



**IGAD  
Livestock  
Policy  
Initiative**

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

Khartoum, 6 – 7 February, 2008



■ **Meeting Report**

## CONTENTS

Acronyms .....	II
Opening Session and Cocktail .....	1
Welcome and Introductions.....	1
IGAD LPI: Activities 2007/Work Programme 2008 .....	1
First Presentation.....	1
Second Presentation .....	4
Discussion .....	4
Country Presentations.....	8
National Presentation: Kenya .....	8
National Presentation: the Sudan.....	9
National Presentation: Uganda .....	11
Discussion .....	12
Findings of Regional Stakeholder Workshop “Strengthening Demand-Led Animal Health Services” .....	15
Presentation.....	15
Discussion .....	17
Enhancing Demand-Led Animal Health Services for Pastoralist Areas of the IGAD Region: an Integrated Set of Concept Notes .....	20
Presentation.....	20
Overview of Project Activities with Budget Estimates .....	25
Presentation.....	25
Summary of Discussions and Recommendations .....	29
Close of Meeting.....	31
Annex A: Agenda.....	32
Annex B: List of Participants.....	33
Annex C: Logical Framework .....	34
Annex D: Steering Committee Terms of Reference .....	37
Annex E: EC/FAO Visibility Campaign .....	38

## ACRONYMS

AFDB	African Development Bank
ALIVE	African Livestock Partnership
AMESD	African Monitoring of the Environment for Sustainable Development
ASARECA	Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa
AU	African Union
AU-DREA	AU Directorate of Rural Economy and Agriculture
AU-IBAR	AU Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources
Beca	Biosciences eastern and central Africa
BSE	Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy
CAH	Community Based Animal Health
CAHW	Community Based Animal Health Worker
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
CODEX	Codex Alimentarius, International Food Standards Organisation
CPA	Comprehensive Peace Agreement (Sudan)
CPMR	Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution
CSP	Country Strategy Paper
EAC	East African Community
EC	European Commission
ECAPAPA	Eastern and Central Africa Programme for Agricultural Policy Analysis
EDF	European Development Fund
ESA	East and Southern Africa
EU	European Union
FAO	United Nation's Food and Agriculture Organisation
FAO AG	FAO's Agriculture Department
FAO TC	FAO's Technical Cooperation Department
FAO TCA	FAO's Policy Assistance Division
FAO TCE	FAO's Emergency Operations and Rehabilitation Division
FAO TCI	FAO's Investment Centre Division
FAO TCO	FAO's Operations Division
FARA	Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa
FEWS NET	Famine Early Warning System Network

FSAU	Food Security Analysis Unit
GIEWS	Global Information and Early Warning System on Food and Agriculture
HYCOS	Hydrological Cycle Observation System
ICPAC	IGAD Climate Prediction and Application Centre
ICT	Information and Communication Technologies
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
IGAD LMIS	IGAD Livestock Management Information System
IGAD LPI	IGAD Livestock Policy Initiative
IOC	Indian Ocean Commission
IRCC	Inter-Regional Coordinating Committee
LESP	Livestock Epidemiology Surveillance
LPI	Livestock Policy Initiative
NTFP	National Technical Focal Point
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO	Non-Government Organisations
NLC	National Land Commission
NMTPF	FAO National Medium Term Priority Framework
OIC	Officer in Charge
OIE	The World Organisation for Animal Health
PACE	Pan African Campaign against Epizootics
PAAT	Programme Against African Trypanosomiasis
PATTEC	Pan African Tsetse and Trypanosomiasis Eradication Campaign
PPLPI	Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Initiative
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers
RAO	Regional Authorising Officer
RDP	Reconstruction & Development Program
REC	Regional Economic Community
REFORM	Regional Food Security and Risk Management
REO	Regional Economic Organisation
RIO	Regional Integration Organisation
RIP	Regional Indicative Programme
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SC	Steering Committee

<b>SCM</b>	Steering Committee Meeting
<b>SPA</b>	Strategic Partnership Agreement
<b>SPS</b>	Sanitary & Phytosanitary
<b>SWALIM</b>	Somali Water & Land Information Management
<b>TFG</b>	Transitional Federal Government of the Republic of Somalia
<b>TPAG</b>	Technical Policy Advisory Group
<b>TPFT</b>	Technical Policy Formulation Team
<b>UNTP</b>	UN Transition Plan
<b>WFP-VAM</b>	World Food Programme's Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping
<b>WTO</b>	World Trade Organisation

Tuesday 5, February

## OPENING SESSION AND COCKTAIL

The third meeting of the Steering Committee (SC) of the IGAD Livestock Policy Initiative (IGAD LPI) was opened during a cocktail reception at the Alferdous Hotel in Khartoum, Sudan. Welcome speeches were given by the following: Dr Dil Peeling, on behalf of the IGAD LPI Project; Dr Samuel Zziwa on behalf of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD); Mr Paul Webber on behalf of the European Commission (EC) Delegation to Ethiopia; Dr Samuel Jutzi on behalf of FAO's Animal Production and Health Division (AGA), within which the project is housed; Mr Abdallah Bin Yehia on behalf of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) Representation in the Sudan; and by the guest of honour, Dr Nawai Gubair Nawai, Director General of Planning and Animal Resources Economics Administration (in lieu of the Undersecretary of Animal Resources and Fisheries, Dr Bashir Taha Mohamed Taha), who welcomed the SC members to Sudan and officially opened the meeting.

Wednesday 6, February

## WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

In the absence of Mr Maina Karaba, the acting Director of Agriculture and Environment, IGAD Secretariat (and therefore acting Chairman of the Steering Committee), Mr. Julius Kiptarus, Director of Livestock Production, Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries, Kenya, agreed to chair the SCM. He began by welcoming the new Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) and all present to the meeting. He recognised the presence of Dr William Olaho Mukani, the SC member from Uganda, Mr Berhanu Sitotaw, SC member from Ethiopia, Mr Ahmed Dharar Djibril, the SC Member for Djibouti and established that a quorum was present to allow the meeting to proceed, noting that Eritrea had officially suspended their membership of IGAD and Somalia had not nominated a SC Member. Mr Kiptarus proposed that the meeting should adopt the Agenda of the meeting (see Annex 1) after which he requested the new CTA, Dr Dil Peeling, to set off the SCM with his presentations.

## IGAD LPI: Activities 2007/Work Programme 2008

### First Presentation

Dr Peeling began by drawing the committee's attention to project log frame and the wording of the 4 specific areas, intended to deliver the project purpose (see Annex 2). The project purpose also had specific terminology that needed to be looked at more carefully. Within the project purpose was the terminology "capacity" in relation to the "livestock" and "policies that sustainably reduce food insecurity and poverty". He observed that the Contribution Agreement of the project was very clear in stating that "...it is widely accepted that member states do not have appropriate policies in place to optimise the contribution of the livestock sector to the achievement of development objectives". He went on to note that this realisation was not new. Quoting a 1999 review of 600 livestock projects, he observed the review's conclusion that there was "...little evidence of widespread sustainable impact on the livelihoods of the poor...." from the

projects. He went on to note that the review further concluded "...despite islands of success....technical and service projects were not successful in benefiting the poor on a sustainable manner..." He stressed that both "technical" and "service" projects were implied in the results of this review. The project financing agreement, itself, clearly stated that "...in many countries, livestock production is heavily distorted in favour of large scale producers..." He then posed the question as to what the "islands of success" were, to which the review referred. Such "islands of success" were extremely relevant to the formulation of the project purpose in relation to the capacity building in the livestock sector and policies that sustainably reduce food insecurity and poverty. According to the Financing Agreement, he noted, "History shows that it is policies and institutions, not technical innovation, that first lead to development and that technology adoption follows institutional change". The project purpose therefore clearly recognised the need to "formulate" and "implement" policies and the targeted audience were "IGAD, member states, regional organisations, and other stakeholders". The policies themselves needed to "support livelihoods", and be "evidence based" and "responsive to the needs of livestock dependant poor". This implied that in order to build the capacities implied in the project purpose, there was a need to understand livelihoods and institutions and to avoid casual assumptions.

Dr Peeling then turned his attention to the 4 result areas that are intended to lead to the achievement of the project purpose (See Annex 2).

Dr Peeling started by noting that the first Result area related to both the increased "capacity" implied in the project purpose and to "awareness" creation.

He further pointed out that the second Result area brought with it the question as to where the capacity implied in the project purpose was supposed to be built. Was it supposed to be built at the organisational or at the individual level? He argued that as it is organisations that produce and implement policy, it is the capacity of organisations that the project should focus on. Improved understanding or capacity of any one individual within the larger system could not be assumed to deliver the policies and institutions required by the project logic.

He noted that in building this capacity, the project had to move from analysis (which had characterised the projects approach to date) through analysis-and-debate (using analysis to stimulate dialogue on policy issues) to learning-by-doing (allowing people to learn at an organisational level as they engage with policy processes). Similarly the project had to move from Knowledge generation, through Attitude change to improved Practice. Dr Peeling observed that the activities in this result area: had to contribute towards the capacity building addressed in the project purpose; had to generate lessons; had to create ownership by the target beneficiaries; had to encompass as far as possible the breadth and complexity of the areas it addresses; had to be feasible and visible, and (in line with previous SC recommendations), had to address national issues of regional importance.

The policy interventions selected under this result area should, as far as possible, meet those criteria. As the project addressed agreed policy areas through national policy fora (termed 'policy hubs') the fora would be supported by the project to evaluate their management of the process in terms of its ability to deliver a favourable outcome for the livestock dependant poor. It would be through this engagement (learning by doing) and through the process monitoring (capturing lessons) that the capacity of organisations would be built. Project interventions could as an example take place in an array of parallel processes such as regulation of markets and emergency response, while the policy processes themselves would need to be monitored, by those involved, for how well they adhered to agreed principles of good policy making.

The project had now completed its preparatory phase and was in a position to commence interventions (ie engagement with policy processes) in a range of areas. Prioritisation, however, would be required, in order to select the project's areas of activity over the coming 12 month period.

Possible areas of engagement that had presented themselves to date were: (i) The representation of livestock in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), (ii) support and regulation of Community Based Animal Health (iii) High Level Meeting of the IGAD Region's Agriculture Ministers in order to agree a regional framework for animal health polices (thereby providing individual countries with guidance as to how to formulate their own pro-poor national policies); (iv) developing strategies and national sensitisation on Commodity Based Trade (v) Regulating National/Local Markets and doing studies on taxation, and (vi) Understanding Market Requirements in the Arabian Peninsula, and; (vii) selection of Techniques for Trypanosome Control:

The project would also foster learning from interventions through analysis of cross cutting themes such as international trade and the poor: do the poor benefit and how could they benefit better?

The third result area was geared towards creating capacity for decision making in policy making and as such, would need to be a two way "service" to policy through analysis and decision support e.g. through livelihoods studies, evaluations or contributions to Result area 1 of the project and institutional analyses. A substantial element of this result would be an information system that would capture lessons and feed them into policy.

Finally, Dr Peeling noted that the key phrase in the fourth result area (involvement of civil society) was "negotiation of policies and institutional changes". From the perspective of capacity building at government level; sustainable linkages needed to be built where civil society would be consulted and reported back to; civil society values are accepted; there is mutual respect, and; there is sustainable funding. From the perspective of building the capacity at civil society level, there was need to improve their understanding of policy processes and to strengthen abilities of advocacy and the presentation of credible, evidence based arguments. He stressed, however, that improving the ability of civil society to negotiate policy outcomes would not only require capacity building within those organisations themselves, but also within government institutions, to allow their meaningful representation.

Concluding his presentation, Dr Peeling noted that the OVIs for the logframe needed to be updated to make them fit for reporting and to align them with the project's actual interventions. He observed that there was need for an output that would respond to training, communications and dissemination.

He finally listed the following as issues that he was requesting the SCM to consider:

- Eritrea: the status of Eritrea as an IGAD LPI project country.
- Somalia: need for a SC Member to represent Somalia.
- Strengthening IGAD: the role of IGAD in regional policy; the type of capacities to be built and where the capacity was to be built whether at the secretariat or in the member states
- Logframe: the logframe needed to be refreshed as a basis for reporting, and
- Strategies; particularly with respect to targeting of Result number 1 of the IGAD LPI Logframe.

With this, Dr Peeling ended the first part of his presentation. Discussions were deferred to the end of the second half of the presentation (below).

## Second Presentation

After a short break, Dr Peeling began the second part of his presentation. He began by observing that in response to the purpose of the project, the project would approach capacity building with a philosophy of “steering and not rowing”; meaning it was national and regional organisations that would have to take the work forward, in order for their institutional capacity to increase. New policy directions had to be found that addressed institutions for the poor. The primary focus would be on policy objectives. Policy needed to come before planning and planning needed to be a response to policy.

Interventions needed to be responsive, meaning there was need to avoid casual assumptions in identifying what was good for poor. The capacity for analysis would therefore be key.

He pointed out that the first result area was the “face” of the project. This result area needed to go beyond creating awareness to promoting livestock issues in policy processes. The Result area needed to manage political will and it needed to go higher and broader than the livestock sector.

The second Result area was the engine of learning, generating this learning through the work of the Policy Hubs.

The third result area was all about policy support and was linked to the planned policy hubs as a client for and provider of information. The output was intended to assist planners in responding to the new policy agenda. He noted that the project website helped to promote the project and the areas in which it is active. He noted that as the project develops it will move from analysis to analysis-and-debate to learning-by-doing. The same framework would be used for the website and such experience would be captured and put in written format, and possibly video, etc. as appropriate. He also introduced the project website containing spatial data which the project was developing as a means of supporting the information system. This would be a temporary database for spatial and other analytical data that the project was compiling. The principle was that the project would be developing a network of information nodes, most of whose information would be in the public domain and accessible to everybody.

The fourth result area was about improving participation, not just at national but also at regional and international levels. The stakeholders addressed in this output (CSOs and NGOs) would form part of the foreseen policy hubs. The project would commission national consultancies to identify key CSOs and NGOs. It would also evaluate their capacities for effective stakeholder representation in the negotiation of policies and institutional changes. Dr Peeling concluded his presentation by observing that there was a need to revisit the log frame and its OVs.

## Discussion

Opening discussions, Dr Zziwa informed the participants that the IGAD website was currently being upgraded from a website to a web portal. Questions regarding the IGAD LPI’s website’s sustainability were raised. Dr Peeling responded by noting that the project website was part of the project’s communication strategy i.e. how it delivers information about policies and institutions. This related to the project’s work in developing information systems at national level, part of which would be networked regionally through the IGAD website. Dr Peeling however accepted that the issue of sustainability would be critical.

Dr Olaho Mukani from Uganda noted that there was limited activity going on at the national level and questioned if the project could address important interventions in the country in the next 2.5 years of the project's life. He stated the need to consider possibilities of extension for the project and asked if there would be possibilities for fast tracking some of the activities before the end of the project.

Dr Peeling responded by noting that it was important to identify the policy issues that could be addressed in the remaining time frame of 2.5 years of the project. He observed that fast tracking was an option that could be looked at for taking the projects initiatives forward. He noted the importance of looking out for partnerships i.e. ongoing experiences in the field and ongoing processes that the project could link up with to extend the time frame for activities being addressed by the project and also to influence the processes which are ongoing and that would continue after the end of the project.

Dr Mirghani from Sudan posed the question as to how the project could interlink the PRSP papers in each country so as to get a Regional process for interventions related to poverty reduction and also to influence the agricultural sector in each country to give more attention to the livestock sector.

Dr Peeling responded by noting that the project's engagement with PRSPs would be at national level and that the networking would be on an issue based level. He reminded the participants that the project had been asked by previous SCMs to look into regional issues of national relevance and that PRSPs were national documents with regional implications. The PRSPs he noted, presented opportunities for the project in terms of institutionalising learning on national policy making processes. PRSPs had regional relevance particularly at the intervention level and they were the means by which the project was addressing Result area 1. He stressed the need for the member states to strategise with the project on how best to promote the livestock sector in their countries. He noted that the project needed to put credibility behind the public face of livestock and in doing that the project should:

1. Address why the livestock sector has historically been given a low priority in national policy documents
2. Engage civil society to address the more political issues
3. Develop a logical case based on the experience generated through the project's interventions as to how livestock can be important.

Mr Berhanu, (Ethiopia) felt the presentation by the CTA did not disclose sufficiently how the activities were to be implemented or what the deliverables were. He also queried whether the SC members were in a position to know how the budget was used in terms of the relative amounts spent between different countries. It was also important to know the budget for the remaining 2.5 years and how it will be utilised by individual countries. He would need to report these to his Minister but it would also be important for determining the sustainability of the activities being implemented by the project.

In response, Dr Peeling pointed out that the project was mandated to address issues of regional importance and therefore it would be difficult to demarcate the budget between regional and national issues.

Dr Peeling further noted that the report to the SC had put more emphasis on the logframe and particularly the OVIs rather than the milestones themselves. He pointed out that in some activities, the project was ahead of schedule and in others the project was behind schedule. He noted that milestones only help to show whether an activity had been delivered on time or not and did not tell if that activity did sustainably contribute to the OVIs. Although those milestones

were reported against, the SC needed to comment on how to deliver them better and also to determine whether the results were those that the project had been asked to deliver.

As an observer from the EC, Mr Webber found it encouraging that the project had changed up a gear in achieving project objectives. He suggested that further discussions needed to include the following:

- The role of NGOs and CSOs in the project, as their role in the project was clearly stipulated in the financing agreement. He raised concerns that it appeared that only government officials were being addressed by the project so far and that maybe there was need for an interpretation of their inclusion in project activities.
- There was need for a clear breakdown of the budget lines as spelt out in the financing agreement in order to see the over and under expenditures since the beginning of the project. He stressed that it was important to take into consideration that this was a regional project and that each country would benefit within this approach and therefore it would not be necessary to disaggregate the budget into countries.
- There was need to discuss the extension of the project as changing policies amongst a diverse group of countries is not easy to achieve in 2.5 years. He however noted that there should be credible evidence of progress on result areas to justify a request for extension. Other options along these lines would be:
  - To have an amendment for the present project if there is funding that is not utilised.
  - Possibility of extension with a budgetary increase if the funds could be found.
  - Possibility of a second phase.

Mr Webber said that this would require lobbying by IGAD because the EC had regional funds for the Horn of Africa which could possibly be channelled through IGAD. He therefore recommended that IGAD should aim to include this in the 10th EDF financing. He recognised the need for an IGAD Agriculture Ministers' meeting but felt it would be a challenge to organise and that the SC could suggest how to organise it and how IGAD could be supported.

The chairman suggested that the IGAD member states could prepare a comprehensive paper during the IGAD meeting justifying the need for the extension of the project.

The budget holder, Dr Tim Robinson said that funding mechanisms were quite cumbersome and therefore supported the need to start the process of any extension early. He also pointed out that there had never been a budget section in the report but this too could be added in the next report, although it would not be disaggregated by country.

SC members from Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda felt that resources to be expended directly in the countries e.g. for NSCFs, consultancies, etc needed to be broken down in order to show the resources going into each country, and therefore the level of participation of those countries in the project.

Dr Nouala from AU-IBAR raised concerns over the participation of Eritrea and Somalia in the project. He appreciated the fact that the project was looking into ways of implementing its activities in Somalia through other FAO. He observed that the project would have to develop a strategy to ensure ownership by the Somali government and to encourage Somalia's participation in the SC meeting.

Dr Peeling said that engagement with Somalia was now possible and that various options for doing this were being discussed with the FAO office for Somalia. The nomination of the SC member for Somalia would indeed have to be made by IGAD for the project to advance its Somali activities.

Commenting on the presentation by Dr Peeling, Dr Jutzi believed it was important to discuss Result No.2. The SCM needed to look at ways of prioritising the activities listed under the output.

Finally, Mr Berhanu (Ethiopia) expressed his opinion that the priority interventions had been identified but that there was still the need to specify the time frame along with the actions that needed to be taken and the name of the participating countries. He wanted to know the type of support required from SC members and NTFPs in each member state. This, he said, would help determine country specific areas of operation and thereby allow for their integration in national programmes, in order to improve sustainability. He also emphasised that the project will have to give a clear direction as to how to implement its interventions whereas harmonising and synthesising the activities would eventually be the responsibility of the countries.

The meeting then broke off for lunch.

## COUNTRY PRESENTATIONS

The afternoon session began with presentations from Kenya, Sudan and Uganda on the findings of the National Stakeholder Consultative Forums (NSCFs) held in those countries.

### National Presentation: Kenya

Mr Kiptarus, from the Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries development began by giving an overview of the current status of pro-poor livestock policy and institutional change in Kenya, stating that the livestock sector contributed about 50 percent of Kenya's agricultural GDP. He pointed out that there were several livestock policies under review in Kenya. Once finalised, these policies would address issues of poverty alleviation, wealth creation and economic growth. He listed the policies as follows:

- Policies Reducing Vulnerability:
  - Access to land: The National Land policy was in draft form and was controversial.
  - Access to Animal feeds: The livestock feeds policy and bill were in their final draft.
  - Access to water: The National policy on water was being developed.
  - Access to risk coping mechanisms: The National policy on disaster management was being developed.
- Policies Creating Conditions for Growth:
  - Agricultural extension: The National agricultural sector extension policy was in draft.
  - Livestock and Veterinary services: The National Livestock policy was ready
  - Rural credit: There was currently no policy on this and this was therefore a policy gap.
  - Livestock Marketing: The National Livestock policy was ready.
  - The Economic Recovery Strategy (ERS) which had been the overall policy document and the equivalent of Kenya's PRSP during the last 5 years had expired and would be replaced by the Vision 2030 document.
- Policies Sustaining Growth:
  - Trade: There was currently no trade policy in place and this was therefore a policy gap
  - Research: The national agricultural research systems policy was in draft.
  - Food safety and quality: The National food safety policy was in draft.
  - Environment: The sessional paper on environment and development was being developed.

Mr. Kiptarus went on to describe the status of the IGAD LPI work in Kenya. The NSCF for Kenya had been held and the report had been submitted to IGAD LPI. The livestock information and livestock related policy inventories had also been conducted by the NTFP and the draft report had been submitted to the project.

Dr Kiptarus concluded his presentation by listing the resolutions that came out of the NSCF. These were:

- Livestock Trade and Marketing
  - Facilitate the development and implementation of policies that enhance private sector involvement in animal health delivery services and establishment of disease free zones.
  - Facilitate the development of policies that encourage public/private sector investment in infrastructure and value addition processes.
  - Facilitate the development and implementation of policies that strengthen regulatory institutions, certification processes and traceability mechanisms.
  - Facilitate the development and implementation of policies that consolidate national security through enhanced regional conflict prevention and resolution mechanisms especially security concerns arising from livestock related conflicts.
  - Facilitate the development and implementation of policies that will enhance regional livestock trade through National Livestock Trade Policy.
- Information Needs, Sources and Accessibility
  - Facilitate livestock information inventory with respect to pro-poor policies.
  - Facilitate the establishment and operation of a Livestock Information Node based around the National Technical Focal Point and with a functional secretariat at the Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development.
  - Facilitate capacity building in Livestock Information analysis and dissemination, including impact assessment, monitoring, and evaluation
- Livestock Institutions and Institutional Linkages
  - Consolidate identified stakeholders into a Livestock Policy Stakeholders Network to provide for continuous engagement of the stakeholders.
  - Establish and operationalise the Livestock Policy Stakeholders Network with a functional Secretariat initially located at the MOLFD and supported by the NTFP.

## National Presentation: the Sudan

Dr Mirghani Hassan, from the Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries, gave an overview of the current status of pro-poor livestock policy and institutional change in Sudan. Explaining that the sector contributed about 21 percent of Sudan's agricultural GDP, he listed the different livestock development strategies developed by the Ministry as follows:

- Giving increased attention to small producers in the traditional pastoral and sedentary sectors (improvement and protection of pasture, opening of stock routes and providing dry feed).
- Promoting livestock systems by expanding the modern sector and intensive production for export.
- Introducing modern technologies in the feed industry and breeding.
- Expanding the delivery of veterinary and extension services.
- Expanding water harvesting along pastoralist stock routes.
- Giving increased attention to marketing services.

- Strengthening the attachment of livestock keepers and other beneficiaries' at large to their land through policies (settling pastoralists).

Dr Mirghani further presented the resolutions coming out of Sudan's NSCF as follows:

- Enhance awareness for a gradual change in the attitude and concepts of livestock policy formulating agencies and stakeholders concerning pro-poor livestock policies at federal, state and locality/community levels.
- Gradually effect a change in livestock owners away from traditional production practices through enhanced marketing.
- Enhancing role of women in livestock rearing, animal production, animal products processing and marketing.
- Putting in place safety net mechanisms for livestock owners against natural disasters and diseases outbreaks.
- Improving the capacity for pro-poor livestock policy formulation and implementation for all stakeholders.
- Cooperating with ongoing and pipe line activities, programs and projects in the area of livestock policy initiative (eg IFAD, WB, etc).
- Enhancing the respective roles of the government, private sector and the community in providing services, inputs, protection, access to land and water resources.
- Enhancing capacity building for policies leading to promotion and marketing of livestock products and by-products (quality, storage, transportation and processing).
- Enhancing capacity for establishing stakeholders' policy associations/organisations at grass root level.
- The NSCF agreed on consolidating the key stakeholders into: The Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries, the Department of Range and Pasture of the Ministry of Agriculture, the state ministries of agriculture, animal resources, irrigation and natural resources, pastoralist union, and representatives of the private sector. The other stakeholders could come in on call.
- Information and Information Nodes: The workshop recommended that the Centre for Information of the Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries should be the main point for collection of information. The centre would need to have capacity for the compilation, storage, retrieval and dissemination of data, information and reports in electronic and hard copies, and printed material. It will need to be linked with other MIS in Sudan (federal and state), and the IGAD Region and other international information network centres.
- IGAD-LPI should support capacity building for pro-poor livestock policy formulation:
  - To assist the MARF with organising pro-poor livestock policy awareness programs among senior staff and other key stakeholders.
  - To assist the Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries (MARF) in the establishment of Technical Policy Formulation Team (TPFT) network selected from key stakeholders at federal, state and community levels.
  - To collaborate with the MARF TPFT in revising existing inventory on livestock policy and strategies and extract/modify pro-poor livestock policies.

- To assist the MARF TPFT in harmonising pro-poor livestock policy with other related policies and government/NGOs/international organisations on-going and pipeline policies and activities in agriculture, social services and trade.
- To assist the MARF in internal and regional training programs/seminars for stakeholders on policy analysis and formulation for poor livestock owners.
- To assist the MARF TPFT in developing policy modules on pro-poor production and marketing institutions, by type and geography of animal distribution.

Dr Mirghani summed up his presentation by saying that the type of support expected from IGAD would be in the form of creating a Technical Policy Advisory Group (TPAG) providing short term consultant services, training, workshops, equipments and software. The proposed TPAG will be composed of: a pro-poor livestock policy formulation specialist, a livestock marketing expert and a livestock institutions expert. The function of the TPAG will be to provide policy advice and technical support to the MARF.

## National Presentation: Uganda

Dr William Olaho Mukani, from the Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) of Uganda, began his presentation by giving an overview of the current status of pro-poor livestock policy and institutional change in Uganda. Explaining that the sector contributed about 17 percent of Uganda's agricultural GDP, he said that Uganda did not have a Livestock Development Policy and that MAAIF was being urged to formulate one. The Plan for Modernisation of Agriculture (PMA) had identified livestock as an entry point for poverty alleviation. The delivery of extension services for livestock was being reviewed by the National Agricultural Advisory Delivery Services (NAADS). The MAAIF Development Strategy and Implementation plan 2004 - 2007 & 2007 - 2012 had prioritised investments in national agricultural development. According to the current NRM-O Policy of Prosperity for All (PFA), all agricultural development projects would now be put under one umbrella to be coordinated by the OPM. In order to properly address and bring about improvement in poverty eradication, the plan urges stakeholders to identify short-term, medium term and long-term agricultural enterprises for agricultural development for 300 households per sub-county; and most importantly identifies livestock as an important entry point for poverty alleviation. He then went on to describe the current efforts taking place in the country. This included: zoning for export of livestock and livestock products; abolition of open livestock markets to avoid disease spread (e.g. FMD & CBPP); centralising disease control and regulatory services and developing a National Livestock Development Policy as recommended by the PEAP. Dr Olaho also listed some of the policies being developed as follows:

- Land policy to be completed in 2008 - although it was still controversial.
- Range utilisation & management policy was under development and it would particularly address pastoral codes of conduct.
- National policy on delivery of veterinary services.
- National veterinary drug policy.
- Animal feeds policy and bill (in Parliament for approval).
- Vision 2035.
- National livestock census (scheduled to start from the 17-23/02/2008).

Dr Olaho described the NSCF held in Uganda from 18 - 19 October 2007 as successful. He shared the recommendations of the workshop as follows:

- Strategic Entry Points for Livestock Marketing:
  - Develop policies that will enhance trade in livestock and livestock products.
  - All livestock policies should be consolidated into a single comprehensive policy guideline document that can be easily accessed and used to guide trade in livestock and livestock products.
  - Develop policies that will enhance quality assurance in the livestock sector.
  - Develop policies in the identified new areas.
  - National Livestock development policy.
  - Land and range management policy.
  - Establish a national database and communications strategy.
- Strategic Entry Points for Delivery of Veterinary Services
  - Develop comprehensive policy and regulations for all livestock services and animal health.
  - Harmonise livestock policies and programmes within the IGAD region and other Regional Economic Communities.
- General
  - Identify and strengthen institutional linkages and coordination through establishment of a livestock policy network to be based at MAAIF and coordinated by the National Technical Focal Point.
  - Agree on a simple nomenclature and terms for the benefit of key stakeholders to the policy process.
  - The policy formulation process should be very consultative and should involve key stakeholders including smallholders and pastoralists.
  - Collate livestock policy information, coupled to a dissemination and implementation strategy.
  - Define what is meant by formal and informal livestock sectors.

Dr Mukani summed up saying that in order to have real impact the whole production value chain needs to be addressed. In the future, he said Uganda may also recentralise the extension workers as they are important to the chain. He noted that without recentralising the extension workers, problems of quality control especially for export of livestock and livestock products would not be tackled. He also stressed the need to address problems like grazing and animal disease by all member countries in order to help the poor livestock farmers.

## Discussion

Dr Peeling opened the discussions by linking the three presentations to what he presented in the work programme for the IGAD LPI Project. He noted that National Stakeholder Consultative Fora, so far held in the 3 countries, were one of the main sources of information in terms of identifying project priorities to be presented to the Steering Committee for consideration and that NSCF were yet to take place in Djibouti, Ethiopia and Somalia. He pointed out some common patterns emerging from the presentations to which the project was responding in the proposed work plan. Issues like the need for regional harmonisation around

the common theme of the supply of animal health services as relates to marketing; the need for broad and inclusive consultative processes and particularly the universal demand for national policy networks had been articulated, albeit in different words, by all presenters.

Dr Peeling pointed out that, linked to the establishment of policy networks, was a valuable list of stakeholders identified during the NSCF. Some of these stakeholders would be engaged regularly in project activities and others would be engaged when appropriate. The stakeholders identified during the NSCF would also provide the reservoir from which the members of the national policy hubs would be largely identified. The communication strategy at project level would ensure that all other stakeholders are adequately informed of project activities.

Dr Zziwa (IGAD) observed many livestock policy documents seemed to be in the pipeline, as illustrated by the Kenyan presentation. He pointed out the need to ensure that these documents were not contradicting or duplicating each other. Turning to the presentation from the Sudan, Dr Zziwa requested clarification on the composition the Technical Policy Formulation Team (TPFT) and asked if this included some grass root representation. He noted that the IGAD LMIS had stopped running as a project almost 2 years ago and that, currently, only Kenya was updating the system on a regular basis. He wondered whether there was a way for the IGAD LMIS system to continue.

Responding to some of the issues raised by Dr Zziwa, Mr Kiptarus observed that the Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries realised that they had around 130 old policies impacting on the agriculture sector and as a result, a country Agriculture Sector Coordinating Unit had been established to coordinate the sector and to prioritise those policies that required fast tracking. Because of this structure, he felt duplications were unlikely.

Dr Mirghani on his part pointed out that the pastoralist union was part of the Technical Policy Formulation Team recommended by the NSCF of the Sudan. The union had branches at the State level where they represented pastoralist communities.

Picking up on the issues raised by Dr Zziwa on the IGAD LMIS, Mr Kiptarus said that Kenya was still updating its LMIS, which showed prices of livestock in various markets, in about 27 locations. It also gives the volume traded and the grades. He further said that Djibouti, Ethiopia, Uganda and Tanzania were also updating the system. On this point, Dr Mukani observed that there was currently a project in Uganda under the African Development Bank (ADB) that was also addressing market information and that there was a need to harmonise this project with the IGAD efforts to avoid duplication. He also agreed on the importance of sustaining the IGAD LMIS.

Dr Jutzi, addressing both the project staff and the presenters, noted that national processes showed quite a wide range of diversity in the way in which livestock policies were being approached in the different countries. He wondered what would be done with the information collected from the NSCF and further queried whether the project would be looking for national issues with regional significance so that the project could respond to the recommendations from the previous SC meeting. Turning his attention to the presenters, Dr Jutzi observed that the term 'Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers' which are important documents in international dialogues were not mentioned in any of the presentations. He wondered if this meant that the PRSPs were not considered important instruments or platforms for addressing livestock concerns for poverty reduction and whether the countries had alternative policy instruments to address poverty alleviation as mentioned by Dr Olaho (Uganda) which might be more significant to these countries.

Mr Berhanu from Ethiopia asked if the project was satisfied with the organisation of the consultations; how the project was going to use the outcome from these 3 consultation meetings in the development of the overall work program for the year 2008 and beyond and what lessons could be drawn for those countries that have not yet conducted the workshops.

Dr Peeling responded that addressing areas of common interest was an important criterion that was given to the project by the SC. There was a need to look for commonalities in the areas identified in the NSCF, e.g. regional harmonisation, provision of demand led animal health services, formation of policy networks, and marketing. He noted that the outputs of the workshops also provided a useful baseline against which perceptions of policy priorities could be measured as the project develops. He mentioned the regional workshop on demand-led animal health services which would be presented by Dr Sones shortly and the political economy studies for all the different countries as further examples of activities whose outputs had contributed to the identification of project interventions. He added that the project was also in the middle of reviewing the policies that are in place in the member states through the NTFPs in each country. The project is also proposing to commission studies of livelihoods and the institutions affecting them; to carry out a review of civil society and how they were engaging in policy processes in order to identify means of providing support for better representation in policy processes.

Dr Peeling agreed that PRSPs had not been adequately discussed in the workshops with the exception of Sudan, and that neither were analysis of gender issues nor differentiation of the different socio-economic strata of poor livestock keepers. However he said that these issues would be addressed in the remaining workshops as an example of how the project would draw lessons to apply in the forthcoming consultative fora to be carried out in Djibouti, Ethiopia and Somalia.

Picking up on the issues of PRSPs and PRSP processes, Dr Mtula observed that the project planned to benefit from the methodological guide for the appropriate inclusion of the livestock sector in PRSPs, which PPLPI was developing in cooperation with ALive and CIRAD. All efforts would be made by the project to provide the relevant people in the IGAD member states with training on these guidelines. With regards to 'where the PRSPs are' Dr Mtula noted that most of the PRSP documents in the region had now been merged with mainstream planning documents e.g. The PEAP in Uganda and the PASDEP in Ethiopia. These would be looked at in the ongoing policy inventory work.

## FINDINGS OF REGIONAL STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP “STRENGTHENING DEMAND-LED ANIMAL HEALTH SERVICES”

### Presentation

Dr Sones began his presentation by pointing out that the need to address demand-led Animal Health Services was anchored on the need to improve market access for livestock and livestock products at local, regional and international levels and the need to reduce vulnerability of poor livestock keepers and their communities, particularly in the face of shocks and crises. IGAD-LPI had hosted a stakeholder workshop in Nairobi in October 2007. The workshop content was built around “success story” case studies; a survey of providers and users of animal health services; IGAD-LPI commissioned reports and working papers and other relevant published and unpublished material. During the workshop, participants came up with the following vision for animal health services in the region. “Enhanced livelihoods of livestock-dependent communities, which make a greater contribution to national economies and are supported by effective and demand-led animal health services”. Participants also came up with a mission statement that read as follows: “To facilitate the growth and availability of credible, coordinated and regulated animal health services, provided by a diverse range of appropriate suppliers that will contribute towards improved market access and reduced vulnerability of livestock-dependent communities in the IGAD region.” Participants had identified the following six areas of focus: (1) A focus on international trade as a bona fide tool for poverty reduction, and the dependency this has on standards of animal health and food safety; (2) A focus on reducing the high levels of vulnerability, and the contributions that healthy livestock can make to this reduction; (3) The development and regional harmonisation of national pro-poor animal health policies; (4) The development of regionally-harmonised national strategies for the control of priority market-impeding and vulnerability reducing livestock diseases; (5) The development and harmonisation of operating policies and procedures for Community-Based Animal Health Systems, and; (6) The integration of emergency livestock interventions with longer-term development and poverty reduction objectives.

Addressing these 6 areas one by one, Dr Sones began by noting that in international trade, there was a need for credible evidence that international trade reduces poverty, and clarification on how this trade depends on standards of animal health and food safety. He observed that the potential for poverty reduction through international market access was dependent upon the comparative advantage in livestock (higher potential to increase in domestic livestock prices when complying with SPS standards); the presence of integrated domestic markets (infrastructure, adequate institutions and policies); high participation of poor producers in domestic markets; high multiplier effect of the livestock sector (well developed crop sector, and developed feed, services and labour markets, and; the presence of significant rural poverty with high share of livestock producers among poor households). He then posed the question as to how the animal disease threat could be tackled. He pointed out that one way to go was through the establishment of disease free zones. Although this option looked politically attractive, was it technically achievable? The other option was through the potential role of deriving commodities from compartments. This approach had current examples in the region; there was a potential for niche

market products; the approach recognised the importance of trading partner engagement; there was however still complications with OIE recognition, and; there was the need for research.

Dr Sones then turned his attention to issues of reducing vulnerability through the strategic exploitation of livestock. The long term use of livestock to reduce vulnerability required targeting (geographical, community, gender, etc) and required addressing the provision of community animal health services. Interventions during crises also needed to be addressed as interventions could be inappropriate for the emergency (e.g. veterinary inputs in droughts where feeding may be more appropriate) and interventions could also undermine existing service delivery mechanisms (e.g. bringing in drugs from outside rather than working through local actors).

Turning his attention to the need for national, pro-poor, animal health policies, harmonised in the region, Dr Sones asserted that the policies should reflect a demand for services (market access, vulnerability reduction, pro-poor growth) and that there was the need for broad participation in their formulation and that it would be needed to consider the potential role for IGAD (through IGAD-LPI).

Turning his attention to national strategies for the control of priority diseases, which again are harmonised in the region, Dr Sones observed the need for a progression from the development of policies to the development of strategies, in order to implement the policies. The reasons for having harmonised approaches included: porous borders; the importance of animal identification and traceability; the importance of surveillance; the need for community animal health systems; epidemiology units, formal & informal communications, mobile phones; regional sharing of laboratory facilities; strategic stocks of vaccines and the need for broad participation.

Looking at Community Based Animal Health (CAH) Systems and the need for harmonised operating policies and procedures, Dr Sones noted that the systems had a unique strength and value, but were highly variable. There were many success stories but the concept was struggling for recognition by vets. There was progress with policies and operating procedures in some countries and therefore the need for shared learning. The concept provided unique support to both market access and vulnerability reduction. The concept was not new, but the time for action was now! Better integration of emergency livestock interventions with longer-term development and poverty reduction objectives required an understanding as to how well the 'machinery' for dealing with emergencies was integrated into long term sector planning and development; the role of NGOs, their communication, their coordination. The challenge lay in the integration of public and private sector players, balancing short-term emergency responses with long-term development.

Finally Dr Sones proposed the way forward. Based on the work they had undertaken, he concluded that to enhance livestock-orientated enterprises, the value of international trade will need to be central to the regional mandate of the IGAD-LPI and secondly that there was need to develop national animal health policies that are driven by the needs of a changing set of livestock and livestock commodity trade opportunities, and that support - and are supported by - national PRSPs. He further stressed the need to develop national strategies for the control of priority diseases constraining international trade opportunities and the need to formalise the role of CAH systems as a central component of pastoralist participation in international, added-value, livestock commodity markets.. The way forward also lay in ensuring that national, market-driven, animal health services are linked to, and in some cases integrated with, routine and emergency demand for animal health services. This was needed to reduce

vulnerability and also to ensure that market-driven animal health services are effectively integrated with national and international emergency response.

## Discussion

Mr Kiptarus began the discussion by informing the participants that the issue of CAHWs in pastoral areas in Kenya was being coordinated by the district veterinary offices in terms of provision of drugs, inputs and training. He observed that the major concern lay in the porous border between the countries and in the livestock movement either for grazing or for trade. He wondered how taxation could be harmonised across borders and how the maximum impact from trade could be achieved for the producers by avoiding middle men.

Dr Mukani stated that the issues raised needed in-depth consideration because they were not only relevant at the national level, but also affected the region as a whole. He observed the need for a supportive/coordinatory role for IGAD and AU-IBAR, because regionally coordinated animal health policies were something which could not be addressed by one country alone. He also noted that there was need to have a coordinated animal health policy and strategy and that IGAD in cooperation with AU-IBAR should take the lead in this regard.

Dr Jutzi explained that the paper was commissioned in the context of the IGAD livestock policy initiative which had a distinct pro-poor focus. He had the following observations to make on some of the points raised in the presentation as follows:

- International trade - he noted that the assumption here was that by enhancing international trade there would be significant pro-poor impacts from the participation of the Region in that trade. His opinion on this was that the stronger participation of the Region in international trade would contribute towards economic growth given the importance of the livestock sector in the region. He however observed that the pro-poor poverty alleviation impacts in the livestock keeping communities would need to be commensurate with that growth.
- Commodity trade - he noted that questions could be raised with respect to the poverty reduction effects. Given that the provision of some commodities out of compartments required substantial investment so as to make the international customer confident of the safety of the products, he wondered how and to what extent poor livestock communities would actually have access to these particular opportunities.
- Biological research - he observed that although there was need for certain biological research, socio-economic research would seem more appropriate for identifying opportunities for poor communities given the pro-poor focus of the IGAD LPI.
- Animal health policies - he noted that harmonised health policies across the Region were highly desirable but one needed to go into depth in discussing these issues.

Dr Sones observed that both biological and socio-economic research had been given equal importance in the Concept Note. In terms of harmonising animal health policies, Dr Sones explained that the proposal was for the IGAD LPI project to take the lead in facilitating national harmonised policies that are inclusive of the poor.

Dr Nouala of AU IBAR on his part observed that in addition to the international market one should also think of the Regional markets and Regional opportunities

that exist within Africa. He noted that he had expected to hear in the presentation the need to create synergy between the different RECs in Africa. He observed that the IGAD member states are currently in 4 different RECs and so the project would have to help in creating platforms where all the RECs engaged in policy harmonisation could meet and discuss in order to avoid conflicting interests.

Dr Sones responded to this by noting that the workshop paper would look at international, regional, national and domestic markets. He further noted that the paper would also give due consideration to the best options related to socio-economic and poverty reduction impacts.

Mr Djibril from Djibouti raised concerns regarding the regional vision for the provision of animal health services and questioned how it would be possible to have one vision when there was disparity with regards to the region's vision regarding animal health. He further raised concerns with international trade, noting that he perceived the link between international trade and food security to be indirect. He gave the example of the regional centre for exportation that had been created in Djibouti but which he noted had indeed contributed to the revenues of the country but there was no real evidence of its poverty reducing impact on the producers.

Dr Sones responded by giving the example of Somalia, where a trade ban becomes a food security issue because pastoralist's major source of income is cash from livestock export. This was the linkage that he had attempted to portray in his presentation.

Dr Mtula noted that the title of the Concept Note needed to be broader if the proposal was to address national policies on animal health, which had a broader constituency that went beyond pastoralist areas. He pointed out that IGAD should be leading the harmonisation effort on animal health and noted that a regional framework agreed upon at the highest level by the relevant Ministers on the national issues with regional relevance would contribute towards the harmonisation effort. This he noted would provide guidance to the national institutions to then tailor whatever they produce at the national level. IGAD had the convening power to enable this kind of ministerial meeting to take place.

In response, Dr Sones noted that the animal health policies mentioned would go beyond pastoralists' issues and the reason for them to have focused on the pastoralists was because they felt that they could have some achievable framework to work within and also because pastoralist issues are common in the IGAD Region. He also felt that the issues beyond the pastoralist agenda were very variable. He pointed out that the title of the concept note had been done in agreement with IGAD LPI and PPLPI as a means of looking for common ground between the IGAD member countries.

Dr Mukani suggested that the harmonisation of animal health policies in the region was an area where a consultancy was required. National experts and funding for this activity would need to be identified to help come up with a harmonised position. He further observed that Directors and Ministers of Animal resources had come up with the explicit recommendation that trade in livestock and livestock products should be the driving force for poverty alleviation in communities that rear livestock. He noted that the problem with facilities such as the one in Djibouti was that they involved middle men who exploited the pastoralists. The way forward would be to organise pastoralists into cooperatives so that they could get value for money on their products. This he said was the concept that the member states needed to sell to their people.

Mr Webber confirmed that no IGAD member state actually had an up to date animal health policy in action at the moment but he also raised the concern whether the poor really had the power to benefit from international trade.

Dr Sones also agreed, saying that his team had been unable to find a comprehensive animal health policy in the region. He noted that it this was an opportunity for IGAD LPI to assist the countries in formulating pro-poor animal health policies.

## ENHANCING DEMAND-LED ANIMAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR PASTORALIST AREAS OF THE IGAD REGION: AN INTEGRATED SET OF CONCEPT NOTES

### Presentation

Starting with the background to the concept note, Dr Sones informed the meeting that the African Development Bank was giving support to animal health initiatives in southern Africa. This had resulted in interest for a concept note for the IGAD region. There was encouraging response from the AfDB on the working paper. The bank had endorsed the focus on new market opportunities, prioritisation to the constraints to these new markets and had advocated for the concept note to be submitted for funding in 2009.

Looking at the problems justifying the concept note in the region, Dr Sones reminded participants of the content of his previous presentation, particularly the need to build capacity for pro-poor policy development and institutional change that enhances the overall volume and value of international, regional and domestic trade and that although live animal trade would continue to dominate markets within the region, a shift towards greater added-value livestock commodities was called for. He further noted that export opportunities for added-value livestock commodities in a variety of traditional and new markets could be explored. The role and economic viability of compartments that include quarantine, feedlot, and slaughter, de-boning and processing of livestock commodities should also be explored. He observed that the animal health and food safety needs along the value chains, using risk analysis tools and Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) procedures, should be explored. Secondly, there was the need for the development of pro-poor national animal health policies that are driven by the needs of a changing set of livestock and livestock commodity trade opportunities and which support - and are supported by - national PRSPs.

IGAD, in collaboration with COMESA, would engage in facilitating the development and regional harmonisation of animal health policies. Thirdly there was a need for the development of pro-poor national strategies for the control of priority diseases that constrain international, regional and domestic trade opportunities, including a regional information sharing and surveillance network. IGAD, in collaboration with AU-IBAR, FAO and OIE, would explore its role of drawing on national programmes to identify regional trade-impairing health constraints. The national strategies should ideally be harmonised, especially where countries share common borders, where pastoralists cross national boundaries with their livestock and where one country relies on another for market access (either higher value regional markets or to access export facilities). IGAD would facilitate the establishment of a regional network of epidemiological capacity to develop evidence-based approaches to animal health interventions. Fourthly, there was a need to formalise the role of CAH systems as a central component of pastoralist participation in international added-value livestock commodity markets. IGAD, in collaboration with AU-IBAR, FAO, OIE, ILRI and veterinary NGOs, would explore its role in facilitating regional harmonisation of operating policies and procedures for CAHWs. Fifth, there was need to ensure that national market-driven animal health services are linked to, and in some cases integrated with, routine and emergency demand for animal health services

to reduce vulnerability. CAHWs would also be the backbone of vulnerability-reducing animal health services - helping pastoralists to keep their most valuable assets alive and safe, and reducing the risk of zoonotic diseases. Sixth, there was need to ensure that market-driven and vulnerability-reducing animal health services are effectively integrated with other national and international emergency response mechanisms engaged in prevention, mitigation and coping strategies for shocks. Beyond this, there was need to ensure that the 'machinery' for dealing with emergencies is integrated into long-term livestock sector planning and development.

In response to these needs, Dr Sones observed that there were four interlinked proposals. The four proposals were the following:

1. Promote IGAD's capacity to facilitate regional harmonisation of pro-poor animal health policies
2. Determine the nature and the poverty reduction implications of expanded/new market opportunities
3. Determine the viability and safety of commodity trade derived from compartments
4. Develop pro-poor national animal health policies and strategies

The first proposal was to promote IGAD's capacity to facilitate regional harmonisation of pro-poor animal health policies. Dr Sones noted that human resource capacity would be built into animal health policy development and in facilitating discussions on harmonising evolving national policies. This would require the recruitment of a senior animal health policy specialist for 3 years and would involve the IGAD Secretariat, IGAD-LPI, AU/IBAR and COMESA.

The second proposal would be to determine the nature and poverty reduction implications of expanded and new market opportunities. This would build on studies of competitiveness by Perry at al (2006). The combination of comparative advantage and gravity models, tempered in the light of the parallel consideration of distortions caused by protectionist barriers and preferences, would provide a valuable tool in evaluating market opportunities. Analysis would be done at relatively regular intervals, given frequency of changes in distortions. Studies on distributional impacts to understand poverty reduction implications of market access would be carried out. This would involve a consultancy for 8 - 12 person months and the link with COMESA would be important.

The third proposal would be to determine the viability and safety of commodity trade derived from compartments. This would involve a review of available literature and doing an inventory and meta-database of commodities for which data available, and carrying out a gap analysis. Laboratory evaluation of safety for livestock products identified in the gap analysis would be done. He posed the question whether there was a role for BecA here?

The third proposal would develop pro-poor national animal health policies and strategies. This would require (i) an evaluation of the technical, institutional and socioeconomic feasibility of commodity based trade through the use of the compartment concept; (ii) the development of national animal health policies and strategies for the control of priority market-impeding livestock diseases to support this; (iii) the development of national operating policies and procedures for Community-Based Animal Health Systems and (iv) better integration of animal health with other services involved in vulnerability reduction, and of short-term emergency response mechanisms with long-term livestock sector planning and development.

Dr Sones then proposed the collaborators in these four interlinked proposals as follows:

- IGAD, Djibouti
- IGAD-LPI, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- AU-IBAR, Nairobi, Kenya
- FAO Regional Office, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- OIE Regional Office, Gaborone, Botswana
- ILRI, Nairobi, Kenya and Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- Chief Veterinary Officers and representatives of other government sectors - notably health, trade and finance and planning (for PRSPs)...
- NGOs
- National veterinary boards and associations
- Livestock producers associations, livestock traders' organisations, meat processors, exporters.
- Livestock and animal health consultants in the region

The duration for the four interlinked proposals would be as follows:

- Component 1. Three years
- Component 2. Eight to twelve person-months of consultancy
- Component 3. Six months of literature review, synthesis and gap analysis, followed by two years of laboratory studies
- Component 4. Four years (2009 - 2012)

The budget elements for the four interlinked proposals would be as follows:

- Component 1.
  - Cost elements: Staff member, travel, administrative support, workshop running expenses
- Component 2.
  - Cost elements: Consultancies of 8 man months (with trade analysis and modelling expertise), travel, workshop expenses, administrative support.
- Component 3.
  - Cost elements: Consultancy of 6 months for literature review, synthesis and gap analysis; Laboratory trials (requiring experts, animals, reagents, facilities, and commodity process capacity).
- Component 4.
  - Cost elements: National leadership (experts, or existing staff?), establishment of task forces, facilitation expenses, workshops, training, and travel.

Dr Sones finally gave the vision of the concept note to be: "Enhanced livelihoods of livestock-dependent communities, which make a greater contribution to national economies and are supported by effective and demand-led animal health services."

## Discussion

Dr Peeling opened the discussion by giving a short background to the CN pointing out that, at present, the ADB was the exclusive target for this CN. He pointed out that although the ADB already supported animal health activities in Southern Africa in the SADEC Region, the Bank had shown interest in supporting initiatives in the IGAD Region. To this effect, the bank had responded encouragingly to the draft working paper that had been circulated.

Dr Peeling further clarified that the 4 outputs were stand alone proposals which could go to different places for funding. He said that the purpose of the study was to see how much of output 1 (regional capacity to coordinate animal health policies) and output 4 (national capacity to develop those policies) could stand alone or how they could move forward as one unit, i.e. supporting each other and focusing on the practicalities of pastoralists and on how outputs 1 and 4 could be interlinked.

Dr Robinson noted that the CN would need a broader coverage as stated on the vision statement. He observed that the strengthening of national veterinary services in support of pro-poor growth would have to be coordinated by a regional body and supported by a broader research and information base. He said that the 3 elements, national plan and strategies; regional coordination; and the research and information base would need to be presented as a package but different donors might be willing to fund the different elements.

Dr Mukani, commenting on the vision and the proposal, pointed out that from experience the demand-led approach was a failure in Uganda partly because the poor were not educated. For this reason they would not know how to demand for the services. He noted that there were areas where the government could intervene without being requested such as the area of animal health especially as relates to diseases such as FMD and CBPP that affect trade both internationally and regionally. Therefore, he stated that one needed to be careful about the wording 'demand-led', preferring the focus of this terminology to be on the simple issues that the poor can demand.

Mr Kiptarus informed the workshop that the National Agricultural Extension Program in Kenya also advocated for demand-led extension services. He however noted that the country did not have the capacity to cater for enough veterinarians or even enough CAHWs to be able to provide the necessary animal health services in areas like the ASALs. He pointed out that deliberate effort was being made to post extension workers in those regions to provide the necessary services. Mr Kiptarus posed the question as to what a good option for the provision of animal health services in the pastoral areas would be. He posed the question as to which services were cost effective; would target the poor; and if there was a successful case study that could be duplicated amongst the IGAD member states.

In response, Dr Sones pointed out that CAHWs were the second best option, but also the achievable option because of their availability. Both the participants to the IGAD LPI's workshop and those who were involved in the study which underpinned the workshop had concluded CAH systems to be a feasible means of delivering animal health services, whereas professional veterinary services for pastoralists would not be easy to achieve in the IGAD region. The point, he said, was the need to make these services better, to regulate them, to link them to government and private veterinary services.

Dr Jutzi's comments targeted the 3rd proposal that was aimed at research on the liability and safety of commodities delivered from compartments. He noted that the success and viability of these opportunities relied on substantial

sophistication and investment. He pointed out that the poor were not likely to benefit from this because of the high transaction costs involved. The poor would also have to withstand the analysis of international customers. If smallholders were to be successful in these initiatives, then they would not only require access to the necessary means but their small scale would be an inconvenience and discouragement because of the transaction costs involved. Dr Jutzi therefore felt that the assumption that such opportunities would benefit the poor small scale farmers might not hold up under tighter scrutiny. Dr Jutzi suggested that this particular proposal should be reconsidered and emphasis should instead be given to the competitiveness of smallholders where access to markets is difficult, including the development of animal health policies that recognised the role of CAHWs.

In response, Dr Sones noted that there were alternative ways for poor people to benefit from commodity based trade besides setting up their own compartments. One area where the poor could benefit from was through the employment opportunities created in well managed commodity trade businesses supplying reliable regional and international markets. Another area was for the smallholders to feed their livestock into larger livestock systems e.g. farmer's choice. Dr Sones observed that employment opportunities created through livestock enterprises of poor people should be seen as an equal option for encouraging poor people to focus on production and marketing in competitive markets.

Responding to Dr Mukani's earlier comments, Dr Peeling noted that the term 'responsive' may be more appropriate than 'demand-led' meaning that the project would go out and advocate for policies that meet the needs of the poor. He observed that these were public goods that should be delivered by the State. Dr Peeling noted that there was a large potential for demand-led services i.e. 'demand' in terms of vulnerability related diseases. He observed that this demand for clinical services would result in demand for an infrastructure of CAHWs. Once this infrastructure was in place then there would be strong potential for public-private partnerships linking private vets (contracted by government) to the supply of services and public goods. Dr Peeling noted that there were encouraging experiences with CAHWs delivering epidemiological surveillance and hoped that demand for clinical services could be integrated through public-private partnerships into the delivery of public goods as well.

Dr Mukani agreed with Dr Peeling on the issue of private and public goods. Dr Mukani stressed that when it comes to international trade, the issues become more public than private. He noted with respect to policies on 'delivery of veterinary services', the Ugandan government had identified private and public good issues along action points as to what the government must do and what the farmers should do. Dr Mukani stressed that there was need to identify those areas that should be dealt with at a regional, national and domestic level in order to create harmonised policies for the good of the Region.

## Overview of Project Activities with Budget Estimates

### Presentation

At the request of the SC, Dr Peeling presented an overview of activities with budget estimates that would be undertaken in the immediate future. Dr Peeling explained that these were activities which would be put in place to deliver the project's Result areas and which also had budgetary implications. The emphasis that he had earlier taken in presenting the project outputs as they related to the project purpose was for the following reasons:

- To outline some basic principles about the project for approval by the SC members i.e. the uncompromising pro-poor policy focus and the principle of selecting interventions that allow learning by doing.
- To enable the SC members better match activities to the priorities set against them for their approval. The prioritisation criteria for the activities was as follows:
  - (i) Activities which fundamentally underpin the project (priority I).
  - (ii) Issues that were thought to be important for the project to address but need not take place this year (Priority II).
  - (iii) Interventions that were thought to be valid (Priority III).

The project interventions were therefore split into the following categories:

#### (a) On going project activities

Activity	Cost \$\$
National Stakeholder Consultative Fora. <i>(Ethiopia/Djibouti/Somalia)</i>	40,000 (total)
Information design w/shop	13,000
Policy Inventory - Djibouti, Ethiopia, Somalia (Ongoing studies in Kenya, Sudan and Uganda)	15,000
Regional w/shop - Trypanosomiasis control	30,000
National Technical Focal Point Coordination Meeting	6,000
- Setting up of Policy Hubs	
- PRSP training	
- Targeting of result 1/Communications.	
- Preparation for High Level Meeting	

(b) New areas of engagement

Activity	Cost \$\$	Priority
National Stakeholder Consultative Fora. <i>(Ethiopia/Djibouti/Somalia)</i>	40,000 (total)	1
Senior, IGAD Level Planning Meeting.	60,000	1
Livelihoods and Institutions - regional desk study	28,000	1
Regional workshop " <i>Generating policy impact through strengthening policy-relevant capacities</i> "	30,000	1
National Surveys of key Civil Society Groups	50,000 (total)	1
Study - participation of poor in international markets.	??	1
Framework of Indicators of policy change.		
Model of taxation/trade flows/livelihoods/revenues. (2 representative countries)	15,000	2
CBAH studies		2
Veterinarian linkages.	20,000	
Drug misuse	25,000	
Study of GDP calculation	30,000	3
Commodity Trade		3
- market implications	23,000	
Commodity Trade		3
- gaps in the science	20,000	
Arabian Peninsula		3
- Import requirements	50,000	

(c) Further possible areas of engagement

Activity
National Workshops for Policy Hubs - PRSPs
- Training
- Strategising

## Discussion

Dr Peeling observed that the SC needed to give an indication as to whether the priority setting was appropriate but that the project would set the time frame for the interventions at a later stage.

Dr Jutzi appreciated the level of resolution that the project had used and found the rationale for the prioritisation to be agreeable. He also agreed that there wouldn't be need for the project to set a time line for the interventions at this point in time. He however questioned whether the project would continue with its engagement in Trypanosomiasis control activities.

Dr Peeling responded that the project was working on building capacity and learning lessons to inform policy e.g. the mapping of the benefits of Trypanosomiasis control methods. This he said was a capacity that the project would leave behind at the end of the regional workshop. The beneficiaries of this outcome would be the stakeholder organisations i.e. PAAT and PATTEC. He however noted that the project planned no further work in this area unless it was raised as an important area of intervention in the NSCF.

Mr Berhanu observed that the responsibilities of NTFPs needed to be clearly defined, and their employers made aware of this engagement of the NTFPs in order for the employer to allocate time for implementation and collaboration with the project team. He emphasised the need to share the proposed activities with the respective departments in each country along with the processes on how to carry out the activities. He also noted that the MTR should probably be listed as part of the other activities under Priority I.

Dr Peeling pointed out that it would be difficult to allocate activities to individual countries at the moment since the studies would require further research to establish where the best lessons could be drawn. Mr. Webber added that the MTR would be an activity to be financed separately by the EC and would therefore not be included in the work plan for the LPI project.

Dr Nouala proposed that the project should convene a meeting between IGAD, EAC and COMESA to discuss pastoral policy and animal trade and to clarify roles. This he observed would create synergy which would lead to visible impact. Dr Peeling concurred with this proposal and informed the SC that the RECS would be included in the high level Ministerial meeting to be convened by IGAD. He added that it was important to create linkages with the IRCC to better understand the role of each REC.

Dr Mukani informed the meeting that there were currently studies on the participation of the poor in international markets being undertaken in Uganda and offered to share the outcomes of the studies with the project.

Dr Zziwa requested for a commitment from the project that the IGAD LMIS activities would continue to be supported, leaving the exact modalities for doing this for the project to workout. Countries like Sudan and Ethiopia however reported that they were no longer benefiting from the IGAD LMIS due to lack of funding in the case of Sudan and due to restructuring in the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development in the case of Ethiopia. Mr. Berhanu informed the SC members that a general agricultural information system was however being designed to include both crop and livestock information for Ethiopia. Mr. Berhanu wondered how the IGAD LMIS project could attain harmonisation and sustainability within the member states with all these disparities. Mr. Djibril informed the meeting about another information system being set up in COMESA. He informed the participants that this information system was being financed by the ADB and was being designed by consultants who had been engaged for a

period of 6 months to collect and disseminate the information to other members in COMESA.

The meeting agreed after some discussion that a workshop for the LMIS users should be included in the work programme for 2008. The meeting agreed that IGAD should engage the project to determine IGAD's capacity building requirements.

## SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Steering Committee Meeting formulated the following list of statements and recommendations:

- The Steering Committee expresses its satisfaction with the arrival of the CTA. The project staffing is now complete. It commends project management for achieving important project outputs so far.
- The committee would favour project investment in interventions that meet the following criteria.
  - *Have the ability to generate lessons about pro-poor policies that influence institutions which shape livestock related livelihoods of the poor.*
  - *Enjoy the ownership of key stakeholder groups*
  - *Allow the project to generate visible and comprehensive lessons across a broad range of organisations.*
  - *Are likely to be successful*
  - *Address national issues of regional importance*
- The provisional work plan is adopted in the context of its prioritization.
- The committee commends the project on the work of its NSCF and notes the conspicuous absence of pro-poor animal health policies in the IGAD region. It calls upon IGAD, assisted by LPI, to facilitate the processes necessary to address this.
- The Steering Committee gives high importance to the proposed convening of IGAD ministers responsible for livestock development and calls upon IGAD to convene the meeting in cooperation with the project. The committee would like to draw the ministers' attention to the need for regionally harmonized animal health and trade policies and the need to ensure that such policies benefit the livestock dependent poor.
- The Steering Committee requests that roughly costed annual workplans be presented at future SC meetings, with approximate time lines for implementation and conclusion.
- The Steering Committee notes with satisfaction the participation of representatives of all IGAD countries with the exception of Eritrea and Somalia. With respect to Somalia, efforts should be made by the IGAD secretariat to facilitate active participation in the SC and project implementation.
- Recognises that a central element of the project is the strengthening of IGAD capacity with respect to livestock related issues. The committee requests the project and IGAD secretariat to explore options for strengthening the secretariat in the short term. Longer term issues of livestock policy capacity within the IGAD secretariat should be addressed by the region's ministers responsible for livestock development.
- The Committee reconfirms the strategic focus endorsed in the second SC meeting, not excluding other initiatives that meet the projects' criteria.

- The Committee noted that the project's MTR will take place during 2008, and recommends that the draft ToR be shared with the SC members, and the draft report presented to the SC for comment.
- The committee welcomes the forthcoming launch of the project's dedicated website ([www.igad-lpi.org](http://www.igad-lpi.org)) and recommends that the site be accessible by way of a two way link to the main site of the IGAD secretariat.
- The Steering Committee agrees with the further development and submission to donors of a concept note, based on the vision statement (paste) in support of developing livestock health services in the region.
- The Steering Committee requests the project management to coordinate the process of identification of follow up to the LPI, beyond its current phase. It expects the elements of such a follow up, in the context of the discussion of the MTR, in its next meeting.
- The committee acknowledges the contribution that the NTFP are making to project implementation in IGAD member states.
- The Steering Committee encourages IGAD to develop close working relationships with COMESA and EAC in the area of livestock.
- The committee recommends that the project logframe be revisited in the MTR.
- The Steering Committee welcomes the participation of civil society in project implementation.
- The Steering Committee expresses its warm thanks to their Sudanese colleagues for their hospitality during the SCM.

## CLOSE OF MEETING

In closing, Mr. Kiptarus noted that the meeting had been very productive and instructed the project staff to present a comprehensive annual work plan and budget to the next SC. This would enable the SC members keep track of the activities and also improve their reporting to their respective Ministers.

Dr Peeling in turn thanked the chairman, for competently guiding the discussions and thanked the project staff for their commitment and hard work prior to and after his arrival. He thanked the SC member for the Sudan, Dr Mirghani and the government of Sudan for all their efforts in organising the meeting. Dr Peeling thanked Ms Habab Elnayal from the Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries of the Sudan for taking the minutes and Ms. Mekdim Abebe Ketsela for handling the logistics of the meeting.

The meeting agreed that the next SCM of the IGAD LPI would be held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia from the 1 - 2 December, 2008.

## ANNEX A: AGENDA

Day 1		
Tuesday 5 February		
19:30	Registration	
	Cocktail & opening address from:	
19:45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guest of Honour, HE Dr Bashir Taha Mohamed Taha</li> <li>• IGAD Representative</li> <li>• FAO Representative</li> <li>• CTA IGAD-LPI</li> </ul>	
Day 2		
Wednesday 6 February		
09:00-09:30	Welcome, introductions and opening remarks.	Chair
09:30-10:45	IGAD LPI: Overview, progress report and work programme. (Presentation)	Peeling
10:45-11:15	Break	
11:15-12:00	IGAD LPI 2007 work programme; summary, issues for the SCM (Summary and discussion).	Peeling
12:00-13:00	Lunch	
	Findings of National Stakeholder Consultative Fora (presentations)	
13.00-14:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kenya</li> <li>• Sudan</li> <li>• Uganda</li> </ul>	Kiptarius Mirghani Mukani
14.30-15:00	Break	
15.00-15:30	Findings of National Stakeholder Consultative Fora (discussion)	Chair
19:30	Welcome dinner	
Day 3		
Thursday 7 February		
09:00-10:00	Findings of Regional Stakeholder Workshop "Strengthening Demand-Led Animal Health Services" (presentation and discussion).	Sones
10:00-11:00	Draft Concept Note " <i>Facilitating Innovations in Demand-Led Animal Health Services to Pastoralist Areas of the Countries of the IGAD Region</i> " (presentation and discussion).	Sones
11.00-11.30	Break	
11.30-13.00	SC suggestions and guidance on work programme. Discussion.	
13:00-14:00	Lunch	
14:00-15:00	Summary of discussions and recommendations	Chair
15:00-15:30	Next SC meeting and close of meeting	Chair

## ANNEX B: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Secretariat		
Chairperson	To be confirmed	
Secretary	Dil Peeling Chief Technical Advisor, IGAD LPI, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia	<a href="mailto:d.peeling@cgiar.org">d.peeling@cgiar.org</a> Off. +251 116172000 Ext. 2573 Cell. +251 913 200895 Fax. +251 116 172001
IGAD Member States		
Djibouti	Ahmed Darar Djibril Technical Adviser to the Minister, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and the Sea, Djibouti, Djibouti	<a href="mailto:ministereagriculture@yahoo.fr">ministereagriculture@yahoo.fr</a> or <a href="mailto:djidarar@hotmail.com">djidarar@hotmail.com</a> Off. +253 351 297 Cell. +253 845 776
Ethiopia	Sitotaw Berhanu Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia	<a href="mailto:sitotaw_berhanu@yahoo.com">sitotaw_berhanu@yahoo.com</a>  Cell. +251 911 500 870
Kenya	Julius Kiptarius, Director Ministry of Livestock Development, Nairobi, Kenya	<a href="mailto:dlp@africaonline.co.ke">dlp@africaonline.co.ke</a> Off. +254 20 2722601 Cell. +254 722 724713 Fax. +254 20 2728609
Somalia	<b>(no response)</b>	
Sudan	Mirghani Hassan Abdalla Director, International Relations Department Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries, Khartoum, Sudan	<a href="mailto:mhasanao@hotmail.com">mhasanao@hotmail.com</a> Cell: +249 122518050
Uganda	William Olaho Mukani Director, Animal Resources, Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industries and Fisheries, Entebbe, Uganda	<a href="mailto:dar.maaif@infocom.co.ug">dar.maaif@infocom.co.ug</a> or <a href="mailto:wolahomukani@yahoo.com">wolahomukani@yahoo.com</a> Off. +256 414 320 825 Cell. +256 77 653 139 Fax. +256 41 320428, 320614
Other Organisations		
AU	Nouala Simplicie Animal Resource Officer AU-IBAR, Nairobi, Kenya	<a href="mailto:nouala.simplice@au-ibar.org">nouala.simplice@au-ibar.org</a> Off. +254 20 367 4000 Cell. +254 724 016 522 Fax. +254 20 367 4341
EU	Paul Webber Rural Development Program Manager, EU Delegation, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia	<a href="mailto:paul.webber@ec.europa.eu">paul.webber@ec.europa.eu</a> Off. +251 116 612511 Ext. 247 Cell. +251 911 684100 Fax. +251 116 612877
FAO-PPLPI	Tim Robinson Information Officer, FAO/PPLPI, Rome, Italy Budget holder, IGAD LPI, FAO, Rome, Italy	<a href="mailto:tim.robinson@fao.org">tim.robinson@fao.org</a> Off. +39 06 570 54901 Cell. +39 340 8585102 Fax. +39 06 570 55749
Observers		
FAO	Samuel Jutzi Director, FAO-AGA, Rome, Italy	<a href="mailto:samuel.jutzi@fao.org">samuel.jutzi@fao.org</a> Off. +39 06 570 53371
FAO	Abdalla Bin Yehia FAO Representative, Khartoum, Sudan	<a href="mailto:Abdulla.BinYehia@fao.org">Abdulla.BinYehia@fao.org</a> Off. +249 1 8377 9367
Guest of Honour	HE Dr Bashir Taha Mohamed Taha Under-Secretary, Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development	<a href="mailto:bashirtaha@hotmail.com">bashirtaha@hotmail.com</a> Off. +249 8347 5996

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

Intervention logic		Assumptions
Activities		Activities to results
<p>1.1 Develop understanding of the role of the livestock sector in food security, livelihood strategies, poverty reduction and economic development</p> <p>1.2 Compile inventories of existing policies, rules and standards and determine their effect on different strata of livestock-dependent people</p> <p>1.3 Develop and implement targeted public relations strategies</p>	<p><b>Inputs: total budget:</b> € 5,489,945</p> <p><b>Means of Verification</b> 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>
<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>		

## ANNEX D: STEERING COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE

- The Steering Committee will meet at least once a year following an inception meeting and will provide general guidance to the IGAD Livestock Policy Initiative in achieving its objectives, monitor progress, review work programmes, identify constraints and propose appropriate measures to overcome these. In particular, it will:
- recommend on recent advances and best practices, for the Initiative's area of interest, that could be beneficially applied to achieve its overall objectives;
- provide direction to the Initiative's work programmes and suggest appropriate methodologies and tools to obtain the Project's agreed outputs and achievement targets;
- promote collaboration of the Initiative within IGAD and FAO and with relevant global, regional and national organizations and agencies, to ensure synergies and enhance its effectiveness;
- stimulate support from the IGAD Member States for the Initiative in addressing livestock-public goods related issues; and
- advocate the IGAD Livestock Policy Initiative at regional and national levels.

## ANNEX E: 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 world wide 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.