



Pro-Poor  
Livestock  
Policy  
Initiative

## Second Meeting of the Steering Committee for FAO's Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPF)

## CONTENTS

### Main Report

---

1. Background.....	2
Project Objective .....	3
Outputs and Activities.....	3
Institutional Arrangements .....	3
2. Structure and Organisation of the SC Meeting.....	4
3. Summary of Presentations.....	5
Opening Remarks.....	5
Overview of Activities, Outputs & Outcomes Since Last Meeting .....	5
Update on the Project Activities in the Mekong Region Hub.....	7
Update on the Project Activities in the South Asia Hub .....	8
Update on the Project Activities in the Horn of Africa Hub.....	9
Update on the Project Activities in the West Africa Hub.....	10
Update on the Project Activities in the Andean Region Hub.....	11
Target Groups for Pro-Poor Livestock Policies .....	12
Tracing Policy Impacts to The Household Level: Preliminary Results.....	13
4. Recommendations of the Steering Committee .....	15
General observations .....	15
Recommendations regarding project strategy.....	15
Recommendations regarding project governance.....	16
5. Consolidated Response to the SC Recommendations.....	18
Recommendations regarding project strategy.....	18
Recommendations regarding project governance.....	20

### Annexes

---

Annex A .....	21
Terms of Reference for the Steering Committee .....	21
Annex B .....	22
Programme for FAO Expert Consultation on the 'Dynamics of sanitary and technical standards, assisting the poor to cope' and the 2 <sup>nd</sup> PPLPI Steering Committee Meeting .....	22
Annex C .....	24
Participants of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> PPLPI Steering Committee Meeting .....	24
Annex D .....	25
Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility: Output-to-Purpose Progress October 2001 to June 2004 ..	25
Annex E Steering Committee Meeting Participants' Contact Details .....	29

## 1. BACKGROUND

With the adoption of the Millennium Development Goals, the international community has agreed to the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger as one of its primary targets. Livestock contribute to the livelihoods of an estimated 70% of the world's rural poor. For many of these rural poor, livestock provide a small but steady stream of food and income, help raise whole farm productivity and are often the only way of increasing assets and diversifying risks. In addition, livestock have an important role in improving the nutritional status of low-income households, confer status, are of cultural importance and create employment opportunities within and beyond the immediate household.

The burgeoning demand for animal protein in low- and middle-income countries (the so-called 'Livestock Revolution') provides an opportunity for the poor to improve their livelihoods. However, the nature of livestock farming is determined by policy and institutional frameworks that are rarely pro-poor and that sometimes encourage forms of production that threaten long-term environmental stability and public health. Similarly, livestock / public goods interface issues such as communicable diseases or food safety are often determined by national and international policies, institutions and processes that require international agreement and cooperation, or are subject to international norms, conventions and protocols that need to be informed from a regional or global perspective.

In 2001, the Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations launched the Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Initiative (PPLPI) which will strive, within a time frame of six years, to facilitate and support the formulation and implementation of policies and institutional changes that have a positive impact on the livelihoods of a large number of the world's poor. In view of the critical role played by livestock in supporting and sustaining their livelihoods, the Initiative has a distinct focus on livestock.

The basic rationale of the initiative derives from the realization that technology oriented projects in the livestock and related sectors have failed to deliver significant improvements in the livelihoods of the poor, and that an enabling institutional and policy environment is indispensable for enhancing the impact and sustainability of pro-poor interventions.

A central Pro-poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPF), funded by the UK Department for International Development, has been established at the headquarters of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) with the responsibility of guiding and co-ordinating the initiative's regional activities and with the ambition to become a point of reference for livestock related pro-poor policy development.

In order to account for the fact that the continuum of policy-making extends from international, through regional and national to sub-national levels, and to address the ensuing need for closer linkages between the various levels of policy making, the Initiative intends to complement the central facility with a number of regional pro-poor livestock policy hubs, to ensure that local concerns feed into higher level processes, and that international policy makers are aware of the impacts of their decisions at local level.

## Project Objective

The objective of the project is a strengthened capacity in FAO, its member nations and international organizations to formulate livestock sector and related policies and implementation plans that reduce poverty, whilst managing environmental and public health risks.

## Outputs and Activities

The principal outputs the project aims to achieve are:

- Portfolio of livestock-related interventions for reducing poverty through policy and institutional change
- Increased awareness and consideration of the potential contribution of livestock and the livestock sector to poverty reduction
- Effective systems for livestock policy information, analysis, decision-support as well as for monitoring and evaluation
- Mechanisms for effective stakeholder representation in the negotiation of policies and institutional changes that better support poor peoples livestock-dependent livelihoods

The project will encourage and facilitate conceptual shifts in policy objectives that create and strengthen the capacity of the poor to act for themselves, engage the poor as partners sharing rights and responsibilities, create incentives for the poor to mobilize resources, help catalyze the formation of people's organization, and protect the assets of the poor to reduce their vulnerability. This will be achieved through the formulation and promotion of policy and institutional reforms that reduce existing financial, technical, and social and cultural barriers, that increase competitiveness, and that reduce risks and vulnerability. In the design of the instruments required to address the primary livestock - equity, health and environmental interactions along the livestock sector development continuum, the facility will use the following development scenarios: a) Coping with growth, b) Creating the conditions for growth, and c) Enhancing rural livelihoods.

## Institutional Arrangements

The Pro-poor Livestock Policy Facility has been set up within the Animal Production and Health Division (AGA) of the FAO to develop the capacity to inform national and international decision-making in support of poor-peoples livestock-related livelihoods. Day-to-day management, backstopping and project development are the responsibility of AGA's Livestock Information, Sector Analysis and Policy Branch (AGAL).

The Pro-poor Livestock Policy Facility will implement the proposed programme of activities and disseminate its outputs through an innovative mixture of strategic alliances that capitalize on the comparative advantage of the FAO and different partner organizations.

## 2. STRUCTURE AND ORGANISATION OF THE SC MEETING

The Steering Committee (*see Annex A for Terms of Reference*) meeting consisted of a mix of formal presentations, plenary discussions and a working group session. Timing was organised such that Steering Committee members could participate in the plenary sessions of the FAO Expert Consultation on the '*Dynamics of sanitary and technical standards, assisting the poor to cope*', which took place in parallel (*see ANNEX B for Meeting Programme*)

The participants of the meeting, aside from the Steering Committee members, included invited guests from international organizations and from other units of the FAO, the regional hub coordinators, and project personnel (HQ staff and consultants). Of the original Steering Committee members, R. Chambers and L. Vaccaro-Pearson had withdrawn (*See Annex C for Participants*).

The meeting was opened by Louise Fresco, the FAO ADG for Agriculture. During the course of the meeting six presentations were made by project staff and coordinators of the regional hubs reporting on issues, activities and progress in the respective regions, while another two presentations dealt with the topic of 'targeting' pro-poor livestock policy interventions.

- Project update: Activities, outputs and outcomes 2003/04 (J. Otte)
- Update on the project activities in the Mekong Region hub (A. Costales)
- Update on the project activities in the South Asian hub (D. Gustafson)
- Update on the project activities in the Horn of Africa hub (T. Robinson)
- Update on the project activities in the West Africa hub (C. Ly)
- Update on the project activities in the Andean hub (H. Cisneros)
- Target groups for pro-poor livestock policies (J. Otte)
- Tracing policy impacts to the household level: Preliminary results from macro-micro simulation studies (D. Roland-Holst)

Each presentation was followed by a short discussion while ample time was retained for general discussion after all presentations had been given. Feedback was also requested from interested Steering Committee members on a proposal for a study on livestock services in dairy market chains in Senegal. A discussion paper entitled *Pro-Poor Livestock Policies - Who to Target?* had been distributed to the Steering Committee members prior to the meeting.

During the course of the meeting, five topics were proposed to the Steering Committee for specific feedback:

- Regional spread of the project and the importance of regional hubs vis-a-vis country-level engagement
- Project focus and strategy
- Steering Committee composition
- Improved engagement of the Steering Committee in the project
- Modality and venue of the next Steering Committee meeting

The Steering Committee adopted an open and transparent process of dialogue and the 'closed sessions' were opened to project staff for full participation in all discussions.

The meeting was closed by Samuel Jutzi, director of the Animal Production and Health Division.

### 3. SUMMARY OF PRESENTATIONS

#### Opening Remarks

By Louise Fresco, Assistant Director General (ADG), Department of Agriculture

The ADG for Agriculture considered the Initiative as a good example of the depth and scope of the development work carried out by FAO – its operations in selected regions of the world, down at the level of individual countries and governments, as well as in global arenas. FAO is moving towards stronger engagement in policy development and policy advice, and in doing so, the organization is obliged to aim for policy coherence.

FAO has well defined goals and objectives in assisting developing countries in the areas of improving animal production, animal health, public health, and sustainable environment. In engaging with individual countries, it often becomes apparent that governments pursue objectives and policies that do not appear to be coherent. It is the task of FAO, through the Division and Initiative, to determine the real problems and assist finding the appropriate solutions. At times, this may need the marriage of policies to achieve the desired coherence. For the Initiative, the ADG encouraged efforts to develop coherence between a number of areas where conflicting policies may arise, such as: livestock and agriculture, livestock and trade, and livestock development and poverty alleviation, and to do so beyond the theoretical level.

Similar to FAO as a whole, the Initiative has to balance its work between analysis and action; and between information gathering and stakeholder engagement. The ADG encouraged the Initiative to ask what it would like to be and to see in 10 years' time in its undertaking on livestock and poverty alleviation, knowing that in the countries where it is engaged in, industrialization of the livestock sector and urbanization continue to take place.

#### Overview of Activities, Outputs & Outcomes Since Last Meeting

By Joachim Otte, PPLPF co-ordinator

The project co-ordinator started his presentation by outlining how the project had addressed the recommendations made by the Steering Committee at the last meeting. The Steering Committee had made recommendations related to the following issues:

- Steering Committee composition
- Expected project outcomes and strategy, including thematic areas
- Functional areas of the project
- Re-consideration of the regional hubs, and
- Formation of partnerships

The project had endeavoured to address all of the above issues over the past year. The Steering Committee had been enlarged by a representative of an international NGO while improved regional representation was felt to be provided by managers of the regional hubs. In terms of thematic focus, the co-ordinator made a case for retaining dairy as the commodity of greatest relevance given that nearly all countries in which the project is active are net importers and are undertaking major efforts for

dairy development, while OECD countries are potentially undermining these efforts through subsidizing dairy production and, worse, exportation of milk powder. Thus, there would be scope to address this issue at multiple scales as requested by the Steering Committee.

With regard to functional areas the co-ordinator remarked that the project would now make the shift from its 'analysis and network building phase' (two years) towards an 'implementation' phase (three years) of increasingly active engagement in policy making processes at national and international level.

After presenting a brief review of the focus countries selected within each of the regional hubs and the working relationships between PPLPF and other actors at national and international level, the co-ordinator provided a summary of the project's activities in its six areas of work, which are:

- The role of livestock in economic development and poverty reduction
- Markets and market access
- Livestock services
- Policies, instruments and actors
- Information management, and
- Instigating change

Activities in the first four areas of work consisted of a mix of methodology development, literature reviews and field investigation. Thus, for example under the 'role of livestock' component, a generic overview of livestock and economic development had been produced, more specific reviews of the livestock sectors in the Mekong region and IGAD had been conducted, living standards measurement survey data from Nepal and Viet Nam had been analysed to assess the contribution of livestock-derived income to total household income, the economics of smallholder dairy production had been assessed in detail for countries in South Asia, and a study on pathways into and out of poverty and the role of livestock had been carried out jointly with ILRI in Western Kenya. A similar mix of activities has been undertaken in the areas of 'markets and market access', 'livestock services' and 'policies, instruments and actors'.

In relation to information management, a substantial number of datasets had been compiled, public relations material had been produced, the project website had been enhanced and the development of decision support tools had been initiated. With regard to 'instigating change', the project had organized four international and ten national workshops in the past year, participated in seven international workshops, and engaged in ongoing policy processes in Orissa, Andhra Pradesh and Uganda.

The co-ordinator concluded his presentation by highlighting the main outcomes of the year's work - a much enhanced understanding of the potential role of livestock for poverty alleviation, the establishment of networks of collaborators in focus countries of all five regions, and the good prospects for strengthening regional / national activities through access to additional funds - and providing an outlook for the work thrust of the coming year, the main points being the development of a capacity building programme for policy analysis and enhanced engagement in identified policy processes.

## Update on the Project Activities in the Mekong Region Hub

By Achilles Costales, PPLPF economist

Phase I of activities of the PPLPF in the Southeast Asian region covered the four countries along the Mekong River basin - Cambodia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Thailand, and Viet Nam. In these countries, with the exception of Thailand, poverty incidence, particularly in the rural communities is high, ranging from 40 to 45 percent.

In the Mekong hub, Viet Nam was chosen as the initial focus country. It is the country with a high incidence of rural poverty (45%) and with the greatest number of rural poor (28.8 million people). Viet Nam is also a country where the current dynamics of transition from a planned economy to a market-oriented economy presents an opportunity for the Initiative to influence the policy making process in making livestock policy related interventions taking a pro-poor slant in orientation and character. Furthermore, much data generation and studies on poverty are being undertaken by international and national research and development institutions in Viet Nam, presenting an opportunity for PPLPF to build on these in the creation an information system in support of pro-poor livestock policy making.

One of the important pieces of data recently released in Viet Nam (Minot, et al., IFPRI, 2003) provided the basis for mapping of poverty incidence and poverty density up to the district level. While the incidence of poverty is highest in the mountainous and more remote areas with least access to markets, the highest number of poor households are found in provinces, districts, and communes close to the major cities. Combined with maps of where major livestock activities are, or are not taking place, these data provide information on targeting regions for maximum impact of policy and institutional intervention on improvement of household income and poverty alleviation.

The type of livestock kept by most rural households are poultry (mainly chicken) and pigs. Close to 70 percent of rural households still have chickens and around 60 percent of household raise pigs. Over the period 1993-2003, poultry and pig meat production were the fastest growing activities in the livestock sector in Viet Nam, expanding at 8.1 percent and 7.3 percent per annum, respectively. While rapid demand growth in these two commodities presents supplementary income opportunities for poor rural households, there are significant barriers to market participation. Particularly in the Northern Mountain Region, economic activity in livestock among households has been shown to be an 'under-performer' relative to its potential (see accompanying presentation of D. Roland-Holst, 2004).

Institutional partnerships at the national and international levels have been established in Viet Nam. The Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD) is the main government partner at the national level. For research, the university rector (Dr. D.V. Bihn) of Hanoi Agricultural University (HAU) has approved of the collaboration between PPLPF and the two of its faculties (Economics and Rural Development; Animal Science and Veterinary Medicine). At the international level, partnerships have been established with the IFPRI-ILRI Joint Programme on Market Opportunities for research on markets and institutions in Viet Nam. Collaboration with the DANIDA as well as the Agrifood Consulting International (ACI) is being established for data exchange on livestock and household poverty. Collaboration is being explored with VSF on micro-level pig and poultry production and marketing information.

The dominant policy issues affecting smallholder livestock keepers have been identified. While livestock household production is mentioned in the policy declarations for making livestock an engine for growth in the rural areas, the strategies and policy measures toward the goal of 'Rural Industrialization and Modernization' do not reflect the integration of smallholders into the overall scheme. Initiatives, mostly by international NGOs, to involve smallholders address resource constraints at the local level (e.g., through micro-finance schemes), lack the legal basis for more sustained bottom-up policy and institutional change. Smallholders face relatively high feed prices due to tariff and non-tariff protection on the domestic feed-grain industry. The poor, as consumers also face relatively high prices of meat and milk, suppressing the growth in domestic demand for livestock products as driver of sector growth. The impact of current policies on livestock markets, and consequently on the livelihoods of the poor rural households is not well grasped by policy makers, resulting in an unfavourable playing field for smallholder livestock keepers relative to commercial farms.

Future plans of PPLPF for the Mekong hub focus on the following: i) Strengthening the linkages with national partner institutions, international agencies with a local base, and international R&D organizations; ii) Expanding activities to Cambodia and Lao PDR; iii) Organizing policy makers and stakeholders for policy dialogues; iv) Developing livestock information systems for the Mekong region; and v) Seeking additional funding for hub activities.

## Update on the Project Activities in the South Asia Hub

By Daniel Gustafson, FAO Representative in India and Bhutan, and Vinod Ahuja, PPLPF manager of the South Asia hub

There are a number of special characteristics that differentiate the South Asia livestock situation, and which orient the work of the Hub. The region contains 22 percent of the world's human population, 17 percent of its livestock and 43 percent of the world's poor. Poverty in South Asia is primarily rural - over 80 percent of all poor are in rural areas and the linkage between poor peoples' livelihoods and the livestock production is particularly strong. In India, more than 55 percent of cows and buffaloes and more than 60 percent of sheep are on the farms of less than two hectares. Similarly in Bangladesh, 58 percent of cows, 68 percent of sheep and goats and 67 percent of poultry birds are on farms below one hectare.

Production has risen rapidly in the region, with South Asia's share of global milk production doubling in the past 30 years. Productivity has also grown but remains far below world average. Incomes are rising rapidly as is demand for animal products. Trade issues are increasingly important, with a need to ensure smallholders' participation in the market. The region has multiple institutional strengths in the livestock sector but a very large and complex set of policy actors. Given this, the hub has established partnerships with the National Dairy Development Board (NDDB), CALPI (the SDC-funded project Capitalisation of Livestock Project Experiences in India), has two state level agreements in Orissa and Andhra Pradesh and partnerships for research in Bangladesh, Pakistan and Nepal.

Key activities over the past year include:

- **Orissa Stakeholder Consultation Meeting**, in support of the Orissa State Livestock Sector Policy;

- International Workshop on Livestock and Livelihoods: Challenges and Opportunities for Asia in the Emerging Market Environment, co-financed by NDDDB and PPLPF;
- Partnership with CALPI on Livestock Service Delivery, designed to create conducive environment for reform in Andhra Pradesh;
- Milk marketing in India: A Review Paper on the Role and Performance of the Informal Sector;
- Reviews of the cost of milk production with emphasis on small-scale producers in Haryana and Orissa, Pakistan and Bangladesh;
- Work in Nepal on poverty, livestock and household typologies;
- Collaboration with the Livestock technology change, livelihoods impact and policy lessons project, with ICIMOD and Imperial College.

Plans for the coming period include formalising the PPLPI-NDDDB Partnership to work on trade issues and provide support for overcoming practical problems to pro-poor livestock initiatives; continued work in Orissa on the state's livestock policy; a study either in Andhra Pradesh or in Orissa to develop a comprehensive typology of livestock dependent households; the continuing initiative in Andhra Pradesh on livestock services reorientation and the veterinary-para-veterinary system in the state; a possible partnership with BRAC in Bangladesh and a national level workshop on livestock and livelihoods, and the application of research results in Nepal.

## Update on the Project Activities in the Horn of Africa Hub

By Tim Robinson, PPLPF information systems specialist

The Horn of Africa Hub of the Initiative falls under the umbrella of the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD), including the member states of Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan, Uganda. Of these, the facility is focussing activities mainly in Uganda due to: a) a high proportion of rural poor (42% = 8.4m people); b) a wide range of opportunities in the livestock sector; c) an apparently open attitude and willingness to change; and d) a relatively clear policy process.

Under contract to the facility, the African Union's Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources (AU/IBAR) conducted a preparatory phase during which national workshops were held and focal points and resource persons identified in the member states. The International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) has been a partner in many studies and the facility has been working closely with IGAD and the European Commission (EC) in developing a proposal for funding proposal prepared for 9th European Development Fund (EDF) under the Regional Indicative Programme (RIP).

Livestock policy issues in the region include those that cut across production systems: 1) capacity for policy analysis and formulation; 2) livestock marketing and exports; and 3) livestock service provision, and those that are more specific to the broad production-systems of: 1) pastoralist / agro-pastoralist areas; 2) highland / mixed-farming areas; and 3) urban / peri-urban areas.

In addition to the preparatory work and developing the funding proposal for the Horn of Africa, activities conducted to date include conducting a regional livestock sector review; a series of country reviews; a political economy study; a review of poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSP); a study of the role of community animal

health workers in (CAHWs) in service delivery; and a study of the pathways in and out of poverty. The facility has also co-sponsored a workshop on urban livestock keeping and, in collaboration with AGAP, conducted an assessment of post-harvest dairy losses. In Uganda more detailed pilot work has been initiated, where the facility has begun to develop a pro-poor livestock policy network and is engaging more closely in the policy process.

Planned activities include: to finalise and implement regional hub and to initiate some follow-up work with AU/IBAR in order to maintain the momentum whilst the hub becomes operational. In the meantime the facility will further engage in the policy process in Uganda and build on the pro-poor livestock policy network being formed there. Specifically it will: continue to be involved in trypanosomiasis policy formulation; conduct a political economy study; collaborate with the Dairy Development Authority (DDA), the Plan for Modernization of Agriculture (PMA) and the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industries and Fisheries (MAAIF) in the development of dairy sector policies; collaborate with the Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS) in the analysis of household survey data to gain a better understanding of the linkages between poverty and livestock in Uganda.

## Update on the Project Activities in the West Africa Hub

By Cheikh Ly, PPLPF manager of the West Africa hub

Within the West African region, eight countries (Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, Niger, Senegal and Togo) have historically encompassed the Franc CFA as a common currency and are presently deepening their economic cooperation through the West African Economic and Monetary Union (UEMOA/WAEMU). AGAL/PPLPF is cooperating with UEMOA through a number of projects related to the harmonisation of zoonosanitary standards and veterinary legislation. PPLPF has organised a workshop in May 2003 at the UEMOA headquarters in Burkina Faso to address the role of livestock in the PRSP's. Representatives from the Ministries of Finance and the Livestock Departments from the eight UEMOA countries as well as Guinea and Mauritania attended. During this workshop the PPLPF West Africa hub was presented, its activities discussed, and the nomination of two national focal points for 'livestock and poverty', one in the Ministry of Finance and the other in the Ministry responsible for livestock, proposed.

In February 2004, the manager of the West Africa hub was recruited and the hub was institutionally embedded within the Ordre des Docteurs Vétérinaires du Sénégal (Veterinary Board) in Dakar, Senegal. Although Senegal was chosen for PPLPF's initial activities, close links with WAEMU and its member countries are envisaged. Initial activities concentrated on 'officialising' the hub, identifying and meeting with private and public stakeholders in the livestock sector in Senegal and the region. Identified key partners include: the ALive-IEPC programme, CIRAD, AfDB, the IFAD-led Global Initiative on Livestock Services for the Poor, ECOWAS, CILSS, EISMV, CIRDES, AFRISTAT, ALG-Liptako-Gourma, CESA0, ROPPA and national ministries and stakeholder organisations.

A study commissioned by PPLPF on the political economy of livestock-policy making in Senegal provided valuable insights. A number of relevant issues were identified and will be addressed by the hub. Important policy issues identified for the region are (a) a lack of awareness of the role of livestock in poverty alleviation, (b) limited capacity for the formulation and implementation of livestock policies, (c) institutional deficiencies in livestock services delivery, and (d) restricted access to credit

hampering livestock trade. In addition, there is a general lack of relevant and reliable data, calling for the establishment of adequate information systems. Policy formulation is very much top-down while negotiation capacity of producers and professional organisations needs to be strengthened.

During the last 4 years, there have been a number of changes in the government structure in Senegal. The most recent changes within the government represent a timely opportunity for PPLPF to actively engage into the policy process surrounding the ongoing restructuring of the livestock sector. The AfDB is presently funding a study on livestock commodity chains in Senegal that will be embedded in the National Programme for Livestock Development, for which the manager of the regional hub will act as independent advisor.

Until the end of this year, the hub plans to carry out studies related to livestock service delivery and marketing (Senegal) and to review the financing mechanisms of livestock services within WEAMU countries. Furthermore, the hub will organise a regional workshop on livestock policies and field test the decision support tool 'Extrapolate' with local policy makers and other actors involved in the livestock sector.

The regional hub manager pointed out that there are currently a number of livestock initiatives with similar purposes active in the region (WB-ALive & FAO-IEPC, PPLPF, AfDB) and that the question of how these relate to each other (are they collaborating or competing?) is an issue of concern to regional policy makers. He further highlighted that personal contact with policymakers and stakeholders is essential to successfully accompany the policy making process within the West African region.

## Update on the Project Activities in the Andean Region Hub

By Judith Kuan and Hector Cisneros, PPLPF Andean Region hub

The Andean region and particularly the Andean zones of Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia host rural populations with high levels of poverty (>70%). The development of these zones relies heavily on livestock related activities, as these represent the main source of livelihood for the majority of the population. The potential for livestock production is high due to the extent of natural pastures in the region: Ecuador records 5 million hectares of natural pastures, Peru 27 million and Bolivia 34 million.

The weaknesses of the region's current livestock sector translate into low value-added livestock products and efforts need to focus on strengthening and developing the competitiveness of the sector. The poor record of development of the Andean livestock sector is partly due to institutional weaknesses as well as the lack of coordination between development projects. Policy deficits arise at different levels (local, sub-national, national and regional) and it is necessary to work at all levels in order to obtain sustainable long-term impacts. There are several limitations in the policy formulation process: conflicts fuelled by civil society groups, politicized producers' organizations, centralized government decision-making, and poor policy analysis and implementation capacity at local level

Although actions could and should be taken at each of these levels, the Andean hub intends to concentrate on on-going activities of partner organizations and institutions. The hub has so far carried out an analysis of the conditions surrounding livestock production in the three countries, followed by an evaluation of the institutional

framework and the characteristics of the organisations involved in the formulation and implementation of livestock sector related policies. National collaborating agencies have been identified in each of the three countries: in Ecuador *the Fondo Ecuatoriano Populorum Progressio* (FEPP), in Peru CARE and in Bolivia the *Centro de Investigación y Promoción del Campesinado* (CIPCA). A proposal for funding of the regional hub has also been formulated. A number of regional, national and local workshops have been organised and first steps towards identifying funding opportunities have been undertaken. Difficulties in obtaining funding for the PPLPI hub in the Andean region are acknowledged despite expressions of interest in promoting and participating in the project from various institutions and donors. Consequently, for the future, priority has been given to identifying where the regional hub could provide value-added to ongoing activities. The concept of 'service centre' will play a central role in framing planned activities. Within these perspectives the hub considers undertaking the following:

- Fine-tuning and broadening the original project proposal;
- Developing specific project proposals within the framework of PPLPI at different levels;
- Contributing to the policy formulation process regarding the camelid sector in conjunction with National Agencies, the National Camelid Commission and with ministries of agriculture;
- Giving more visibility to the initiative through workshops;
- Organization of a competition of successful cases of policy implementation;
- Conducting a study on poverty dynamics in the Andean region of Peru.

The study of poverty and the factors determining the pathways into and out of poverty of rural households as well as the competition of successful cases of implementation of policies in relation to the contribution of livestock to poverty reduction, will enhance the policy dialogue in the Andean region. The studies will also provide a basis for streamlining the Initiative in the region, contribute to the definition of a range of alternatives to reduce poverty taking the livestock sector as the entry point, and will contribute to the Initiative's choices of ongoing activities to which it add value.

## Target Groups for Pro-Poor Livestock Policies

By Joachim Otte, PPLPF co-ordinator

The presenter started by listing various sub-groups of poor people, on which the project could focus its attention and by raising some questions related to the criterion to use for deciding on which sub-group to focus. The question addressed by the presentation was then narrowed down to identifying those livestock keepers most likely to benefit from improved framework conditions, i.e. policies, for livestock production. To tentatively answer this question, the presenter drew on the results of three types of studies conducted by the project:

- The assessment of the contribution of various activities to household income based on the analysis of living standards measurement surveys, using the case of Nepal,
- The analysis of detailed information on household, farm and dairy income of dairy households in South Asia, collected within the framework of the international farm comparison network, and
- The investigation of pathways into and out of poverty conducted in Western Kenya.

From the first study it could be concluded that urban livestock keepers, normally among the poorer strata of the urban population, are 'on average' still substantially better off than the majority of rural households. In rural areas, land ownership, even of an above average sized plot, does not protect against poverty (nor does owning a large ruminant) and the bulk of the rural poor (nearly 60%) own some land and some livestock. The rural landless constitute around one fifth of the rural poor and only earn 30% or less of their income through direct agricultural activities (their income mainly stems from wages, self-employment or remittances).

The second study showed that in South Asia landless and dairy farmers with marginal land holdings (less than 1 ha of land) have daily household incomes of around USD 0.5 per household member and even so called 'larger' dairy farmers (more than one hectare of land in rural locations) often live very close to the poverty line of 1 USD per household member and day. As seen in Nepal, the rural landless dairy farmers obtained around 70% of their household income from off-farm sources. Returns to labour were below local wage rates for rural landless and 'marginal' dairy farmers and it is probable that these farmers will abandon dairy farming as soon as labour opportunities emerge. By contrast, large (peri-urban) dairy farms (10 to 20 dairy animals) are very profitable and contribute to employment generation.

The study on pathways into and out of poverty, conducted in Western Kenya, was based on collective memory and traced movements of households into and out of poverty in two selected districts over a time span of 25 years (1978 to 2003). Although the probability of a poor household to move out of poverty (56%) was much higher than the probability of a non-poor household to become poor (28%) the net change in the proportion of households living in poverty was minimal given that around one third of households was considered poor at the outset. The three main reasons given for falling into poverty, in order of importance, were poor (human) health, funeral expenses, and poor education, while those for escaping poverty were employment, cash from crops and diversification into livestock. These results closely resembled those from a similar study carried out in India.

Overall conclusions drawn from these three studies are: employment generation is the most promising route out of poverty for the poorest of the poor. Employment generation can initially be stimulated by increasing the agricultural income of the 'median' poor, which still generate a substantial share of their income through direct agricultural activities and constitute the bulk of the rural poor, and which will use their additional income largely for the purchase of local goods and services. At the same time, safety nets are required to reduce the probability of households slipping back into poverty (or from poverty into destitution), and in this respect safeguarding human health appears to be of crucial importance.

## Tracing Policy Impacts to The Household Level: Preliminary Results

By David Roland-Holst, Director RDRD UC Berkeley, consultant to PPLPF

Prof. Roland-Holst started his presentation by outlining how detailed economic analysis can support policy and complement technical assistance, namely by (a) enhancing the understanding of the effects of economic fundamentals on various population groups, (b) thereby enabling more effective targeting of assistance in heterogeneous environments, and (c) facilitating *ex-ante*, *ex-post* and concurrent assessment of projects/policy interventions. He then provided an overview of Integrated Poverty Analysis for Livestock Promotion (IPALP), the methodology being developed, and its application to the Northern Mountain Region (NMR) of Viet Nam.

The methodology concatenates economic modelling at three levels, national, regional and household, the parameters feeding into the models being derived by econometric and poverty analyses applied to available datasets (e.g. household surveys, regional input-output data, etc). To understand the behaviour and incentives governing livestock adoption/expansion, rural farm households are modelled as multi-input, multi-output production units, which retain a portion of their output for consumption. Furthermore, off-farm employment and transactions costs with respect to regional and national markets are incorporated.

Preliminary results of the application of the modelling and analytical framework to the NMR showed that subsistence rates are high, overall around 45% of agricultural output was marketed in 1998, with the poorest quintile only marketing around one third of their agricultural produce. Most of the increment in rural household income achieved between 1993 and 1998 stemmed from increased income from crops (44%), remittances (12%), enterprise (16%) and wages (11%), while increased income from livestock only contributed 7% to the overall rise in incomes. Marketing of livestock was most highly and positively correlated with remittance income, followed by agricultural income, highlighting the capital requirement for initial investment into market-oriented livestock production. Analysis of production responses and price elasticities revealed that interactions between livestock and other agricultural factors, inputs and outputs are quite complex, making predictions about adjustment patterns difficult.

Even at this preliminary stage however, the following conclusions could be drawn: (a) heterogeneity is a predominant feature of rural environments and for aid to be effective it needs to adapt to local circumstances, (b) private capital is indispensable to expanding the capacity for livestock production and (c) a multi-level approach to the alleviation of rural poverty may be desirable, namely investment into infrastructure and good governance, targeting of 'median' poor for livestock development (credit, technology transfer, etc), and addressing the poorest through labour market facilitation.

Prof. Roland-Holst ended the presentation by providing an outlook of future developments, which include dis-aggregation of the livestock activities and more detailed examination of their local characteristics, extension of the prototype to all of Viet Nam, application of the approach to other focus countries, and linking the modelling capacity to poverty maps.

## 4. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

### General Observations

1. The Steering Committee was greatly impressed by PPLPF's progress and appreciated how it had addressed the recommendations from the first steering committee meeting. The Steering Committee congratulated the PPLPF team on their hard work and the produced outputs.
2. The Steering Committee felt that the project is at an important junction. The team has completed most of the start-up activities and significant analytical work. Now is the time to focus on those activities with a high likelihood of turning 'analysis into action' and delivering the envisioned outputs linked to specific policy and institutional changes.

### Recommendations Regarding Project Strategy

#### 1. Finding the right balance between regional hubs and focus countries

The selected focus countries should be maintained. 'Fully-fledged' regional hubs, as originally envisioned, have not become a reality because additional funds have so far not been forthcoming. The only exception could be the Horn of Africa region, where the European Commission, the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), and PPLPF have agreed on a regional project and are finalizing a proposal to be financed by the 9<sup>th</sup> European Development Fund. Within the next six months, the PPLPF team has to take a decision as to whether it is worthwhile to continue attempting to raise funds for 'fully fledged' regional hubs or to aim fundraising efforts at more narrow activities and tasks.

#### 2. Selecting a portfolio of livestock-related interventions for reducing poverty, i.e. identifying opportunities for policy and institutional change

The Steering Committee believes that the following three approaches could help the PPLPF team assemble a promising portfolio:

- Be opportunistic. Explore options for adding value to on-going policy and institutional shifts, search for policy processes at a tipping point (for example a recent crisis that has made policymakers highly receptive for policy advice), or consider policies that are linked to important 'drivers of change' in a country. The project should not lock itself into an exclusive producer perspective, should explore policies and policy instruments beyond its technical (i.e. livestock) home, and pitch its interventions along the requirements of structural change. While the Steering Committee did not want to make recommendations on particular national policy opportunities (these are best identified by the teams and partners working in the different regions), it provides the following general guidance:
  - For some countries, policy and institutional changes supporting the implementation of national poverty reduction strategies could be a useful entry point to achieve results for PPLPF.
  - A list of criteria could help in selecting areas of project engagement. These include sufficient scale of impact, achievability within the envisioned time frame, interested local and national partners that are involved in policy processes, potential to extrapolate beyond the specific area of intervention, and geographic diversity of cases. The final set of activities should be

accompanied by plausible scenarios of change and/or a more detailed influence strategy.

- Be systematic. During both Steering Committee meetings, members have suggested that policies related to changing markets and market access could have a significant impact on poverty levels. A systematic coverage of that theme, that would for example cut across regions and scales and include both areas with short-term and long-term opportunities for change, could make it easier to extrapolate results to other areas once better opportunities for change arise in a few years. Policies related to markets and market access should be considered at different scales:
  - national - here, the emphasis should be on making markets work better for domestic producers.
  - regional - the PPLPF team should seek out opportunities to foster regional trade perhaps working with bodies supporting regional integration such as Union Economique et Monétaire Ouest Africaine (UEMOA) in West Africa.
  - global - at this scale, the PPLPF team should bridge a significant information gap and show how rules and institutions governing global market access and global markets are impacting smallholders in developing countries (other institutions could then use such information, for example to support efforts for reducing and eliminating protection and subsidies in developed countries).
- If necessary, focus on a selected sub-group of the poor. In some cases, policies targeting a sub-group of the poor such as rural, semi-subsistence households in selected areas may yield a higher return (number of poor lifted out of poverty) to 'investment' than non-targeted interventions. PPLPF has demonstrated how such groups could be identified by using, for example, a systematic analysis of poverty density, gap, incidence, degree of market integration, documented pathways into and out of poverty, and growth opportunities. PPLPF should feel free to make such a choice but needs to make its rationale transparent. It is essential to include in this justification an analysis of the impacts across all major sub-groups of the poor. The latter is especially important, because some Steering Committee members cautioned about the applicability of such a focus within the project's time horizon and the inverse effects that such a narrow focus might have.

### **3. Developing mechanisms for effective stakeholder representation**

The project did not have sufficient time to achieve progress in this area yet. The PPLPF team needs to make a specific effort towards this stated output. One suggested possibility is to work with NGOs or link up with nascent and established producer organizations.

### **4. Building capacity at and influencing international organizations**

Forming a coalition proposing adaptive standards (national versus international) that takes into account local/national circumstances (as opposed to one standard based on developed country conditions) could be an opportunity here. Similarly, specific recommendations could be made with OIE and the amalgamation of List A and List B diseases. It is recommended that the PPLPF compiles a concise list of other projects housed within FAO and explores possibilities of common action towards the above aim.

## **Recommendations Regarding Project Governance**

### **1. Composition of Steering Committee**

- The Steering Committee recommends inviting one more NGO representative, preferably from OXFAM.

- The Steering Committee agreed to invite a representative of the 'Sustainable Agriculture Initiative' subject to circulating more information on the Initiative to Steering Committee members. This invitation will be done on a 'no objection basis.'
- Cost and manageability of the Steering Committee prohibit adding further members from regional organizations (e.g., IGAD, UEMOA) to the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee would like to emphasize the importance of their representation in advisory groups or steering committees for the PPLPF regional work. Moreover, it is important for the Steering Committee to involve the PPLPF regional hub managers in their deliberations, since they provide an important 'ground truthing' of ideas from a broad cross section of regions.

## 2. Opportunities for increased involvement of Steering Committee

- The Steering Committee would like to see succinct quarterly or six-monthly progress reports, distributed by e-mail. These updates should report progress against the log frame (aggregate indicators plus some explanation) and also include information on the status of fund-raising.
- The Steering Committee would like to be alerted (by e-mail) about completed studies and other outputs.
- The Steering Committee is available to provide advice and comments via e-mail between the annual Steering Committee meetings. The PPLPF team could request specific inputs on a voluntary basis, either *ad hoc* or a more planned consultation.

## 3. Reporting to Steering Committee

- The Steering Committee would like to see future reporting (i.e., interim updates and presentations at the next Steering Committee meeting) to be aligned to the log frame.
- The Steering Committee is asking that most major background documents are available one week before the next Steering Committee meeting.

## 4. Venue of next Steering Committee

- The Steering Committee briefly discussed advantages and disadvantages of linking the meeting to the 'Livestock Week' (or another event) or to organize it at a different institution or location (for example a regional hub), but made no specific recommendation.

## 5. CONSOLIDATED RESPONSE TO THE SC RECOMMENDATIONS

### Recommendations Regarding Project Strategy

#### 1. Finding the right balance between regional hubs and focus countries

Supplementary financial support for the establishment of Regional Hubs has not been forthcoming to the extent hoped for, with the exception of the Horn of Africa, and therefore activities in the selected regions has been focussed on specific countries or even specific States therein (eg Orissa and Andhra Pradesh in India). However, even in this reduced form, activities at country level prove vital to the project as they provide the means for direct engagement with stakeholders (government ministries, NGOs, producers, donors, national research institutes etc) and the reality check required for the Central Facility to chose the issues to engage in at the higher / supra-national level. The country-based activities also provide the level of detail of understanding required to gain acceptance as 'point of reference' for livestock sector policy issues.

Given that many donors have decentralized their decisions on project funding to country level it seems rather unlikely that finances for a 'fully fledged regional' hub will become available, with the exception of the Horn of Africa. The PPLPF therefore intends to shift its fund-raising strategy towards country-level interventions of interest to specific donors within the selected focus countries, and to contribute and add-value to ongoing projects (eg the CALPI/SDC - PPLPF initiative on livestock service reform in Orissa).

Nevertheless, the project does not intend to completely abandon the concept of regional hubs as it anticipates that the policy work at country level will show that many policy concerns are of transboundary nature and eventually will require a regional approach. The regional projects may, however, have to be tailored to address specific regional concerns rather than pro-poor policies in general.

#### 2. Selecting a portfolio of livestock-related interventions for reducing poverty, i.e. identifying opportunities for policy and institutional change

The project acknowledges that an opportunistic approach to the engagement in policy and institutional change has its merits, particularly when time is short and actual policy changes need to be demonstrated. However, given that the project purpose is to enhance the capacity for policy formulation, it is felt that opportunistic engagement in on-going policy processes, although necessary, cannot be the core strategy adopted by the project in its attempt to assemble a portfolio of livestock-related interventions for poverty reduction.

Overall the project has fared well with its systematic approach to the selection of regions for engagement, the subsequent selection of focus countries within those regions, 'standardized' assessment of the political economy and policy issues within selected countries and careful selection of partners. This approach has led to the identification of policy issues recurring in all regions / countries, one example being government support to smallholder dairy development, driven by equity concerns as well as by concerns over negative trade balances. A portfolio of policies in support of smallholder dairy development would embrace protective measures against unfair international trade practices, guidelines for engagement with multinational dairy

processors, adequate national standards for milk hygiene, labelling requirements, dairy breeding policies, etc all of which needs to be brought together into a coherent package.

Similarly, the project will address policies related to markets (for livestock and livestock products) and market access in a systematic way, as suggested by the steering committee. In this regard the project is collaborating closely with ILRI's research theme on Market Opportunities, both at country as well as at international level. Another area countries consistently seek policy advice relates to livestock service provision (finding the right balance between public and private provision and how to address market failure, identifying the services for which there is demand and by whom, the role of community animal health workers, etc). By selecting such policy areas, the project would retain a close link to its 'technical' home, even when addressing related policy issues that lie outside its 'technical' home.

The project feels that the development of a 'typology' of poor livestock keepers is required to identify policies that will have a major impact for poverty reduction through livestock development, in terms of number of poor lifted out of poverty. In order to make a choice here, an understanding is required of the various groups of livestock keepers within the sector, and of how and to what extent they will be affected by a given policy change. The project acknowledges that it is impossible to identify policies that will exclusively benefit a single target group without affecting others and any trade-offs need to be assessed. However, there seems to be convergence in international development thinking that poverty reduction is largely dependent on growth in primary agricultural production (through productivity increases) and that the latter is more easily achieved by supporting productive activities of the 'median' poor rather than those of the 'destitute'.

In terms of spatial targeting of interventions the most promising areas will not be the most marginal areas, even though in the latter livestock might be essential for the livelihoods of the poor. Non-marginal areas normally do not figure amongst those with highest poverty *incidence*, but may have high poverty *densities*. It is likely that the largest impact in terms of poverty reduction can be made where large numbers of poor can be found in proximity to large numbers of not-so-poor. Nevertheless, in West and East Africa, the project would still consider pastoralists an important target group, as they lack an alternative to livestock keeping.

### **3. Developing mechanisms for effective stakeholder representation**

The project acknowledges that it has not achieved the desired progress in this area yet. The project has however initiated the formation of pro-poor livestock policy networks in Uganda and Viet Nam, which comprise NGOs and government officials. A similar network will be established in Senegal. In the Andean region, through CONDESAN, the project has established a coalition of three major NGOs operating in Ecuador, Perú and Bolivia respectively. A wide array of stakeholders, including farmers, were represented in workshops held in relation to the livestock service reform processes in Orissa and Andhra Pradesh. The project intends to strengthen these mechanisms for stakeholder representation in the coming year.

### **4. Building capacity at and influencing international organizations.**

PPLPF will compile a concise list of other projects housed within FAO during the next month and explore possibilities of common action towards the above aim. Similar recommendations of more active engagement of FAO in ensuring standard setting that does not harm poor livestock keepers interests by the Expert Consultation on the '*Dynamics of sanitary and technical standards, assisting the poor to cope*', which

took place in parallel and from an FAO/IGG symposium on 'Meeting international standards affecting the livestock sector - the challenge for developing countries'. Thus, it appears that there is scope for a larger FAO effort towards influencing standard setting of CODEX (housed in FAO and WHO) and OIE, which would count with the support of PPLPF.

## Recommendations Regarding Project Governance

### 1. Composition of Steering Committee

As suggested, the PPLPF shall invite a representative of OXFAM to join the Steering Committee. The project shall further provide the Steering Committee with information about the 'sustainable agriculture initiative' for consideration of whether or not it should be represented in the steering committee.

The PPLPF team gratefully acknowledges the decision taken by the Steering Committee this year to open its 'closed session' to project staff and the regional hub managers.

### 2. Opportunities for increased involvement of Steering Committee

PPLPF will provide the Steering Committee quarterly progress reports against the log frame by e-mail. The first of these reports is included in this document (ANNEX D). Information on the status of fund-raising shall be included as a separate note.

Furthermore, the project will alert the Steering Committee about completed studies and other outputs as soon as these are published.

The project gratefully accepts the Steering Committee's offer to provide advice and comments via e-mail between the annual Steering Committee meetings and will request specific inputs on a voluntary basis.

### 3. Reporting to Steering Committee

Future reporting to the Steering Committee (i.e., interim updates and presentations at the next Steering Committee meeting) will be aligned to the log frame and background documents will be made available one week before the next Steering Committee meeting.

### 4. Venue of next Steering Committee

Although the Steering Committee did not make any specific recommendations regarding various options for the venue of the next meeting, subsequent discussions within the PPLPF team led to the conclusion that disadvantages of linking the next meeting with 'livestock week' outweigh the advantages. PPLPF will further explore the option of linking the next Steering Committee meeting to an event organized by the project in a focus country / regional hub.

### Terms of Reference for the Steering Committee

#### Functions

The Steering Committee (SC) will provide advice and guidance to the Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility in achieving its objectives and, in particular, it will:

Recommend on recent advances and best practices, for the Facility's area of interest, that could be beneficially applied to achieve the overall objectives of the Facility;

Provide direction to the Facility's work programmes and suggest appropriate methodologies and tools to obtain the project's agreed outputs and achievement targets;

Promote collaboration of the Facility with relevant global, regional and national organizations and agencies to ensure synergies and enhance its effectiveness; and

Stimulate donor support for the Facility in addressing livestock - public goods related issues.

The SC will elect a Chairperson and a vice-Chairperson for a (renewable) period of two years. Secretariat facilities will be provided by AGA of FAO.

The SC shall meet at least once a year and more often if required.

#### Composition

The SC shall consist of:

Distinguished development thinkers and other renowned individuals appointed in a personal capacity and drawn mainly from the academic/NGO/CSO community in developing and developed countries; and

A maximum of three representatives from the donor community and international agencies associated with the goals of the Facility.

## ANNEX B

### Programme for FAO Expert Consultation on The 'Dynamics of Sanitary and Technical Standards, Assisting The Poor To Cope' and The 2nd PPLPI Steering Committee Meeting

Tuesday, 22 June

FAO Expert Consultation		PPLPI SC Meeting Mexico Room	
8:30 to 9:00	Registration		
9:00 to 9:30	Opening session		
9:30 to 10:30	Presentation & discussion		
10:30 to 11:00	Coffee		
10:30 to 12:30	Presentation & discussion		
12:30 to 14:00	Lunch		
14:00 to 15:00	Presentation & discussion		
15:00 to 15:30	Tea/coffee		
15:30 to 17:30	Working groups	16:00 to 17:30	Introduction (L. Fresco) Overview of activities, outputs & outcomes since last meeting (J. Otte)
17:30 to ????	Joint Reception (Aventino Room)		

Wednesday, 23 June

FAO Expert Consultation		PPLPI SC Meeting Mexico Room	
		9:00 to 10:15	Presentation E.Asia hub (A. Costales) Presentation S.Asia hub (D. Gustafson)
		10:15 to 10:30	Tea/coffee
		10:30 to 12:30	Presentation E.Africa hub (T. Robinson) Presentation W.Africa hub (C. Ly) Presentation Andean hub (H. Cisneros)
		12:30 to 13:30	Lunch
		13:30 to 15:00	Presentation: Role of livestock in food and income generation - policy implications (J. Otte) Presentation: Tracing policy

FAO Expert Consultation		PPLPI SC Meeting Mexico Room	
			impacts to household level - preliminary results (D. Roland-Holst)
		15:00 to 15:30	Tea/coffee
		15:30 to 17:00	Closed discussion SC

Thursday, 24 June

FAO Expert Consultation		PPLPI SC Meeting Mexico Room	
		9:00 to 10:15	Closed discussion SC
		10:15 to 10:30	Tea/coffee
10:30 to 12:30	Working group presentations (open session)		
		12:30 to 14:00	Lunch
		14:00 to 15:00	Report of SC & discussion
		15:00 to 15:30	Tea/coffee
		15:30 to 16:00	Closure (S. Jutzi)

Participants of the 2<sup>nd</sup> PPLPI Steering Committee Meeting

<b>Steering Committee Members</b>	
Bazeley, P.	LID
Benzarrak, S.	VSF
De Haan, C	private
Henninger, N.	WRI
Jutzi, S.	FAO - AGAL
Leonard, D.	UC Berkeley
Musiime, J.	AU-IBAR
Patel, A.	NDDDB
Sere, C.	ILRI
Steinfeld, H.	FAO - AGAL
Viatte, G.	private
Yvon, J.	DFID
<b>Invited Guests</b>	
Gustafson, D.	FAO - India
Leyland, T.	CAPE
Mack, S.	FAO - AGAP
Pica-Camarra, U.	FAO - AGAL
Rey, B.	EC
Roland-Holst, D.	UC Berkeley
Shallon, D.	FAO - PBE
Zziwa, S.	IGAD
<b>Regional Co-ordinators</b>	
Cisneros, H. (Andean Region)	CONDESAN
Ly, C. (West Africa)	EIMVS
<b>Project Personnel (HQ Staff &amp; Consultants)</b>	
Chilonda, P.	
Costales, A.	
De Balogh, K.	
Kazybayeva, S.	
Knips, V.	
Maltsoglou, I.	
Miceli, A.	
Otte, J.	
Riviere-Cinnamond, A.	
Robinson, T.	
Villicana, S.	

## ANNEX D

### Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility: Output-to-Purpose Progress October 2001 to June 2004

Intervention logic	OVis	Progress	Comments & recommendations
Goal			
Enhanced contribution of the livestock sector to poverty reduction	GINI coefficient of income derived from livestock-based activities reduced by 10% Livestock sector growth larger than overall economic growth	Too early to judge	
Purpose (Immediate Objective)			
Strengthened capacity in FAO, member nations and international organisations to formulate livestock sector and related policies and implementation plans that reduce poverty, whilst managing environmental and public health risks	<p>Documented link between policies affecting the livestock sector and poverty reduction, and evidence of effective stakeholder representation in 10 FAO member nations by 2007</p> <p>Detailed implementation plans for the selected policies in 10 FAO member nations by 2007</p> <p>Monitoring and evaluation system for measuring policy impact in 10 FAO member nations by 2007</p> <p>WTO, OIE &amp; Codex take into account the impacts of their rules and standards on poor livestock keepers with evidence for effective stakeholder engagement by 2007</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partnerships concerning the role of livestock for poverty alleviation established with a range of external international organisations and institutions, e.g. ILRI/IFPRI joint programme on Livestock Market Opportunities, UC Berkeley, International Farm Comparison Network, CALPI (India), CARE (Perú)</li> <li>Development of methodology for integrated poverty assessment for livestock promotion (IPALP) with UC Berkeley underway with initial application in Viet Nam</li> <li>Capacity for analysis of Living Standards Measurement Surveys for contribution of livestock to income (and expenditure) established in FAO/AGA</li> <li>Qualitative, participatory policy decision support tools are under development with partners and being field tested (Uganda and Senegal)</li> <li>Financing Agreement with the EC for the establishment of Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Capacity in IGAD near signature</li> </ul>	Need to ensure such capacity gains are mainstreamed in AGA.

Intervention logic	OVI	Progress	Comments & recommendations
Outputs			
1. Portfolio of livestock-related interventions for reducing poverty through policy and institutional change	Endorsement of at least 5 identified policy options by the Steering Committee and external reviewers by 2004 (outputs 1, 2 & 3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy issues relevant to livestock keepers identified in a selected country in each of the 5 regional hubs</li> <li>• The political economy of livestock sector policy making assessed in 5 countries and possible policy entry points identified</li> <li>• Project has engaged in the livestock service delivery reform process in Orissa and Andhra Pradesh</li> <li>• White paper on 'Reorientation of Livestock Service Delivery' in Andhra Pradesh</li> <li>• Desk reviews of role of government and financing options for livestock services in resource poor situations carried out</li> <li>• Project requested to participate in the formulation of Uganda's new dairy development policy</li> </ul>	There are no reasons to believe that assumptions underlying output to purpose relationship do not hold true
2. Increased awareness and consideration of the potential contribution of livestock and the livestock sector to poverty reduction	PPLPI and stakeholders are actively promoting identified pro-poor livestock-related policy and institutional options in 5 countries by 2006 (outputs 1, 2 & 3)	<p>International Institutions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FAO/AGA reoriented its Regular Programme to better address livestock and poverty alleviation</li> <li>• ILRI linking livestock to poverty alleviation in its research portfolio</li> <li>• DG of OIE and FAO staff associated with Codex aware of potential detriment of OECD-driven standards on smallholder livestock keepers</li> <li>• WB-driven ALive initiative launched, which has goals closely aligned with those of PPLPI</li> <li>• AsDB funding major poverty reduction livestock projects in Nepal and Bangladesh</li> </ul> <p>Regional Bodies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UEMOA, IGAD, AU-IBAR and CAN linking livestock to poverty alleviation and regional integration in their portfolio of activities</li> </ul> <p>National governments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ministries of Finance in West Africa realizing importance of livestock for PRSPs and have</li> </ul>	

Intervention logic	OVIs	Progress	Comments & recommendations
<p>3. Effective systems for livestock policy information, analysis, decision-support and M&amp;E</p>	<p>PPLPI and related partners have secured funding for at least 5 projects with a livestock-related livelihoods component by 2007 (outputs 1, 2 &amp; 3)</p> <p>Policy makers and other key stakeholders, including 'non-livestock' actors, actively seek information and use tools generated by the project in their policy formulation and preparation of poverty reduction strategy papers (outputs 2, 3 &amp; 4)</p>	<p>designated focal points in Ministries of Agriculture and Ministries of Finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increasing profile of livestock in the revised Ugandan PEAP document (2004)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Networks of partners for pro-poor livestock development established in 5 'focus' countries</li> <li>• MoU signed with SDC-funded CALPI project for joint activities in India</li> <li>• MoU with Liptako-Gourma project (Islamic Bank funded) for West Africa PPLPI to provide guidance in design of the programme (USD44.5 Mio) ready for signature</li> <li>• Financing Agreement with EC for establishment of Horn of Africa hub within IGAD near signature</li> </ul> <p>International Institutions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WB, EU, AfDB, IFAD and FAO TC department requesting PPLPI for inputs in the preparation of regional programmes and country policy work</li> <li>• FAO/AGA promoting PPLPI issues through Expert Consultation on Sanitary Standards</li> </ul> <p>Regional bodies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inputs into the preparation of regional programmes provided to IGAD</li> </ul> <p>National governments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Viet Nam livestock policy makers (at MARD) have expressed need for staff training on policy and planning for smallholder livestock development for income opportunities expansion and poverty alleviation</li> </ul> <p>Bilateral Donors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DANIDA project in Viet Nam has expressed interest in policy support from PPLPI</li> </ul> <p>NGOs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VSF Viet Nam seeking policy support from PPLPI to gain more stable operating space at the ground level</li> </ul> <p>Unspecified</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approx. 2,000 visits to project website per month</li> </ul>	

Intervention logic	OVIs	Progress	Comments & recommendations
<p>4. Mechanisms established for effective stakeholder representation in the negotiation of policies and institutional changes that better support poor people's livestock-dependent livelihoods</p>	<p>At least 10 organizations actively contributing to the information, analysis, decision-support and M&amp;E systems by 2005 (output 3)</p> <p>Acceptance of at least 5 identified fora as the negotiating platform for pro-poor policy formulation by a majority of stakeholders by 2004 (output 4)</p>	<p>resulting in around 3,500 monthly document downloads</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WB, World Resources Institute, CONDESAN, ILRI, GoU, ACI sharing poverty and livestock related data and information with PPLPI</li> <li>• Livestock &amp; poverty forum established in Peru</li> <li>• Pro-poor livestock policy network established in Uganda</li> <li>• PPLPI 'Andean Hub' (CONDESAN) represented in the Comunidad Andina</li> <li>• Policy dialogue network formed in Viet Nam comprising ministry officials, provincial/district-level officials, academic and research institutes, local producer organizations, international organizations (IFPRI, ILRI) and NGOs (VSF, DANIDA. Proposals for a similar structure is for Cambodia is being negotiated;</li> <li>• PPLPI 'West Africa hub' directly involved and consulted in the policy process in Senegal</li> <li>• Participatory decision support tools under development</li> </ul>	

## ANNEX E STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING PARTICIPANTS' CONTACT DETAILS

**Louise Fresco**  
Assistant Director-General  
FAO - Agriculture Department (AGD)  
[louise.fresco@fao.org](mailto:louise.fresco@fao.org)

**Samuel Jutzi**  
Director  
FAO - Animal Production and Health Division (AGAD)  
[samuel.jutzi@fao.org](mailto:samuel.jutzi@fao.org)

**Henning Steinfeld**  
Chief  
FAO - Livestock Information, Sector Analysis and Policy Branch (AGAL)  
[henning.steinfeld@fao.org](mailto:henning.steinfeld@fao.org)

**Peter Bazeley**  
Director  
theIDLgroup  
[peter.bazeley@theidlgroup.com](mailto:peter.bazeley@theidlgroup.com)

**Carlos Seré**  
Director General  
International Livestock Research Institute  
[c.sere@cgiar.org](mailto:c.sere@cgiar.org)

**Gerard Viatte**  
Ex-OECD Staff Member  
[gerard.viatte@ubiquando.com](mailto:gerard.viatte@ubiquando.com)

**Jo Yvon**  
First Secretary (Development)  
UK Permanent Representation to the UN  
Food and Agriculture Agencies in Rome  
[j-yvon@dfid.gov.uk](mailto:j-yvon@dfid.gov.uk)

**Cornelus de Haan**  
ex-World Bank - Rural Development Department  
[cdehaan@worldbank.org](mailto:cdehaan@worldbank.org)

**Norbert Henninger**  
Deputy Director, Global Information  
World Resources Institute  
[norbert@wri.org](mailto:norbert@wri.org)

**David Leonard**  
Dean of International and Area Studies  
Professor of African Politics and Development Administration  
University of California at Berkeley  
[leonard@socrates.berkeley.edu](mailto:leonard@socrates.berkeley.edu)

**Jotham Musiime**  
Director  
AU-IBAR  
[jotham.musiime@oau-ibar.org](mailto:jotham.musiime@oau-ibar.org)

**Amrita Patel**  
Chairperson  
National Dairy Development Board, India  
[amrita@nddb.coop](mailto:amrita@nddb.coop)

**Joachim Otte**  
PPLPI Co-ordinator  
FAO - Livestock Information, Sector Analysis and Policy Branch (AGAL)  
Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPI)  
[joachim.otte@fao.org](mailto:joachim.otte@fao.org)

**Tim Robinson**  
Livestock Information Officer  
FAO - Livestock Information, Sector Analysis and Policy Branch (AGAL)  
Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPI)  
[tim.robinson@fao.org](mailto:tim.robinson@fao.org)

**Katinka de Balogh**  
Animal Health Officer  
FAO - Livestock Information, Sector Analysis and Policy Branch (AGAL)  
Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPI)  
[katinka.debalogh@fao.org](mailto:katinka.debalogh@fao.org)

**Achilles Costales**  
Livestock Economist  
FAO - Livestock Information, Sector Analysis and Policy Branch (AGAL)  
Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPI)  
[tim.robinson@fao.org](mailto:tim.robinson@fao.org)

**Pius Chilonda**  
Livestock Information Analyst  
FAO - Livestock Information, Sector Analysis and Policy Branch (AGAL)  
Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPI)  
[pius.chilonda@fao.org](mailto:pius.chilonda@fao.org)

**Ana Riviere-Cinnamond**  
Consultant  
FAO - Livestock Information, Sector Analysis and Policy Branch (AGAL)  
Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPI)  
[ana.rivierecinnamond@fao.org](mailto:ana.rivierecinnamond@fao.org)

**Vivien Knips**

Consultant

FAO - Livestock Information, Sector Analysis and Policy Branch (AGAL)

Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPI)

[vivien.knips@fao.org](mailto:vivien.knips@fao.org)

**Irini Maltoglou**

Consultant

FAO - Livestock Information, Sector Analysis and Policy Branch (AGAL)

Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPI)

[irini.maltoglou@fao.org](mailto:irini.maltoglou@fao.org)

**David Roland-Holst**

Consultant

Director

Rural Development Research Consortium

338 Giannini Hall

University of California

Berkeley, CA 94720

[dwrh@rdrc.net](mailto:dwrh@rdrc.net)

**Saule Kazybayeva**

Consultant

FAO - Livestock Information, Sector Analysis and Policy Branch (AGAL)

Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPI)

[ana.rivierecinnamond@fao.org](mailto:ana.rivierecinnamond@fao.org)

**Antonella Miceli**

Operations Clerk

FAO - Livestock Information, Sector Analysis and Policy Branch (AGAL)

Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPI)

[antonella.miceli@fao.org](mailto:antonella.miceli@fao.org)

**Daniel Gustafson**

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) India

[Daniel.Gustafson@fao.org](mailto:Daniel.Gustafson@fao.org)

**Hector Cisneros**

(Andean Region)

Coordinator

Consortium for the Sustainable Development of the Andean Region (CONDESAN)

[h.cisneros@cgiar.org](mailto:h.cisneros@cgiar.org)

**Cheikh Ly**

(West Africa)

Consultant

Ecole Inter-Etats des Sciences et Médecine Vétérinaires (EISMV)

[chly@refer.sn](mailto:chly@refer.sn)

**Tim Leyland**  
Head of Unit  
Community-based Animal Health and Participatory Epidemiology Unit (CAPE)  
[tim.leyland@oau-ibar.org](mailto:tim.leyland@oau-ibar.org)

**Simon Mack**  
Senior Officer (Livestock Prod. Systems)  
Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO-AGAP)  
[Simon.Mack@fao.org](mailto:Simon.Mack@fao.org)

**Ugo Pica-Ciamarra**  
Consultant  
Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO-AGAL)  
[Ugo.PicaCiamarra@fao.org](mailto:Ugo.PicaCiamarra@fao.org)

**Bernard Rey**  
Livestock and Animal Health Officer, Rural Development and  
Environment Unit-AIDCO/C/6  
European Commission (EuropAid Co-operation Office)  
[bernard.rey@cec.eu.int](mailto:bernard.rey@cec.eu.int)

**Daniel Shallon**  
Evaluation Officer  
Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO-PBE)  
[Daniel.Shallon@fao.org](mailto:Daniel.Shallon@fao.org)

**Samuel Zziwa**  
Chief, Agricultural Development and Food Security Section  
Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD)  
[samuel.zziwa@igad.dj](mailto:samuel.zziwa@igad.dj)