



**IGAD  
Livestock  
Policy  
Initiative**

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

**Naivasha, Kenya, 14-15 December, 2010**

## CONTENTS

ACRONYMS .....	3
OPENING SESSION .....	5
IGAD LPI: ACTIVITIES 2010 .....	6
Overview of the project and key issues (Dr Peeling).....	6
REINFORCING VETERINARY GOVERNANCE IN AFRICA.....	9
Overview of Veterinary Governance Project (Dr Simplicie) .....	9
ANNUAL REPORTS ON RESULT AREAS - 2010 .....	10
IGAD LPI: Results 4 and 2 (Dr Mtula) .....	10
IGAD LPI: Results 1 and 3 (Dr Jama).....	14
IGAD LPI Communication Strategy (Mr Abebe) .....	17
Discussion on the 2010 Report .....	18
REPORT ON THE 5 <sup>TH</sup> SCM .....	20
MEMBER STATES PRESENTATION ON SUSTAINABILITY OF INSTITUTIONS.....	21
Djibouti .....	21
Ethiopia.....	21
Kenya.....	22
The Sudan.....	23
Somalia.....	24
Uganda .....	24
Discussions on presentations of country teams .....	25
PRESENTATION ON THE CONTRIBUTION OF LIVESTOCK TO ETHIOPIA'S ECONOMY .....	27
PRESENTATIONS ON WORKPLAN 2011 .....	29
Annual workplan 2011 (Dr Peeling).....	29
Exit strategy for Result 3 (Dr Jama) .....	30
Programmes in Somalia (Dr Jama) .....	30
A Study on Livestock Contribution to National Economy in Kenya (Dr Jama) .....	31
A Programme on lesson learning (Dr Mtula).....	32
PRESENTATIONS ON 2011 BUDGET .....	33
Presentation on 2011 budget (Dr Peeling).....	33
Discussions on the 2010 budget proposal.....	33
CLOSE OF MEETING .....	34
ANNEX A: SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 6 <sup>TH</sup> SCM.....	35
ANNEX B: AGENDA .....	37
ANNEX C: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK.....	39
ANNEX D: INDICATIVE COSTING OF THE WORKPLAN 2011 .....	42
ANNEX E: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS OF THE 6 <sup>TH</sup> IGAD LPI SCM.....	43
ANNEX F: EC/FAO VISIBILITY CAMPAIGN .....	45

## ACRONYMS

ACP	African Caribbean and Pacific
AgSWG	Agricultural Sector Working Group
AHTPR	Animal Health for Trade and Poverty Reduction
ALive	Africa Livestock Development
APHRD	Animal and Plant Health Regulatory Directorate
ASCU	Agricultural Sector Coordination Unit
AU-IBAR	African Union - Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources
CA	Contribution Agreement
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Programme
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
CSO	Civil Society Organisations
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DSIP	Development Strategy and Investment Plan
EAC	East African Community,
EC	European Commission
EDF	European Development Fund
ERCs	Regional Economic Communities
ES	IGAD Executive Secretary
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nation
GDP	Gross Domestic Products
GTP	Growth and Transformation Plan
HSPS	Harmonisation of Standards on Paraveterinary Service
ICPALD	IGAD Centre for Pastoralism and Livestock Development
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute
KNBS	Kenyan National Bureau of Statistics
LPI	Livestock Policy Initiative
MAIF	Ministry of Animal Industries and Fisheries
MARF	Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
MoA	Ministry of Agriculture
MoFED	Ministry of Finance and Economic Development
MOL	Ministry of Livestock
MTR	Mid Term Review
NDP	National Development Plan
NINCs	National Information Node Coordinators
NINs	National Information Nodes
NP	National Planning

NPFS	National Program of Food Security
NSC	National Steering Committee
OIE	Office International des Epizooties (World Organization for Animal Health)
PEAP	Poverty Eradication Action Plan
PESP	Poverty Eradication Strategy Paper
PH	Policy Hub
PPLPI	Pro Poor Livestock Policy Initiative
PRSPs	Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers
RDFS	Rural Development and Food Security
REOA	FAO Sub-Regional Emergency Office for Eastern and Central Africa
RPF	Regional Policy Framework on Animal Health in the Context of Trade and Vulnerability
SCM	Steering Committee Meeting
SOLISCOF	Somali Livestock Stakeholders Coordination Forum
STVS	Sheikh Technical Veterinary School
TFG	Transitional Federal Government of Somalia
TMM	Top Management Meeting
TWGs	Technical Working Groups

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

Tuesday 14, December 2010

**OPENING SESSION**

The 6<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee Meeting (SCM) of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development Livestock Policy Initiative (IGAD LPI) was formally opened and chaired by Mr Maina Karaba, Acting Director for Agriculture and Environment at the IGAD Secretariat. Welcoming all present to the meeting, Mr Karaba noted that it was a great honour for him to chair this important meeting and confirmed that he would deliver the recommendations of the meeting to the IGAD Secretariat.

He then invited the participants to introduce themselves. Following the introduction, Mr Karaba recognised the presence of Dr Ahmed Darar Djibril, SC member for Djibouti, Dr Alemayehu Mekonnen, representing Dr Berhe Gebre-Egziabher, SC member for Ethiopia, Mr Abdullahi O. Esmail representing Dr Julius Kiptarus, SC member for Kenya, Dr Abdirahman Nur Qeyliye, SC member for Somalia, Dr Kamal Tagelsir Elsheikh, SC member for the Sudan, Dr. Nicholas Kauta, SC member for Uganda, and Dr Dil Peeling, Chief Technical Adviser of IGAD LPI and Secretary of the meeting, and confirmed that a quorum was present to allow the meeting to proceed.

He also recognised the presence of two representatives from FAO Headquarters, Dr Samuel Jutzi, Director of Animal Production and Health Division at the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nation (UN-FAO), and Dr Tim Robinson, IGAD LPI Budget Holder. He also recognised the presence of 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 Simplicie Nouala, from the African Union Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) also representing the Partnership for Africa Livestock Development (ALive) Secretariat and Dr Herve Delsol, from Rural Development and Food Security Section of the Delegation of the European Union (EU) to Ethiopia, and officer responsible for IGAD LPI and Natural Disaster Facility.

Mr Karaba then proposed the meeting adopt the draft Agenda, which the meeting adopted by endorsement with some modifications on the timetable of the presentations, where Dr Simplicie was permitted to give his presentation following Dr Peeling's introductory note on project purpose and key issues. Consequently, the chairperson requested Dr Herve Delsol and Dr Samuel Jutzi to make opening remarks.

Appreciating the achievements so far attained by IGAD LPI, Dr Delsol noted that the remaining one year will be much more important than those before for both the project and EU as it would be a period when key lessons would be captured, consolidated and disseminated to key stakeholders. Dr Jutzi also remarked that the

project had achieved tangible results which IGAD could extend to push the livestock agenda further and deeper with the aim of addressing poverty and food insecurity in the region.

Following the remarks, the chairperson invited Dr Dil Peeling to speak on the project purpose of IGAD LPI and key issues.

## IGAD LPI: ACTIVITIES 2010

### Overview of the project and key issues (Dr Peeling)

Dr Peeling started by pointing out that his presentation would first briefly highlight the purpose, models and working principles of IGAD LPI (hereinafter the project), and would proceed to present the key aspects of project activities since the fifth SCM that was held in January 2010 in Djibouti, Republic of Djibouti; and the rest of the project 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 discussions on sustainability of institutions, which the project established in IGAD member states; as well as the work plan for 2011 and issues related to project funding.

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 organisations and other stakeholders to formulate and implement livestock sector and related policies that sustainably reduce poverty and food insecurity. To achieve this, Dr Peeling said, the project implemented a model which is peculiar to the project in formulating and implementing pro-poor policies in the livestock sector. He stressed that the Policy Hub (PH) in each member country lies at the heart of the working model, where the policy process is based on “learning by doing”.

Dr Peeling noted that PHs constitute technical and policy-oriented people from government, non-government and civil society organisations (CSOs), as well as from the private sector and women’s associations. The PHs are operating based on the information and policy analysis they obtain from the Technical Working Groups (TWGs) and National Information Nodes (NINs). He explained that while the TWGs are the engines, the NINs are the brains of the policy debates in the PHs.

Dr Peeling underlined the fact that the project has been building the capacity to formulate and implement livestock policies that address the needs of poor livestock keepers across the IGAD region. Through organizational learning, he noted, the project underpinned the capacity building model of “learning by doing” to enable members of the policy forums analyse and fully comprehend the underlying constraints that affect the poor livestock keepers; as well as bring into light innovative policy remedies to those constraints. He explained that the project tried

to build organizations in a way that these organizations could do things differently with the vibrant participation of all relevant stakeholders.

He further pointed out that the policy debates in the PHs had contributed to the formulation of the Regional Policy Framework on Animal Health in the Context of Trade and Vulnerability (RPF). Apart from this, he noted, the PHs have been engaged in the policy process to raise the profile of livestock in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) in their respective countries. In addition, he remarked the level of engagement and the outcome of the PHs had varied from country to country because of a number of factors, including the level of institutionalisation, involvement of CSOs in the PHs and the culture of conducting a successful meeting.

Dr Peeling further explained that, at the national level, the “pro-poor policy making” model has been in place in all capacity building areas, which inform the livestock policies to be livelihoods-focused, participatory and evidence-based. He said that the project advocated the principle of “livelihoods-focused” on the ground that livestock are so imperative for the poor in improving their living standards. Unlike the wealthy livestock keepers and traders, he said, the poor men and women keep livestock for food, saving, income for health and education, absorbing shocks, social capital, as well as for sources of energy and means of transport. He noted that if the interests of governments in the IGAD region are poverty reduction and food security at grassroots level, then livestock stand as a viable sector to achieve these goals. However, he noted, this can only be achieved by formulating and implementing workable pro-poor livestock policies which address the challenges that the poor men and women encounter. He stressed that it is with this notion that the project advocates pro-poor policy making; not from the point of view of opposing the principles which promote trade and marketing of livestock and livestock products, which is encouraged by governments. He further noted that even if the philosophy behind the pro-poor policy making has been gaining ground within the policy forums, it would require more efforts to get policy makers to fully understand and accept it.

In addition, Dr Peeling explained that the project has also advocated full participation of poor men and women, through CSOs, in policy debates so that policies could be effective in resolving the constraints of the poor. In this respect, he noted, the project has achieved some results by improving the number and intensity of participation of women and the CSOs in some countries. In terms of evidence based policy process, he stressed the fact that policies which are based on evidence could help governments to address key constraints of the poor livestock keepers. In this regard, he reported, the project has already deployed and run the livestock data and information portal which has been populated and maintained by the National Information Node Coordinators (NINCs) with the overall support of the project.

With regard to Somalia, Dr Peeling informed the meeting that the project has already established was for each of the three entities, i.e. Somaliland, Somali

Transitional Government (TFG) and Puntland. Though the project implemented a slightly different model for Somalia, he said, the PHs are operating well and the composition of the PHs would be improved in due course with better representation of women. He further noted that the establishment of NINs in the three entities, operating through the Sheikh Technical Veterinary School (STVS), was being carried out intensively.

In general, at national level, Dr Peeling remarked the performance of country teams has been so encouraging that the cohesion and momentum of policy debates have been maturing overtime. Dr Peeling however pointed out that despite considerable efforts by the project to keep the country structures going, there had been challenges in some countries to ensure an active participation of CSOs and women in policy debates.

Turning his attention to the intervention made at regional level, Dr Peeling pointed out that the establishment of the IGAD Centre for Pastoralism and Livestock Development (ICPALD) had been central to the project's plans for sustainability. With this in mind, he said, the project commissioned a consultancy in April 2010 that documented lessons learned from the establishment and institutional arrangements of other IGAD specialised agencies. Consequently, he noted, based on the findings of the institutional review, the IGAD Executive Secretary (ES) asked for a road map to be drawn for the establishment of the centre, and the ES also set up a committee to realise the road map. Ultimately, Dr Peeling said, it was clear that the establishment of the centre was beyond the management of the project. Dr Peeling then advised the SC members to look into the implication of all these issues on the 2011 workplan and strategy of the project.

Recalling the recommendations of the 5<sup>th</sup> SCM, Dr Peeling highlighted the fact that the project would continue to work on institutionalisation of the PHs and NINs in each country in 2011. He pointed out that country teams would be focusing on tasks that raise the profile of the livestock sector in PRSPs. In addition, he said, activities linked to Disaster Risk Management (DRM); the Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP); capturing and disseminating lesson-learning; and strengthening the technical teams in Somalia would be the key areas which would take up much of the resources.

Thanking Dr Peeling for his comprehensive report, the chairperson invited Dr Nouala Simplice, Senior Animal Resource Officer at African Union, Inter-Africa Bureau for Animal Resources to make his presentation on a new project of Veterinary Governance.

## REINFORCING VETERINARY GOVERNANCE IN AFRICA

### Overview of Veterinary Governance Project (Dr Simplicé)

Dr Nouala Simplicé started his presentation by recalling what Dr Peeling had remarked earlier in his presentation, in which Dr Peeling mentioned that livestock profile had always been low in government planning and budgeting in all IGAD member states; even though the contribution of livestock for the overall economy and food security had been significantly high. Against this background, Dr Simplicé said the new project, which he was about to introduce, would improve this scenario through better veterinary governance systems. Dr Simplicé mentioned that the project has a stated objective of *"improving the institutional environment at national and regional levels to provide effective and efficient animal health services in Africa"* and would encompass 47 African Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries and 7 Regional Economic Communities (ERCs). He said the project will commence on early 2011 and the main expected outcomes would be policies & strategies that foster effective and efficient animal health services in the continent. He said the project would commence on three levels of interventions covering advocacy, awareness rising, and capacity building for formulation and implementation of policies, strategies, and legislations. Additionally, Dr Simplicé informed the meeting that while Office International des Epizooties (World Organization for Animal Health - OIE) would be in charge of quality control on PVS pathway and capacity building on veterinary legislation, FAO would be in charge of support to policy analysis and strengthening regional networks; and AU-IBAR would be responsible for the overall coordination, support to RECs, inter regional harmonisation and advocacy and awareness. Finally, he remarked that AU-IBAR has no intention to create new institutions from scratch; rather it would prefer to build on what has been already laid down in all RECs.

Following his brief presentation, the chairperson invited the meeting to pose questions to Dr Simplicé on the presentation.

Accordingly, Dr Samuel Zziwa inquired whether AU-IBAR has already developed a regional workplan for the project. Dr Abdirahman Nur Qeiliye asked if AU-IBAR had discussed the objectives and themes of the project with member countries. Dr Samuel Jutzi also commented on that he was very much encouraged to observe that this project has so much in common with IGAD LPI, and it would be a great opportunity for the new project to build upon what has already been achieved by IGAD LPI.

In response to the questions and comments raised by participants, Dr Simplicé informed the meeting that the contract agreement will be signed among AU-IBAR, donors and other implementing parties in the near future and then RECs would be able to call their member states for a meeting to work on the detailed workplans. Initially, he remarked, AU-IBAR has intensively discussed the concept notes with national team members and left the detailed workplan to be worked out by RECs.

Dr Simplicite finally noted that the project objective and models were highly similar to those of IGAD LPI and eventually it would be possible to fully utilise the PHs and NINs created by IGAD LPI in all IGAD member states.

Thanking Dr Simplicite for his timely presentation, the chairperson remarked that there appeared a lot of complementarities between this project and IGAD LPI and hence IGAD would be in a good position to implement the new project. With this remark, the chairperson invited Dr Otieno Mtula, Dr Abdi Jama, and Mr Abebe Demissie to present the performance report for the year 2010 in their respective areas.

## ANNUAL REPORTS ON RESULT AREAS - 2010

### IGAD LPI: Results 4 and 2 (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 fourth output 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*". In order to fully achieve this objective, he said, the project has been focusing on the establishment and institutionalisation of the PHs, TWGs and NINs.

With respect to the establishment and composition of PHs, Dr Mtula informed the meeting that networks were established in the form of multi-stakeholder policy fora or PHs in 2009 with the prime tasks of formulating and implementing pro-poor livestock policies. Since then, Dr Mtula said, the focus of the project has been on strengthening the PHs. In so doing, he recalled, the representation of stakeholder groups, particularly those who can articulate the voice of poor men and women livestock keepers was identified by IGAD LPI regional workshops as a cornerstone for effective policy making. Dr Mtula asserted that this conclusion was supported by the recent FAO review of 12 policy support projects, in consultation with 25 development agencies. He further noted that the PHs are structured to allow broad representation of CSOs and the process was monitored for its inclusiveness. Through the work of the PHs, he said, the value of broad participation had become self evident. He however explained that achieving genuine participation had provided challenges in all countries, often for different reasons such as difficulty in identifying such groups, in bringing them to the table, in agreeing who can genuinely represent the needs of poorer livestock keepers, in allowing them space within policy debates, etc. Furthermore, he noted, the increased emphasis of the project on gender had led country teams to review the depth of representation of women and their level of participation in their PHs, which was improving in all countries. In addition, inventories of NGOs and CBOs had been undertaken in all

member states and the representation of these groups in the PHs had subsequently improved.

With respect to the institutionalisation of PHs and NINs, Dr Mtula informed the meeting that, at the technical level, the foundations had been built to develop a new generation of poverty focussed livestock policies in the region and that the institutions and processes put in place by the project provided an opportunity to do this. He confirmed that as the project approaches its final year of implementation, it had generated a momentum which would outlive the Initiative itself. He mentioned the driving forces for this momentum as follows:

- (i) the aspirations of IGAD LPI's multi-stakeholder fora, which are hosted by the ministries responsible for livestock in all member states and which have now become influential in government;
- (ii) expectations of stakeholders to the livestock sector, not least the governments of the member states themselves, who have benefited from project generated skills and awareness;
- (iii) explicit statements of political will from ministers in the livestock sector and beyond; and
- (iv) the signed RPF and the agenda which it calls upon IGAD to implement.

Dr Mtula noted that the progress that had been made indicated that the capacities the project had put in place were appropriate and sufficient for the task at hand. However, as yet, substantial resources had not been allocated to put those capacities to work in addressing the policies themselves on a large scale. He pointed out that this fact and the calls from the Mid Term Review (MTR) of IGAD LPI echoed the need for the sustainability of the PHs and NINs beyond the lifetime of the project. Similarly, he said, the 5th Steering Committee Meeting of IGAD LPI also instructed member states to *"...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."* He added that since IGAD LPI scheduled to end in February 2012, it would be important to ensure that the PHs and NINs are sustainable.

Turning his attention to the OVI of result number 4, which reads as, *"At least 10 organisations / networks participating in the policy formulation process in IGAD member states by 2008"*, Dr Mtula reconfirmed that this OVI had been achieved for some time now. During the period of implementation, he remarked, the project had deepened and broadened the participation of stakeholder groups in policy dialogues and looked at sustainably institutionalising them within national decision making.

Continuing 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"*, Dr Mtula informed the

meeting that much of the project's support to such policy options and investment opportunities would be reported by Dr Abdi Jama under Result 1. He however mentioned that the other principal policy focus of the project had been RPF, signed by ministers in December 2009, which identified several policy areas that would require further elaboration even beyond the lifetime of IGAD LPI. He remarked that due to budgetary constraints, activities in this field would be modest until IGAD further identifies resources for its regional livestock agenda, presumably after IGAD LPI's implementation phase. He then listed the three possible areas of engagement which were approved by the SCM in January 2010 as follows:

- I. the establishment of ICPALD;
- II. the harmonisation of standards for paraveterinary service providers; and
- III. the development of mechanisms for Disaster Risk Management (DRM) at regional level.

Starting with the establishment of ICPALD, Dr Mtula noted that Article 5 of the RPF called for the establishment of the Livestock centre and the project had placed particular emphasis on this in its work plan elaborating/implementing the RPF. To this end, IGAD LPI put in place a consultancy to document lessons learned from the establishment and institutional arrangements of other IGAD specialised agencies. Dr Mtula informed the meeting that the report from this consultancy was delivered on time and laid the foundations for subsequent activities which included the ES inviting IGAD member states to nominate representatives for the establishment of a committee, on which Dr Dil Peeling would sit, to spearhead the process of establishing the centre. Dr Mtula noted that in this regard, IGAD LPI would subsequently not be in a position to manage the pace of the establishment of the centre as the committee was now responsible for its establishment. Nonetheless, Dr Mtula pointed out that IGAD LPI, through the CTA, would work closely with the consultant to push forward the delivery of the centre and to ensure that the regional dimensions of IGAD LPI particularly the RPF are taken up by the centre.

Turning his attention to the harmonisation of standards for Paraveterinary Service Providers, Dr Mtula informed the meeting that based on Article 3 of the RPF, the project was willing to implement this activity but, due to funding constraints, the project intended to shelve the implementation of this activity either indefinitely or, if funding becomes available, until 2011 as stipulated in the workplan.

Finally, Dr Mtula informed the meeting that responding to Article 1 of the RPF, the project had supported the FAO Sub-Regional Emergency Office for Eastern and Central Africa (REOA) in the design of a 3 year European Commission (EC) funded project in the field of Disaster Risk Management (DRM) called "Regional Initiative in Support of Vulnerable Pastoralists and Agro-pastoralists in the Horn of Africa" which was now operational. Its overall objective is to contribute to reduced vulnerability of (agro) pastoral communities in the Horn of Africa and the specific objective is to strengthen institutional and policy frameworks affecting the resilience of (agro) pastoral communities and the diversification of their livelihoods. IGAD LPI is

specifically collaborating on Result 3 of the project which is Regional policies and institutions developed in support of pastoralist livelihoods. IGAD LPI would further engage with this project in 2011, which would require the recruitment of consultants and the convening of policy hub and working group meetings.

Dr Mtula also informed the meeting that the collaborative task of mapping policies and institutions in the IGAD region with AU-IBAR was now ongoing. A variety of studies, including some commissioned by IGAD LPI, continually point at the multiplicity of international, regional, national and local policies and institutions impacting on the livestock sector and by extension on the livelihoods of the livestock dependent poor in the IGAD member states. However, despite this realization, an overview of these policies and institutions at the different levels and their coherence in addressing the livestock sector and the livelihoods of the livestock dependent poor does not exist. It is with this in mind and in line with AU IBAR's mandate to harmonize livestock-related policies and legal frameworks, that AU-IBAR and IGAD-LPI has joined forces to investigate objectives, directions and consistency of the international, regional and national policy and institutional environment influencing IGAD's livestock sector. The major output of this joint collaboration will be a report that responds to the following questions: (1) what livestock sector policies and programmes are currently in place in the IGAD region and what are the dominant development narratives that drive these policies and programmes?; and (2) What are the expected and actual impacts on households' livelihoods of the dominant narratives driving the livestock sector policies and programmes?

Concluding his presentation, Dr Mtula also pointed out that the study on 'Innovation Response Capacity in Relation to Livestock-Related Emergencies in East Africa' with accompanying policy briefs had now been completed. He explained that the report, using 2 case studies, describes innovation response capacity in relation to livestock-related emergencies in East Africa using the examples of a recent regional drought and the zoonotic disease, Rift Valley fever, situating these in on-going conceptual and policy debates. The case studies are described and then analyzed using an analytical framework that considers, actors and their roles, patterns of interaction, habits and practices, and presence or absence of an enabling environment.

Looking into the OVIs of Result 2, the first output of which reads "(i) *Importance of livestock acknowledged in the PRSP processes of 2 countries by 2008*", Dr Mtula informed the meeting that the project was on track to achieve this OVI during its implementation phase, mainly through the activities to Result 1. With regard to the second output, which reads, "*National livestock strategies in place in 2 countries by 2008*", Dr Mtula updated the meeting that the agreed approach for the project had already reduced the relevance of this OVI. The project initially took a regional policy approach, thereby setting the context in which national policies can be developed. He said, although the project was supporting strategy development on key areas (mentioned above); the engagement was not likely to result in a comprehensive livestock strategy outside Somalia during the implementation phase

of the project. Having noted the unquestionable need and demand for national livestock policies, Dr Mtula noted that there was need to build on the capacities developed by the project to deliver pro-poor livestock policies. He added that the question therefore remained as to the respective roles of IGAD, the governments of its member states and FAO in supporting the future development of pro-poor livestock 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 third output which is "*to put systems in place for livestock policy information, analysis, decision-support and monitoring of policy change.*"

In line with this output, Dr Jama focused on two major activities i.e. the Information Nodes and on the development and management of the information and data portal. According to Dr Jama, the NINs, which are now operational in all countries including Somalia, have been fully engaged in the gathering of relevant information, and feeding information into the policy processes. Dr Jama informed the meeting that the procurement of equipment for IGAD Secretariat and Somalia was underway. With regard to the development and management of the portal, Dr Jama mentioned that the portal was well taken care of by the NINCs in populating with livestock-related information, under the overall guidance of the project. He said the portal had so far hits over 7,770 from 126 countries across the world.

Turning his focus to the other activity of Result 3, which is focusing on monitoring of the policy process, Dr Jama indicated that the policy process monitoring form was revised and engendered to ensure that policy debates and outcomes are reflecting the key principles of the project. The policy monitoring tool had been administered during meetings of PHs and TWGs; and the analysis had been conducted by the NINCs. With regard to policy outcomes, Dr Jama mentioned that the project had already developed a set of indicators for the short, medium and long-term outcomes.

Dr Jama reported activities done to ensure the sustainability of NINs in the member countries. Based on the recommendation of the 5<sup>th</sup> SCM, Dr Jama said the PHs in all countries had conducted a series of meetings on sustainability where the institutionalisation of NINs in their respective countries had been a prime agenda. As a result, Dr Jama said, the PHs had tried to identify places in ministries in charge of livestock to house the NINs and ensure a continuous funding for the NINs, and to this effect, memoranda of understanding were signed in some countries.

The workshop on Animal Trypanosomiasis and Poverty in the Horn of Africa, which was conducted on the 6th and 7th July 2010 in Nairobi, Kenya was the other task reported by Dr Jama. He informed the meeting that the workshop was a collaborative activity among IGAD LPI, FAO, PPLPI and PAAT and it drew participants from all IGAD member states, AU, FAO and IGAD Secretariat to provide

a forum for sharing experience. Dr Jama noted that the workshop has forwarded new analytical techniques in selecting priority areas and planning for the prevention and control of animal trypanosomiasis.

Turning to the OVs of Result 3, which read "*(i) 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*", and "*(ii) Appropriate indicators identified for monitoring policy change by 2007*", Dr Jama indicated that these OVs had been achieved and the project would continue to strengthen the use of information and project tools in policy formulation as well as to '*review and refine*' them with respect to the indicators throughout its implementation phase.

As to the exit strategy, Dr Jama informed the meeting that NINs would be operational and working with PHs and the portal would work as the backbone of the NINs and as a link among national teams. Since the portal was set up in Joomla! Platform, Dr Jama reminded the meeting that there would not be any problem to hand it over to IGAD Secretariat. This would allow NINCs to continue to populate the portal, while the IGAD Secretariat handles the overall management and technical backstopping. To this effect, Dr Jama said, there would be a plan to provide IGAD Secretariat with a server and move the portal data to IGAD Secretariat by June 2011. For this, Dr Jama confirmed that the project would facilitate the handover, as well as the coordination and technical support for the Node at IGAD Secretariat before the end of the project.

Dr Jama continued to report on the first output of 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*". This output addresses the prioritisation of the livestock sector in policy planning and resource allocation at the national level. Dr Jama described three major activities under the first output:

1. Strategic inclusion of livestock in PRSPs and CAADP;
2. Calculations on the contribution of livestock to national economies (Ethiopia and Kenya);
3. Implementation of IGAD LPI Communications Strategy.

Dr Jama mentioned that the project employed various strategies to conduct the above mentioned tasks. The project worked through PHs and TWGs, supported by the NINCs, to identify priority issues for investment in each country. To implement the 1st activity, the project provided technical support and tailored capacity building programmes to the country-teams. Indicating the steps necessary for attaining a sound representation and inclusion of livestock in PRSPs, Dr Jama noted that 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 the current roles of ministries in charge of livestock and their stakeholders in PRSP. Dr Jama then presented a report on the status of the 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 recently evaluated. The second PRSP (INDS) was under development and country teams were working with the Focal Person for integrating the ongoing PRSP process with that of CAADP, which was at the initial stage. With regard to priority areas and proposals, Dr Jama informed the meeting that the PH, guided by National Program of Food Security (NPFS), was focused on livestock development in the context of poverty alleviation and gender equity, particularly in the pastoral areas of the country. According to Dr Jama, the country team in Djibouti had worked with the Agricultural Sectorwide Committee to identify entry points for selected projects to ultimately improve the livestock component of INDS.

With regard to Ethiopia, he reported that the country has approved the Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP) on December 10, 2010, which is the main national development plans. Dr Jama mentioned that the country has already signed the CAADP Compact and hence the PH was working with the national CAADP Focal Person. As to priority areas and proposals, Dr Jama highlighted animal health, animal feed, genetic resources, and protection of livelihoods and asset bases would be the key focus areas for pro-poor livestock projects. In Ethiopia, Dr Jama remarked, more understanding was created on the roles of livestock in poverty alleviation and the PH suggested a need for new institution to support the proposed policy agenda. Dr Jama has also highlighted that the Ethiopian team has worked with the Agricultural Sector Working Group of the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) for better inclusion of the proposed projects into GTP through the Animal and Plant Health Regulatory Directorate (APHRD) and CAADP Focal Point.

In Kenya, Dr Jama reported that the Policy Hub was focusing on incorporating identified projects into the National Development Plan, called Vision 2030. He noted that the identified projects deal with peace building & conflict resolution, disease control, improving market access, access to financial services, and management of rangelands, which would significantly improve the livelihoods of the poor livestock keepers in Kenya. In addition, Dr Jama informed the meeting that the country has signed the CAADP Compact and the PH was closely working with CAADP Focal Point; as well as with the Ministry of Livestock Development (MOLD) and the Agricultural Sector Coordination Unit (ASCU) for better inclusion of priority areas in implementation of the Medium Term Plans of Vision 2030 for the livestock sub-sector.

In the Sudan, Dr Jama reported, the national Poverty Eradication Strategy Paper (PESP) was developed and implemented; but the process of incorporating CAADP in the national programme was at its initial stage. Based on factors of feasibility, importance to livelihoods, gender equity and poverty alleviation, Dr Jama said, the Sudan country team identified viable projects which focused on improvement of

veterinary services, livestock production and productivity, capacity building, protection of natural resource base, policy and institutions, and fishery development. Similar to other countries, the Sudan country team had been working with the National Steering Committee (NSC) on PESP and with the livestock sector component of the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MARF) to identify entry points as well as potential donors for the projects.

As to Uganda, Dr Jama reported that the country had signed the CAADP Compact and the proposed National Development Plan (NDP), which is the overall planning framework and the Development Strategy and Investment Plan (DSIP), which integrated CAADP and NDP are the guiding policy documents for all economic sector, including livestock. Upon the evaluation of these documents, Dr Jama said, the PH in Uganda identified priority areas which focused on the control and surveillance of trans-boundary animal diseases, development of water and forage resources and promotion of alternative feed resources; as well as improvement of marketing infrastructure. Dr Jama also mentioned that the Ugandan team had been working closely with the Agricultural Sector Working Group (AgSWG) of the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industries and Fisheries (MAAIF) through the Directorate of Animal Resources to identify entry points for the inclusion of the newly developed livestock projects in the national planning.

To sum up, Dr Jama highlighted some of the observations he made on engagements of the PHs and NINs with PRSPs. Accordingly, he mentioned that the process was participatory, livelihoods and gender focused, as well as based on analysis of not only technical issues but also institutional and policy requirements and gaps.

Turning his attention to OVI of Result 1, which reads, "*IGAD and stakeholders are actively promoting identified pro-poor livestock-related policy and institutional options in the region by 2008*", Dr Jama confirmed that the OVI had already been achieved.

The other point which Dr Jama raised in his presentation was the study on livestock's contribution to GDP in Ethiopia. He underlined the fact that the study had proved that the contribution of livestock in the Ethiopian economy was much higher than previously thought. In his report, Dr Jama highlighted the findings of the study by informing the meeting that livestock contribute 45% of Ethiopia's agricultural GDP, which is much higher than the existing figure of Ethiopian Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MoFED). He additionally mentioned that the main sources of underestimations were inaccurate numbers on the size of livestock populations, outdated coefficients and exclusion of draught power. Based on this study, Dr Jama said, MoFED has started the revision of GDP methodologies through a task force.

### IGAD LPI Communication Strategy (Mr Abebe)

Mr Abebe Demissie started his presentation with an introductory remark that his report would look into the level of performance in terms of implementing the

Communication Strategy, which was approved by the SCM in January 2010 and would try to indicate the way forward in the new budget year. Recalling that the Communication Strategy of the project had set two major objectives, which read *"to increasing the profile of IGAD LPI"* and *"to increase understanding and receptiveness with respect to the new paradigms and working principles which IGAD LPI is promoting"*, Mr Abebe briefly illustrated what had been done in terms of creating a good communication environment as well as in the areas of production of communication materials.

In reference to laying out the foundations for good communication, Mr Abebe mentioned that the project had implemented a new branding which was being reflected in all its publications, website and stationeries. He also said that the first set of a workable contact database had been in place. With regard to the production of communication materials, he indicated that a number of publications such as the project profile (for print and online), policy briefs, a promotional brochures, year planners & cards, etc had been produced and disseminated. He also informed the meeting that the project had used various tools, like newsletters, annual reports, project websites and the portal as well as blogs and other social media systems to disseminate its information.

In the new budget year, he mentioned, the communication office would focus on the production of a documentary movie on livestock, livelihoods and gender, as well as permanent posters and other public relation materials while keeping other publishing tasks on track. Additionally, he said, the focus would rest on supporting country teams to build their capacities in the area of communication whereby they would prepare and implement their own country-specific communication plans, which can promote the livestock agenda further.

### Discussion on the 2010 Report

Following the presentations by the project team, the chairperson painted the gloomy portrait he observed in relation to the profile of livestock in all member states and the need for more awareness programmes to alter the prevailing perceptions. Even if the IGAD region is rich in livestock resources, he said, countries are not fully aware of their livestock herd sizes and the potential it has to alleviate poverty. He then commented that he had a great hope that member countries would start to recognise the contribution of livestock to their own Gross Domestic Products (GDP) through the study commissioned by the project. He also noted that an important step has been taken in the communication area where a number of important livestock-related briefs were published to promote the livestock sector. These publications should continue to be published to foster the efforts exerted by different stakeholders to create an enabling environment where the livestock sector can get its appropriate place in the national planning. On a separate note, he informed the meeting that IGAD is celebrating its 25th anniversary in January 2011, and hence all IGAD affiliated organisations should

reflect the spirit of this in all their products and publications, based on the guidelines circulated by IGAD Communication Office in late 2010.

Having said the forgoing remarks, the chairperson opened the floor for questions and comments on key issues raised during the presentations by Dr Peeling, Dr Mtula, Dr Jama and Mr Abebe.

Dr Nicholas Kauta opened the discussion by commenting on the difficulty the livestock professionals are facing in promoting the livestock agenda in his country. Although we frequently present our cases with tangible research results, he said, it had been very difficult for livestock professionals to break the prevailing attitude and practice, which underestimate the livestock sector as a viable means to cope with poverty and food insecurity. As a result, he noted, livestock remained under represented in almost all policy documents.

Expressing his appreciation of what had been achieved by the project, Dr Samuel Jutzi commented that of all topics, he found the issues of sustainability of institutions very pertinent and pressing to the meeting. He added the resolutions the meeting would pass on these would allow country teams keep the gains of the project alive and useful in the future. He further expressed his hope that the SCM would indicate some thoughts to maintain project gains after the closing of the project. He however expressed his disappointment over IGAD's Decision not to support the extension proposal forwarded by the project.

Dr Abdirahman Nur Qeiliye conveyed his concern that the decision taken by IGAD not to extend the project time beyond February 2012 would greatly affect the activities in Somalia more that it does to any other country. He said, there were some key activities spearheaded by the project to bring the Somalia contingent up to the level where other countries had reached. Noting that the case in Somalia was unique, Dr Qeiliye asked IGAD to look into the case and come up with a measure that could maintain the momentum created by the project and foster the development of the livestock sector in Somalia.

Dr Kamal Tagelsir Elsheikh also commented that it was this project which brought the importance of pro-poor livestock policies to the table, with the view to ultimately reduce poverty and food insecurity. Now, he said, unlike the previous times, policy makers tended to discuss such issues as poverty eradication and food security; rather than discussing only trans-boundary diseases and export markets. Hence, the continuation of the project would make a difference in terms of thought and practice at the level of policy makers.

In response to the comments raised by Dr Kauta, Dr Mtula agreed that there was indeed difficulty in getting the livestock agenda included into policy documents but even where the issues were included in policy documents he was also aware of the difficulty of getting certain livestock draft policies through the system and there were cases where such draft policies had got stuck at cabinet level for many years. He stressed the need to undertake consistent and viable advocacy at all levels to counter this problem and to facilitate the raising of funds for the livestock sector.

Mr Maina Karaba, the chairperson, responded to the common concerns reflected by many of the country representatives on sustainability of institutions and project's ending time. Mr Karaba said any project has a lifetime but this does not mean that the outputs and outcomes of projects would be thrown away; they would continue to serve good causes in another form. He then informed the meeting that the gains of the project would be retained and used for a better and enhanced livestock agenda. But, he said, it is important to come up with innovative and viable recommendations on how to maintain and utilise the gains of the project in different settings.

With these remarks and deliberations, the Chairperson called upon Dr Peeling to present the report on the 5th SCM recommendations.

## REPORT ON THE 5<sup>TH</sup> SCM

Dr Peeling read out the progress report against the recommendations endorsed by the 5th Steering Committee Meeting, which was held in January 2010 in Djibouti, Djibouti Republic. Dr Peeling mentioned that he would briefly report on the results focusing on the recommendations which called for specific actions to be taken by the project. Accordingly Dr Peeling reported the efforts made against the recommendations:

1. The pro-poor policy capacity needs had been emphasised by the project team while efforts were made to institutionalise and strengthen country teams;
2. The project team had been working with the IGAD region's ministries responsible for livestock, particularly in Ethiopia and the Sudan to ensure that their areas of operation enable them to respond to the diverse roles of livestock to the livelihoods needs of the poor livestock keepers;
3. Based on scenario 1 (end date late 2011) of the project's workplan endorsed by the SCM, the project flexibly placed emphasis on maintaining momentum and morale of national partners, and the establishment of the Livestock Unit in IGAD;
4. The project had refined the ToR for the policy hubs to ensure that the hubs' role is seen to be delivering balanced and representative analysis of issues to their ministers and other decision makers;
5. It was possible to have all member states engaged in and develop plans for the institutionalisation of the PHs, TWGs and NINs.

Following Dr Peeling report, Mr Karaba, the chairperson, suggested to the meeting that since those elements in Dr Peeling report had already been discussed, it would be important to allocate more time to the reports of member states on sustainability issues, rather than discussing on the report. Thanking Dr Peeling for his report, the chairperson then called upon the representatives of the member states to deliver their reports on sustainability issues.

## MEMBER STATES PRESENTATION ON SUSTAINABILITY OF INSTITUTIONS

### Djibouti

Dr Ahmed Darar Djibril informed the meeting that the institutions created by the project for Djibouti had gained strength since their establishment in 2008 and they were multidisciplinary entities which advocate for the betterment of the livestock sector. In Djibouti, he said, the proposed structure placed the PH in the government ministry. Such an arrangement, he said, would allow the PH attain a decree, which in turn, allow the PH to solicit funds from government treasury. The PH will also have the legal status to establish partnerships with donors and have an official website to advocate for livestock.

With regard to the NIN, Dr Djibril said that it needs a capacity strengthening programme in terms of equipment and human resource to expand its functionality, for which the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries will allocate funds.

As to the TWGs, he mentioned that the groups have been so important to come up with policy proposals in the areas of livestock disease and PRSP. He said it will be important to reinforce these groups in a way they can be inclusive of women and the private sector and to find sources of funding for the continuous meetings these groups were conducting.

### Ethiopia

Briefing the meeting with the population size of cattle, sheep, goats, equines, camels and poultry in Ethiopia, Dr Alemayehu Mekonnen explained that for many years livestock has been the major means of livelihoods for millions of the rural population in Ethiopia and it has been Ethiopia's second most valuable source of foreign exchange, after coffee. Yet, he said, its profile in the national planning has remained low. In order to alter such worrying representation of livestock, Dr Alemmayhu said, the Ethiopian PH, which is composed of two working groups: the National Planning (NP) and the Animal Health for Trade and Poverty Reduction (AHTPR), has been actively engaged in policy analysis and project proposals. While the NP TWG was working on the appropriate inclusion of livestock in Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP) and institutional arrangements for the PH and NIN, the AHTPR TWG has been engaged in the implementation of the RPF. Currently, he said, the PH and the NP TWG have been intensively engaged in the selection and validation of viable projects which will be incorporated in the GTP planning document. For this, he said, the findings of the study on the 'Contribution of Livestock in the Ethiopian Economy", which was commissioned by IGAD LPI, contributes a lot in valuing the contribution of livestock for the national GDP.

The study, he explained, empowered the PH and other stakeholders to advocate for the improvement of the profile of livestock in the national accounts, which is

administered by MoFED. Following the first phase of the study, Dr Alemayehu mentioned, the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) in collaboration with IGAD LPI organised a consultative meeting with various stockholders drawn from MoFED, National Statistics Authority, the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI), and the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA). The consultative meeting has finally established a Task Force that will examine and compare the existing and recommended methodologies to advise MoFED in adapting a better methodology for accurately estimating livestock's contribution to Ethiopia's GDP.

Turning his focus to other issues, Dr Alemayehu informed the meeting that Ethiopia had signed the CAADP Compact, whose programmes are incorporated in the agricultural component of the GTP.

Finally, he remarked that even if the PH was formally created by the Ethiopian Ministry of Agriculture, it has been fully engaged with IGAD LPI programmes. He also noted that the PH has benefited much from the project in terms of strengthening the capacity to develop and implement livestock policies that target poverty and food insecurity. He said that there is a strong consensus that the PH and the NIN need to be institutionalised within the government structure. As the project is winding up in February 2012, he said, the gains of the project should be protected by the upcoming ICPALD and hence there is a great hope that the new centre would continue to support member states by building up on what has been achieved by the project.

## Kenya

Speaking on sustainability issues, Mr Abdullahi O. Esmail informed the meeting that in Kenya the PH remains an independent lobby group partnering with the Government of Kenya and other bodies. The mandate of the PH is to advocate for pro-poor policies which ensure a sustainable livelihoods and gender equity for the poor livestock keepers. Mr Esmail added that the proposed structure of the PH consists of a steering committee, and members from government offices, international organisations, inter-governmental organizations (FAO, IGAD, AU-IBAR, etc), regional bodies like East African Community (EAC), Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), etc, CSOs and livestock professionals. He noted that the PH should be able to mobilise resources for specific activities from within member organisations as well as from other well wishers. Furthermore, he said the PH will have a quarterly and ad-hoc meetings and present its outputs on national policy forums, as well as at events like Kenya Pastoralists Week, and Breeders and Agricultural Shows.

With regard to the NIN, Dr Ismael noted that the NIN has a clear focus on livestock livelihoods, gender and poverty and hence its relevance to livestock policy dialogue is uncontested. He further noted that it would be attached to a relevant government Ministry with links to such institutions as AU-IBAR, FAO and ILRI to solicit funds.

## The Sudan

Dr Kamal Tagelsir Elsheikh underlined the fact that in the Sudan there has been a shortage of an adequate policy environment that fully supports poor livestock keepers and pastoralists to mitigate the constraints they face in sustaining their livelihoods. The role played by the project to bridge this gap has been paramount. Hence, Dr Kamal said, the issue of sustainability and institutionalisation of the PH and NIN was a prime agenda in the Sudanese PH meetings. The resolution of the PH meetings made it clear that the PH and NIN must continue their usual roles. He said that there was a feeling that the PH is a *de facto* parliament of pastoralists that resonates in various forums. Even members representing government institutions, he added, are convinced that their mother ministries are not doing what the PH is doing; the PH is a far more advanced way to address poverty issues. He then informed the meeting that the PH is working towards attaining a ministerial decree. This will give the PH more protection and autonomy. The PH would also be reformed to accommodate more CSOs, pastoralist women, and NGOs representing pastoralists to address issues related to gender and livelihoods. It will also have a strong linkage with the upcoming ICPALD.

With regard to NIN, Dr Kamal informed the meeting that it played an important role throughout the project lifetime and this role is well recognised by the PH members. He said that PH members however felt that the current role of the NIN should be expanded to the extent of managing information in the areas of animal health, animal production, range land and pasture. Members also recommended the establishment of regional information nodes in each state with a strong link to the central NIN. Upgrading the existing Poverty Reduction Unit and linking it with the PH is also seen as an important step to further the pro-poor livestock agenda.

In this arrangement, Dr Kamal said, the PH is a semi-autonomous body which reports to the Minister (MARF) with coordination by the Undersecretary of MARF. The Poverty Reduction Unit in the Ministry acts as a Secretariat for the PH. The NIN, under the General Directorate of Planning and Livestock Economics, will support evidence-based planning, investment and policy making. It will also have a strong link with the Information centre of MARF and with the proposed information units in the states. PH, as an independent body, though linked with the Ministry, would be managed by a voluntary body (a president and secretary). The main managing body however will be the PH members and other related constituents. The management body will have a clear ToR for its roles and responsibilities. The PH members recommended that all these bodies would be funded by the Ministry of Finance and other sources, which would be interested to finance the policy process. He finally informed the meeting that MARF has already agreed to fund all information activities in the fiscal year 2011.

## Somalia

Noting the fact that livestock sector is the backbone of the economy of Somalia with 40% of the national GDP and 80% of foreign currency earnings, Dr Abdirahman Nur Qeiliye remarked that the profile of livestock in the national planning has never been outstanding. To redress this, he reported, the PH members drawn from the three entities (Somaliland, Puntland and South Central Somalia) have been engaged in many activities including the preparation of the country position and the RPF, which were all successfully accomplished. Recalling how the Somali Livestock Stakeholders Coordination Forum (SOLISCOF) was came to being and what it was mandated for, Dr Qeiliye informed the meeting that the gains and activities of IGAD LPI must be well maintained and pursued through SOLISCOF, which had almost a similar mission and model to IGAD LPI. He noted that SOLISCOF was tasked with a number of activities the main ones of which were to share information on animal diseases and threats, formulate strategies to deal with disease outbreaks, as well as to harmonise animal health certification approaches.

Speaking on the composition of the SOLISCOF, Dr Qeiliye said, the permanent members are drawn from public and private institutions of the 3 entities of Somalia where the Ministry of Livestock, Ministry of Commerce, Veterinary Association, Chamber of Commerce and the Somali OIE Delegate are well represented.

In order the Forum to be functional and strong, he highlighted, international and regional organisations such as AU-IBAR, IGAD, FAO, and OIE should give their recognition. Besides, Dr Qeiliye said, the Sheikh Technical Veterinary School (STVS), which is being managed by Terra Nuova of GTZ, under the coordination and supervision of AU-IBAR, will be an alternative to institutionalise the PH and NIN. He added that the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Forestry and Range Land of the Transitional Federal Government of Somalia (TFG) handed over the School to IGAD Secretariat last September in order the STVS become a regional institution for pastoralists and livestock sector for all IGAD member countries.

## Uganda

Dr Nicholas Kauta started his presentation by introducing the mandates of the Ugandan Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Industries and Fisheries (MAAIF) as well as the Directorate for Animal Resources to explain how the Ugandan team tried to improve the structural arrangements to house the PH and NIN. Having explained also the roles of the different departments under the Ministry, he indicated that there is multiplicity of internal and external stakeholders who are involved in policy review, development and implementation. He noted that the common forum for the various stakeholders within MAAIF is the Top Management meeting (TMM) where ministers and heads of directorates, departments and agencies are represented. He also noted that between MAAIF and other stakeholders there is the Agriculture Sector Working Group, which is composed of Ministries, NGOs, and international development partners. He said, it was suggested that the project should report to

the Agricultural Working Group with the view to enable country teams mainstream the activities of the project into the Ministry structure with a project approach. The project will have the same name of Livestock Policy Initiative and a steering committee composed of the entire membership of the Agriculture Sector Working Group and others. He said, the project approach helps to attain an effective coordination and coherence in planning and budgeting.

### Discussions on presentations of country teams

Dr Otieno Mtula started the discussion with a question to the IGAD Secretariat on sustainability of institutions at national and regional levels. He inquired whether the IGAD Secretariat has a regional workplan to sustain the gains of the project as well as the institutions created by the project in each member state.

Dr Jutzi had also reflected his observation on the issues of sustainability of institutions, which were raised by all country teams. In order to maintain the momentum of these machineries, Dr Jutzi said, member countries must be careful to avoid any break in the transition by closely examining the workplan of the project for the next year as well as by exploring other means of funding to run the machineries.

In complementing Dr Jutzi, Dr Samuel Zziwa noted that the project should give such issues of sustainability a priority in the new workplan. With regard to the findings of the GDP study, Dr Zziwa pointed out that it would have been very important to recalculate the contribution of sectors other than livestock to GDP at this point to confidently claim the significant contribution of livestock to GDP. The agricultural GDP of livestock against crop in Ethiopia might not be as huge as reported.

In response to Dr Mtula's question, Mr Maina Karaba pointed out that IGAD Secretariat has attached a great deal of importance to livestock and the gains of the project will be maintained as much as possible and be incorporated in the new centre. Adding to this, Dr Zziwa presented a brief report on the regional plan on sustainability. He said, sustainability issues were normally built into the project design; but in the case of IGAD Secretariat, the project design faces problems. He mentioned that there are key sustainability issues that cannot be adequately addressed by IGAD Secretariat:

1. The location of the project, which is now at ILRI campus, is unsuitable for IGAD because of high renting costs;
2. Employing all senior project staff as FAO staff makes it difficult for IGAD to absorb them at IGAD rates;
3. The implementation arrangements of the Contribution Agreement (CA) do not allow for capacity building of IGAD Secretariat;

4. Sustainability was assumed to be guaranteed by the existence of the Pro Poor Livestock Policy Initiative (PPLPI) at FAO with regional hubs, but PPLPI ended before the end of IGAD LPI.

Dr Zziwa noted that there are, however, developments at IGAD that could assist with sustainability. IGAD secured an 18 months extension of the project to allow taking measures on sustainability issues both at national and regional levels. He informed the meeting that IGAD is in the process of establishing a livestock and pastoralist centre. This will implement livestock programmes and projects for IGAD. AU-IBAR plans to implement a number of projects, like the Veterinary Governance project, which contribute staff to IGAD to help address capacity gaps. IGAD also seeks additional resources from EDF 10 to formulate and implement livestock projects of interest to the member states.

Following Dr Zziwa's presentation, Dr Dil Peeling raised few comments and questions. He reminded that the CA is clear about the capacity building programmes at IGAD Secretariat. Accordingly, he said, the project has assisted member states to formulate the RPF and their national position papers. He however pointed out that it is not clear how the centre will implement the RPF and make use of the institutions created by the project. Besides, he also inquired how the new centre upholds the pro-poor policy making principles which the project has underpinned throughout its lifetime. Noting that member states are unaware of the establishment of the centre and STVS, Dr Abdi Jama asked what measures IGAD takes to inform member states about the progress made in terms of the establishment of the centre and STVS.

In response to comments and inquires raised above, Dr Zziwa informed the meeting that the process of transforming the IGAD STVS into a regional livestock and pastoralist centre is in progress. The process requires a protocol to be prepared by member states in January 2011 and be adopted by the Council of Ministers. It is therefore difficult to speak on the link between the centre and STVS before the protocol is endorsed. Currently, he said, IGAD had formed a management committee, where every member states and IGAD LPI are represented, and it will start operation very soon. With regard to the RPF, Dr Zziwa said, member states would decide on the way it should be implemented and the project can also come up with viable options within the remaining one year. Mr Karaba added to this that the issues coming out of this meeting are crucial and hence IGAD noted that policy issues would remain one of the key development agendas which IGAD is fostering. Hence, he affirmed, the products and gains of the project will not be left out; they will be incorporated in the new centre.

With this comment, the chairperson concluded Tuesday's meeting at 5:30 p.m.

## PRESENTATION ON THE CONTRIBUTION OF LIVESTOCK TO ETHIOPIA'S ECONOMY

Acknowledging the presence of Dr Roy Behnke, a consultant from Odessa centre Ltd., who joined the meeting in the second day, Mr Maina Karaba invited Dr Abdi Jama to formally introduce Dr Behnke to the meeting. Accordingly, Dr Abdi Jama introduced Dr Roy Behnke as a reputed scholar and consultant in the fields of livestock development and that he conducted the study of the "Contribution of Livestock in the Ethiopian Economy".

Dr Behnke started his presentation by highlighting the areas of focus included in his study, as well as the rationale, objectives and methodology of the study. He informed the meeting that while phase one of the study focuses on the assessment of the agricultural sector, the second phase is on all other economic sectors. The underlying justifications behind conducting these studies were that the significant contribution of livestock to the national economies is not fully appreciated. Hence the objective of the studies are to enable countries modify the methodology they use to calculate the contribution of livestock to their economy by accommodating a partially commercialised livestock sector into the calculation.

Mentioning that the phase one study in Ethiopia is concluded, Dr Behnke highlighted the methodology he followed to make the GDP calculations. Accordingly, he said Ethiopia uses a production approach to estimate the agricultural value where livestock populations, their product outputs, and production costs are taken as key coefficients. He explained that livestock population estimates in the existing methodology do not fully include animals in pastoral areas, and production coefficients are out of date and hence the value of livestock to GDP is highly curtailed. Improving these data and the coefficients, he said, the study showed the contribution of livestock to the Ethiopian agricultural GDP is higher than previously thought. The use of animal draught power in crop cultivation in Ethiopia is also so significant that it constituted 31% of the total value of livestock output. Including ploughing services, the total gross value of livestock output is more than double of the current GDP estimates of livestock's contribution to the agricultural sector. On top of these, livestock are providing other services benefiting owners in savings, credits and insurance, as well as in transport and haulage. The foreign currency amount Ethiopia is getting from cross-border trade in live animals is also very significant.

Dr Behnke informed the meeting that the second phase will focus on livestock's contribution to industry and services. The study will explore the values of livestock from farm gate to consumer; i.e. from raw skins to finished consumer products such as belts, shoes and jackets, then distributed and sold. The focus of the study will be on processing and manufacturing of livestock products, wholesale and retail trade in these products, animal draught for transport and haulage as well as on the

impact of livestock activities on support services. Apart from these, the phase two study will also look outside of the boundaries of the national accounts.

He finally concluded his presentation by highlighting the findings of his study. According to his explanation, livestock's contribution to Ethiopia's agricultural GDP, including ploughing services, had increased to 45%. Taking into account the unofficial cross-border trade in live animals, Ethiopia's livestock exports rival that of coffee. With this in focus, he said, the inter-ministerial task force on livestock GDP in Ethiopia has been created and the task force will work on the methodology with a view to increase the profile of livestock in the national planning documents. And the same study would be done for Kenya.

Following Dr Behnke's presentation, the chairperson opened the floor for discussions. Accordingly, Dr Jutzi remarked that the study was an important piece of work which offered a strong evidence for advocacy for the better inclusion of the livestock sector in the national planning. He added that the study presented a certified methodology which can be applied to every IGAD member state. He also informed the meeting that FAO had conducted a similar study, which can help to refine the newly-developed methodologies for IGAD member states.

Dr Peeling noted that the study would be an important tool to revisit how the national account system captured the contribution of livestock in the Ethiopian economy. Noting that the study would commence in Kenya, he stressed that this was an area where IGAD should build up on after the winding up of the project. He added that the findings of the study will be important pieces of information for advocacy and funding; as well as to broaden the prevailing narrow viewpoint of key stakeholders about the potential of livestock to the overall economy. He said livestock in the IGAD region play crucial roles in mitigating food shortages, and transportation and energy needs. It also provides traction power for the crop sector, which accounts for a bigger portion in country's GDP. Livestock help the poor to survive shocks and for saving and insurance. He added that it would then be possible to indicate to governments where to put their resources to reduce poverty and food insecurity.

Congratulating Dr Behnke, Dr Qeiliye commented that the study clearly showed the significant role that livestock plays in the Ethiopian economy. Nonetheless, it would have been commendable if the study had also looked at issues of animal welfare. He said in Somalia animals are badly treated and, as a result, the benefits we get from those animals are diminishing from time to time. Dr Kamal also informed the meeting that livestock in the Sudan contributed much more than what had been indicated in the studies. He said, livestock products have been used as sources of fertilizer, traditional medicine, fuel, construction inputs, etc and hence studies in this area must capture all these.

Dr Tim Robinson on his part commented that the study has cast a new light on the contribution of livestock in the Ethiopian economy. With a similar study, countries in the IGAD region can clearly understand where they stand in terms of calculating

the contribution of livestock to their national economies. Complementing his view, Dr Dil Peeling noted that countries, except Djibouti, already suspect that livestock are poorly represented in the national planning documents.

With these deliberations, the chairperson invited Dr Dil Peeling to present the 2011 workplan.

## PRESENTATIONS ON WORKPLAN 2011

### Annual workplan 2011 (Dr Peeling)

Dr Peeling commenced the presentation of the workplan for 2011 by indicating that the deliberations of the previous day on sustainability would set the scene for the 2011 workplan. Accordingly, he mentioned that in the remaining year, the project will focus on the institutionalisation of the PHs and NINs in each of the member states. Furthermore, he said that the project would work for better inclusion of livestock in PRSPs and on implementation of CAADP. He noted that the workplan also gave utmost emphasis on Somalia and the establishment of ICPALD. Dr Peeling pointed out that capturing and disseminating the lessons learned during the implementation period of the project was a prime task for the project team, for which technical and high - level meetings would be organised.

Dr Peeling further highlighted the support the project would offer to the new project, "Regional Initiative in Support of Vulnerable Pastoralists and Agro-Pastoralists in the Horn of Africa", which is implemented by FAO and funded by EU. He mentioned that based on Article 3 of the RPF, IGAD LPI would support the project, the objective of which is to strengthen institutional and policy framework affecting resilience of (agro) pastoral communities and the diversification of their livelihoods in the Horn of Africa. Dr Peeling mentioned the following three result areas that the project was expected to deliver:

- Target communities are better prepared for disaster through community planning and action;
- Strengthened coordination of both development and humanitarian initiatives in (agro) pastoral areas from community through national levels to regional institutions;
- Regional policies and institutions developed in support of pastoralist livelihoods.

Mentioning that the project is a three year initiative, Dr Peeling said it would focus on communities living along the border areas of Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda. These target areas include the Karamojong cluster in Karamoja region in Uganda and Turkana and West Pokot in Kenya; the Somali cluster including Mandera (Kenya) and Liban zone of Somali regional state (Ethiopia) and the Oromo cluster

including Marsabit, Moyale (Kenya) and South Omo zone of SNNPR and Borana zone of Oromia Regional State (Ethiopia).

Thanking Dr Peeling for his concise presentation, Mr Maina Karaba invited participants to forward questions to the presenter.

Accordingly, Dr Nicholas Kauta remarked that projects can be initiated in the region without much trouble; nonetheless getting them on the ground has never been an easy task. They require quite a significant effort and resources for coordination and implementation. Dr Zziwa also asked about the level of cooperation between FAO and the EU and how adequate the resources at IGAD LPI would be to carry out these functions. Dr Kamal expressed his concern over the budget allocated to perform the activities stipulated in the project document.

In response to these, Dr Peeling remarked that while FAO was tasked with the implementation of the first two outputs, IGAD LPI would support the third output. So, it would be feasible for IGAD LPI to implement activities to this output within the set timetable. The money the IGAD LPI obtained, he added, would rather be allocated to entrench the gains of the project within the national structures.

With these deliberations, the chairperson invited Dr Abdi Jama to present the exit strategy for result 3 of the project log frame.

### Exit strategy for Result 3 (Dr Jama)

Dr Abdi Jama informed the meeting that at the end of the project time, all NINs will be operational and working with PHs very effectively. The portal would be strengthened to get it serve as a backbone of the NINs and as a common platform for national nodes. Since the portal was set up in Joomla!, its integration with IGAD web system would be facilitated without much difficulty. NINCs would continue to populate the central database and IGAD LPI would handle the management and technical backstopping as long as it exists. With regard to the data server, Dr Jama noted that it was currently located at ERGO Oxford and there was a plan to provide IGAD with a server and move the portal to IGAD Secretariat by June 2011. IGAD LPI would then hand over the coordination and technical support role of the nodes to IGAD Secretariat before the end of the project.

Following the brief presentation by Dr Jama, Dr Tim Robinson asked whether the IGAD Secretariat is ready in terms of capacity to run and maintain the portal and the website. In response, Dr Zziwa noted that IGAD has all the capacity to run and maintain the portal and the website and at the same time it is also important to consider the centre as viable option to host the portal and the website.

### Programmes in Somalia (Dr Jama)

Dr Abdi Jama noted that the purpose of the programmes in Somalia is to strengthen livestock institutions of the three entities and enhancing the capacity of the TWGs to formulate and implement livestock sector pro-poor policies. He said STVS, which

would host the Central Information Node, will be a neutral venue for the three entities. The project continues to deliver its capacity building trainings to the School. So far, Dr Jama said, the project had given the Gender and Livelihoods trainings for the Somali country team and a number of activities took place to improve the composition of the TWGs to ensure broad representation. He said the support for participatory and country-led activities would be strengthened to make policies more pro-poor and CAADP compliant. He also noted that the project would exert maximum effort to get the institutions created by the project entrenched in the system.

Following Mr Jama's presentation, questions were raised by Dr Kauta and Dr Zziwa. While Dr Kauta asked the location of the permanent seat of the Somali Policy Hub; Dr Zziwa inquired how the sources allocated to IGAD LPI could be utilised by SOLICEP if the PH of Somalia is fully integrated to SOLICEP.

In response, Dr Qeiliye informed the meeting that there were so many problems to set up a common system for Somalia since the country lost its central government. Every entity has its own leadership, even if none is legally independent. However, he said, the livestock sector had been so unique in that the different entities could come together to promote the sector for common good. He also added that SOLICEP had its own plans and programmes and often offered logistical support to various forums. So, linking IGAD LPI institutions with SOLICEP was an ideal option. The STVS which is located in Somaliland does also give a common forum for all entities to advocate for livestock. Dr Jama also commented that though SOLICEP and IGAD LPI promoted distinct objectives, it was appropriate to use the Forum to meet those distinct objectives through improving the representation of the Forum. Dr Peeling on his part mentioned that almost 70% of the SOLICEP members were participating in the Somali PH and they were the ones who developed the country positions. It would be possible to merge the two and to offer institutional support towards promoting the livestock sector in Somalia.

Mentioning that the most important aspect of the intervention in Somalia was the creation of synergy and avoiding duplication between IGAD LPI and SOLICEP, the chairperson asked Dr Jama to inform the meeting about IGAD LPI's plan for the GDP study in Kenya.

### A study on Livestock Contribution to National Economy in Kenya (Dr Jama)

Dr Abdi Jama briefed the meeting on the progress made with regard to the GDP study in Kenya. Accordingly, he mentioned that the project had already briefed the Ministry of Livestock Development about the nature of the study and links were established with the Kenyan National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS). He also informed the meeting that the project had identified consultants and developed ToRs for the consultants. He finally informed the meeting that the methodology developed in Ethiopia would be applied to conduct the contribution of livestock to the Kenyan economy.

Following Dr Jama's presentation, the chairperson called upon Dr Otieno Mtula to speak on the project's plan on capturing and disseminating the lessons learned.

### A programme on lesson learning (Dr Mtula)

Dr Mtula informed the meeting that the process of learning-by-doing was built into the project's operations from the outset. Much of the work over the next year would be related to revisiting the approaches used and assessing their strengths and weaknesses. The lessons captured from this would inform the parallel process of institutionalisation. Critical analysis started at national level, particularly through the reporting of the NTFPs would be complemented by an independent assessment of the PHs, TWGs and NINs. Based on this, he said, the PMU would develop a framework for capturing and codifying lessons learned.

He explained that the project recognised that its most useful legacies may not only be the technical gains and decision making structures, but also the institutional capacity to stimulate innovation in the field of policy. For this reason, with the establishment of the PHs, the project adopted a learning model emphasising organizational, rather than individual, learning. The project located as much of the generation of lessons as possible within the participating organizations through national and regional workshops.

Initial thoughts on lessons learned, based on the above framework, he noted, would be shared with national partners, reviewed at regional level, and then fed back to the project to refine the framework. Lessons learned would also be disseminated through the project's Communication Strategy, including a short film to illustrate livelihoods and gender focussed needs assessment.

He said that it was now apparent that organisational learning, innovation and institutionalisation were coming together as countries evolve the PHs and NINs for continuity and sustainability. In all countries, the poverty focus was underpinning the institutionalisation of PHs. In Uganda and Kenya, he said, there was a drive to have the policy hub situated outside government to secure the advocacy role whereas there was explicit recognition that linkages with government must be maintained because of the roles of government in policy formulation. In the Sudan, the drive was to expand the functions and mandate of the PH in government to include addressing pressing developmental issues concerning poor livestock keepers. In Ethiopia, there were efforts to use the PH to make the case for a more focussed representation of livestock within government. The project would therefore work with countries in pursuing these issues in the remaining year.

With these presentations of the project team on the 2011 workplan, the chairperson invited Dr Peeling to present the budget for the new fiscal year.

## PRESENTATIONS ON 2011 BUDGET

### Presentation on 2011 budget (Dr Peeling)

Informing the meeting that the operational budget was estimated to be \$425,000, Dr Peeling started with the budget estimates for outstanding works from Result 1, which would take up about \$87,000 in total. He also noted that the PH and NIN activities in Somalia would also require about \$110,000. The project also allocated \$8,000 for the activities related to establishment ICPALD and \$20,000 for procurement of computers and servers for STVS and IGAD. He informed the meeting that the consultancy fee for the study on Livestock Contribution to the Economy of Kenya would be \$55,000. He further noted that while the two regional technical workshops would cost \$70,000, the high level meeting would take up about \$40,000 and the communication programme of the project would cost \$35,000. The implementations of the Disaster Risk Management and the Harmonisation of Standards on Paraveterinary Service (HSPS) programmes, he said, would entail \$335,000 and \$250, 000 respectively.

Dr Peeling informed the meeting that since the budget allocated for 2011 was not sufficient to implement all planned activities, which would require \$760,000 in total, the project was forced to hold back the latter two activities i.e. the DRM and HSPS. (Please see Annex D for the detailed budget proposal)

### Discussions on the 2010 budget proposal

Thanking Dr Peeling for his brief presentation, Mr Karaba opened the floor for discussion by commenting that he was expecting a much higher operational budget than what Dr Peeling had presented. Complementing Dr Karaba's view, Dr Zziwa remarked that it would have been important for IGAD to see the detailed breakdown of the budget to determine how the project should allocate its resources to priority areas. Dr Kamal asked whether a budget was allocated for the key activities that target the institutionalisation of the PHs and NINs in the member states.

In response to the queries, Dr Peeling noted that the operational cost was the amount after the deduction of administrative costs and it would have been possible for him to present the detailed breakdown if he had been aware that there was a need to do so. He noted that he just followed the regular format, which depicts only the major breakdowns of operational costs. Dr Samuel Jutzi also remarked that it was clearly indicated in the budget statement that the key activities in the final year had attained better portions of the budget. He further noted that activities related to lesson learning also attained a focus in the budget statement. It was thus possible to say that the priority activities in the transition period were well covered.

With these comments and deliberations, Mr Karaba invited Dr Peeling to review the main issues raised during the 6<sup>th</sup> SCM.

Accordingly, Dr Peeling summarized the main issues discussed in the meeting and read out the agreed recommendations of the 6th SCM (Please see Annex A for Recommendations of the 6th SCM).

## CLOSE OF MEETING

In closing, the chairperson thanked all participants for exerting maximum effort to make the 6th SCM a success. He also thanked AU-IBAR for hosting the meeting. He then invited Dr Delsol, Dr Jutzi and one representative from member countries to say a few words. Accordingly, Dr Delsol noted that the project had achieved a lot in terms of raising the profile of livestock in the region, which he believed would be upheld by the upcoming ICPALD. 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 team again for raising the sustainability issues, Dr Jutzi appreciated the SCM for the steps it took to ensure the gains of the project continue to serve good causes. Dr Kamal, on behalf of the participants from the member states, also expressed his utmost appreciation for IGAD and the project team for their contribution and effort to advance the livestock agenda in the IGAD region and the great commitment countries demonstrated to maintain the gains of the project in their respective countries.

With these remarks of Dr Delsol, Dr Jutzi, and Dr Kamal and the chairperson, on behalf of IGAD Secretariat, concluded the 6th 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 14:30.

## ANNEX A: SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 6<sup>TH</sup> SCM

The SC acknowledged with gratitude the efforts undertaken by IGAD and the project team for a costed extension of the project to end February 2012 and is very grateful to the European Union for allocating funds for enabling this extension.

The SC congratulated the project team for adjusting its work plans to the extended timeline of the project along the agreed priorities and results framework and for undertaking necessary steps to support the sustainability of the major project achievements.

The SC received the information from the IGAD representatives that the IGAD Secretariat is now confident to be in a position to enter into direct customised implementation agreements with donors - in particular with the EU - and that it therefore has the intention of taking over all the transition activities of the project after the end of the current financing period (February 2012).

The SC approved the proposed workplan, subject to available funding, and made the following recommendations:

- 1) The SC further noted that the IGAD secretariat is confident that it can undertake the necessary steps for making full use of the primary results achieved by IGAD LPI at the end of the project's operations (e.g. establishment of ICPALD; IGAD-related action in the framework of the AU-IBAR coordinated Veterinary Governance project; the regional policy framework on animal health, trade and vulnerability, dedicated livestock development projects to be designed in the regional European Development Fund (EDF) 10 framework; regional Disaster Risk Management project as coordinated by FAO). It is necessary for the IGAD secretariat to take the above steps in full.
- 2) The SC recommends IGAD give full consideration to the need for timely and substantial support to project generated initiatives and institutions as IGAD LPI's implementation phase comes to an end.
- 3) The SC welcomes the proposal of a high level meeting to agree the nature of the institutional and policy environment required to ensure food security for livestock dependent men and women in the IGAD region and recommends that it takes place in 2011.
- 4) The SC recommends IGAD and IGAD LPI develop a phasing out and transition plan, in collaboration with the member states, for the project at national and regional level.
- 5) For the final period of LPI up to end February 2012, the SC recommends the project to focus on strengthening / sustaining the institutional instruments at the national level (Policy Hubs and Information Nodes) and on designing firm linkages of these national instruments to the Regional Livestock Policy Framework.

- 6) The SC welcomes the proposed collaboration between IGAD LPI and the “Regional Initiative in Support of Vulnerable Pastoralists and Agro-Pastoralists in the Horn of Africa” project. It recommends that the collaboration be managed in order to further develop the capacity of the national level institutions established through IGAD LPI, and to strengthen their linkages with the IGAD Secretariat.
- 7) The SC recommends that the project pursue a balanced approach in designing and advocating evidence-based livestock sector development policies (i.e. livestock’s role in (a) economic growth, markets and trade; (b) livelihood support and poverty alleviation).
- 8) The SC appreciates the value of the study of livestock’s contribution to the national economy which was carried out in Ethiopia. It further recommends member countries carry out similar studies, the outputs of which can then be used in support of livestock policy and project proposals for consideration by governments.
- 9) The SC recommends that the policy hubs encourage the initiation of policy proposals from stakeholder ministries other than those directly responsible for livestock.
- 10) The SC recommends that all effort be placed on completing planned project activities in Somalia, and in this connection, to support the newly established Somali Livestock Stakeholder Forum in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, October 2010.

## ANNEX B: AGENDA

Agenda for the 6<sup>th</sup> IGAD LPI Steering Committee Meeting  
14<sup>th</sup> - 15<sup>th</sup> December 2010,  
Naivasha, Republic of Kenya

Day 1	Tuesday, December 14, 2010	
09:00 - 09:30	Welcome, introductions and adoption of Agenda	Chair
09:30 - 10:30	Overview on Progress: Key Issues to be Addressed	Dil Peeling
10:30 - 11:00	Break	
11:00 - 12:15	Report on 2010: Result Areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Result 4</li> <li>• Result 3</li> <li>• Result 2</li> <li>• Result 1</li> <li>• Communication Strategy</li> <li>• Discussions</li> </ul>	Abdi Jama Otieno Mtula Abebe Demissie
12:15 - 12:30	Report on Progress Against Recommendations of 5 <sup>th</sup> SCM	Dil Peeling
12:30 - 13:30	Lunch	
13:30 - 15:30	National Plans for Sustainability	IGAD LPI Team
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction</li> </ul>	Otieno Mtula
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Djibouti</li> </ul>	Ahmed Darar Djibril
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ethiopia</li> </ul>	Alemayehu Mekonnen
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Kenya</li> </ul>	<b>Abdulahi O. Ismael</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Somalia</li> </ul>	Abdirahman Nur Qeiliye
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Sudan</li> </ul>	Kamal Tagelsir Elsheikh
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Uganda</li> </ul>	Nicholas Kauta
15:30 - 16:00	Break	
16:00 - 17:00	Regional Plans for Sustainability	IGAD
19:00	Welcome dinner	AU-IBAR

Day 2	Wednesday, December 15, 2010	
09:00 - 10:00	GDP Study Findings	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction</li> </ul>	Abdi Jama
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Study findings</li> </ul>	Roy Behnke
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• discussions</li> </ul>	Abdi Jama
10:00 - 10:15	The Veterinary Governance Project. An Overview and Questions	Nouala Simplice
10:15 - 10:45	Break	
10:45 - 1:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work plan 2011 - up to 2012</li> </ul>	IGAD LPI team
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Overview</li> </ul>	Dil Peeling
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Disaster Risk Management Programme</li> </ul>	Otieno Mtula
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Information Function- Exit Strategy</li> </ul>	Abdi Jama
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Somalia programme</li> </ul>	Abdi Jama
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Kenya National Economy Study</li> </ul>	Abdi Jama
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Lesson learned</li> </ul>	Otieno Mtula
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Discussion</li> </ul>	Dil Peeling
1:00 - 14:15	Lunch	
14:15 - 15:30	Steering Committee Recommendations	Chair
15:30	Close	Chair
15:30 - 16:00	Break	

## ANNEX C: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Intervention logic	OVI	MoV	Assumptions
<b>Overall objective</b>			
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>	
<b>Project purpose</b>			<b>Project purpose to overall objective</b>
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
<b>Results</b>			<b>Results to project purpose</b>
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><b>Inputs: total budget:</b></p> <p>€5,489,945</p> <p><b>Means of Verification</b></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 2011**

Item	Cost (\$ US)
Result 1	87,000
Somalia	110,000
ICPALD	8,000
ICT procurement	20,000
Livestock and Kenyan Economy	55,000
Lesson Learning	145,000
<b>Total from IGAD LPI funds</b>	<b>425,000</b>
DRM	335,000
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>760,000</b>

## ANNEX E: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS OF THE 6<sup>TH</sup> IGAD LPI SCM

Secretariat		
Chairperson	<b>Mr Maina Karaba</b> Acting Director for Agriculture and Environment, IGAD Secretariat, Djibouti, Republic of Djibouti	maina.karaba@igad.int Off. +253-356452 Fax. +253-353520
Secretary	<b>Dr Dil Peeling</b> 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	<b>Dr Ahmed Darar Djibril</b> 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
Ethiopia	<b>Dr Alemayehu Mekonnen</b> Veterinary Public Health, Inspection and Quarantine Unit, Animal and Plant Health Regulatory Directorate (APHRD) Ministry of Agriculture (MoA)	anbessie777@yahoo.com <b>alemalemayehu22@gmail.com</b> <b>Office +251-116-462301</b> Tel:- <b>Mob +251-911-609912</b> E-mail:-
Kenya	<b>Mr Abdullahi O. Esmail</b> Deputy Director of Livestock Production Ministry of Livestock Development, Nairobi, Kenya	aoesmail@gmail.com Off. +254 20 2722601 Fax. +254 20 2728609
Somalia	<b>Dr Abdirahman Nur Qeiliye</b> Director General, Ministry of Livestock, Fisheries and Environment, Somalia	garish01@hotmail.com Off. +252 151 32463 Cell. +254 729 375810 Nairobi, Kenya
Sudan	<b>Dr Kamal Tagelsir Elsheikh</b> Director, International Relations Department, Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries, Khartoum, the Sudan	ktagelsir11@yahoo.com Off. +249 926 448513 Khartoum, Sudan
Uganda	<b>Dr Nicholas Kauta</b> Commissioner, Dept. of Livestock Health & Entomology, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Animal Industry and Fisheries	nicholaskauta@yahoo.co.uk P.O.Box 513 Tel. Mobile: +256 (772) 693 257 Entebbe, Uganda
Organisations		
IGAD	<b>Dr Samuel Zziwa</b> Programme Manager for Agriculture, Livestock and Food Security, IGAD Secretariat, Djibouti, Republic of Djibouti	igad@igad.int Off. +253-356452 Fax. +253-353520
AU	<b>Dr Nouala Simplicie</b> 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	<b>Dr Herve Delsol</b> IGAD-Livestock Policy Initiative and Natural Disaster Facility, Rural Development and Food Security Section, Delegation of the European Union to Ethiopia	herve.delsol@ec.europa.eu Tel. +251 11 661 25 11 Ext. 225 Cell: +251 913 38 57 22
FAO	<b>Dr Samuel Jutzi</b> Director, FAO-AGA, Rome, Italy	samuel.jutzi@fao.org Off. +39 06 570 53371
FAO-PPLPI	<b>Dr Tim Robinson</b> 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
<b>Presenter</b>		
Odessa Centre Ltd.	<b>Dr Roy Behnke</b> Freelance Consultant	roy_behnke@msn.com Tel. +44 (0) 1608 674489
<b>Participants</b>		
FAO IGAD LPI	<b>Dr Abdi Jama</b> Livestock Information Advisor Addis Ababa, Ethiopia	a.jama@cgiar.org Off. +251 116 172000 Ext. 2574 Cell. +251 912 056713 Fax. +251 116 172001
	<b>Dr. Otieno Mtula</b> Livestock Policy Advisor Addis Ababa, Ethiopia	o.mtula@cgiar.org Off. +251 116 172000 Ext. 2575 Cell. +251 912 056714 Fax. +251 116 172001
	<b>Mr. Abebe Demissie</b> Communication Officer Addis Ababa, Ethiopia	a.demissie@cgiar.org Off. +251 116 172000 Ext. 2571 Cell. +251 911 661257 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.