa Livestock Development (ALive) Secretariat and Dr Nawai Gubair Nawai, FAO Consultant of the Somali Livestock Certification Project (SOLICEP) based at IGAD-Djibouti, and informed the meeting that Mr Juan José Valle Chacón, the responsible desk officer from the regional European Commission

(EC) Delegation, based in Addis Ababa, would be joining the meeting later on. He proposed that the meeting should adopt the draft Agenda for the meeting, which the meeting adopted by endorsement. The chairperson then requested Dr Peeling to commence on the SCM with his presentations.

IGAD LPI: ACTIVITIES 2009

Overview of the Project (Dr Peeling)

Dr Peeling started by pointing out that his presentation would first briefly introduce the purpose of IGAD LPI (hereinafter the Project) considering that there were new members of the SCM present who may not be fully familiar with the details of the Project; and would proceed to flesh this out with a fuller account of the past year's outputs. He added that he would present the key aspects of Project activities since the fourth SCM that was held in December 2008 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; and the rest of the IGAD LPI team would be presenting the details of activities based on the four outputs of the Project log frame. He then noted that the main purpose of his presentation was to establish the context for the subsequent discussion on the work plan for 2010 and any issues related to Project funding.

Project purpose

Dr Peeling pointed out that the fundamental purpose of the Project was capacity building i.e. to build the institutional capacity within IGAD Secretariat, IGAD member states, regional organization and other stakeholders to formulate and implement livestock sector and related policies that sustainably reduce poverty and food insecurity. The underlying assumption to this approach has been that IGAD Secretariat, IGAD member states, and other regional organizations and stakeholders lack the relevant institutional and policy making capacity in the livestock sector.

Dr Peeling noted that the Project adopted a regional rather than national approach, and the area of intervention of the project was the IGAD region. He explained that the regional approach made more sense given that the problems concerning livestock in the region were regional in their nature, due to movement of people and Livestock, cross border trade, the regional nature of animal disease and also to make use of economies of scale. He further noted that the emphasis to date had been on policy formulation and it was only a matter of time before the Project could engage in the implementation phase.

Dr Peeling underlined the fact that poverty alleviation and food security was at the heart of the Project purpose. He further informed the Meeting that in countries where livestock related policies did exist, they hardly addressed the issue of poverty and food insecurity and therefore the benefits failed to reach the poor. In a bid to reverse this, Dr Peeling noted, IGAD member states had already signed the "Regional Policy Framework on Animal Health in the Context of Trade and Vulnerability" (RPF) - a high-level document which paved the way for greater impact on poverty reduction and food

security. He further explained that the RPF was an agreement between IGAD member states on how they will manage their common challenges of animal disease, trade and poverty alleviation, together. The framework put IGAD member states in a stronger position to maintain the health of their livestock, to trade within and beyond the region and to reduce the vulnerability of their livestock dependent poor. The RPF deals a lot with policy harmonization, regional coordination and the removal of regional barriers to trade. It comes at the end of a broad process of stakeholder consultation within IGAD member states that the Project supported. Through this policy framework, all IGAD member states recognize the opportunities that regional economic integration and improved regional trade offer, particularly to the livestock sector. He then invited the Meeting to consider recommendations for member states on how to implement the RPF.

The work plan of 2008

Recalling the recommendations of the 3rd SCM, which was held in February in 2008 in Khartoum, the Sudan, Dr Peeling highlighted the fact that the Project had since been focusing on the implementation and capacity building tasks of the National Policy Hubs (PHs), Technical Working Groups (TWGs) and National Information Nodes (NINs) in each country. Dr Peeling pointed out that the key areas of policy making being looked at by the country teams were at national and regional levels. At the national level, the PHs and TWGs had been focusing on tasks that raise the profile of the livestock sector in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP) in their respective countries. At the regional level, these country-teams had been heavily engaged in the formulation of national positions that eventually led to the formulation of the RPF. During the process of capacity building in the formulation of the RPF, Dr Peeling noted, much effort had been exerted by the Project to put the capacity building issues of evidence-based, livelihood focused and participatory approach into the formulation process.

Turning his attention to Somalia, Dr Peeling pointed out that a different approach had been employed in the engagement with the Somalia team in the formulation of the RPF. The approach involved holding broad consultative fora followed by technical working group meetings in all three entities (Central/Southern Somalia, Somaliland and Puntland) from which a national position was agreed. The experience had delivered one of the very few examples of open technical dialogue taking place between all three entities in Somalia and has identified key stakeholders throughout Somalia on which the Project can focus on for further capacity building. He said this approach strengthened the Transitional Federal Government's (TFG) capacity to present a broadly representative, Somali position to IGAD, inclusive of the views of Somaliland and Puntland. In relation to the PRSP work, he noted that there was no PRSP process, as such, in Somalia but the Project intended to instigate a national dialogue, to agree development priorities in Somalia's livestock sector.

Regional economic integration

Dr Peeling pointed out that livestock could be the prime opportunity to translate the vision of greater economic cooperation and integration into a reality; and that the Project had started the journey with concrete steps with the signing of the RPF.

Midterm Review

Referring to the IGAD LPI Midterm Review (MTR) report, Dr Peeling noted that the Project had put in place mechanisms to strengthen networking with key stakeholders and institutions and mainstreaming gender in all its activities, including country teams'. As recommended by the MTR, efforts would be made to mainstream PHs into government policymaking processes with the support of relevant government ministries.

Training

Mentioning the type and number of regional and national trainings conducted in the member states, Dr Peeling informed the Meeting that all training offered was supposed to support the "learning by doing" approach adopted by the Project, which would empower the country teams to deliver pro-poor livestock policies.

The work plan of 2009

Dr Peeling began by pointing out that the Project employed a bottom-up approach and that the national teams would deliver the RPF, which would be the main focus for the Project and country teams in the following years.

What is on our minds (Dr Peeling)

Dr Peeling pointed out some issues that were influencing and would influence further Project implementation. He noted that regionally, IGAD's profile was increasing due to the fact that the Project had been helping member countries to formulate and agree on the RPF. The regional economic agenda was also getting prominence following the signature of the RPF, which would propel the livestock sector to be the vanguard of economic cooperation and integration in the IGAD Region. The Project staff had also made efforts to get livestock-specific action items to be incorporated into the strategic plan of the IGAD Secretariat. Improved and workable planning and policymaking mechanisms, such as the PHs, were in place at national and regional levels, which would result in better action plans and policies. Stronger links and networking had also been established at national and regional levels with relevant government offices, Non-Government Organisations (NGOs), Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) and other institutions, which were considered useful to promote the livestock agenda. On the other side of the coin, Dr Peeling pointed out that inadequate capacity at IGAD Secretariat to take the livestock agenda forward in terms of having a clear plan for the establishment of the "livestock unit" would require pragmatic action. Keeping the poverty focus approach alive would also entail a significant intervention of the SCM.

Turning his attention to the national level, Dr Peeling noted that the multi-disciplinary PHs and TWGs with the support of the NTFPs, NINCs and Facilitators, set up by the Project, were actively participating in the policy making process and the capacity building effort was well underway. Nevertheless, there was still the need to constantly

review and refine the terms of references (ToRs) of the country teams. It is the projects aspiration to make this rich experience sustainable and useful to other sectors of the economy.

Dr Peeling stressed the fact that there were so much to accomplish; but with little resources remaining. With this in mind, Dr Peeling noted that the Project would try to balance resources, and be flexible in shifting activities. The establishment of new institutions, which create enabling environment for the poor would commence at a larger scale. Dr Peeling informed the meeting that the Project was now the *de facto* interim livestock secretariat of IGAD and all out effort would be made to establish the proposed livestock unit at IGAD.

Annual Report (Dr Peeling)

Presenting the annual report, Dr. Peeling informed the Meeting that with the political and organizational support the Project was receiving from IGAD Secretariat, its member states and other organizations, the Project continued to drive the livestock agenda forward and achieve its mandate. As a result, the operation of the PHs, TWGs, and NINCs at national levels had been gaining ground. There were however still challenges to overcome to get these machineries to deliver quality outputs, which in turn required a great deal of technical and financial support. Dr Peeling noted that while dealing with these challenges, the Project would pursue individual approaches to cope with individual challenges each country faces in formulating and implementing pro-poor policies.

Dr Peeling however pointed out that despite the efforts being exerted by the Project to keep the momentum of the machineries going; there was still the problem of lack of adequate funding to contend with. He noted that in this regard, the Project's collaboration with the Regional Support Programme for Coordination and Capacity Strengthening for Disaster/Drought Preparedness in the Horn of Africa (RDD) funded by the European Community Humanitarian Office (ECHO) had enabled the implementation of regional Gender and Livestock training in Addis Ababa and the conducting of the civil society study in Djibouti. Nevertheless, he said, the search for sustainable funding would remain a major task in the coming months.

Turning his attention to the capacity building strategy, Dr Peeling observed that the Project put emphasis on the representation of stakeholders in the policy fora to enable the voice of various represented groups to be heard. This helped capture collective voices in one forum in the policy making process which in turn allowed the Project to establish new institutions which support pro-poor policy making.

Dr Peeling then invited Dr Abdi Jama and Dr Otieno Mtula to report on the activities addressed in 2009 work plan under the four outputs of the Project. He noted that the outputs/results of the Project were divided into four areas (see Annex 2). The first and second result areas were about delivering policies, while the third and fourth result areas were about putting in place the capacity for delivering policies.

IGAD LPI: Results 1 and 3 (Dr Jama)

Dr Jama reported on the first and third outputs of the Project log frame (see Annex B). He started his presentation with the first output which is to *"increase awareness by public, private, and tertiary sector organizations of the potential contribution of livestock and the livestock sector to growth, food security and poverty reduction"*. This output addresses the prioritization of the livestock sector in policy planning and resource allocation at the national level. Three major activities are listed under this output.

The first activity under the first output is to *"develop understanding of the role of the livestock sector in the food security, livelihood strategies, poverty reduction and economic development"*. Dr Jama mentioned that the Project employed various strategies to achieve this result. The Project worked through PHs and TWGs, supported by the National Information Node Coordinators (NINCs), to identify priority issues for investment in each country. To implement this activity, the Project provided technical support and tailored capacity building programmes to the country-teams through *"learning by doing"* methodology. The Project also conducted studies and analyzed information to feed into the policy development processes as identified by the PHs.

Indicating the steps that should be followed to attain a sound representation and inclusion of livestock in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), Dr Jama noted that almost all countries had made significant progress in many respects. He mentioned that PHs were in a position to form strategic links with the national institutions in charge of PRSPs. Furthermore, the PHs increased their understanding of the PRSP processes in their respective country, and identified possible entry points, reviewed the importance of livestock for national economy and at household levels, and the current roles of the ministries in charge of livestock and their stakeholders in PRSP. He, however, noted that the activity could not be fully achieved as planned due to the limited number of meetings the PHs and TWGs meetings had conducted for PRSP due to the shift of focus of the Project to the RPF.

Dr Jama then presented a report on the status of inclusion of the livestock sector in the PRSPs in each country. In Djibouti, he said, the first PRSP (IPRSP) was implemented from 2004 to 2006 and was evaluated. The second PRSP (INDS) was under the final stages of implementation. He further noted that Djibouti included 22 sectors under 4 components: macroeconomics stability, improving social services, fighting poverty, and governance in the national PRSP document.

With regard to Ethiopia, he reported that the first Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Program-SDPRP (2002/03-2004/05) and was followed by the Second document called, *"A Plan for Accelerated and Sustained Development to End Poverty (PASDEP) (2005/06-2009/10)"*, which incorporated significant number of livestock issues. He continue to mention that the PHs and TWGs were able to identify possible entry points into the PASDEP both the current one and upcoming to further maximize the representation of the livestock sector in the planning and budgeting schemes.

In the case of Kenya, Dr Jama noted that the country's PRSP (IPRSP) was implemented from 2001 to 2003, which was followed by an Economic Recovery Strategy (2003-2007) document. Kenya has now adopted a Vision 2030, which is an economic development plan by the Kenyan government implemented through 5 year Medium Term Plan. The first Medium Term of Vision 2030 (2008 -2012) was currently being implemented by the Kenyan government. He noted that there was hardly any pro-active engagement of stakeholders in the livestock sector with Kenya Vision 2030 and in any other government strategies at present. It was therefore critical that strategies for implementation, advocacy and lobbying should be developed by the Kenyan PHs to rectify the situation.

In the Sudan, Dr Jama reported that following the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) and Interim National Constitution (INC), which were signed in 2005, a National Poverty Eradication Strategy Concept Note (NPESCN) was developed and a Joint Assessment Mission (JAM) identified priority needs in post-conflict Sudan. According to Dr Jama, the process of combining the two papers was being wrapped up in 2010 to produce a National Poverty Eradication Strategy Paper (PESP) after significant delays due to lack of capacity, which in turn called for the intervention of the African Development Bank (AfDB) to fund a project to build the required capacity.

Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) in Uganda, according to Dr Jama, was launched in 1997. The first was conducted in 2000, and second revision of the document was concluded in 2004 (2004/5-2007/8). At the end of the second revision process, a five-year National Development Plan was developed which would be launched in 2010.

Dr Jama also highlighted some of the challenges observed in the implementation process of the first activity. Lack of capacity in the livestock ministries to identify and develop pro-poor proposals and thereby attaining corresponding budgets had been some of the major challenges. In addition, there were little pro-active engagements of stakeholders in the livestock sector with PRSPs and other government strategies. It was therefore critical that strategies for implementation, advocacy and lobbying were developed. Dr Jama also noted that commitments to the livestock sector in the PRSP document did not guarantee sufficient funding without a pragmatic engagement of key stakeholders in the budgetary process. Dr. Jama stressed that given the multidisciplinary nature and wide stakeholder representation in the policy hubs, it could have significant influence on how livestock is incorporated in the PRSP and other national development plans.

Dr Jama further pointed out that the Project had commissioned relevant studies in order to increase the understanding of the role of livestock sector in the national economy. The study on the "Accessibility Mapping in the Horn of Africa" had been completed, mentioning that access to services and markets are important contributors to poverty reduction. Another study on the "Assessment of Livestock Contributions to GDP" had also been started in Ethiopia and would be rolled out in other countries when the pilot study in Ethiopia confirmed the best possible methodology.

The second activity under the first output is to *"compile inventories of existing policies, rules and standards and determine their effect on the different strata of livestock dependent people"*. In this regard, Dr Jama mentioned that an extensive

policy inventory had been conducted in Djibouti, Kenya, Somalia and the Sudan; and it was being done in Ethiopia. A collaborative activity with AU-IBAR would also be strengthened to map out and catalogue policies and initiatives that affect the livestock sector in the IGAD Region.

The third activity under the first output is to “*develop and implement targeted public relations strategies*”. Dr Jama mentioned that the Project had now hired a communication officer and the communication strategy of the Project was developed. Its implementation would commence in the New Year.

The third output in the Project log frame is to “*put systems in place for livestock policy information, analysis, decision-support and monitoring of policy change*”. This output constitutes four activities. Dr Jama said, “evidence based” analysis was required to put the right policies into place. Evidence-based policy-making meant that, wherever possible, public policy decisions should be informed by careful analysis using sound and transparent data and information. The Information Nodes, he said, were the cornerstones for evidence-based policy making linked regionally through the regional web portal developed by the Project. The portal would be a one-stop-shop for livestock policy relevant information, whereby sharing of information and knowledge could be promoted among institutions and countries.

Dr Jama further indicated that the information in the portal included documents, spatial datasets, and links to key information sources and could be viewed at www.igad-data.org. The portal was built by the latest version of Joomla Framework, a popular Content Management System already used by the IGAD Secretariat. The Project web-portal would eventually be hosted by IGAD Secretariat. Its compatibility with its existing websites and portals would therefore make the hand-over from the Project to IGAD easier. The information would be updated by the ministries in charge of livestock through their NINCs and coordinated by the IGAD Secretariat. In Somalia, Dr Jama remarked the Project had already agreed with the Sheikh Technical Veterinary School to set up the Information Node. Additionally, the Project had been working with IGAD Secretariat to establish the regional Information Management System (Regional Node) at IGAD Secretariat.

Dr Jama mentioned that two major training programmes were given to NTFPs and NINCs which were meant to equip them with the knowledge and skills they needed to manage and manipulate information and knowledge using the Project portal. The first was on Geographic Information System (GIS), and the second one was on portal design and content management system. Parallel to these training sessions, equipment necessary to implement the decision support system was also procured. Policy process monitoring forms had been revised and engendered, and the initial sets of policy indicators were developed. In concluding his presentation, Dr Jama pointed out that the Project needed to build an organizational culture within key stakeholders across the member states for sharing information and usage. In so doing, the role of NINCs to proactively identify, organize and feed data and information into the policy debate would be strengthened.

Thanking Dr Jama for his informative presentation, Dr Zziwa invited Dr Otieno Mtula, the Policy Advisor of the Project, to proceed with his presentation of output 2 and 4.

IGAD LPI: Results 2 and 4 (Dr Mtula)

Dr Mtula reported on the second and fourth outputs of the Project log frame (see Annex B). He started his presentation with the second output which is to *“provide policy options and investment opportunities for enhanced livestock sector contribution to growth, food security and poverty reduction identified”*. Five activities are listed under this output.

The first activity under the first output is to *‘conduct sector reviews and institutional analyses’*. In this regard, Dr Mtula reported that the Project supported the identification of realistic entry points into policy processes through which the Project could engage with member states. The Project also provided the analysis that guided the SCM steer towards *“the regulation of markets for livestock and livestock products and the delivery of animal health services, particularly in, but not limited to, pastoral areas. This would enable the livestock industry to comply with regulations of national, regional and selected international markets”*. He added that this was further refined in subsequent SCM towards the current Project focus which was the development of RPF and engagement with PRSPs. In addition, he reminded the Meeting that studies on sector reviews and institutional analysis were completed on schedule and uploaded in the Project’s web site.

From the steer received from the SC, and in the context of the RPF, the second, third and fourth activities: *“analysing and debating policy options”, ‘identify measures to improve service provision’ and ‘Identify measures to improve marketing”*, had been implemented in tandem. Dr Mtula reminded the Meeting that these activity areas were being addressed by the PHs and TWGs as they engaged in the development of RPF. He then illustrated the process through which PHs and TWGs had passed in the development of the RPF. Speaking of the RPF, Dr Mtula noted that despite varying strengths of the PHs and TWGs between countries, the energies put into the elaboration of the policy framework by the national teams were very laudable. He further noted that the observed variation in the strengths of the PHs and TWGs in the process of developing the RPF had been noted and the Project would return to them in 2010. He observed that it was important to note that national positions were developed by the PHs and TWGs in all IGAD member states, which enabled IGAD on behalf of the Project to convene the region’s ministers responsible for livestock in December 2009, in Djibouti, where the RPF was signed.

With regard to the development of the RPF and regional economic integration in IGAD, Dr Mtula recalled that the 12th Summit of IGAD Heads of State and Government held in June 2008, which revitalized IGAD’s mandate of Regional Economic Integration (REI). The signing of the RPF, he said, ushered in an agreement on a fairly comprehensive framework for the harmonization of policies in the context of regional economic integration. He further noted that article 4 of the RPF particularly recognizes the importance of the creation of an IGAD wide Free Trade Area (FTA) to foster intra regional trade in livestock and livestock related products, inputs and services. Dr Mtula said the development and signing of the RPF, in itself, was an important step towards the development of an IGAD wide FTA for two reasons: the harmonization of

policies would be an essential step in delivering a FTA, and conversely the existence of a FTA was likely to increase the benefits of harmonizing policies.

Dr Mtula outlined the fact that the context for the Project would be therefore increasingly inclined to regional economic integration, its implications, opportunities and implementation. As recognised in article 5 of the RPF, he said, it would be necessary to establish capacity within IGAD to convene and coordinate expertise and decision making at the regional level to reach the objective of a FTA. The institutional demands on IGAD of delivering the regional economic integration agenda were considerable. As the IGAD Secretariat's livestock arm, Dr Mtula remarked, the Project had been providing that capacity, though the function would need to evolve from a project approach to one more deeply embedded in IGAD's structure.

Dr Mtula informed the Meeting that the analysis of how poor livestock keepers participate in markets was completed on time and had been uploaded onto the Project's website as a working paper. An analysis of the benefits of trypanosomiasis control in the Horn of Africa was near completion, resulting in guidelines for formulating trypanosomiasis control policies and strategies, for use by IGAD member states, Pan African Tsetse and Trypanosomiasis Eradication Campaign (PATTEC), the African Development Bank (AfDB), and the wider development community.

Turning to the implementation of Activity 2.5, which is "*to assist IGAD in early response*", Dr Mtula informed the Meeting that the Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS) and the supporting electronic tool, developed by the Project were launched in April, 2009. LEGS, which would inform the design, implementation and assessment of livestock interventions to assist people affected by humanitarian crises and the electronic tool, were available on the Project's website. Dr Mtula noted that the draft work plan for 2010 proposed supporting IGAD with the integration of emergency planning into national development planning, as recommended by the LEGS guidelines.

Dr Mtula further informed the meeting that there had been collaboration with the Regional Support Programme for Coordination and Capacity Strengthening for Disaster/Drought Preparedness in the Horn of Africa (RDD) funded by the European Community Humanitarian Office (ECHO). The collaboration with RDD enabled the Project implement the regional training on Gender and Livestock in Addis Ababa and conduct the studies on civil society in Djibouti.

Dr Mtula then turned his attention to Output 4 of the Project log frame which is "*the creation of networks of professional and grassroots organizations established/reinforced for effective stakeholder representation in the negotiation of policies and institutional changes that better support poor people's livestock-dependent livelihoods*". Three activities are listed under this output.

The first activity under output four is to '*support the establishment and/or development of professional and grassroots organizations and facilitate their participation in livestock policy processes*'. Dr Mtula mentioned that the Project model for supporting grassroots organisations and civil society in general employed the same mechanisms as that for supporting capacity development in government. He

noted that supporting grassroots organisations was not simply about internal strengthening within the organisations themselves. Their ability to influence policy outcomes was dependent on the policy environment in which they operate, including their acceptance by other stakeholders, their access to information and the accountability of public institutions. For this reason, the active participation of civil society was a particular focus of project monitoring, ultimately allowing an evidence-based case for a greater role for civil society being developed. Surveys undertaken by national teams in Djibouti, Kenya, Sudan and Uganda were available, identifying civil society organisations suitable for inclusion in the PHs. In Djibouti, Dr Mtula noted, an additional study of civil society in its regions was implemented in collaboration with the RDD project. In Ethiopia, the Ethiopian Veterinary Association (EVA) had carried out the survey.

With regard to the implementation of Activity 4.2, which is to *“facilitate regional representation at international fora”*, Dr Mtula remarked that Article 2 of the RPF details the intentions of IGAD member states with regard to IGAD representation and participation in international standard-setting institutions, which would be the focus of this activity. Accordingly, there had been consultations on future collaboration with the *“Participation of African Nations in Sanitary and Phytosanitary Standard-Setting Organizations (PAN-SPSO)”* programme which aims to facilitate effective involvement of African delegates in committees that set international standards for food safety and health regulations for animals and plants.

The third and final activity under result four is to *‘identify training needs and build capacity to enable stakeholders to become effective in livestock policy processes’*. Dr Mtula pointed out that the identification of training needs and subsequent interventions to build capacity was specifically linked to the activities mentioned under output 4. In 2009, he said, training was provided to Project partners from Ethiopia, Kenya, Sudan and Uganda on ‘Monitoring and Evaluation of Institutional Change’, while a ‘Gender and Livestock’ training was given to all country teams followed by national trainings in Djibouti and Kenya. Further planned trainings on ‘Livestock and Livelihoods’ (all member states) and ‘Gender and Livestock’ (remaining to be delivered in Ethiopia, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda) had been postponed until the first quarter of 2010.

Discussion on the 2009 Report

After the conclusion of the presentations, the chairperson opened the floor for questions and comments, in order to allow participants to dwell on key issues raised during the presentations by Dr Peeling, Dr Jama and Dr Mtula.

Dr Tim Robinson opened the discussion by raising a question on the sustainability of the Project portal and the Project website. He wanted to know whether the process of transferring the Project portal and website to IGAD Secretariat was started. He also needed to understand whether the Project intended to integrate the Project website and the portal into one.

In response to Dr Robinson's questions, Dr Peeling said that even if the Project was ready to transfer the site and the portal; the Secretariat was not yet ready to manage it. He also noted that, as the two sites have distinct purposes, the Project had no intention to integrate the two sites, at least in the short run. Complementing Dr Peeling's response, Dr Jama said discussions were underway with IGAD Secretariat with a view to get the Secretariat to own and administer the portal and the site.

Dr Qeyliye conveyed his concern that Somalia was behind schedule in terms of the implementation of the Project log frame and hence, he wanted to know whether the Project would take this setback into consideration and initiate special measures to strengthen the country team.

In response to Dr Qeyliye's question, Dr Peeling said that the TFG of Somalia, had not been engaged in the PRSP process. So far, often without meaningful consultation with the TFG, development partners had been pursuing interventions chiefly related to marketing that had not attempted to encompass the specific needs of poorer and women livestock keepers. It is therefore, he said, very important for the TFG to engage in the PRSP process, where the interests of the poor livestock keepers could be fully reflected. This also would offer the Project with the platform to further the strategy through the TWGs and NINC. This would also enable the TFG to secure funds from donors.

Expressing his congratulatory message to the Project staff for the signing of the RPF, Dr Simplicite asked whether the Project had developed a mechanism to assess and monitor the implementation of the RPF in each member country. Additionally, he expressed his concerns of sustainability of institutions formed by the Project. Dr Simplicite noted that even if there are hopes for the continuation of the Project it would be appropriate to think of developing an exit strategy to have the PHs and TWGs fully integrated within the government structure. He also noted the importance of strengthening the capacity of PHs in a bid to make significant influence on the policy making process and PRSPs in the member states. Dr Simplicite also stressed the fact that IGAD Secretariat might have a role in the advocacy of the role of livestock in economic development in the government circles, so that the Project would attain more support from key stakeholders. He reminded the Meeting that it would be commendable to find a way to include the Project in the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP). He further noted that it would also be important for the Project to synergize its activities with those of the East African Community (EAC) and Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA). He noted that, in this regard, IGAD Secretariat would have a role to play in creating the aspired relationship and synergy with a view to harmonize regional activities in the livestock sector. Dr Simplicite then turned his attention to the ongoing study of "GDP Calculation" in the IGAD region. He recalled that African Livestock Partnership (ALive) had developed a toolkit which helped to calculate the contribution of livestock to GDP, and it would be feasible to evaluate this toolkit and establish a synergy with ALive in this regard.

In response to Dr Simplicite comments and questions, Dr Peeling informed the Meeting that some of the issues raised were the primary focus of the Project's

2010 work plan. With regard to the monitoring and assessment of the implementation of the RPF, Dr Peeling informed the Meeting that the Project team had already identified the priority items for implementation in short and medium terms and put them on the work plan with all indicators and benchmarks. Though it was difficult to measure the ultimate outcomes of the Project purpose i.e. poverty alleviation and food security, he added that the Project team would be able to monitor and measure the outputs coming out of the implementation of the RPF. As for the exit strategy, Dr Peeling reminded the Meeting that no matter when the project ended, the Project team would focus on institutional strengthening to make sure that the country machineries kept their momentum within the government structures even without the presence of the Project. Dr Peeling added that, being an interim livestock secretariat of IGAD, the Project would hopefully attract donors to keep this momentum alive with new tasks and outputs taken on at national and regional levels. He added that the PHs and TWGs would be strengthened and robustly integrated with the government structures to allow countries fully own and utilize them.

Dr Peeling went on discussing the efforts made with other relevant organizations, like ALive, COMESA and EAC, to establish and strengthen mutual cooperation. He noted that there were a number of areas the Project could cooperate with ALive; but this required a series of dialogues to start collaboration and exchange of ideas, like the GDP Calculation toolkit. The issues of cooperation with COMESA and EAC also called for discussions on the possible ways of creating synergy in order to target the livestock sector across the sub-region.

With regard to Dr Simplicé's remark on IGAD's role in the promotion of livestock sector in the region, Dr Peeling mentioned that it was conceivable that there existed immense contributions of IGAD and African Union (AU) to influence national policies and practices. However, he remarked, the major share still lies on the hands of national players, like the PHs and other organs. He added, the technical and non-technical people in the PHs and outside must be encouraged to bring in a tangible positive impact on their own national livestock policies and programmes.

Dr Peeling also remarked that the Project was interested in creating links with CAADP and preliminary works had already started. He said, the Project needed to work out the details at national and regional levels to find an entry point into the programme. It was in the Project's interest to discuss with CAADP and to come up with concrete steps to be part of this regional programme.

Dr Jutzi expressed his appreciation for the presentations and the progress made in Project implementation, particularly with the signing of the RPF. He recognized the fact that the RPF generated opportunities to look into the livestock sector as a prime agenda for regional economic cooperation and integration in the IGAD region. With this remark, Dr Jutzi noted that he shared the concerns raised by Dr Simplicé on sustainability of institutions. He wanted the Meeting to deliberate on

the modalities by which the perceived “livestock unit” would be established at IGAD Secretariat and how the transition from a Project to a livestock unit would be materialized. He also asked the Meeting to discuss on the arrangements on which the new livestock unit would maintain the poverty focus initiative which the Project had so far pursued.

With these initial remarks and deliberations, the Chairperson called upon Dr Peeling to present the report on the 4th SCM recommendations.

REPORT ON THE 4TH SCM

Dr Peeling read out the progress report against the recommendations endorsed by the 4th Steering Committee Meeting, which was held in December 2008 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Dr Peeling mentioned that he would briefly report on the results focusing on the 10 recommendations which called for specific actions to be taken. In so doing, he informed the Meeting that acceptable financial reporting format was developed and the results based programme management was adopted. Dr Peeling mentioned that the request of the ES of IGAD for €1,098,000 to fund an 18 month extension was endorsed by the European Commission (EC), and the ultimate outcome of this effort would be known by March 2010. He however lamented that efforts exerted to search for sufficient funding for the Project had been inadequate and disappointing. He also reported that the MTR team had submitted its final report to the EC on 12th January and the report was available on the Project website. The MTR team also submitted a short document in support of project extension based on its main findings. With regard to the relationship between FAO representations and country teams, Dr Peeling mentioned that the situation had improved. The interaction with IGAD had also been enhanced with regular meetings and telephone conversations. He noted that the Project would re-allocate \$20, 000 to strengthen the IGAD Livestock Marketing Information System (LMIS) in 2010, and the fund could be utilized as and when requested by the IGAD Secretariat. He finally said, the identification of specific activities that would enable countries institutionalize the policy hubs and information nodes; as well as utilization of material resources developed by the Project was postponed until the 6th SCM.

Following Dr Peeling report, Dr Zziwa, the Chairperson, briefed the Meeting that the search for funding had been high on the ES’s agenda to the extent of writing letters to all suggested donors and meeting officials from the Islamic Development Bank and USAID. He added that USAID allocated funds for food security and the livestock sector would be the priority. He also remarked that since the livestock marketing system required sustainable funding to revitalize its functionality, it had been difficult for IGAD to put the LMIS back on track.

Continuing the discussion, Dr Robinson asked the Project team whether the official response of EC on funding was known. Dr Simplicite also inquired a clarification on the kinds of changes that would occur in the relationship between the Project, FAO and IGAD Secretariat, when the current implementing agency - FAO Pro Poor Livestock Policy Initiative (PPLPI) was closed. Moreover, Dr Simplicite commented that it would

be important for AU-IBAR to clearly understand how the Project intends to implement its programmes in the coming years, so that AU-IBAR could strategize its future support to IGAD. Dr Abdullahi Ismael also suggested that it would be appropriate for the Project to align its plans and activities by taking the official Project ending period, rather than the perceived extension time.

In response to Dr Robinson's, Dr Peeling noted that there was no official reply received from the EC so far, but it would be known by March 2010. With regard to structural issues raised by Dr Simplicie, Dr Otte remarked that EC, IGAD and the Project would directly communicate with Animal Production Service (AGA) Department of FAO when the Pro-Poor Policy Initiative was closed down.

Dr Otte asked the Meeting for clarification about the perceived livestock unit, its mandate, and how it was envisaged to be part of the IGAD Secretariat. In response to this, Dr Peeling briefed the Meeting that the whole idea of the establishment of the livestock unit was emanated from country teams with the good intention of furthering the livestock agenda in IGAD. Article 5 of the RPF dealt with this institutional arrangement. He noted that IGAD's legal instruments allowed the Secretariat to establish specialized units, like IGAD Conflict Early Warning and Response Mechanism (CEWARN) and IGAD Capacity Building Program Against Terrorism (ICPAT), to better execute its mandate, and the effort was to establish one such like satellite office which would be responsible for livestock.

Noting the many training sessions conducted in the past years by the Project, Dr. Qeyliye conveyed his concerns on whether these trainings were attended by Somali participants. He also asked the Project team whether responsible officials from the government side were represented during the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) for the establishment of the Information Node at the Sheikh Veterinary School in Somalia. In response to Dr Qeyliye's, Dr Jama mentioned that there were no Somali representatives in the trainings undertaken so far, but the Project planned to offer the gender, livelihood and livestock trainings to Somali participants in the upcoming months. He also mentioned that the MoU was signed with the School to deploy the machines and the official documents, which state the whole arrangement, was sent to the Ministry responsible for livestock and to other technical people.

Introducing Mr Juan Villa Chacon, from the EC, who joined the Meeting in the afternoon, Dr Zziwa invited Dr Dil Peeling to present the 2010 work plan.

PRESENTATIONS ON WORKPLAN 2010

Introductory notes for workplan 2010 (Dr Peeling)

Dr Peeling commenced the presentation of the work plan for 2010 by elaborating the three scenarios, which dictated the planning. He explained that **Scenario 1** assumed the end date of the Project would be mid/late 2011 whereas **scenario 2** assumed that

the end date would be August 2010; and **scenario 3** over 3 years. Indicating that Dr Jama and Dr Mtula would present the detailed work plan, Dr Peeling drew his attention to the general guiding principles for the planning. He noted that the Project would present its work plan and planned activities based on the SCM recommendations of result-focused programming. He also noted that even if the Project does not know how much money it would be left with, the execution of the planned activities would be flexible. Dr Peeling mentioned that the Project would try to execute new activities while strengthening the already established machineries, i.e. the PHs and NINs. The Project would also strive to find funds for running workshops and trainings across all member states and this would be very flexible in terms of application. Adding that the activities planned for this year may overspill to the next year, he invited Dr Jama and Dr Mtula to present the work plans for Result 1 & 3, as well as Result 2 & 4, respectively.

Work plan for Result 1 and 3 (Dr Jama)

Dr Jama began by mentioning that his presentation would start with the description of the outcomes, the activities relevant to the outcomes and the outputs of those activities. Accordingly, he began by reminding the Meeting of the first output in the Project log frame, which is to *"increase awareness by public, private, and tertiary sector organizations of the potential contribution of livestock and the livestock sector to growth, food security and poverty reduction"*. The first outcome for output 1 is to *"establish a long term institutional capacity at IGAD secretariat to further pro-poor livestock policy agenda at regional level"*. He noted that the activity falling under this outcome was the establishment of the IGAD livestock unit and the outputs falling under it were *"institutional study of IGAD specialised organizations (by March 2010)"*, *"agreement between member states on the unit's terms of reference (ToR), placement and staffing (by September 2010)"* and *"repositioning the Project as livestock secretariat to IGAD (forthwith)"*.

The second outcome is to *"devise and implement a strategy for national engagement with CAADP"*. Dr Jama pointed out that the project in close consultation with AU_IBAR as a leading organization in mainstreaming livestock issues in CAADP, would commence discussions with national partners on alignment with regard to identification of priority areas of investments, which could be supported by CAADP and the creation of a platform to improve resource allocation for livestock sector in Somalia.

With regard to outcome 4, which is *"livestock's contribution to national economies understood"*, Dr Jama informed the Meeting that the communication strategy of the Project and the new study on *"Livestock Contribution to GDP"* would be implemented. This will be followed by a discussion forum of findings of the study by national PHs and TWGs (by December 2010).

The fifth outcome under Result 1 is *"analysis of benefits of different control techniques for Trypanosomes"*. Dr Jama informed the meeting that this outcome would involve the finalization of the analysis and preparation of guidelines for formulating trypanosomiasis control policies and strategies, for use by IGAD member

states, PATTEC, the AfDB and the wider development community. The results would be disseminated in a regional workshop at the end of the year.

Dr Jama then turned his attention to the work plan for Result 3, which is to *"put systems in place for livestock policy information, analysis, decision-support and monitoring of policy change"*. Detailed activities in line with this output included doing the information inventory in Ethiopia, setting up Information Node in Somalia, establishing a central Information Node at IGAD Secretariat, and strengthening NINs to have the information needs of the machineries fulfilled. In addition, Dr Jama noted that the Project would improve the policy process monitoring programme, assist the NINs to play a critical role in advocacy and communication programmes and institutionalize the NINs in their respective ministries to enhance sustainability.

Dr Jama further informed the Meeting that a roundtable discussion on the culture of information management and sharing would be conducted in each of the IGAD member states. He also noted that a follow up on trainings on web-portal content management and Geographic Information System would be given to country teams. Expected outputs from these activities included Information Nodes acting as credible sources for policy relevant livestock information and the Project portal to be fully functional to provide quality information into the policy processes. Both the Livestock Information Portal and the task of coordination of the Livestock Information Nodes would eventually be transferred to the IGAD Secretariat.

Work plan for Result 2 and 4 (Dr Mtula)

Dr Mtula started his presentation with the work plan for output 2, which is to *"identify policy options and investment opportunities for enhanced livestock sector contribution to growth, food security and poverty reduction"*. The delivery of this result area would involve three core activities: (i) continuous effort of strengthening the PHs and TWGs, (ii) maintaining the focus of the Project's policy dialogue on poverty and women, and (iii) implementing priority items of the RPF.

Dr Mtula noted that there were two tasks in the work plan to accomplish the first core activity. The first task was to conduct an independent assessment of PHs and related institutions (by March 2010). The Second task was to carry out a regional review meeting, which would evaluate the revised Project model (by September 2010). The Project envisaged two sub tasks on the second core activity described above. The first was to provide "Livestock and Livelihoods" training in all member states and "Gender and Livestock" to PH members in Ethiopia, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda (the training was conducted in Djibouti and Kenya). The second task was disseminating specific studies and policy briefs commissioned by the project to all stakeholders. In reference to the third core activity, Dr Mtula further indicated specific areas in the RPF had already been prioritized for implementation.

He informed the meeting that the criteria used for prioritizing the items of the RPF was agreed upon at the technical meeting that preceded the ministerial meeting

where the RPF was signed in December 2009. The criteria contained the following elements:

- Activities demonstrate progress with respect to regional economic integration;
- Activities demonstrate progress with respect to poverty alleviation;
- Feasibility within a limited time frame;
- Importance to member states;
- Funding availability.

Dr. Mtula then led the meeting through the prioritized items of the RPF. The first one is to *“enhance national and regional capacity for early warning and response for livestock-related emergencies, building on existing capacity where relevant (Article 1, Item 2 b of the RPF)”*. Dr Mtula pointed out that under this item, there would be a review of the information, as well as the timeliness, reach and modalities of key information providers (e.g. FAO/EMPRES, ICPAC and CEWARN) with respect to early warning related information and this would be compared to demands (by June 2010). The work would be done in close consultation with policy hubs in the member states and the findings and recommendations of this exercise would be communicated to relevant stakeholders at a regional workshop to be held in October 2010.

Another prioritized area is to *“collaborate to identify priority interventions and disease control measures, in order to use limited resources for maximum regional impact; and ensure that due consideration is given in the process to those measures which are likely to address the specific disease-related constraints of poor, women and vulnerable livestock keepers (Article 1, Items 2 h & j of the RPF)”*. Dr Mtula pointed out that this work would take the form of a consultancy that would involve the review of literature to identify disease-related constraints of the poor, women and vulnerable livestock keepers. This work was scheduled to be completed by July 2010. The findings and recommendations of the consultancy would be presented at a regional workshop (by November 2010). This would result in a working paper documenting the conclusions of the regional workshop. Dr Mtula noted that this would lead to an agreement among member states on the specific disease-related constraints faced by poor men and women and vulnerable livestock keepers and the measures required to address them.

The other prioritized area was to *“work, under the facilitation of IGAD, towards establishing regionally acceptable levels of risk and harmonise sanitary standards with which to achieve them; as well as ensure regional standards based on relevant The World Organization for Animal Health (OIE) and International Food Standards Organisation (Codex) standards and serve to facilitate trade” (Article 3, Item 2 d & g of the RPF)*. Dr Mtula informed the Meeting that this activity entailed the establishment of IGAD wide regionally acceptable levels of risk. To establish this, the Project and the PHs would take into consideration risk assessment work and risk levels set by EAC and COMESA (by June 2010 and November 2010, respectively). A regional technical workshop would recommend IGAD wide acceptable regional standards, which would be documented in a working paper. Dr Mtula noted that the regional standards would be discussed and agreed upon at a high level ministerial meeting scheduled to be held in February 2011.

A further prioritized area was mentioned by Dr Mtula is to *“agree and adopt common definitions, standards, qualifications, selection criteria, training and regulation for the various cadres of Para-professionals operating in the IGAD region, including, in those countries where they also work in cooperation with their governments, community based animal health/development workers; (Article 3, Item f of the RPF)*. Dr Mtula pointed out that this activity would be implemented by feeding information and data on the current understanding of training and regulation of paraprofessionals to the PHs through NINCs (by July 2010) and agreeing on the national positions (by November 2010). Then a regional technical workshop would be convened to recommend regional standards, which would be documented in a working paper. The findings of the workshop would in addition be discussed at the ministerial meeting scheduled to be held in February 2011 to agree on regional standards for IGAD. Dr Mtula noted that this endeavour would ultimately lead to the agreement and adoption of common definitions, standards, qualifications, selection criteria, training and regulation for the various cadres of Para-professionals operating in the IGAD region.

Another prioritized area for the 2010 work plan is *“enhancing IGAD representation and participation in International Standard-Setting Institutions and of Intra-regional Trade in Livestock and Livestock Related Products, Inputs and Services (Articles 2 and 4 of the RPF)”*. Dr Mtula elaborated that in order to implement this article in an informed manner, the PHs would need to deepen their understanding of many trade and regulatory issues. The Project would therefore provide trainings and technical assistance to the PHs to allow them perform this. In this regard, AU-IBAR’s PAN-SPSO project was active in some related fields and any possible collaboration with them would be explored. Training needs assessment in collaboration with NTFPs would be conducted by March 2010 and training would be delivered to all PHs by September 2010. Discussions with AU-IBAR PAN SPSO would commence by February 2010; and initial areas of engagement with international standard setting organisations would be identified by the end of 2010.

Turning his attention to the outstanding items from the 2009 work plan, Dr Mtula informed the meeting that the collaborative task of mapping policies and institutions in the IGAD region with AU-IBAR would be conducted by April 2010. The study would map out policy objectives affecting the region’s livestock at all levels, as well as catalogue the objectives of initiatives at national level. The study would then undertake a series of comparisons of policy objectives to identify complementarities, contradictions, trade-offs, overlaps and gaps. He pointed out that the results of the study would allow policy makers, programmers and project designers to highlight areas of activity at the national level and better target their outputs. It would also allow identifying priority areas of policy where policy harmonisation would be appropriate, particularly to AU IBAR and Regional Economic Communities (RECs).

Finally, on the work plan for output 4, which is to *“establish and/or reinforce networks of professional and grassroots organisations for effective stakeholder representation in the negotiation of policies and institutional changes that better support poor people’s livestock-dependent livelihoods”*, Dr Mtula underscored the need to strengthen PHs and TWGs in terms of quality of representation and

participation. He mentioned surveys undertaken by national teams in Djibouti, Kenya, Sudan and Uganda to identify civil society organisations (CSOs) suitable for inclusion in the PHs would be considered to this effect. He further noted that support would be rendered to PHs and TWGs to ensure the policy formulation is participatory, evidence based and livelihood focussed.

Dr Zziwa thanked Dr Peeling, Dr Jama and Dr Mtula for their presentations and putting the work plan in the context of the lifespan of the Project. He then opened the floor for comments and questions on the work plan presented.

Discussion on the 2010 work plan

Dr Simplicite started the discussion session with comments that targeted the timeframe of the work plan, implementation of RPF and the livestock unit. He indicated that the SCM would find it difficult to approve the work plan based on assumptions. Hence, the Project should present its updated work plan upon securing the extension. With regard to the implementation of the RPF, Dr Simplicite noted that it was time for IGAD Secretariat to take the lead in implementing the signed RPF, in which the role of the Project would be offering technical assistance to IGAD. To this effect, Dr Simplicite noted, IGAD should establish and strengthen the livestock unit to obtain funds and technical assistance from all sources to establish and run the unit. A procedure needed to institutionalize the unit under the IGAD structure. He pointed out that as the AU began strengthening regional institutions, it would be appropriate for IGAD, with all its credibility and trust, to have this unit functional under its mandate to access funds from the African Union (AU).

Dr Otte also remarked that IGAD should define the roles and responsibilities of the livestock unit to ensure sustainability. The ToR of the livestock unit should be worked out in detail with an operational plan. Adding to the foregoing comments, Dr Abdullahi Ismael remarked that even if the SCM had hope of getting an extension from the current funding agency it would be difficult for the SCM to decide on the Project's work plan, unless a clear positive indication was obtained from IGAD. He added that, given the importance of livestock in the East African region, IGAD should take the lead in linking livestock issues with the EAC. Dr Ismael also noted that given the critical importance of it, the proposed GDP calculation study which he felt should be conducted in all member countries.

Dr. Qeyliye on his part noted that since all member countries agreed to establish the livestock unit, IGAD Secretariat should take the responsibility to implement the decision, and the Project should be able to offer technical assistance towards its establishment.

Mr Juan Villa Chacon inquired whether IGAD had similar satellite offices under its structure, other than IGAD LPI. He also informed the Meeting that AU IBAR, on behalf of AU, had submitted a funding request to the EC that targeted improving veterinary and other related services, the implementation of which would be handled by regional

institutions. Dr Tim Robinson on his part wanted to know the proportion of the budget IGAD satellite offices obtained from IGAD and donors.

In response to the above suggestions and comments, Dr Zziwa observed that IGAD had some satellite organizations, like CEWARN and ICPAC, to better execute its mandate in specific areas. He added that some of these organizations were under IGAD and hence their budget was supplemented by IGAD. The budgets of other satellite organizations were being covered by IGAD member states and donors, like USAID. With regard to the livestock unit, Dr Zziwa noted that the original thinking was to create a division/section at the Secretariat. However, given the crucial significance of livestock in the region, the establishment of a bigger livestock unit came into the picture at a later stage to push the livestock agenda further.

Dr Peeling, on his part, briefed the Meeting that the plan of establishing the livestock unit, which would serve the whole IGAD region, emanated from the PHs and TWGs. This was further discussed at the technical workshop preceding the Ministerial Meeting, held in December 2009 in Djibouti. Noting the importance of this unit, he reminded the meeting that the Ministers responsible for livestock had again dwelt on it and approved Article 5 of the RPF, which explicitly discusses the establishment of the unit. Adding to this, Dr Jama informed the Meeting that the Project held a meeting with IGAD high-level officials in November 2009, where it was decided that an institutional review of the satellite organizations should be conducted by an international consultant, with a view to start the process of establishing the livestock unit.

With this brief discussion on the 2010 work plan, the Chairperson invited Dr Peeling to present the budget for the new fiscal year.

PRESENTATION ON 2010 BUDGET

Presentation on 2010 budget (Dr Peeling)

Informing the Meeting that the budget would be presented in terms of the first two scenarios reported earlier, Dr Peeling started with the budget estimates for scenario two, which takes the end date of the Project to be August 2010. Dr Peeling said in the case of Scenario two the Project would have a modest work plan with a focus on institutional sustainability and capturing and disseminating the lessons learned in the process of pro-poor policy making.

With regard to sustainability, Dr Peeling noted that an agreement on the establishment of the livestock unit, the institutionalisation of the PHs, and the consolidation of capacities in information-related activities, as well as the activities started in the areas of PRSP would take the utmost focus. Other activities like the trainings focused on gender and livelihoods as well as studies on GDP calculation and livestock policies would be continuing. The capacity building programme on early

warning systems and the work related to the formulation of trypanosomiasis control policies and strategies could also be completed within the time frame indicated.

On documenting and disseminating the Project's best practice experience, Dr Peeling noted that, Project activities and outputs would be reviewed with a view to capture and share lessons learned through regional workshops and other means of communication.

With this backdrop, he disclosed that the estimated available budget for activities mentioned above would be \$1,100,000 of which the running costs would take up \$250,000 and the national machineries would require \$570,000. It was also assumed that member states would contribute about \$33,900 to run the NINs. He noted that about \$300,000 would be left to run the Project's activities, which included trainings, studies and reviews, roundtables, consultant supports, communication, etc. With this in mind, Dr Peeling noted the overall budget in the second scenario would be \$ 292,500.

Continuing to elaborate the budgeting, Dr Peeling stated that, the first scenario (Project end date February 2012), unlike the second one, offers a breathing time to make the machineries more mature and implement the key items on the RPF. He further indicated that the first scenario also present an opportunity to attain a significant representation of the livestock sector in the PRSPs and work on the establishment of livestock unit. The estimated available budget for these activities would be \$1,580,000, of which \$250,000 would be utilized for over-running activities and \$730, 000 for national machineries. At the end, he said about \$600,000 would be left to run the Project's activities, which include the delivery of all planned trainings, studies and reviews, round tables, consultant supports, communication tasks, etc. Taken this into account, Dr Peeling noted the overall budget in the first scenario would be \$448,000 (See Annex C).

Discussions on the 2010 budget proposal

Thanking Dr Peeling for his brief presentation, Dr Zziwa opened the floor for discussion by asking a briefing on whether any budget was allocated for the tasks that aim the establishment of the livestock unit. Dr Kamal Tagelsir Elsheikh also asked why the Project allocated such a big amount to the machineries and whether this amount could possibly be covered by other donors. Dr Otte also commented that the best way to capture lessons learned would be through the livestock unit. It was therefore, he said, very important to go beyond conducting an institutional study and find ways to establish a functional unit under the IGAD structure. Adding to this, Dr Jutzi said, under the damage control scenario, implementing what the Ministers responsible for livestock have indorsed in connection to the livestock unit would be highly recommended. Dr Jutzi has also forwarded some comments and questions that targeted the EC. He inquired Mr Chacon to inform the Meeting about status of the Project's request for an extension and what would be the other possible options the Project had to see to obtain sufficient fund from EC.

Mr Chacon informed the meeting that the request was submitted to EC office in Brussels with the hope to obtain an extension from EDF 10. He said, even if there was hardly any mentioning of livestock in the document submitted by IGAD, the area to which the IGAD fund was requested was very broad and hence the required fund might be acquired. He also added that as long as IGAD wanted the extension for the second phase, it would have been easier for the Project to acquire an extra funding from EDF 10. Finally he commented that the result would be known by the end of February or any time in March 2010.

Dr Peeling asked Dr Zziwa of what would be the best possible alternative for getting funds. Dr Zziwa informed the Meeting that it is appropriate to develop a concept note to forward to USAID and others. Mr Chacon also informed the Meeting that there is a 20 million Euro fund, requested by IGAD for other projects. Dr Simplicie suggested that the Project can be embraced by CAADP, for which IGAD should approach The New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD). This would also allow AU-IBAR offer support to the Project.

Having noted the comments and questions raised, Dr Zziwa invited Dr Peeling to briefly address the rest of the questions raised by the Meeting.

Dr Peeling explained that the Project would continue to spend much of its resources on the PHs and TWGs to keep them running; because they had been the absolute focus for the Project. National livestock policies were emanated from these machineries and hence the Project would not consider the investment as a waste. Rather, he said, the whole process would lead the SCM to think of extra budget to strengthen these machineries.

With these brief deliberations, Dr Zziwa invited Mr Abebe Demissie, the Project's Communication Officer, to present the newly-developed communication strategy to the Meeting.

PRESENTATIONS ON COMMUNICATION STRATEGY & WORKING PAPERS

Presentation of Project's Communication Strategy (Mr Abebe)

Having introduced himself to the Meeting, Mr Abebe started his presentation with the introductory note on the elements of a communication strategy and then passed over to the Project's Communication Strategy. In his presentation, Mr. Abebe elaborated the communication needs, the goal and objectives, target audiences, key messages, appropriate channels and methods as well as key action points of the Project's communication strategy.

Following his brief presentation, Dr Zziwa invited participants to comment on the Strategy presented. Accordingly, Dr Otte suggested this communication strategy could incorporate ways through which the Project's lessons could be captured and passed over to various stakeholders.

With these presentations, comments and discussions the Meeting concluded its first day deliberations at 5:30 p.m.

Wednesday 20, January 2010

Presentation of project's working papers - introduction

The second day of the 5th SCM commenced with a presentation of two working papers by consultants, commissioned by the Project. Dr Zziwa invited Dr Peeling to briefly introduce the working paper and their relevance to the livestock sector.

Accordingly, Dr Peeling introduced the title of the first working paper, which was, "*Livestock, livelihoods and institutions in the IGAD Region*" and its relevance to IGAD's agenda to the livestock sector. He informed the Meeting that the Project commissioned the study with the aim of providing insight on the issues of livestock and livelihoods as well as the institutions that influence livelihood strategies of the livestock dependent poor men and women in the IGAD region. In light of this, the study, he said, underpinned the Project's effort towards building capacity in the following areas that define a pro-poor policy making process: evidence-based, participatory and livelihoods-focused. These areas need to be fully understood and applied by country teams to elaborate pro-poor policies. Dr Peeling further said, the researcher and presenter of the first paper, Dr Steve Ashley and his associates from theIDLgroup had written a very useful paper titled "*Livestock, Livelihoods and Institutions in the IGAD Region*", which should be read and digested by all country teams, including the Steering Committee Members and which would provide background material in proposed livelihood training workshops to be held in all the IGAD member states. Dr. Peeling invited all Members to participate in the upcoming national livelihood training workshops in their respective countries. Dr Peeling then called upon Dr Ashley to briefly present the findings of the study.

Working paper 1: Livestock and Livelihood (Dr Ashley)

Dr Ashley began his presentation by reminding the Meeting of the relevance of the study to fulfil the capacity building mandate of the Project. He said the focus of the study was on livestock and livelihoods, as well as institutions defined as the rules of the game. Then he presented the study in three sections: the roles of livestock in sustaining the livelihood of the poor, livelihoods strategies of the poor, and the roles and implications of institutions for pro-poor policy making.

Dr Ashley highlighted the fact that livestock play a central role in the lives of the poor and livestock-keeping strategies are typically very logical and, for the poor, the important unit of analysis is the livelihood not the livestock or the enterprise. With regard to roles and implications of institutions, Dr Ashley noted that they are the written or unwritten rules of the game, which are either enabling or disabling for the

poor men and poor women at local, national, regional and global levels. He further noted that disabling institutions often outweigh enabling institutions for the poor; so that pro-poor development would not be realised by making technical changes, rather by changing formal and informal institutions that impact the lives of the poor. Speaking on the implications of institutions in pro-poor policy making, Dr Ashley underlined that policy making must be based on an understanding of the livelihoods strategies of the poor and the institutions that impact these strategies, rather than focusing more on production for more income. To this effect, he noted, a different approach for policy making is required to help the poor livestock keepers acquire, protect, and accumulate livestock and maximize their livelihoods through these strategies.

Thanking Dr Ashley for his concise and insightful presentation, Dr Peeling went on introducing the second paper, which was, "Livestock Exports from Pastoralist Areas: An Analysis of Benefits by Wealth Group and Policy Implications". Dr Peeling noted that this paper, to be presented by Mr Yacob Aklilu, from Tufts University, was commissioned by the Project with the aim of understanding the impact of the export trade in the pastoralists' area of the IGAD region. He said the paper examines the benefits derived from the livestock export trade from pastoral areas by wealth group, and helps to identify those groups (wealthier pastoralists or other actors) who are benefiting more from export trade. He also noted that the paper helps to understand the extent to which these wealth groups benefit from the export market and how livestock export systems can be justified in terms of reducing pastoral poverty or vulnerability. He then invited Mr Yacob Aklilu to make his presentation.

Working paper 2: Livestock Exports from Pastoralist Areas (Mr Aklilu)

Having illustrated the methodology and the purpose of the study, Mr Yacob Aklilu highlighted the fact that the study revealed that livestock export systems are driving some people into poverty. He said the export trading system in the pastoralist areas compelled many people to sell their livestock and leave their place for search of jobs. As a result, he said, significant numbers of pastoralists were obliged to seek non-livestock economic opportunities available in these areas.

Mentioning that the paper has included field researches in pastoral areas of Ethiopia, Kenya and the Sudan in 2009, Mr Aklilu revealed that at the level of national poverty assessments, pastoralist areas can be characterized as universally poor; and yet concepts of vulnerability and risk in pastoral areas are not well captured or understood by policy makers. He further noted that the dominant policy narrative within some donors and governments promotes vibrant export markets with the belief that they were benefiting all actors. Additionally, he mentioned that the study revealed that while the livestock export trade from the region continues to grow, so do levels of pastoralist destitution. So that, he remarked, a more poverty-focused approach in pastoralist areas would explicitly recognize and support a strategy of herd growth for poorer households. He pointed out that the elements of such a strategy would emphasize on the following: developing the infrastructure (secondary roads)

and communications (mobile phone networks) in pastoral areas; financing poorer herders; preventing avoidable livestock losses through clear policy support of primary veterinary service, etc.

Thanking both presenters, the Chairperson then opened the floor for comments and questions on the two presentations.

Discussion on the presentations of the two working papers

Dr Otte opened the discussion with a series of questions to the presenters. He asked whether pro-poor policy making would be the only and feasible option to address the problems of livestock keepers. He also wanted to understand whether or not governments would be able to support all livestock keepers in the same manner and magnitude; and whether they should look to other sectors outside of the livestock sector for livelihoods and job creation for the poor. In addition, he asked why the livestock sector is not a credible resource for micro-credits; and what other means the livestock keepers had to get micro credits. Dr Jutzi also inquired what was being done at IGAD Secretariat and member states to maximize the role of livestock to reduce poverty. Responding to the questions and suggestions raised, Mr Yacob Aklilu noted that it would be very difficult for governments and donors to support all pastoralists at the same time and in the same manner. It would thus be recommended to look for the best alternative strategy to sustain the livelihoods of the poor, such as small-scale business. Dr Ashley, on his part, suggested that there would be hardly any other viable strategy, outside of livestock, which could work for pastoral communities, because livestock glued so many resources that support their livelihoods. In order to obtain credit livestock was still the only option for collateral and other requirements. He however observed that there was need for a balanced strategy to maximize the roles of livestock in supporting the national economy without violating the interests of the small holders. Dr Ashley further noted that in order for governments to decide on policy issues and come up with balanced policy instruments, they needed to understand the issues of livelihoods and lifestyles, markets, and other elements that impact on a community.

With these comments and deliberations, Dr Zziwa invited Dr Peeling to review the main issues raised during the 5th SCM.

Accordingly, Dr Peeling summarized the main issues discussed in the Meeting and read out the agreed recommendations of the 5th SCM (Please see Annex A on page 32 for Recommendations of the SCM).

CLOSE OF MEETING

In closing, the Chairperson thanked all participants for exerting maximum effort to make the 5th SCM a success. He also thanked the Djibouti Republic for hosting the Meeting. He then invited Dr Jutzi to say a few words. Dr Jutzi, on behalf of FAO, expressed his appreciation to IGAD, Project staff, SCM participants, and donors, for their relentless effort to drive the livestock agenda forward and for making the sector more poverty focused. Congratulating the Project again for getting the RPF signed by government ministers, he illustrated why he considered the SCM had been very useful: (i) the IGAD region was rich in livestock and had a large population which was dependent on livestock; (ii) the Project focus was on policy and institutions, rather than technologies; (iii) the policies were focusing on livelihoods of the poor; (iv) the Project was regional whereby the practice of countries could be synergised; (v) IGAD Secretariat was taking up responsibility to press on with the livestock agenda; and (vi) the people who engaged in these tasks were very concerned with livestock and livelihoods.

With this remark of Dr Jutzi, The Chairperson, on behalf of IGAD Secretariat, concluded the 5th SCM by thanking the Chief Technical Advisor of the Project, the Project team, and all participants and presenters for a successful SCM.

The Meeting was concluded at 17:30.

ANNEX A: SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 5TH SCM

1. The Steering Committee extends its congratulations to the Project management on the results achieved over the reporting period and in particular the agreement of the regional policy framework on animal health in the context of trade and vulnerability. It also congratulates the collaborating, national teams for the role they have played in the progress that has been achieved.
2. In any future work plans it encourages the Project to continue to structure proposed activities around outcomes in support of Project results.
3. Article 5 of the Regional Policy Framework on Animal Health in the Context of Trade and Vulnerability relates the establishment of a livestock unit by IGAD. The Steering Committee suggests the IGAD ES request IGAD LPI to assess the options for setting up the IGAD Livestock Unit. The ES may issue an official, written communication designating IGAD LPI as an integral part of the IGAD Secretariat charged with assessing the options for setting up the livestock unit and with assuming responsibilities in the interim.
4. The Steering Committee would like to express its disappointment and concern with the poor progress in securing funding for IGAD's livestock agenda. The ES is requested to secure follow up funding as soon as possible. Among his approaches to donors the Committee believes he may propose to the IRCC that funding is made available under the 10th EDF. The ES is encouraged to request IGAD LPI to propose/draft specific elements of his communication with donors to make sure IGAD's livestock agenda is adequately resourced.
5. The Steering Committee reaffirms that pro-poor policy capacity needs to be emphasised in future institutional strengthening activities of the Project and in the establishment of the livestock unit.
6. The Steering Committee further requests the Project to work with the Region's ministries responsible for livestock to ensure that their areas of operation enable them to respond to the diverse roles of livestock in the livelihoods of the livestock dependent poor.
7. The Steering Committee recognises the important role that the Policy Hubs play in advising ministerial decisions and therefore recommends the Project enters into dialogue with the ministries to more closely define the ToR for the Policy Hubs, ensuring that the hubs' role is seen to be delivering balanced, representative analysis of issues to their ministers and other decision makers, coupled to recommendations where appropriate.
8. The Steering Committee recommends that over the course of the implementation period member states develop plans for the institutionalisation of the Policy Hubs,

Working Groups and Information Nodes, and share them with other member states at an appropriate meeting to be hosted by the project.

9. The SCM endorses the project's work plan proposed under both scenario 1 (end date late 2011) and scenario 2 (end date August 2010) depending on the availability of funds. It accepts the need for flexibility in the work plan's final design in the light of available funds, but places emphasis on:
 - Maintaining momentum and morale among national partners,
 - Establishing the Livestock Unit in IGAD;
 - The implementation of an exit strategy if necessary.
10. The Steering Committee recognises the importance of the National Information Nodes and their support to evidence-based policy making, but notes the need for the Project to maintain funding for the running of the Nodes contrary to the terms of the Memoranda of Understanding. It therefore urges all member states to make provision in their budgets to assume financial responsibility for running the nodes. In the case of Somalia, the Committee acknowledges that special provisions may have to be made.
11. If the Project is successful in accessing further funding, the Steering Committee recommends that its next meeting be held in December 2010.

ANNEX B: AGENDA

Agenda of the 5th IGAD LPI Steering Committee Meeting 18th - 20th January 2010, Republic of Djibouti

Day 1	Monday 18 January	
18:00	Arrival of Participants	
18:30	Cocktail & Opening Addresses	IGAD LPI Team
Day 2	Tuesday 19 January	
09:00 - 09:30	Welcome, introductions	Chair
09:30 - 9:45	Overview of Key Issues to be Addressed	Dil Peeling
9:45 - 10:30	Report on 2009 The Project Purpose	Dil Peeling
10:30 - 11:00	Break	
11:00 - 12:30	Report on 2009 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results 1 & 3 • Results 2 & 4 • Discussion 	Abdi Jama Otieno Mtula
12:30 - 13:00	Report on Progress Against Recommendations of 4 th SCM	Dil Peeling
13:00 - 14:15	Lunch	
14:15 - 15:45	Workplan 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview • Specific Activities • Discussion 	IGAD LPI Team
15:45 - 16:00	Break	
16:00 - 16:30	Work plan 2010 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications Strategy • Discussion 	Abebe Demissie
19:00	Welcome dinner	IGAD LPI Team

Day 3	Wednesday 20 th January	
09:00 - 10:00	Poverty Focussed Policies - Presentations of LPI working papers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Livestock Related Livelihoods and Institutions in the IGAD Region. Livestock export, trade and the poor. 	Steve Ashley Yacob Aklilu
10:00 - 10:30	Break	
10:30 - 11:15	Discussion of working papers	Dil Peeling
11.15 - 12:30	Review of Main Issues Discussion	Dil Peeling Chair
13:00 - 14:15	Lunch	
14:15 - 15:30	Steering Committee Recommendations	Chair
15:30 - 15:45	Next Steering Committee Meeting and Close	Chair
15:45	Coffee	

ANNEX C: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Intervention logic	OVis	MoV	Assumptions
Overall objective			
Enhanced contribution of the livestock sector to sustainable food security and poverty reduction in the IGAD region	<p>Incidence of poverty and food insecurity among livestock dependent people reduced by 10% by 2010</p> <p>Livestock sector growth is larger than overall economic growth</p>	<p>National poverty surveys National health statistics</p> <p>National economic indicators</p>	
Project purpose			Project purpose to overall objective
Strengthened capacity in IGAD, member states, other regional organizations and other stakeholders to formulate and implement livestock sector and related policies that sustainably reduce food insecurity and poverty.	<p>Documented link between policies affecting the livestock sector and poverty reduction, and evidence of effective stakeholder representation in IGAD member states by 2008</p> <p>Detailed implementation plans for selected policies in IGAD member states by 2008</p> <p>Information system for measuring policy impact in IGAD Secretariat and member states by 2008</p>	<p>Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs)</p> <p>Regional development initiatives (e.g. NEPAD)</p> <p>National economic development plans</p> <p>Policy impact assessments</p>	<p>Political agendas do not restrict regional integration</p> <p>Competing policy priorities do not reduce political will to implement pro-poor policies at regional and national levels</p> <p>Diverging interests of essential partners do not constrain collaboration</p> <p>There is adequate institutional capacity for pro-poor policy implementation and stakeholder representation at regional and national levels</p>

Intervention logic	OVis	MoV	Assumptions
Results			Results to project purpose
1. Increased awareness by public, private, and tertiary sector organizations of the potential contribution of livestock and the livestock sector to growth, food security and poverty reduction	IGAD and stakeholders are actively promoting identified pro-poor livestock-related policy and institutional options in the region by 2008	<p>Press reviews</p> <p>Minute of IGAD ministerial meetings</p> <p>PRSPs and government reports</p> <p>Report of Steering Committee meetings and external reviews</p>	Stakeholder participation and enhanced access to information and decision-support tools are sufficient to ensure the formulation of appropriate policies and institutional changes
2. Policy options and implementation strategies for enhanced livestock sector contribution to growth, food security and poverty reduction identified	<p>Importance of livestock acknowledged in the PRSP processes of 2 countries by 2008</p> <p>National livestock strategies in place in 2 countries by 2008</p>	<p>PRSPs and government reports</p> <p>Project reports</p> <p>Public, private, and tertiary sector organizations strategic plans</p> <p>Approved project documents and financing agreements</p>	
3. Systems in place for livestock policy information, analysis, decision-support and monitoring of policy change	<p>Policy makers and other key stakeholders actively seek information and use tools generated by the project in policy formulation and in preparation of PRSPs by 2008</p> <p>Appropriate indicators identified for monitoring policy change by 2007</p>	<p>Statistics on numbers of website visitors and requests for tools and information</p> <p>PRSPs and government reports</p> <p>Project reports</p>	
4. Networks of professional and grassroots organizations established and/or reinforced for effective stakeholder representation in the negotiation of policies and institutional changes that better support poor people's livestock-dependent livelihoods	At least 10 organizations / networks participating in the policy formulation process in IGAD member states by 2008	<p>Distribution lists of pro-poor livestock policy networks</p> <p>Reports of stakeholder meetings and workshops</p> <p>Records of attendance of stakeholder representatives at policy debates</p>	

Intervention logic		Assumptions
Activities		Activities to results
<p>1.1 Develop understanding of the role of the livestock sector in food security, livelihood strategies, poverty reduction and economic development</p> <p>1.2 Compile inventories of existing policies, rules and standards and determine their effect on different strata of livestock-dependent people</p> <p>1.3 Develop and implement targeted public relations strategies</p> <p>2.1 Conduct sector reviews and institutional analyses</p> <p>2.2 Analyze and debate policy options</p> <p>2.3 Identify policy and institutional measures to improve the performance of livestock service providers</p> <p>2.4 Identify policy and institutional measures to enhance marketing of livestock and livestock products within and outside the region</p> <p>2.5 Assist IGAD to determine regional early response mechanisms to drought and disease</p> <p>3.1 Identify information needs and uptake pathways of stakeholders in the policy process</p> <p>3.2 Establish systems for data and knowledge collection, processing and dissemination</p> <p>3.3 Develop and adapt decision support tools to guide policy formulation, and build capacity in their use</p> <p>3.4 Identify and monitor indicators of policy change at different levels</p> <p>4.1 Support the establishment and/or development of professional and grassroots organizations and facilitate their participation in livestock policy processes</p> <p>4.2 Facilitate regional representation at international policy fora</p> <p>4.3 Identify training needs and build capacity to enable stakeholders to become effective in livestock policy processes</p>	<p>Inputs: total budget:</p> <p>€ 5,489,945</p> <p>Means of Verification</p> <p>Six-monthly financial reports</p> <p>Work plan reviews</p> <p>Project evaluations</p>	<p>Sufficient financial support is secured for activities at national and regional levels</p> <p>Core staff continuity</p> <p>Pledged funds are disbursed as agreed</p> <p>Diverging interests of essential internal and external partners do not constrain collaboration</p>

ANNEX D: INDICATIVE COSTING OF THE WORKPLAN 2010

Indicative Costing: Scenario 2 - end date August 2010

NO.	ACTIVITIES	COST \$\$
1	GDP Study (2 countries)	29,000.00
2	Training - Evidence Based Policy Making	42,000.00
3	Training - Webportal Mgt and Intermediate GIS	22,000.00
4	National Information Round Table	34,000.00
5	Capacity for Early Warning	52,500.00
6	Consultant support - Gender	5,000.00
7	Consultant Support - International Trade Law	5,000.00
8	Consultant Support - Spatial Data (RCMRD)	6,000.00
9	Consultant Support - Information System	15,000.00
10	Review of Policy Hubs	19,000.00
11	Institutional Review of IGAD	13,000.00
12	Communication	50,000.00
TOTAL		292,500.00

Indicative Costing: Scenario 1 - end date Mid/Late 2011

NO.	ACTIVITIES 2010	COST \$\$
1	GDP Study (4 countries)	70,000.00
2	Training - International Trade	42,000.00
3	Training - Webportal Mgt and Intermediate GIS	22,000.00
4	National Information Round Table	34,000.00
5	Regulation/Training of Paraprofessionals	52,000.00
6	Disease Constraints of Poor	50,000.00
7	Capacity for Early Warning	52,500.00
8	Consultant support - Gender	5,000.00
9	Consultant Support - International Trade Law	5,000.00
10	Consultant Support - Spatial Data (RCMRD)	6,000.00
11	Consultant Support - Information System	15,000.00
12	Review of Policy Hubs	19,000.00
13	Institutional Review of IGAD	13,000.00
14	Communication	62,000.00
TOTAL		448,000.00

ANNEX E: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS OF THE 5TH IGAD LPI SCM

Secretariat		
Chairperson	Dr. Samuel Zziwa Programme Manager for Agriculture, Livestock and Food Security, IGAD Secretariat, Djibouti, Republic of Djibouti	samuel.zziwa@igad.int Off. +253 356452 Fax. +253 353520
Secretary	Dr. Dil Peeling Chief Technical Advisor, IGAD LPI, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia	d.peeling@cgiar.org Off. +251 116172000 Ext. 2573 Cell. +251 913 200895 Fax. +251 116 172001
IGAD Member States		
Djibouti	Dr. Ahmed Darar Djibril Technical Adviser to the Minister, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and the Sea, Djibouti, Republic of Djibouti	ministereagriculture@yahoo.fr or djidarar@hotmail.com Off. + 253 351 297 Cell. +253 845 776
Kenya	Dr. Abdulahi O. Ismael Deputy Director of Livestock Production Ministry of Livestock Development, Nairobi, Kenya	Off. +254 20 2722601 Fax. +254 20 2728609
Somalia	Dr. Abdirahman Nur Qeiliye Director General, Ministry of Livestock, Fisheries and Environment, Somalia	garish01@hotmail.com Off. +252 151 32463 Cell. +254 729 375810
Sudan	Dr. Kamal Tagelsir Elsheikh Director, International Relations Department, Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries, Khartoum, the Sudan	ktagelsir11@yahoo.com Off. +249 926 448513
Other Organisations		
AU	Dr. Nouala Simplicie Animal Resource Officer, AU-IBAR, Nairobi, Kenya	nouala.simplice@au-ibar.org Off. +254 20 367 4000 Cell. +254 724 016 522 Fax. +254 20 367 4341
EU	Mr. Juan Villa Chacon Rural Development Program Manager, EU Delegation, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia	Juan.Chacon@ec.europa.eu Off. + 251 0116 612 511 Ex. 247 Cell. +251 0912 745329 Fax. +251 116 612877
FAO	Dr. Samuel Jutzi Director, FAO-AGA, Rome, Italy	samuel.jutzi@fao.org Off. +39 06 570 53371
Observers		
FAO-PPLPI	Dr. Tim Robinson Information Officer, FAO/PPLPI, Budget holder, IGAD LPI, FAO, Rome, Italy	tim.robinson@fao.org Off. +39 06 570 54901 Cell. +39 340 858 5102 Fax. +39 06 5705 5749
FAO-PPLPI	Dr. Joachim Otte Coordinator, FAO/PPLPI	Joachim.Otte@fao.org Off. +39 06 5705 3634

	Rome, Italy	Cell. +39 340 699 9736
Presenters		
Tufts University	Mr. Yacob Aklilu Senior Researcher/Policy Advisor Feinstein International Center Tufts University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia	yaklilu@ethionet.et Off. 251 0 11 662 6333 Cell. 251 0 911 208 073
theIDLgroup	Dr. Steve Ashley Principal Consultant and Director, The IDL Group, Bristol, England	steve.ashley@theidlgroup.com Off. +44 1603 508456 +44 1934 864266 (via IDL) Cell. +44 7867 977505
Participants		
FAO IGAD LPI	Dr. Abdi Jama Livestock Information Officer Addis Ababa, Ethiopia	a.jama@cgiar.org Off. +251 116 172000 Ext. 2574 Cell. +251 912 056713 Fax. +251 116 172001
	Dr. Otieno Mtula Livestock Policy Advisor Addis Ababa, Ethiopia	o.mtula@cgiar.org Off. +251 116 172000 Ext. 2575 Cell. +251 912 056714 Fax. +251 116 172001
	Mr. Abebe Demissie Communications Officer Addis Ababa, Ethiopia	a.demissie@cgiar.org Off. +251 116 172000 Ext. 2571 Cell. +251 911 661257 Fax. +251 116 172001
	Ms. Mekdim A. Ketsela Personal Assistant to the CTA Addis Ababa, Ethiopia	m.ketsela@cgiar.org Off. +251 116 172000 Ext. 2576 Cell. +251 911 218090 Fax. +251 116 172001

ANNEX F: EC/FAO VISIBILITY CAMPAIGN

Since September 2006, the Knowledge and Communication Department of FAO implements a visibility campaign, advocating the strong and growing co-operation between the EC and FAO, as laid down in the Strategic Partnership concluded between EC and FAO in 2004.

The UN and EC confirmed their commitment to communicating results of partnership through the Joint Visibility Action Plan of September 2006. As foreseen in the Action Plan, the EC and UN have undertaken to adopt joint visibility guidelines.

Presently in their final drafting stage, these guidelines outline a two-pronged approach to communication. While emphasizing the need for visibility-related actions to be incorporated in project work plans and budgets, the guidelines also provide for "wider communications" and envisage "to use the individual project communication and visibility budgets to put together a more comprehensive communication programme." (art. 2.3).

Accordingly, FAO's EC visibility campaign provides for actions at two different levels:

- i) "At" the project level, providing hands-on assistance to staff of EC-funded FAO projects in complying with EC visibility requirements;
- ii) "Above" the project level, communicating the added value of the strategic partnership between FAO and the EC to selected audiences.

In defining a consistent communication strategy, the campaign ensures that both levels are mutually reinforcing. Individual projects serve to illustrate the core message that partnership strengthens both organisations in helping developing countries alleviate rural poverty and hunger. At the same time, action above project level trickles down to projects, for example through worldwide distribution of promotional material and by largely expanding the audiences reached via media releases.

The EC/FAO visibility campaign is funded by all EC-funded FAO projects on a cost sharing basis with a maximum of US\$ 10,000 per project per year.

Results achieved "above" project level in 2007 include:

- EU/FAO calendar, distributed worldwide among EU/FAO partners;
- Public Service Announcement on EU/FAO partnership; placed on Al Jazeera, BBC World, CNN, Euronews, Deutsche Welle, RAI and others;
- Multimedia package for World Water Day, with Video News Release (VNR) aired through Reuters, APTN, Eurovision, UNIFEED, as well as radio feature, print feature, photo gallery;
- Booklet on EC/FAO cooperation "Success stories from inside poverty's door"
- Multi-media package on Cassava Mosaic Disease for the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, including 1 VNR, 2 audio features, 2 illustrated feature stories.