



Pro-Poor
Livestock
Policy
Initiative

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

Rome, 14-15 June 2005

CONTENTS

1. Background	1
Project Objective	1
Outputs and Activities	2
Institutional Arrangements	2
2. Structure and Organisation of the SC Meeting.....	3
3. Summary of Presentations	4
Output 1: Portfolio of Livestock-related Interventions for Reducing Poverty through Policy and Institutional Change	4
Output 2: Increased Awareness of the Potential contribution of Livestock and the Livestock Sector to Poverty Reduction.....	6
Output 3: Effective Systems for Livestock Policy Information, Analysis, Decision Support and Monitoring and Evaluation	7
Output 4: Mechanisms Established for Stakeholder Representation in the Negotiation of Policies and Institutional Change	9
Pathways into and out of Poverty in Peru	10
International Rules, Food Safety and the Poor Developing Country Livestock Producer	12
PPLPF Country Strategy	13
4. Recommendations of the Steering Committee	16
General	16
With regard to the recommendations made by the review and management response	16
5. Consolidated Response to the SC Recommendations	18
General	18
With regard to the recommendations made by the review and management response	18

Annexes

Annex A: Terms of Reference for the Steering Committee.....	20
Annex B: Programme the 3rd PPLPI Steering Committee Meeting.....	21
Annex C: Participants of the 3rd PPLPI Steering Committee Meeting	22
Annex D: AGA Management Response to PPLPI Mid-Term Review	23
I. General.....	23
II. AGA Management Response to Recommendations of the Evaluation Report.....	23
III Substantive Repositioning of PPLPI.....	28
AGA Consensus on PPLPI Focus and Substance	29
Annex: Elements for the TORs of the Management Board	31
Annex E: Steering Committee Meeting Participants' Contact Details.....	33

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 frequently 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 national (and 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 strategically selected 'focus countries', 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 meeting consisted of a mix of formal presentations, plenary discussions and a working group session. The participants of the meeting, aside from the Steering Committee members, included Michael Nelson from the University of Berkeley, California, the regional hub coordinators, project personnel (HQ staff and consultants) and members of the newly installed PPLPF management board. Of the Steering Committee members, A. Patel (NDDDB India), S. Bezarrak (VSF) and C. Sere (ILRI) were not able to attend the meeting. C. Sere was represented by J. McDermott (ILRI) (*See Annex C for Participants*).

The meeting was opened by Samuel Jutzi, Director of the Animal Production and Health Division of FAO (AGA). On the first day of the meeting four presentations were made by project staff and regional coordinators reporting on progress towards each of the four project outputs, while a second set of three presentations dealt with selected topics.

- Output 1: Portfolio of livestock-related interventions for reducing poverty through policy and institutional change (J. Otte)
- Output 2: Increased awareness of the potential contribution of livestock and the livestock sector to poverty reduction (K. de Balogh)
- Output 3: Effective systems for livestock policy information, analysis, decision support and monitoring and evaluation (T. Robinson)
- Output 4: Mechanisms established for effective stakeholder representation in the negotiation of policies and institutional changes that better support poor people's livestock-dependent livelihoods (A. Costales, C. Ly, J. Kuan, T. Robinson and V. Ahuja)
- Pathways into and out of poverty in Peru (J. Kuan)
- International rules, food safety and the poor developing country livestock producer (M. Nelson)
- PPLPF country strategy (J. Otte)

Each presentation was followed by a short discussion while ample time was retained for general discussion after all presentations had been given.

The report of the PPLPF mid-term review as well as the management response to the review (*See Annex D*) had been sent to the SC members prior to the meeting. On the second day of the meeting, S. Shallon of the review team gave an overview of the review findings to the Steering Committee while Samuel Jutzi presented AGA's management response to the recommendations of the review team.

As in the previous meeting, the Steering Committee adopted an open and transparent process of dialogue and the 'closed sessions' were opened to project staff and members of the management board for full participation in all discussions.

The meeting was closed by Louise Fresco, FAO Assistant Director General, Department of Agriculture.

3. SUMMARY OF PRESENTATIONS

Output 1: Portfolio of Livestock-related Interventions for Reducing Poverty through Policy and Institutional Change

By Joachim Otte

To strengthen the capacity in FAO, its member nations and international organizations to formulate pro-poor livestock sector policies, the project is attempting to establish a conceptual framework that allows the systematization of policy options in terms of objectives and instruments as a basis for developing a comprehensive portfolio of livestock-related policy interventions.

To this aim the project has (a) critically reviewed and systematized the socio-economic literature on pro-poor growth and pro-poor policies, and (b) examined macroeconomic, institutional, agricultural and livestock sub-sector policies in the eighteen countries of the originally envisaged regional hubs (Ethiopia, Kenya, Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda in East Africa; Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal in West Africa; Bangladesh, India and Nepal in South Asia; Cambodia, Laos, Thailand and Vietnam in Southeast Asia; Bolivia, Ecuador and Peru in Latin America). Compared to conventional socio-economic and policy analysis, the focus of the review has been on the livestock sector and on poor livestock keepers.

The findings of this work so far can be summarized as follows: (i) Economic growth is the most powerful engine to poverty reduction; however missing and imperfect markets often prevent the poor from benefiting from and contributing to economic growth; markets are not institution-free. (ii) There are a number of appealing definitions of pro-poor economic growth. These, however, are often elusive in terms of policy recommendations, which end up being extremely generic, such as 'investing in agriculture' and 'improving the institutional infrastructure'. (iii) Policy makers have largely failed to appreciate the poverty reduction potentials of livestock development (in agriculture-dominated economies). The policy objective for the sector, if any, is normally on increasing livestock production rather than mitigating poverty. (iv) Livestock development is shaped by an intertwined mixture of macroeconomic and agricultural sector policies, with livestock sector specific interventions playing a sub-ordinate role. (v) The broad agricultural policy thrusts tend to overlook the specificities of livestock production. (vi) Livestock policies are frequently 'designed' in isolation by technical officers in the livestock department with minimal consultation between ministries or representatives of the livestock sector. The policy focus, therefore, is mostly on technical interventions and only to a very minor extent on institutional issues. (vii) Current institutional policies centre on improving government structure and financial performance while they rarely adequately address governance and fail to appreciate the rational endogeneity of local, livestock-related institutions.

Based on the review, PPLPI proposes a hierarchical framework for the systematization of livestock sector related policies so as to: (i) facilitate analysis of livestock policies from a pro-poor angle, and, hence, the recognition of existing policy gaps and inconsistencies; and (ii) assist with the identification of livestock-related policy instruments and their strengths and weaknesses. Macroeconomic and macro-institutional policies, such as the decentralization thrust, are taken as a given in this framework as PPLPI, as well as livestock sector policy-making bodies in general, have no comparative advantage in this policy making level.

The proposed framework identifies three major policy objectives contributing to the pro-poor development of the livestock sector, i.e. to a growth of the livestock sector that directly improves the livelihoods of the poor livestock keepers, rather than through trickle down effects. These objectives reflect a policy sequence, but could well be pursued jointly. For each objective a number of specific subsidiary policy sub-objectives are identified and detailed and the rationales for public actions are stated. Finally, for each policy sub objective some existing policy instruments are indicated.

The first major objective of the sequential pro-poor livestock policy framework is 'establishing the basics for livestock production/enhancing rural livelihoods', i.e. providing poor livestock holders with adequate and secure access to basic production inputs to start producing. This overall objective is broken down into two subsidiary policy objectives, which are (a) securing access to land, water and feed, and (b) providing risk coping mechanisms for natural disasters and price shocks. Insecure access to basic inputs and variability of returns, in fact, prevent livestock keepers from making efficient use of their scarce resources and efficiently responding to market signals. For instance, uncertain land rental contract may induce farmers not to make long-term land-fixed investments; high variability of returns could induce pastoralists to over-stocking and using livestock as a form of insurance.

The second major objective of the pro-poor livestock policy framework is 'kick-starting livestock markets/creating the conditions for growth'. This objective is split into three subsidiary policy sub-objectives, which are providing secure access to (a) livestock services, (b) credit and secondary inputs, such as compound feeds, and (c) to domestic output markets. Poor livestock producers, in fact, even when 'having access to the basics' may be locked into low-income equilibria as missing and imperfect markets prevent them from availing those production-increasing inputs, including information, necessary to escape poverty. For instance, high fixed transaction costs and lack of information hinder price transmission so that smallholders cannot fully benefit from a prospective increase in meat/milk price.

The third major objective of the pro-poor livestock policy framework is 'sustaining and expanding livestock production/coping with livestock growth'. Three sub-objectives made up this overall objective: (a) securing food safety and quality of livestock products according to national, regional and international standards; (b) promoting research activities on animal feed and breeds to support the production of high quality commodities; (c) ensuring the environmental sustainability of livestock production. These are mostly public goods and necessary components for countries to be competitive in international markets and to avoid smallholders be crowded out by foreign competitors. For instance, livestock research activities, increasingly driven by the profit-seeking efforts of private institutions rarely serve the poor, which are deemed to be un-willing or un-able to pay for research outcomes.

For each sub-objective a preliminary list of existing policy instruments his being compiled. The project intends to refine this lists of instruments, identify the economic and institutional pre-conditions for each instrument to be effective and effectively pro-poor, and to identify both successful and unsuccessful examples of application of the instruments. The ultimate objective is to develop the proposed pro-poor livestock policy framework into a comprehensive portfolio of livestock related public interventions to support decision makers both in pro-poor livestock policy analysis (diagnosis) and formulation.

Output 2: Increased Awareness of the Potential contribution of Livestock and the Livestock Sector to Poverty Reduction

By Katinka de Balogh

The presentation sought to give an overview of the activities and outcomes regarding with respect to Output 2 within FAO, in the target countries as well as at international level. The activities initially consisted in disseminating information about the project's aim and envisaged activities but thereafter moved to disseminating of information about the policy issues that had been identified and were being addressed. The PPLPI website, through which the PPLPI working papers and policy briefs as well as other selected material was made available constituted an important dissemination channel. The participation and (co)-organisation of PPLPI in a number of events was a further way to directly interact with stakeholders/policy makers at different national, regional and international level. These events have been organised mainly in the focus regions including countries such as India, Uganda, Senegal, Bolivia, Vietnam and Peru and the project cooperated with a wide spectrum of partners in these events. The partners ranged from international and regional bodies (UEMOA, NEPAD/AU, IGAD, COMESA, IFAD, World Bank and Asian Development Bank) to developed and developing country institutions such as CIRAD, NDDDB, CONDESAN, and ISRA. In addition, some activities were organised with non-governmental organisations such as VSF and CARE.

Within AGA, PPLPI has and continues to cooperate with the 3 services of the Animal Production and Health Division (AGA) supplementing the technical issues with a policy focus. Within the wider FAO, PPLPI provides a livestock and poverty dimension to the broader agricultural issues. Special cooperation has been developed with the Economic and Social Department (ESA) on information and mapping systems as well as on small holder typology and CGE modelling. Further joint activities have been conducted with the Livelihoods Support Programme (LSP/SDR) and the Policy Assistance Division (TCA).

As mentioned above, the PPLPI website has provided an important means for the dissemination of the information generated by the project. The number of visits and document downloads is steadily increasing and currently around 6,000 document downloads are registered per month. PPLPI working papers have been catalogued and papers are being submitted to PPLPI for dissemination as PPLPI Working Paper. Furthermore, other institutions are increasingly referring to or providing links to the PPLPI Website and its documents.

There have been a number of official requests for co-operation with PPLPI. A Pro-poor livestock policy initiative for the Horn of Africa, funded by the EC, will be hosted by IGAD. Furthermore, PPLPI has collaboration agreements with Autorité Liptako-Gourma in West Africa and the Plan Sierra in the Andean region. The project is also directly involved in the elaboration of the NEPAD/CAADP document to integrate livestock into the Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme.

The presentation further provided information on the capacity building programme for middle management officers of the animal husbandry department Andhra Pradesh's conducted by PPLPI. So far, the programme has had a very positive response and a request for at least two more courses has been submitted to PPLPI, for which the state government has indicated its willingness to co-finance 50% of the costs.

The project acknowledges that it now needs to formulate a comprehensive communication and dissemination strategy which clearly lays out what information will need to be channelled to specific target groups and how this is best done. The wide variety of target groups demands for different approaches. Possibly one of the most difficult target groups to reach are the actual policy makers, which in

themselves constitute a heterogeneous group. However, a common feature is that information provided has to be concise and to the point. Often a direct discussion or briefing can be more effective than any printed material. Addressing the different socio-cultural settings and 'cross-fertilizing' through insights and processes generated in the different regions, provides a further challenge and requires to search for (innovative) communication and dissemination strategies to fully achieve the aim of enhancing the awareness of the potential contribution of livestock for poverty reduction.

Output 3: Effective Systems for Livestock Policy Information, Analysis, Decision Support and Monitoring and Evaluation

By Tim Robinson

The project aims to collect, collate and organise **information and data** that are relevant to decision making and policy support in the livestock sector. These data fall into quantitative and qualitative categories, most of the latter being compiled within Geographic Information Systems (GIS) databases.

'Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS)' and similar datasets that are available in many countries constitute a very useful information resource and the project has attempted to obtain these household data for most of the hub countries. A broader 'Global Livestock Information System' is under joint development with AGA's Regular Program, with the aim of systematically managing and processing sub national livestock data. Fairly comprehensive GIS databases have and are being collated for all the hub countries but most progress has been made for Uganda and Vietnam. In Uganda the project, in collaboration with ILRI, has conducted some preliminary GIS studies to prioritise areas for trypanosomiasis control, on which it is building to further explore the linkages between livestock, poverty and the environment. Similarly, the project has conducted some very extensive GIS analyses for Vietnam.

Given its importance in policy analysis and advocacy, the project has contributed to developing high resolution ('small area') poverty maps, e.g. for Kenya, Uganda and Vietnam. Aside from developing high-resolution poverty maps the project is leading an initiative to further develop the traditionally used, World Bank-developed 'small area mapping techniques' (linking population census to LSMS-derived poverty rate estimates) by introducing other spatial data such as accessibility and satellite-derived environmental data into the small-area process.

Qualitative data fall under the following main thematic areas: national policy; legislative structure; institutions; contact details for networks of livestock policy stakeholders.

Cognizant of a poor level of analysis and **decision support** in national-level policy development, the project has both adapted existing tools and developed new ones to: analyze the effects of existing policies on different groups of producers and consumers; predict the impact of changing institutional and market environments on existing policy outcomes; and predict the impact of policy changes on different stakeholder groups.

A key decision support tool under development is *EXTRAPOLATE (EX-ante Tool for RANKing POLicy ALTErnatives)*. This is a participatory tool that enables users to visualize the predicted impacts of policy interventions on livelihood outcomes, based on numerical analysis. EXTRAPOLATE serves as a rapid screening device to carry out quick assessments of likely candidate policy changes that may have particularly beneficial impacts on the poor in particular situations, the most promising of which

can be explored in greater detail in terms of costs and feasibility of implementation, and expected outcomes on different groups. The EXTRAPOLATE tool is being/will be 'field tested' in each of the hubs, focusing on the dairy sector in Uganda, small ruminants in Andhra Pradesh and Senegal and on camelid fibre in Peru.

A second decision support tool whose adaptation to developing country circumstances and application in hub-countries is being funded by PPLPF is the *Technology Impact and Policy Impact Calculation Model (TIPI-CAL v4.0)*, which is a tool to analyse impacts of technology and policy changes on dairy households. The household model is flexible in terms of a 10 year strategy analysis with reference to changes in non-farm / farm activity, liability allocation, household asset management, living expenses, capital inflow and outflow, etc. The model is being adapted to include non-cash aspects and risk / variability associated with smallholder dairy farming.

Finally, in collaboration with the University of Berkeley, the project is developing a methodology termed *Integrated Poverty Assessment for Livestock Promotion (IPALP)*, which aims to support more technically focused livestock policies with deeper insight into economic conditions, behavior, and market linkages. For PPLPI, Integrated Poverty Assessment (IPA) of this kind can serve as an important evaluation tool both *ex ante* and *ex post*. Analysis of initial conditions can improve identification of target groups and anticipate their needs for effective program support and market access. Continuing and *ex post* economic assessment can strengthen ongoing program implementation and increase effectiveness of future programs. The IPALP methodology comprises four parts: 1) Data development on rural economy and the livestock sector; 2) Policy Modelling, setting out baseline scenarios for growth over the next fifteen years; 3) Living Standards Assessment, based on the above, evaluating the effects of policies on poverty, inequality, and a variety of living standard and human development indicators; and 4) Digital Mapping of the results of policy simulations. Largely based on data from Viet Nam, the IPALP methodology, is now at an advanced stage of development, and will further be applied in Senegal, Peru and Uganda.

On the information dissemination front, a brochure outlining the project rationale, objectives, and activity areas has been produced and widely disseminated. All project outputs are written up in a timely manner, and made available to the public via the PPLPI web site. To enable an interactive search for documents, project outputs and other resources on the web site by type, by geographic region and by theme, a dynamic information system is being developed.

As for monitoring and evaluation, the project is drawing up a set of indicators by which to monitor and evaluate the impact of policy reform. The project aims to establish a minimum set of key indicators to describe the present situation as a baseline (geographical locations / agro-ecological regions / livestock production systems) from which to measure impact in the in the short (1-2 years), medium (5 years) and long (10+ years) term.

Output 4: Mechanisms Established for Stakeholder Representation in the Negotiation of Policies and Institutional Change

By Achilles Costales, Vinod Ahuja, Tim Robinson, Judith Kuan and Cheikh Ly

The activities by the project in the focus countries toward establishing mechanisms for stakeholder representation in the negotiation of policies and institutional change are not undertaken on their own but as complement to the other outputs of the project. In particular, the progress made in Output 1 provides a starting point in the identification of sub-sectors in livestock where policy and institutional change is deemed to have large potential impacts on sectoral growth and poverty alleviation. Likewise, the livestock information systems, analytical and decision support tools developed under Output 3, are directly used as vital inputs in stakeholder and decision maker engagement in Output 4.

The areas where policy and institutional interventions can be geared toward livestock development and poverty reduction were directly derived from the project's individual country assessments. For each focus country, although the activities undertaken cover more than one industry in the livestock sector, for the SC meeting reporting focussed on one sub-sector on the basis of the relative importance of the latter to the livestock economy and to the significance of the economic activity to rural households in the country as a whole, or in a particular region covered by the project. The sub-sector or activity dealt with in each of the focus countries is shown in the table below.

Focus Country	Region	Livestock Industry/Activity
Viet Nam	Southeast Asia	Pig industry
India, Andra Pradesh	South Asia	Livestock Service Delivery
Uganda	Horn of Africa	Dairy Industry
Senegal	West Africa	Dairy Industry
Peru	The Andes	Cattle industry

The country reports were structured around three main parts. The first part provided the rationale for engagement in the identified sub-sector of the livestock industry. The major issues in the development of the sector (or activity) were put forward. The project concerns relative to the implications of the current policy and institutional environment were elaborated and particular concerns were raised on whether or not the current policy thrusts allowed for a more broad-based participation of rural households and small-scale livestock keepers within the overall development strategy.

In the second section, the focus country reports identified the chosen institutional partners that the project is collaborating with in specific country activities. In all countries, the Ministry of Agriculture and the various departments charged with livestock development and the delivery of livestock services were deemed strategic partners. The officials in these government agencies are the direct link of the project to policy making and institutional reforms. Direct engagement with these officials has provided an avenue for these government representatives to become more aware of the potential of the livestock sector (or a sub-sector within) to significantly contribute to agricultural and rural development and the reduction of rural poverty. Their first-hand exposure to, and familiarization with, the stakeholder analyses, policy assessment, and decision support tools that the project has begun to introduce is providing a mechanism by which subsequent policy decision will assume greater local

ownership. The close involvement of Ministry officials has also provided a window through which project recommendations for pro-poor policy and institutional changes can directly find official champions and get endorsement for potential adoption and implementation at a later stage.

The project has also chosen to partner with selected international organizations with prior and current intensive activities in the PPLPI focus countries, either in knowledge generation in the field of agricultural and livestock development (research), or in the provision of direct assistance or delivery of services to small livestock keepers (development). These international organizations were chosen as partners on the basis of their credibility with the national government of the respective countries concerned, and in their like-mindedness with the goals of PPLPI in the country where they are present.

A third set of partners of the project in the focus countries are the (local) NGOs that work with the projects partners in the government sector in the area of livestock services provision, rural development and poverty alleviation. The NGOs are relatively strong in providing ground-level footing in the understanding of smallholder livelihood constraints, and in understanding grass roots sentiments among rural households. The role of (local) NGOs differed among focus countries, and were particularly prominent in India (Andhra Pradesh) and Peru.

The activities of the project under Output 4 in the focus countries consists of meetings, stakeholder and policy workshops involving the government (national and local), international, and (local) NGO partners, taking as working materials the project outputs in the country in the area of research, livestock and poverty distribution maps generated from country-level databases and other information, as well as work in progress in the policy analyses and decision support tools.

The third part of the focus country reports consisted of presenting the specific opportunities for policy and institutional change, which the project, together with its partners in the respective countries, can opportunistically seize, to bring about pro-poor reforms. These opportunities are largely shaped by developments external to the country, but which necessitate subsequent changes in national policies, laws and regulations, that will have impact on the livestock or related sectors (e.g., membership in the WTO, agreements due to membership in regional trade areas or free trade zones). The reports also identified opportunities arising from within, manifested in the increasing awareness among the lower echelons of the government bureaucracy in the focus countries, of the importance and value of policy and institutional shifts that would bring about a more broad-based distribution of the benefits of growth in the livestock sector.

The reports concluded by presenting the challenges that the project faces and has to resolve to bring about sustainable pro-poor policy and institutional changes that emerge from the participation of stakeholders and negotiation among themselves in the character of the reforms to be made.

Pathways into and out of Poverty in Peru

By Judith Kuan

The presentation was based on the study 'Household Poverty Dynamics in Forty Communities of the Peruvian Andes', commissioned by PPLPI, using the 'Stages of Progress' methodology developed by A. Krishna from Duke University.

The study's objectives were to assess changes poverty status in rural areas, to clarify the role of livestock in these changes and to derive related policy recommendations for poverty alleviation.

In Peru, official poverty levels are defined on the basis of basic needs and revenues (with a bias towards urban 'standards'), while participatory poverty assessments building on peasants' own points of view have not been carried out. Also, there is a lack of knowledge of the way communities and rural households organize themselves to cope with poverty, and little is known about the socio-economic situation in the highland's.

Between August and October 2004, a study of household poverty dynamics was carried out in forty rural communities of the Andean highlands of Peru to ascertain how different households have fared over time (25 years). The Stages of Progress approach was adopted to ascertain the reasons that are associated, respectively, with escaping poverty and falling into poverty and applied to a group of forty communities of two regions, Cajamarca and Puno. These two regions were selected because they are among the poorest regions of the country and capture diversity with respect to five criteria: altitude, livestock activity, market access, size of community, and especially in Puno, ethnic group and language. The communities selected are located at an altitude ranging from a low of 1,900 meters to a high of 4,500 meters above sea level. Economic activity varies as a result.

A total of 3,817 households are currently resident in the selected villages, and following the participatory, community-based methodology their poverty trajectory was reconstructed by members of each household over the previous twenty-five years. In addition, for a random sample of twenty-five percent of these households - 1,041 households in all - the causes associated with their particular trajectories were ascertained.

Descents into poverty have occurred alongside escapes in every one of the forty communities investigated. Different reasons are related respectively with escapes and with descents. Households in the communities of Puno and Cajamarca have escaped from poverty primarily when they have diversified their income sources. Diversification of incomes from livestock, including change in breeds and change in products, have been critical for upward movements, as can be expected, given these highland communities' historic dependence upon livestock, but diversification of crops and new income from non-agricultural sources have also played a hand in households' escapes from poverty in these regions. Migration to towns, both temporary and permanent, has assisted in tapping some new income sources. However, village households who have diversified traditional activities of animal and crop breeding have also realized significant gains.

Ill health and high healthcare expenses were primarily associated with descent in both regions. For fifty-one percent of households that fell into poverty, these health-related factors served as a principal contributing cause. Physical disability was associated with another eighteen percent of descents in communities of the Cajamarca region, while accidental losses were related with an additional seventeen percent of descents in villages of Puno.

Making progress in poverty reduction will require both, facilitating escapes while simultaneously reducing descents. It makes little sense to support only those who are already poor because many more will become poor unless descent is concurrently prevented. Different policies will be required to serve these two distinct objectives.

Ascertaining reasons for descent and escape is important for appropriate policy design. The reasons for falling into and escaping from poverty vary by region, and they also vary over time. What was salient ten years ago is not so salient now. Policy effectiveness can be improved, therefore, by undertaking regular, decentralized

studies. The Stages-of-Progress methodology provides a useful tool for this purpose. Combined with other methods, including panel data studies and participatory poverty appraisals, it can generate more comprehensive knowledge about the nature and causes of poverty.

International Rules, Food Safety and the Poor Developing Country Livestock Producer

By Michael Nelson

This presentation was based on findings of a working paper of the same title commissioned by PPLPI, carried out by Michael Nelson from Berkeley, University of California under the research supervision of Prof. D. Leonard.

In the past, the Codex Alimentarius Commission (Codex) was the agency primarily responsible for the development of public international food safety rules, although the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE) created some rules relevant to livestock food product safety. These rules took the form of voluntary standards—guidelines for state practice and recommendations for protecting human health. Since 1995 the World Trade Organization has linked the international rules created through these organizations to its own rules regarding trade as defined by the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) Measures. Especially important are provisions for a SPS Committee and links to the WTO's enforcement mechanism (the Dispute Settlement Mechanism). This enforcement mechanism makes OIE and Codex rules suddenly appear less voluntary and more important.

At the same time international rule-making is changing, there is increasing awareness of the importance of livestock food products in human consumption and the potential associated risks. One notable trend is that growth in consumption and production of these products in developing countries is outpacing that in developed countries. Furthermore, what is being called a 'livestock revolution' is heralded by some as an important route out of poverty. All of this raises two questions: What is the relevance of food safety law to poor producers seeking to use livestock as a way out of poverty? **And if any of these rules are relevant what can be done to ensure that rule-making processes consider poor producer interests?** The primary focus of the study was on this last question.

The study concludes that international food safety rules are only one factor among many affecting the competitiveness of poor livestock producers. The basic fact that most of these producers do not export means that many of these rules are of little or no direct import. However, international food safety standards can have both positive and negative effects. They should not be ignored. While they present the potential to restrict market access for livestock food products from developing countries, standards can also benefit both poor producers and poor consumers in developing countries if producers are given appropriate technical assistance. The standards adopted might well be different if better technical information about the different circumstances of developing countries and the poor within them were presented effectively.

The WTO, Codex, and OIE are the three most important international organizations for livestock food safety rules. Also important are the relationships in rule-making activities among these organizations. The WTO's SPS Agreement significantly altered the international rule-making environment for food safety. State strategies to influence international rule-making frequently require combined approaches to multiple international organizations. The interests of poor developing country producers of livestock food products are *not* directly represented in international food

safety rule-making. Indirectly, their interests may be represented by their own governments but developing country participation in relevant rule-making activity is limited. Additionally, it is clear that developing country government interests will not necessarily be the same as those of their own poor producers.

Influencing the development of rules requires an understanding of the international organizational environment and the capacities and interests of relevant actors. Specifically, it is important to consider (a) the unique rule-making dynamics of each organization; (b) the degree to which these organizations are embedded in other international organizations (Codex is embedded in the UN system, for instance); (c) the dynamics that formal and informal linkages between these organizations create; (d) the relevant differences in capacities of states for participation in these organizations; (e) the different situations of repeat players and one-shotters; (f) how coordination among one-shotters can provide some of the advantages of repeat players (for instance, through regional organizations); and (g) the relatively high level of engagement by industries and consumer groups compared to those with pro-poor concerns in lobbying for rules and shaping scientific discourse. These factors are important determinants of the constraints and opportunities the current international rule-making system has for poor livestock producers and their advocates.

Recommendations for making international rule-making friendlier to poor producers consider two perspectives. From the perspective of poor producers and their advocates the primary routes to influencing international rule-making include: influencing their own country's position in international organizations; lobbying those training country delegates to international organizations to include a focus on the relationship between food safety rules, poverty reduction, and the needs of poor livestock producers; establishing transnational alliances with other poor producers and/or NGOs; and contributing to the scientific understanding of food safety concerns in their unique contexts. Developing country governments, on the other hand, have more options for representing their own interests in international rule-making. While their participation in international organizations is historically less than that of developed countries there are signs of improvement in recent years. Important activities they can engage in include: greater coordination at the national level among ministries and individuals responsible for developing policy positions in all international food safety organizations; improving the quality and quantity of delegations to international organizations; forming alliances with other similarly-situated countries on issues of particular concern; and lobbying for technical assistance to comply with international standards and with a goal of complying with private international standards as well.

PPLPF Country Strategy

By Joachim Otte

The aim of this presentation was to provide an overview about the rationale and approach adopted by PPLPF for its country work, using Viet Nam and its policy for the pig sector as illustrative example.

The reason for PPLPF country engagement is twofold, first it allows the project to make closer contact with policy makers and the 'poor' in order to get a better understanding of their concerns and constraints and second, direct engagement in selected countries provides the opportunity (and obligation) for the project to learn how it can more effectively inform and influence national (and regional) policy making to achieve pro-poor outcomes.

A 'generic workplan' for the focus countries, elaborated in 2002, encompasses the following four major elements: (a) assessment of where livestock is a livelihood priority, (b) evaluation of the policy context within which the poor have to make their living, (c) identification of the specific policy measures that affect them, and, (d) creation of a network of partners to create / capitalize on opportunities to achieve pro-poor policy shifts.

A combination of GIS and analysis of Living Standard Measurement Surveys (LSMS) was used to map poverty incidence and density, livestock dependency and relevance of different livestock species for household income. These maps reveal a high density of livestock-dependent poor in the Red river delta, as opposed to other areas of Viet Nam, which either exhibit high incidence (but low density) of livestock-dependent poor (the Northern Mountain Region) or high density of non-livestock dependent poor (Mekong river delta). Detailed analysis of the LSMS shows that although agriculture accounts for roughly 60% of the income generated in rural areas, income portfolios are quite diverse and that nearly half of the rural households obtain more income from non-agricultural activities than from agriculture. Nevertheless, semi market-oriented agricultural households (more than 50% of income from agriculture, of which between 25% and 75% is obtained through market transactions) constitute around one third of the rural population disposing on average of an income that lies below the official poverty line.

Nationally, demand for pig meat exhibits strong growth, stronger than that for poultry, and on average pigs provide 60% to 80% of the total livestock income of rural households of which more than 90% is in the form of cash from sales (while most income from poultry is in the form of home consumption). Analysis of the LSMS also revealed that the semi-commercial households only obtain around half the returns per pig per year compared with producers classified as 'commercial' in the analysis (75% or more of agricultural revenue from sales). Thus, interventions to increase the productivity of semi-commercial pig producers in the Red river delta to cater for domestic demand should be one effective measure for poverty reduction. The national policy for the pig sector, however, promotes commercial scale estate farms to produce pork for export and hardly attempts to address problems faced by small-scale producers, which are access to credit, livestock (health) services, production inputs and markets. There is currently no legal basis for the provision of micro-credit, most of it being provided by NGOs, livestock services are decentralized and poorly coordinated, inputs are available but not subject to quality control and therefore not 'reliable' and transactions are subject to heavy taxation.

With the aim of re-orienting the policy and strategy for the pig sector towards producing for the rapidly growing domestic market in a manner that also strengthens the ability of rural smallholders to efficiently participate in and supply such markets on even terms with larger industrial/commercial producers, PPLPF has formed a 'network for change' that brings together representatives of government, research institutes, the private sector and an international NGO. Through meetings, workshops, circulation of reports etc it appears that the 'network' has managed to raise concerns within official circles about the 'wisdom' of current policy and middle-level bureaucrats are, in stakeholder and policy meetings, beginning to state the need for giving greater importance and focus to the growing domestic market (formal and informal) for pork, with a corresponding de-emphasis on expanding export markets for high-quality meat.

A number of lessons about engagement in policy work and exerting policy influence have emerged from PPLPI's work in Viet Nam and in other countries: (a) it takes time to find appropriate entry points (policy change desirable and achievable), (b) co-operation is costly in terms of time and resources (although agreement on the 'problem' can be achieved relatively easily, reaching agreement on a solution is much more difficult) and trade-offs have to be considered, (c) setbacks are normal (governments change and so do policy environments), (d) partnerships and networks

are increasingly replacing hierarchies and 'authorities', (e) effecting policy change requires medium to long term engagement rather than punctual intervention, (f) use of / input into existing policy for a / processes is to be preferred over the creation of new ones, and (g) policy 'blueprints' do not exist and policies need to be developed for specific circumstances through adaptive processes and mechanisms.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

General

1. The SC appreciates the progress made as demonstrated by the presentations by project staff.
2. The SC members were impressed with the quality of the evaluation report and the pro-active management response.
3. The SC appreciated the analysis of how a technical analysis could be used to influence policy through the conceptual framework as was demonstrated by the Viet Nam example on pigs

With regard to the recommendations made by the review and management response

4. The SC strongly supports the vision of the project as transforming AGA and through AGA its international and national partners to achieve better pro-poor policy.
5. For post-project sustainability, this transformation must link to success at the country and regional level. An important element in sustainability is strengthening country and regional institutions.
6. At country and regional levels influencing policy through a learning-by-doing approach is a key ingredient of the project (learning experience), particularly in mainstreaming pro-poor policy approaches and capacity into the normative function of AGA.
7. Fostering change is the second critical ingredient and is key to attracting investors.
8. It is necessary to set boundaries to the country work and reduce to three or four the number of countries and increase resources to build capacity in AGA. The principles guiding focus should be the likelihood of early success and the ability to scale findings out and up.
9. The SC considers that focal actions should include sectoral policy actions for stimulating economic growth in the livestock sector and not be restricted to *coping with growth* and *reducing vulnerability*.
10. The SC recommends that the project builds on and brings existing work to completion and not work in new focal areas or countries without additional financial resources and/or a compelling opportunity for success. While not every Steering Committee member fully subscribed to this recommendation, the majority of members, nevertheless, endorsed this recommendation. It was suggested that a systematic analysis of the prospects of success in the areas in which work already has been begun, would be a useful exercise for the project and help to focus existing resources and efforts.
11. Technology, institutional change and policy actions are all essential ingredients of pro-poor livestock development. The SC emphasizes the importance of combining all these and having expertise for each embedded in AGA's service teams. Awareness and changing job descriptions are helpful but insufficient. AGA must be a champion of this integrated (technology, institutional change and policy actions) approach in FAO and the international community.

12. Given these conditions, a management board as proposed by the review team will be important in mainstreaming pro-poor policy approaches and capacity in AGA. This management board should not be involved in day-to-day management of PPLPI but in the strategic directions of the project and in mainstreaming pro-poor approaches and capacity in AGA and beyond.
13. Beyond the response by management, the SC feels there must be a formal mechanism for linking AGA at the ADG and Director levels to wider policy and economic services in FAO.
14. PPLPI still requires an independent advisory support. This could be the function of the current SC. TORs and more regular electronic consultation would be helpful with physical meetings as requested by management.
15. The SC strongly endorses the review team's recommendation on communications / engagement strategy. This should include coalitions for change both within and without FAO.

5. CONSOLIDATED RESPONSE TO THE SC RECOMMENDATIONS

General

1. The PPLPI gratefully acknowledges the appreciation shown by the SC for progress made by the project since the last SC meeting;
2. The PPLPI concurs with the opinion of the SC on the quality of the evaluation report and supports the response from management in reply to the recommendations contained in the evaluation report;
3. The PPLPI is pleased to note that the SC appreciated its conceptual framework on how to use technical analyses to influence and change policies and institutions, and regards this as encouragement to continue work in this direction;

With regard to the recommendations made by the review and management response

4. The PPLPI concurs with the strong endorsement of the SC that the project not only be one of the mechanisms to build the capacity of national and international partners to achieve pro-poor policy and institutional change, but that the project at the same time enhances the capacity **within** AGA to support such processes. The PPLPI will continue to strengthen its activities in this area to ensure the sustainability of the significant results achieved thus far. However, the PPLPI would like to stress that transformation of AGA can only take place if strongly supported by AGA management with proactive measures put in place to sustain changes after the end of the project;
5. 6. & 7. The PPLPI agrees that learning-by-doing combined with success at country and regional level has to remain one of its main implementation strategies to support the role the project plays in the institutionalisation of pro-poor policy approaches and capacities within and without AGA. PPLPI will increasingly focus on using on 'lessons learned' to strengthen the capabilities and response capacities of key national and regional organisations that play a role in livestock and livestock related policy formulation. In addition, such activities will continue to facilitate processes and mechanisms that lead to genuine policy and institutional changes with pro-poor outcomes, to deliver factual 'proof-of-concept';
8. The PPLPI agrees that additional sharpening of the focus of its in-countries activities will be required to ensure project success and to channel further resources to capacity strengthening activities within AGA. The project has started a detailed review of ongoing and planned in country activities and 'stop-go' decisions will be taken on the basis of the likelihood of success within the project life and the potential to create and diffuse knowledge and concepts that enhance the ability of social and economic systems to formulate [pro-poor] policy and achieve institutional changes in the livestock sector;
9. The PPLPI agrees that the focus of its sectoral policy activities should not be restricted to the *coping with growth* and *reducing vulnerability* scenarios only, but that project activities, provided they are selected on the basis of the criteria developed under (8), can and will continue to cover all three scenarios outlined in the original project document to ensure that the trends in the livestock sector are best used to promote equitable wealth creation and sustainable economic development;

10. See (8);
11. PPLPI fully endorses the views expressed in this recommendation. Although significant progress has been made in this respect, the project will strive to enhance activities that contribute to the identified capacities becoming an integral part of AGA operations. In order to create and diffuse such knowledge within and without AGA, PPLPI will implement a variety of interactive knowledge sharing and learning networks with national, regional and international agencies and include a combination of hands-on research, development and training;
12. The PPLPI agrees with the role the SC identifies for the recently established management board. However, PPLPI contends that this mechanism will contribute to the identified objective only if the management board provides strategic direction to all AGA activities and not just those of the project. The extension of the mandate of the management board to exercise oversight over all AGA funds and activities would facilitate joint implementation of activities and the leveraging of both project and regular programme, thus not only optimising the use of scarce resources but also contributing significantly to the building of in-house policy capacity at the same time;
13. The PPLPI fully supports this recommendation, and the project will initiate a dialogue aiming at the establishment of such a forum;
14. The PPLPI looks forward to establishing a more sustained dialogue with the SC and will assess possibilities of operationalizing a regular dialogue;
15. The PPLPI is already working on a revised communication and engagement strategy, employing methods ranging from flagship publications, seminar presentations, web site revision, round-table discussions and network establishment to representation at professional conferences and development fora. At the same time the project has initiated a in-house communication strategy through a series of regular 'high' and 'low' level seminar presentations.

ANNEX A: 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 THE 3RD PPLPI STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday 14 June

09:00 - 09:15	Welcome	S. Jutzi
09:15 - 09:45	Progress Report on Output 1: Policy Portfolios	J. Otte
09:45 - 10:15	Progress Report on Output 2: Increased Awareness	K. DeBalogh
10:15 - 10:45	Tea / Coffee	
10:45 - 12:15	Progress Report on Output 4: Stakeholder engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Viet Nam - Andhra Pradesh - Uganda - Senegal, UEMOA - Peru 	A. Costales V. Ahuja T. Robinson C. Ly J. Kuan
12:15 - 14:00	Lunch	
14:00 - 15:00	Progress Report on Output 3: Monitoring & Information Systems	T. Robinson
15:00 - 15:30	Tea / Coffee	
15:30 - 17:00	Selected Topics / Studies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pathways into /out of Poverty in Peru - International rules, food safety & the poor developing country producer - PPLPF country strategy 	J. Kuan M. Nelson J. Otte
17:30 - 19:00	Cocktail	

Wednesday 15 June

08:30 - 10:00	Results of mid-term Project Review Management Response	D. Shallon S. Jutzi
10:10 - 10:30	Tea / Coffee	
10:30 - 12:30	SC Discussion	N. Henninger
12:30 - 14:00	Lunch	
14:00 - 15:00	Report of SC & Discussion	N. Henninger
15:00 - 15:30	Closure	L. Fresco

ANNEX C: PARTICIPANTS OF THE 3ND PPLPI STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

Steering Committee Members	
Bazeley, P.	LID
De Haan, C	private
Henninger, N.	WRI
Jutzi, S.	FAO - AGAL
Leonard, D.	UC Berkeley
McDermott, J.	ILRI
Nasskau, E	DfID
Steinfeld, H.	FAO - AGAL
Traore, M.	AU-IBAR
Viatte, G.	private
Invited Guests	
Domenech, J.	FAO - AGAH
Hoffmann, I.	FAO - AGAP
Nelson, M.	UC Berkeley
Regional Co-ordinators	
Ahuja, V. (South Asia)	IIMA
Kuan, J. (Andean Region)	CONDESAN
Ly, C. (West Africa)	EIMVS
Project Personnel (HQ Staff & Consultants)	
Chilonda, P.	
Costales, A.	
De Balogh, K.	
Dijkman, J.	
Kazybayeva, S.	
Knips, V.	
Miceli, A.	
Otte, J.	
PicaCiamarra, U.	
Rass, N.	
Robinson, T.	

I. General

- a) AGA Management expresses its gratitude to the Evaluation Panel for a thorough, constructive mid-term review of the Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Initiative (PPLPI) with important recommendations for the orientation of the project's future operations and strategies.
- b) AGA Management notes that the evaluation report emphasises in its recommendations aspects of management and operations of the PPLPI rather than elements of programme and substance. The evaluation report provides a quantitative rather than a qualitative assessment of the project's outputs. As for substance, the evaluation report recommends a sharpening of the focus of the project without indicating any specific elements of such a focus. Furthermore, it is noted, that the evaluation report recommends a greater emphasis on the strengthening of AGA's (FAO's) capacity to provide pro-poor livestock policy advice.

AGA Management provides (1) a response to the recommendations with an indication, where appropriate, of the timeline for the implementation of these recommendations if they are accepted [Section II], and (2) a proposal for the substantive repositioning of PPLPI in response to the recommendation of the evaluation report for a decisive sharpening of the project focus [Section III]. AGA decided to submit this proposal as a part of this Management Response so as to take advantage of the annual meeting of the PPLPI Steering Committee (SC, 14-15 June 2005); the delay of the discussion of such a repositioning in the Steering Committee by one year would make it little effective given the project's timeline. The proposal was prepared by the entire AGA Management (Director, Service Chiefs, Programme Entity Managers, PPLPI Coordinator).

- c) AGA Management submits that the evaluation report substantially undervalues the impact of the PPLPI (given its short existence and considering FAO's institutional and planning framework) on the transformation of the Animal Production and Health Division from a division focussing primarily on technology transfer to one that recognises and systematically takes into account institutional and policy aspects in the delivery of its programme as a technical division. AGA Management refers to the recent (submitted to FAO's Programme Committee in April 2005) external evaluation of AGA's Livestock Production, Policy and Information Programme which has recognised a substantial transition in incorporating livestock policy advice into AGA's programme. AGA Management would like to record that this transformation is due both to the creation of the AGA Livestock Policy, Sector Analysis and Information Branch in 1999 and the conception, establishment and presence of the PPLPI soon thereafter.

II. AGA Management Response to Recommendations of the Evaluation Report

Major Recommendations (as in Executive Summary)

- 11. The most important overall recommendation of the Evaluation Team concerns the need to build on the strong body of experience and outputs accumulated over the past two and a half years and concentrate more deliberately on

developing FAO/AGA's capacity to provide pro-poor livestock policy support to member nations and international organisations.

AGA Management Response: AGA interprets this recommendation as an indication that the Panel does not consider the on-going efforts in mainstreaming policy and institutional dimensions in its staff establishment and programmes to be sufficient. As a decisive enhancement of its professional capacity in economics and other social sciences is not feasible without weakening its technical mandate (AGA is and will remain FAO's technical division dealing with animal production and health issues), the implementation of this recommendation must rely on enhancing the linkages between the PPLPI and AGA's Regular Programme (RP) priorities. This implies substantial programmatic realignment of PPLPI's programme priorities [see Section III]. On the other hand, it is suggested to continue the on-going practice of incorporating 'institutional and policy awareness' as a requirement in descriptions of most technical posts in AGAH and AGAP that become vacant. Furthermore, AGA will identify one forthcoming vacant post in each Technical Service (AGAP and AGAH) that will have an institutional and policy capacity introduced as one of its essential qualifications.

12. As a first action, AGA should sharpen the focus of the project's objective, as articulated in the Purpose statement of the log-frame. The Team recommends that AGA hold a professionally facilitated strategic planning and logframe revision workshop in this context (para. 36). The Evaluation Team is convinced that the achievement to a significant degree of the project's overall goal of poverty reduction through improved policy making in the livestock sector can only be reached in the long term by focusing more narrowly in the short term (life of the project) on strengthening FAO's capacity to provide effective support. In this context, the OVIs should all be reconsidered and amended appropriately, including recognition of the approved one-year extension to September 2008 (para. 46).

AGA Management Response: This recommendation for a substantive repositioning of PPLPI is accepted. The AGA Management Team (in the composition of the recommended PPLPI Management Board) has prepared a proposal for such a repositioning to be discussed in the Steering Committee meeting scheduled for 14-15 June 2005 (see Section III). If the Steering Committee accepts the proposal, then the detailed planning will go ahead immediately and, if necessary, will include an externally facilitated workshop as suggested.

13. Suggestions as to how the project can contribute to strengthening FAO capacities include such initiatives as organising/sponsoring **joint field visits** both to PPLPI focus countries and to other AGA (or FAO) field activities; **joint planning, proposal preparation, reviewing/auto-evaluating** including bringing non-project staff into the project implementation process; **reciprocal peer reviewing** and discussion of each other's work; **joint participation** in international and regional meetings, workshops or training opportunities on related topics, and other means as determined during implementation. (para. 42).

AGA Management Response: Principle of recommendation accepted

14. Ensuring the **sustainability** of acquired project knowledge and experience, as well as databases, information systems, communications and other strategies, will also involve **gradually transferring responsibility** for PPLPI work to more permanent staff, e.g., through redefining existing AGA posts (ongoing to some extent), co-funding posts with the RP, seeking to place project staff on vacancies that open up in AGA, etc. (para. 43)

AGA Management Response: Accepted in principle (see response to 11 above). AGA Management reiterates its view that more progress has been achieved in this aspect than recognized by the Evaluation Report.

15. The second most important recommendation concerns the environment in which the PPLPI (one of AGA's major investments) operates in AGA and in FAO. Management of this environment, which must be as receptive and supportive as possible, requires decision-making and configuration of resources beyond the project itself and beyond the Project Coordinator's mandate and ability to influence. The original project memorandum foresaw a "management task force" drawn from various parts of AGA and elsewhere in FAO but this was tried only briefly. (paras. 81-84)
16. This is a governance issue that the Division Director needs to tackle and he is the appropriate person to decide. However the Team strongly suggests that it would be of benefit to create a small "**Management Board**," consisting of the Division Director, the three Service/Branch Chiefs of AGA, the two non-chief Programme Entity Managers and the Project Coordinator. Board meetings might also include occasional participation of one or two people of at least Service Chief level from elsewhere in FAO outside AGA but in closely related activities (such as the Chief, Agricultural Sector in Economic Development Service, and the Director, Policy Assistance Division).
17. Such a Board would meet no more frequently than once every two months. Its job would be to support translation of project progress into 'impact', in particular impact on AGA. The concept is that these meetings should serve as 'mini-retreats' for reflection and discussion of strategic issues in the evolution of AGA and the project's role in that evolution. They should not resemble "management meetings" in the current sense of AGA's weekly management meetings.
18. The Management Board will need clear Terms of Reference (see suggested elements for this in Annex II) which define its role in creating and supporting the environment to promote the spread of knowledge, attitude, analysis and experience emerging from the project within AGA and FAO.
19. While budget-holder and day to day management responsibility would remain with the Project Coordinator, the Board could, if appropriate, provide approval of overall annual workplan and budget allocations. The Team also suggests that the Management Board might have direct control over a small part of the project budget (say 10% of remaining funds) to allocate to activities directly contributing to the exchange and transfer of capacity between the project and FAO's regular programme staff and activities like those suggested in the previous recommendation.
20. One specific issue which may benefit from the Board's attention: There is a fine line between achieving integration and mainstreaming of headquarters-based ('normative') project initiatives, and use of such a project to subsidize regular programme work. The Evaluation Team has some concerns that that line may be being crossed at times, and encourages AGA management (through the Management Board) to keep this under review. (para. 119)

AGA Management Response: AGA Management accepts the recommendation for the creation of a PPLPI Management Board as a suitable tool for creating the environment within which the PPLPI operates in the Division. The Management Board has in fact already been established and is responsible for this management response to the Evaluation Report. The inclusion, as recommended, of managers of other associated units in FAO (TCA, ESA etc) may be considered as per the requirements of specific meeting agenda items. AGA Management believes that there are also other means to achieve integration and mainstreaming within the Organization - such as continuous and targeted information, participation in seminars/workshops and for key people to

participate, preferably as ordinary members, in Steering Committee meetings. Management would welcome a decision by the Steering Committee on this point.

The frequency of the meetings of the PPLPI Management Board needs to be kept flexible and determined by the needs of the project.

AGA Management provides some comments on the suggested Terms-of-Reference (TORs) for the Management Board in the attached Annex.

The recommendation to set-aside 10% of the project's resources for allocation by the Management Board is rejected as not considered consistent with the Board's comprehensive responsibility for consistent Programme delivery. The recommendation is viewed as potentially counter-productive for the intended project integration in the divisional programme.

Extra-budgetary funded projects are required to support the regular programme activities given the continuing decrease in real terms of FAO's regular programme resources. AGA Management notes that the evaluation report is not entirely consistent in this respect (e.g. when suggesting post co-funding - para 14) but it agrees that the Management Board should keep this under careful review.

21. The Team recommends continued activity by the project in the area of global decision making on livestock development and poverty, and in particular (para. 111):
- PPLPI should continue to commission and publish studies on international trade and other PPLPI issues relating to **international public goods**.
 - The Animal Health Service (AGAH) should take the initiative in **raising pro-poor issues in OIE in close consultation with the PPLPI**.
 - PPLPI should **invest more time and resources in relationships with key international institutions** (well identified in the project document) - both directly and through the mandated interlocutors (for example the FAO Investment Centre [TCI] in the case of the World Bank and AGAH in the case of the OIE).
 - PPLPI should examine the possibility of increasing its influence at the international level by appropriate **briefing of civil society organisations and the mass media**, that have an increasing influence both on developed countries' development aid and on trade policies. Substantial indirect influence may be achieved in this way.
 - As part of the process of clarifying its objectives and mandate, PPLPI should convene reasonably high level meetings of the development agencies and sector institutions now working on livestock-sector policy and standard-setting, and on policies relating to livestock's contribution to poverty reduction (OIE, World Bank, IFPRI, ILRI...), to examine and **better define institutional mandates, competencies and comparative advantages** and, above all, to remove any duplication and competition for resources. (para. 37)
 - A specific meeting (at least Director-level) should be convened by the PPLPI between the key international institutions involved in the **World Bank's ALive initiative** (WB, OIE, EU, FAO/TCI) in order to better define complementary roles in this particularly closely related activity.

***AGA Management Response:** This set of recommendations is accepted in principle. Substantial developments have taken place since the Evaluation which are referred to in Section III, notably: (1) the PPLPI Horn of Africa hub has been recognized and is being financed (by EC) as an ALive (Africa Partnership for Livestock Development, Poverty Alleviation and Sustainable Growth) programme element; (2) agreement with the World Bank for PPLPI*

inputs in the preparation of "Policy Notes" and with TCI (FAO Investment Centre) and World Bank for developing the methodology for the design of "Livestock - PRSPs" - both within the context of the ALive platform; and (3) formal request from AU/IBAR for AGA/PPLPI collaboration in livestock policy design by AU/IBAR.

AGA will convene a high level meeting between key international institutions to examine and better define institutional mandates, competencies and comparative advantage, but suggests that the Division convenes such a meeting rather than PPLPI, so as to facilitate integration of PPLPI's objectives into AGA and to ensure high level participation of other institutions involved.

22. The Team supports continuation of the focus country activities, as learning activities. It is recommended that PPLPI formulate a **more solid strategy** for providing assistance to individual member nations consisting of direct participation of PPLPI in the policy formulation process, but predominantly focused on the **vigorous dissemination of experiences and results** through various means targeting particular information to different audiences, and in particular audiences within FAO/AGA. These could include publications and articles, but also visits, workshops and seminars, joint activities with others, etc. This is closely related to the recommendation relating to the need for a **communications strategy**. Of course, this recommendation also applies to **exchange of experiences between focus countries**. (para. 96)

AGA Management Response: Accepted as part of the substantive discussions on repositioning being undertaken by the Management Board.

23. The PPLPI needs to take a clear position on the future of the concept of regional hubs, which is at present confused. If this approach is to continue, then a specific strategy will need to be developed. (para. 101)

AGA Management Response: Agreed. Due to limited donor interest (exception: Horn of Africa hub), the PPLPI has already dropped the concept of hubs (as communicated to the Evaluation Panel) and is instead currently addressing individual countries in the selected regions (to which recommendation in para 22 refers). The repositioning of the project as suggested in Section III will imply careful reconsideration of PPLPI's country programme portfolio.

24. Several recommendations refer to specific implementation issues. These include the following:
25. The livestock-dependent poor are very often women. The Team was surprised by how seldom women or gender more generally were present in discussions of PPLPI and in the documentation, both in Rome and in the focus country visits. As a general recommendation, the PPLPI **should give more attention to gender issues**. Greater gender balance in staff and the SC might help with this. (para. 46).

AGA Management Response: Accepted; in addition to gender sensitivity, AGA is undertaking substantial efforts for considering more generally diversity sensitive approaches in all its programmes.

26. As Output 1 (developing a portfolio of policy interventions) is currently defined, it is not really possible to assess progress. The log-frame needs to be revised to incorporate both the need to **build up a body of knowledge** and the need to **systematise the policy options**, e.g. in terms of objectives and instruments - as is now being worked on by PPLPI. (para. 49).

AGA Management Response: Accepted

27. Under Output 2 (increased awareness of the potential of PPLP), the Evaluation Team recommends that the **emphasis on dissemination** in the original project log-frame be restored. The PPLPI should focus on development of a **Communications Strategy**, as this will necessarily be a key element of future work in informing the policy process. It should also be clear that the stakeholders concerned are not just those of the focus countries. (para. 57).

AGA Management Response: Accepted in principle. This will be incorporated into the divisional communication strategy so as to avoid inconsistencies/duplication.

28. With regard to Output 3 (effective information and decision support systems), the Team recommends that the Steering Committee consider **whether the number of decision-making tools being simultaneously developed is too large** for PPLPI adequately to supervise and/or to test and advise on. Early emphasis should be given to the question of M&E indicators where little progress seems to have been made. Also, someone unconnected with developing the systems needs to do some simple "market research" to see **what kind of systems are in practice "demanded"** (and likely to be used); and what difficulty, if any, users have had in getting acquainted with the PPLPI tools. (para. 61).

AGA Management Response: Accepted

29. The activities under Output 4 (effective stakeholder representation) are behind schedule. PPLPI needs to rethink its approach in ensuring stakeholder representation and to equip itself with adequate skills in institutional matters. Serious consideration should be given to **recruiting an Institutional Development Specialist** as was originally foreseen. Only by doing that is the PPLPI likely to achieve the quality and quantity of activities needed under this Output. (para. 66).

AGA Management Response: Accepted

30. It is highly recommended that PPLPI **pursue the establishment and development of a global network** (and possibly regional networks) in support of pro-poor livestock policy, as foreseen in the project log-frame. (para. 111).

AGA Management Response: Accepted. This will be done in conjunction with relevant AGA Regular Programme activities.

III Substantive Repositioning of PPLPI

AGA Management (through the newly established PPLPI Management Board) submits its consensus view for the repositioning of the PPLPI. This takes account of the Evaluation Report's recommendations to strengthen its focus, reconsider its purpose for the remaining period and to improve integration with the rest of AGA.

Considerations

- (1) The Evaluation Report states as its most important recommendation that the PPLPI **"concentrate more deliberately on developing FAO/AGA's capacity to provide pro-poor livestock policy support to member nations and international organisations"**. It must be made clear that this can only be achieved within the mandate of AGA as a technical division of FAO. AGA cannot, and will not, be transformed into a policy division. AGA will remain as a technical livestock division **but** with sufficient **awareness and capability** to place its technical programme within an appropriate policy and institutional context. Awareness will be strengthened in the Animal

Production and the Animal Health Services (AGAP and AGAH), while the core policy/institutional capabilities remain within the Policy and Information Branch (AGAL). AGA has adopted the practice that most post descriptions for vacant technical post in AGAP and AGAH include the requirement of some policy and institutional development experience in addition to the technical qualifications and experience. Furthermore, AGA Management has agreed that two future vacant posts (one in each of AGAP and AGAH) will require a policy/institutional competency as one of the essential qualifications.

- (2) Based on the adjustments in AGA's technical post profiles as referred to above, and capitalising on the professional policy capabilities of AGA's Policy and Information Branch (AGAL), the enhanced capacity of AGA as a division to provide pro-poor livestock policy support can only be achieved through the programmatic integration of the PPLPI with relevant aspects of the division's regular and field programme activities. This will be done in selected programme elements given the requirement of rapid impact and the short remaining duration and resources of the PPLPI. The selection of these programme elements will also consider the potential for follow-up external funding.

AGA Consensus on PPLPI Focus and Substance

(I) "Coping with growth and structural change"

In regions characterized by strong per caput GDP growth coupled with high rates of urbanization, livestock production is expanding rapidly resulting in major structural changes in the sector. These changes have substantial impacts on natural resources, public health and societies in rural, peri-urban and urban areas. While these regions provide major opportunities for rural poverty alleviation through enhancement of rural-urban linkages, they also present the threat of marginalisation of a large proportion of the population directly or indirectly involved in the livestock sector. There is the potential for PPLPI to provide innovative policy/institutional solutions for a wider participation in livestock sector growth, particularly in rural areas, whilst safeguarding the sustainable use of natural resources and maintaining veterinary public health. Two priority areas of PPLPI are identified:

1. Policies and institutions that deal with the impact of sector expansion and the consequences of such change on rural society (a value chain approach to mitigate against the adverse affects of the rapid exclusion and marginalisation of small-scale livestock producer), and
2. standards and norms in modernising markets and veterinary public health policies in support of more socially equitable livestock sector growth.

The main geographical focus of this component will be East and South Asia developing the on-going collaborative work with LEAD and ILRI/IFPRI on market chains and institutional arrangements in India and Vietnam. This component would also expand the work on SPS rule-making and the impact analysis of SPS measures on national, regional and international trade in livestock and livestock products. Programmatic integration with AGA's Regular Programme is as follows:

- 213P1 (Global Livestock Information), specifically livestock distributions and production systems
- 213P2 (EMPRES), specifically SPS-issues and trade
- 213B2 (Livestock Sector Analysis and Policy Development), specifically market/value chains and standards
- 213B4 (Veterinary Public Health and Food Safety), specifically food safety and standards

- 213B6 (Livestock - Environment Interactions), specifically related to land-livestock balances as worked on by LEAD, and related disease and environmental issues.

Further external linkages: ESN Codex, OIE, WHO.

(II) 'Reducing vulnerability'

An estimated 70 percent of the rural poor raise livestock, often under marginal conditions. This exposes them to major climatic (drought, flood), disease (animal and human), economic/market (price shocks, theft and fraud) and political (conflict) risks which lock them into activities that are relatively secure, low risk, but have low returns and which restrict their ability to respond to market signals. Ongoing macroeconomic and institutional policies, which follow the mainstream economic theory, are likely to sustain a conducive market environment for those which have a fallback position such as alternative income or livelihoods. Agricultural and livestock sector policies, however, that do not adequately address the major binding constraints affecting poor livestock holders are unlikely to make a major contribution to poverty reduction and may even lead to further marginalisation. Two areas of PPLPI investment are identified:

1. Policies and institutions that reduce the likelihood of occurrence of animal and zoonotic human health emergencies and natural disasters and institutional and policy response mechanisms that mitigate against their impacts
2. policies and institutions that secure access to resources and that foster increasing market participation of small-scale producers.

The main geographical focus of this component will primarily be Africa, where PPLPI has made most progress both in substance and in institutional recognition: the Horn of Africa hub of PPLPI is just about to be funded (EC; 4.5m\$) and will be executed through IGAD in association with the African Union (AU). In the first General Assembly of ALive on 31 May 2005, the Horn of Africa hub was recognised as part of the ALive Programme (which itself has been accepted by the African Union and the Regional Economic Commissions in Africa). PPLPI will collaborate with the World Bank and FAO's Investment Centre (TCI) to elaborate the methodology for the preparation of Livestock PRSPs and is committed to provide inputs into the preparation of "Policy Notes" in support of the ALive platform vision. PPLPI has also been involved, as requested by NEPAD, in the preparation of the CAADP-II Compendium on Livestock (Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme). The new Director of AU/IBAR has requested a formal agreement and collaboration with AGA/PPLPI in support of the AU/IBAR policy formulation facility. In addition to the Horn of Africa based programme of work, the potential for a West African base will be explored capitalising on current work with UEMOA and in Senegal.

Programmatic integration with AGA's Regular Programme is as follows:

- 213P1 (Global Livestock Information), specifically poverty / vulnerability mapping
- 213P2 (EMPRES), specifically disease prevention and control
- 213B2 (Livestock Sector Analysis and Policy Development), specifically livestock policy formulation related to access to resources and services
- 213B4 (Veterinary Public Health and Food Safety), specifically zoonotic disease management
- 213B5 (Livestock Development and Poverty Reduction), specifically through good agricultural practices, value chain development through improved processing and access to services, and emergency mitigation strategies

- 213B6 (Livestock - Environment Interactions), specifically in the area of drylands management, in conjunction with related LEAD activities in West Africa.

All other elements of PPLPI will be downscaled and / or phased out.

Annex: Elements for the TORs of the Management Board

Background

1. FAO is committed to poverty reduction and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. This implies an upscaling of development efforts, and ways of working that impact at scale. Increasingly, this means focusing AGA's work on the broad underlying policies and institutions that determine poor people's livestock-related livelihoods.

AGA Management Response: AGA's and PPLPI's "work is certainly on 'underlying policies and institutions that determine poor people's livestock-related livelihoods" - however, the livestock sector development provides threats and opportunities for the livelihoods of people not directly producing animal products. AGA is adopting a value chain approach in its programme prioritization which implies that policies and institutions need to take account of implications beyond livestock-dependent livelihoods.

2. Livestock contribute to the livelihoods of many of the world's rural poor. However, the nature of livestock farming is typically determined by policy and institutional frameworks that are rarely pro-poor and that sometimes encourage production that threatens environmental stability and public health. Characteristically the rules of the game surrounding trade in livestock and access to services are increasingly determined by national and international policies, institutions and processes that require supra-national agreement and cooperation and/or are subject to international norms, conventions and standards that need to be informed from a global or regional perspective. AGA's 'Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Initiative' (PPLPI) aims to establish and institutionalise capacity to support and provide input into national and international policies and institutions in support of poor people's attempts to make 'A Living from Livestock'.

AGA Management Response: Same comment as for para 1: "national and international policies and institutions in support of poor people's attempts to make 'A Living from Livestock'" preferably also refer to people beyond those directly involved in livestock keeping and primary production.

Purpose

3. While the project's day-to-day management is delegated to a Project Coordinator, it is the wider AGA's responsibility to ensure that the products of this significant FAO investment are mainstreamed into its Regular Programme, into the Field Programme where appropriate, and into work of FAO more generally, as well as into the work of AGA's external partners. In order to assist in this mainstreaming, a Management Board will be constituted.
4. The purpose of the *PPLPI Management Board* is to:
 - Manage the environment (within AGA) into which PPLPI's outputs are delivered, in order to maximise the return on AGA's investment in PPLPI;
 - Ensure coherence and complementarity between the work of the PPLPI and AGA's Regular Programme Entities;

- Ensure coherence and complementarity between the work of the PPLPI and AGA's external interactions and relationships (with, for example, the World Bank and the OIE);
- Ensure the sustainability of PPLPI impacts by managing the mainstreaming over time of PPLPI project activities and staffing into the Regular Programme;
- Provide the Project Coordinator with guidance and support in the allocation and management of PPLPI resources, including staff recruitment and performance.

Operation

5. The Management Board will meet every 2 months. Its members will comprise:
 - Director, AGA (Chair)
 - Service / Branch Chiefs of AGAH, AGAL and AGAP
 - **all** other managers of AGA Programme Entities (**those** who are not service chiefs)
 - PPLPI Coordinator

AGA Management Clarification: AGA's Medium Term Programme (2006-11) has six Programme Entities which are coordinated by as many Programme Entity Managers; three of them are Service/Branch Chiefs and three are not Chiefs. The Coordinator of PPLPI is at the same time Manager of the AGA Programme Entity on Global Livestock Information.

6. The Management Board will have at its disposal approximately 10% of the PPLPI's remaining financial resources to allocate in support of collaborative, cross-disciplinary work across AGA, and to assist the integration of PPLPI activities and approaches into the Regular Programme.

AGA Management Response: This recommendation is rejected (1) as it introduces a unjustified weakening of the coordinator's programme delivery responsibility and (2) as the Board can and should be expected to rule unequivocally on the entirety of the programme.

7. The Management Board will prepare a report to the PPLPI Steering Committee each year on its activities and recommendations.

ANNEX E: STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING PARTICIPANTS' CONTACT DETAILS

Louise Fresco
Assistant Director-General
FAO - Agriculture Department (AGD)
louise.fresco@fao.org

Samuel Jutzi
Director
FAO - Animal Production and Health Division (AGAD)
samuel.jutzi@fao.org

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

Peter Bazeley
Director
theIDLgroup
peter.bazeley@theidlgroup.com

John McDermott
Deputy Director General
International Livestock Research Institute
j.mcdermott@cgiar.org

Gerard Viatte
Ex-OECD Staff Member
gerard.viatte@ubiquando.com

Liz Nasskau
UK Permanent Representation to the UN
Food and Agriculture Agencies in Rome
e-nasskau@dfid.gov.uk

Cornelus de Haan
ex-World Bank - Rural Development Department
cdehaan@worldbank.org

Norbert Henninger
Deputy Director, Global Information
World Resources Institute
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

Modibo Traore
Director
AU-IBAR
mobido.traore@au-ibar.org

Joachim Otte
PPLPI Co-ordinator
FAO - Livestock Information, Sector Analysis and Policy Branch (AGAL)
Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPI)
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

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

Achilles Costales
Livestock Economist
FAO - Livestock Information, Sector Analysis and Policy Branch (AGAL)
Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPI)
achilles.costales@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

Jeroen Dijkman
Livestock Development Officer
FAO - Livestock Information, Sector Analysis and Policy Branch (AGAL)
Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPI)
jeroen.dijkman@fao.org

Saule Kazybayeva
Consultant
FAO - Livestock Information, Sector Analysis and Policy Branch (AGAL)
Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPI)
saule.kazybayeva@fao.org

Vivien Knips
Consultant
FAO - Livestock Information, Sector Analysis and Policy Branch (AGAL)
Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPI)
vivien.knips@fao.org

Irini Maltsoglou

Consultant

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

Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPI)

irini.maltsoglou@fao.org

Michael Nelson

Doctoral candidate in Political Science at the University of California, Berkeley

MichaelNelson@berkeley.edu

Antonella Miceli

Operations Clerk

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

Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPI)

antonella.miceli@fao.org

Judith Kuan

(Andean Region)

Coordinator

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

judithkuan@amauta.rcp.net.pe

Vinod Ahuja

(South Asia)

Consultant

Indian Institute of Management

ahuja@iimahd.ernet.in

Cheikh Ly

(West Africa)

Consultant

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

chly@refer.sn

Ugo Pica-Ciamarra

Consultant

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO-AGAL)

Ugo.PicaCiamarra@fao.org