



Pro-Poor  
Livestock  
Policy  
Initiative

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

Rome, 27-28 June, 2006

## CONTENTS

Acronyms .....	ii
1. Structure and Organisation of the SC Meeting.....	1
2. Summary of Presentations .....	2
Modelling the Poverty Impacts of Livestock Policy Change – Experiences from Viet Nam and Senegal .....	2
Activities Undertaken by PPLPI in Response to the Mid-term Review and the SC Recommendations and Future PPLPI Directions .....	4
PPLPI – Strategic Partnerships.....	7
Overview of the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD) Livestock Policy Initiative (LPI) .....	9
Lessons Learned from PPLPI’s Engagement in South Asia .....	11
Likely Impact of FAO Reform on AGA and Livestock Related Policy Work in FAO and Report of the PPLPI Management Board (MB) on Activities Undertaken in Response to the Mid-Term Review and SC Recommendations .....	13
Expectations of India’s NDDB’s for the South Asia Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Programme .....	14
3. Recommendations of the Steering Committee .....	15
General .....	15

### Annexes

Annex A: Terms of Reference for the Steering Committee.....	17
Annex B: Programme of the 4th PPLPI Steering Committee Meeting.....	18
Annex C: Participants of the 4th PPLPI Steering Committee Meeting .....	19
Annex D: PPLPI Management Board Meetings .....	20
PPLPI Management Board (MB).....	20
Annex E: Steering Committee Meeting Participants’ Contact Details.....	22

## ACRONYMS

AGA	Animal Production and Health Division
AGAL	Livestock Information, Sector Analysis and Policy Branch
AGAP	Animal Production Service
ALive	African Livestock initiative / African partnership for livestock development, poverty alleviation, and sustainable growth
AP	Andhra Pradesh
AU-IBAR	African Union - Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources
CAADP II	Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme II
CALPI	Capitalization of Livestock Program Experiences India
DREA	Department of Rural Economics and Agriculture
EC	European Commission
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
ESA	FAO Agricultural and Development Economics Division
ESC	FAO Trade and Commodities Division
HPAI	Highly pathogenic avian influenza
IFCN	International Farm Comparison Network
IGAD LPI	Inter-Governmental Authority on Development - Livestock Policy Initiative
ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute
IPALP	Integrated Poverty Assessment for Livestock Policy
ITC	International Trypanotolerance Centre
LEAD	Livestock, Environment and Development initiative
LINK	Learning, Innovation and Knowledge (network)
MB	Management Board
MTR	Mid-term review
NDDDB	National Dairy Development Board
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NRMPA	Natural Resource Management Program, Andhra Pradesh
PAAT	Programme Against African Trypanosomiasis
PATTEC	Pan African Tsetse and Trypanosomiasis Eradication Campaign
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
SA PPLPP	South Asia Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Programme
SCOPE	Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment
SIT	Sterile Insect Technique
SMILDA	State Management Institute for Livestock Development of Andhra Pradesh
TCA	Program Assistance Division, FAO Technical Cooperation Department
UCB	University of California Berkeley
UEMOA	Union Économique et Monétaire Oest Africaine
UNU	United Nations University - Maastricht Economic and social Research and training centre on Innovation and Technology
MERIT	
WISP	World Initiative for Sustainable Pastoralism

## 1. STRUCTURE AND ORGANISATION OF THE SC MEETING

The Steering Committee meeting consisted of a keynote presentation, presentations on topics related to project delivery and relevant activities, plenary discussions and a working group session.

The participants of the meeting, in addition to the Steering Committee members, included David Roland-Holst, James Irvine Professor of Economics at Mills College and Director of the Rural Development Research Consortium at the University of California, Berkeley, and HQ and regional staff of the PPLPI, including Prof. B. Mochoge, Director of the Agriculture & Environment Division, IGAD Secretariat. Of the Steering Committee members, M. Traore (AU-IBAR) and S. Benzarrak (VSF) were not able to attend the meeting. Furthermore, the Director of the Trade and Commodities Division (ESC), represented by the Service Chief of ESCB, Merritt Cluff, the Director of the Policy Division (TCA), Mafa Chipeta, the Director of the Agricultural and Development Economics Division (ESA), Prabhu Pingali were invited to attend the meeting and to provide their views on future relationships between their departments and AGA / PPLPI (See Annex C for Participants).

The meeting was opened by Prabhu Pingali. In his welcome remarks, he highlighted the common interest of ESA and AGA in the area of livestock policy work, particularly with AGAL and PPLPI. He emphasized the need to improve the understanding of the implications of changing diets in developing countries toward high-value food products, such as dairy and meat, and of the repercussions of changing domestic and global markets for smallholders and their livelihoods. In the context of the on-going FAO Reform, he reiterated the importance of collaboration and the need to capitalize on complementarity.

On the first day of the meeting, five presentations were made by project staff and the regional coordinator of the South Asia hub. The first was the keynote presentation by Prof. Roland-Holst. The succeeding presentations reported on progress towards the major directions set by the previous year's Steering Committee.

- Presentation 1: Modelling the poverty impacts of livestock policy change - experiences from Viet Nam and Senegal (D. Roland-Holst)
- Presentation 2: PPLPI on Activities Undertaken in Response to the Mid-term Review and the SC Recommendations and Future PPLPI Directions (J. Otte)
- Presentation 3: PPLPI - Strategic Partnerships (J. Dijkman)
- Presentation 4: Overview of the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD) Livestock Policy Initiative (LPI) (T. Robinson)
- Presentation 5: Lessons Learned from PPLPI's Engagement in South Asia (V. Ahuja)

Furthermore, the SC was informed on the likely impact of FAO Reform process on AGA and livestock policy-related work in FAO and on the outcomes of PPLPI Management Board Meetings and actions in response to the previous year's Mid-Term Review recommendations, through brief reports presented by Samuel Jutzi, AGA Division Director and Chair of PPLPI's Management Board. Finally, Amrita Patel, Chairperson of India's NDDDB outlined NDDDB's expectations for the South Asia Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Programme (SA PPLPP). Each presentation was followed by a short discussion.

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

The meeting was closed by A. Mueller, FAO Acting Assistant Director General, Department of Agriculture.

## 2. SUMMARY OF PRESENTATIONS

### Modelling the Poverty Impacts of Livestock Policy Change - Experiences from Viet Nam and Senegal

By David Roland-Holst

The Integrated Poverty Assessment for Livestock Policy (IPALP) is a research component of PPLPI dedicated to elucidating the economic fundamentals of smallholder production. Its main rationale stems from the recognition that, while livestock is significant to the livelihood of a large proportion of the rural poor, exploiting the livestock sector's potential to improve the livelihoods of rural households depends on complex economic linkages and behaviour. The work consists of data development in identified PPLPI hub countries where macro, sector, and household level information are available, with which static analysis and policy simulation is performed in each case. The goal of this work is to support more effective pro-poor livestock policies at all levels - macro, meso, and micro.

The presentation focused on major topics: i) Livestock and rural poor households, ii) Smallholders and the food supply chain, and iii) HPAI - challenges and opportunities from a major animal disease risk.

With the benefit of improved national and sub-national sector data and detailed microeconomic surveys, the study continues to validate the importance of livestock to smallholder livelihoods. In West Africa, the poorest countries are among those where livestock dependence, measured in terms of the relative share of the livestock sector GDP to the total GDP, are also among the highest. In Viet Nam, where rural households most common participation in the livestock economy is in the holding of a few pigs and poultry, a striking feature of income and asset distribution is that while income is highly skewed in distribution, the distribution of incomes from poultry and from pigs, considered individually, are significantly more equitable. The challenge is to translate livestock dependence into a sustained source of income growth. In most of the country cases examined so far, the best means for realizing this is through improving the terms for smallholder participation in food markets generally, and livestock and livestock products markets in particular. Following from microeconomic fundamentals, three general ways of doing this are to effect 1) an increase in output; 2) an increase in output prices; or 3) a reduction in production and marketing cost.

In most developing countries, the majority of rural income arises from marketing food products (e.g., averaging 62% among rural households in Viet Nam). Livestock's contribution to this income depends on complex market supply chains extending from the farm gate to urban and even foreign households. The current findings on these linkages indicate that the terms of this market participation are far from achieving their potential to help the rural poor.

The IPALP approach employs multiplier analysis with Social Accounting Matrices (SAMs) as a convenient way to elucidate livestock's linkages across the whole economy. To date, the work on PPLPI hub countries has developed five SAMs for Viet Nam and three for Senegal. Different aggregations are used to examine a variety of income-expenditure linkages. Initial results for Viet Nam and Senegal show that higher income groups generally enjoy larger multiplier effects because they have more diverse linkages to the economy. In the Senegal simulations, however, it was found that, while more livestock income go to the higher income groups, in relative terms, livestock income gains are more important to the rural poor than to the richer households.

Using simulation models, IPALP can assess ex ante the impact of a wide variety of policies on household groups and on poverty. Initially, two generic kinds of policy scenarios were evaluated: i) Producer support policies to improve livestock production, and ii) Policies geared at improving international market access. For the first group, producer scenarios of doubling livestock productivity and a 20-percent capital subsidy to the livestock sector were considered. For the second group of policies, trade liberalization for greater international market access was considered. The main finding was that when generalist policies are used, the higher income groups capture most of the ensuing economic gains. This leads to the conclusion that policies intended to more strongly affect poor households need careful targeting.

New applications of the IPALP are being brought forward to deal with issues related to animal and public health. Pathogens associated with livestock, such as the highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI) pose a challenge to public health and economic security at the national and global levels. Conventional measures to control diseases such as the HPAI can seriously threaten the livelihood of smallholder livestock producers. The impact of control measures on poor households depends on which points along the supply chain the control measures are imposed (e.g., farm production vs. processing level) and the level of participation smallholders and other stakeholders in the various economic activities along the poultry supply chain. This would differ significantly, for example, between the highly sophisticated export-oriented broiler economy of Thailand and the domestic market-oriented and local chicken-dominated poultry sector of Viet Nam. IPALP simulation results show that a general nationwide policy of culling 50-percent of the poultry flock at any one time has relatively larger negative impacts on poorer households in Viet Nam.

On the other hand, from a development perspective, disease risk management can be an opportunity to improve the circumstances of smallholders. In the context of HPAI, the disease presents an unusual opportunity for international cooperation because poor rural households can contribute to the global common good of disease prevention. The participation of smallholder producers in this effort of preventing the spread of disease, however, is unlikely to be voluntary, and indeed should be rewarded if success is to be achieved. To make disease prevention policies effective, economic analysis of incentives as well as a localized design and implementation of measures are needed.

The aim of policy therefore should be one of reducing HPAI risks to animal and human populations, while safeguarding livelihoods. To reduce health risks without undue adverse effects on the livelihoods of the poor, policy makers need cost-effective measures to identify local outbreaks and contain them. Evidence suggests that local communities are well aware of infection patterns, but the reporting processes are plagued by inefficiency and incentive problems. Socially effective risk reduction requires systematic procedures to ensure that this information is revealed and mechanisms are implemented to ensure it is rapidly disseminated for analysis and policy response. Recognizing the economic realities in poultry production and livelihoods, the PPLPI HPAI activity proposes a three-part program to reduce health risks along the general headings of surveillance, control and traceability.

Under surveillance, the research is beginning to examine alternative policy designs that in facilitate early detection of outbreaks. Effective surveillance must provide incentives for collective responsibility and self-reporting on the part of poultry keepers, but at the same time take account of the resource constraints of different communities, with the aim of developing mechanisms that reduce health risk while protecting the economic survival of producers.

Under control, for the long-term success of disease management, cost-effective decentralization of control capacity is essential. In the HPAI epicenter countries, this will require new command and incentive relationships between district and provincial

authorities, the central government, and outside stakeholders (NGOs, aid agencies, etc.).

Under traceability, mechanisms must be developed and implemented to trace the movement of agricultural products (e.g., livestock products, poultry) through the food supply chain to enable rapid identification of infection and sources of supply. Rapid sourcing of infection through traceability reduces the scope and time of disease incubation, lowering mutagenic risk.

Traceability has value for governments, consumers and producers, reducing health risk while increasing the effectiveness of demand targeting and raising value-added by origin. For the government, moving testing downstream, from extensive to intensive screening (funneling), reduces search costs and reduces the scope of surveillance systems. Rapid identification and localization also allows more effective targeted culling, thereby reducing control costs by the government. Traceability mechanisms also transfer the accountability and risk of non-compliance to producers and supply chain participants, creating the incentives for self-monitoring and other SPS discipline.

For consumers, effective traceability mechanisms bring about disease risk reduction, food quality improvement and product differentiation. For producers, traceability brings about greater market access and greater value chain participation, creates the enabling environment for focused extension services and effective technology transfer, and promotes development of network externalities (e.g. marketing boards, producer cooperatives).

Without traceability mechanisms, when the successive intermediaries along the supply chain (traders, wholesalers, processors, distributors) negotiate between each other with asymmetric information, the resource and information flow between producer and consumer is broken. With effective traceability systems along the same supply chain, producers are linked to all downstream buyers and they can be rewarded for quality improvements, a positive incentive to reduce disease risk. On the other side of the market flow, the willingness to pay premium (value) for higher quality of livestock products provide the incentives to develop and employ the technology to more efficiently produce and supply such products along the value chain, improving condition of production and market access (productivity enhancement and distribution services). The result is a virtuous cycle of improved product quality and higher incomes for primary producers.

## Activities Undertaken by PPLPI in Response to the Mid-term Review and the SC Recommendations and Future PPLPI Directions

By Joachim Otte

The presentation contained two major sections: i) The PPLPI response to the Mid-term Review and the 3rd SC recommendations, and ii) 'Pending issues' and planned activities.

The work of the PPLPI over the reporting period (June 2005 - May 2006) was set against the background of the general environment in which the Project had to go about doing its tasks. The year that passed was dominated by the FAO reform process, which generated uncertainty about the organisational structure and work programme of AGA, exerted additional demand on AGA staff, including PPLPI staff, and resulted in increasing disenfranchisement. Additionally, the past year was marked by the culmination of the HPAI crisis, which led to an accentuated imbalance

in AGA's programme portfolio (toward HPAI activities) and to a strong reversion of AGA to 'field' mode.

Despite these circumstances, two significant achievements were made: i) The Financing Agreement for the EC-funded Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) Livestock Policy Initiative for the Horn of Africa was signed and programme implementation has started, and ii) A Partnership Agreement was negotiated with the Indian National Dairy Development Board (NDDDB) for a South Asia Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Programme (SA PPLPP).

***Response to major MTR and SC Recommendations:***

Eight major recommendations arose from the MTR and 3rd SC. Each recommendation and the accomplishments of the Project vis-a-vis each of them are presented in order.

1. Provide 'a systematic analysis of the prospects of success in the areas in which work has already begun.'

PPLPI has developed a (focus-) Country Strategy, which identifies the policy process(es) in which the project engages, defines the criteria for success, sets the timeline for (dis-)engagement, and estimates the financial requirements for each country engagement.

2. The SC strongly endorses the review team's recommendation on communications / engagement strategy

A Communications Strategy has been developed. In this strategy, target groups and key messages are identified. For these key messages and respective recipients, tone and mode of transmission were defined. The resulting activities will be complemented by the PPLPI Partnership Strategy.

3. The project should hold a professionally facilitated strategic planning workshop and logframe revision workshop and revise the log-frame to incorporate both the need to build up a body of knowledge and the need to systematise the policy options.

A log-frame workshop was not held due to the prevailing uncertainty about AGA's work programme (brought about by the FAO reform process), which is essential background for defining PPLPI's purpose and hence the log-frame.

In response to the recommendation to systematise policy options, Part 1 of a 'Policy Menu' was drafted and circulated for feedback.

4. Convene reasonable high-level meetings of the development agencies and institutions working on livestock sector policy and on standard setting and to convene a specific meeting between the key international institutions involved in the ALive initiative.

High-level meetings have not been convened due to the uncertainties surrounding the AGA programme and due to most development agencies also being absorbed by the HPAI crisis.

The PPLPI, however, has held a meeting and established a working relationship with WB's ALive Secretariat and is jointly preparing a Livestock PRSP guide and selected policy notes.

5. The project should 'formulate a more solid strategy for providing assistance to individual member nations consisting of direct participation of PPLPI in the policy formulation process.'

PPLPI reviewed its engagement in national policy processes to develop the strategy by systematically following the steps experienced to be effective in engaging with national and sub-national stakeholders in the policy process. The 'usual' sequence of steps undertaken are the following: i) A detailed 'livelihood'



analysis (based on existing data); ii) Identification of pro-poor livestock policy issues where change could be possible (through commissioned political economy studies); iii) Formation of a network of like-minded institutional partners (led by a national champion); iv) Stakeholder engagement and dialogue through meetings and workshops; v) Clarification of disputed issues through local, problem-oriented research; and vi) Preparation of a 'consensus' proposal for new legislation / policy. The experiences in these processes will be systematically documented.

6. The project should 'rethink approach to ensure stakeholder representation and equip itself with adequate skills in institutional matters (possible recruitment of an institutional development specialist)'

PPLPI feels that stakeholders have been generally well represented in all policy processes the project has engaged in and the Andhra Pradesh (AP) experience in stakeholder engagement has been processed, documented and lessons have been drawn. The details of the process of the process of stakeholder engagement in AP, which is similar to that adopted by PPLPI in other countries, are discussed in the presentation on the 'Lessons learned from the PPLPI's engagement in South Asia'. (Presentation 5, by V. Ahuja).

7. The project should 'pursue the establishment of a global network (and possibly regional networks) in support of pro-poor livestock policy.'

The PPLPI is establishing Regional networks where there is direct engagement with the concerned stakeholders. The regional networks being built are those of the Horn of Africa (IGAD) and in South Asia (SA PPLPP).

Furthermore, PPLPI is linking into other networks. ELDIS, ALive, and WISP are examples of policy-oriented networks into which PPLPI links while LINK, ILRI and UNU constitute research-oriented networks with which PPLPI has established close relationships.

8. The project should 'work on gender mainstreaming.'

The Project agrees to this recommendation and admits that no concrete steps have been taking in this regard. PPLPI would appreciate practical guidance from the SC on this matter.

### *'Pending' Business and Planned Activities*

Three main areas of 'pending business' were identified. The first is the development of PPLPI's communications component, where the Communication Strategy will be developed into a Communication Plan, with specific Communication Activities.

The second area is the elaboration and implementation of the PPLPI Partnership Strategy. Major institutional partners identified are ILRI, ITC, ALive, IGAD-LPI, NDDDB, and in-house units.

The third area in which PPLPI has to invest is the development of the Institutional Learning Strategy for FAO and other partners. This component will distil lessons learned and develop strategy for feeding them into different organizations, and hopefully influence the FAO reform.

PPLPI has, over the past year started to engage in one 'new policy area', in which it sees promise in pursuing further, namely to contribute to and complement FAO AGA's efforts in containing HPAI through providing policy advice. The focus of PPLPI's contribution is on the development of smallholder-compatible control strategies for HPAI in the Mekong epicentre countries, building on previous work carried out in Viet Nam. A second area to which PPLPI has devoted (minor) resources is the development and elaboration of 'Livestock Development Goals' (LDGs), modelled on the MDGs, and related indicators as a potential set of Goals behind which the 'livestock community' could be 'united' and against which it could demonstrate progress.

The presentation ended with a question about the position and role of PPLPI in the context of a 'FAO Reform' namely whether the PPLPI purpose of being an AGA change agent be maintained.

## PPLPI - Strategic Partnerships

By Jeroen Dijkman

The presentation outlined the design of the PPLPI partnership strategy as it responds to the recommendations of the Mid-term review and 3rd Steering Committee meeting (2005) on mainstreaming of the PPLPI perspective and capacities in AGA, FAO and beyond in support of the design of policies and institutions that respond more effectively to the needs of the livestock sector-dependent poor people.

The PPLPI is a small outfit but with a large agenda. It aims to be the one-stop shop for technical and institutional guidance for livestock sector (and related) policy making processes and formulation that contribute to socially desirable outcomes. It is a unit designed to provide services and products that facilitate others to perform their own roles and functions in the policy making process more effectively. Being small, the PPLPI needs to leverage resources and influence, for which reason internal and external partnerships are essential.

To date, PPLPI has build up of a large body of pro-poor livestock policy relevant knowledge and analyses. The build up of this body of knowledge was necessary for the PPLPI to be able to function effectively, as it needed to establish its credibility, through proof of its capacities and competencies in the area of policy and institutional change for poverty reduction. Greater emphasis, however, is now required on engagement with and facilitation of policy actors and processes: Policy and institutional change relevant to poor people is the result of the interactive learning among a critical mass of different actors working toward this goal.

PPLPI's partnership strategy is shaped by the following principles: adherence to joint objectives (goals), complementarities exploiting own comparative advantage, recognition of distinct roles in the process of change, engagement based on mutual respect and recognition of ownership of change process, transparency in communication, and the recognition of temporal and spatial boundaries in the field of work.

Partnerships are being developed at four levels: in-house (FAO), national and local (country), regional, and international. In-house, the Initiative aims to influence FAO's agenda and to institutionalise the competencies and skills developed within FAO's architecture. At the national and local levels, the project aims to build the capacity of public, private and tertiary sector actors to engage effectively in local policy processes and institutional change. It also facilitates the conduct of policy-relevant research and analysis, but these activities are increasingly delegated to the 'new' regional hubs in East Africa and South Asia. At the regional level, the initiative engages with policy and planning organizations and economic commissions, particularly to strengthen capacities for regional policy harmonisation, livestock and livestock product trade regulations, and SPS concerns. At the international level, the initiative participates in research and analyses, policy processes, to influence the international architecture of decision making, and the planning and investment portfolios of donors and civil society.

The presentation provided key examples of PPLPI strategic partners at each of the four levels of engagement. At the in-house level, key partners are AGAL-LEAD in AGA, and TCA. With AGAL-LEAD, the initiative contributes to the coordination of the work on the SCOPE/LEAD Livestock in a Changing Landscape (LCL). LEAD and SCOPE are strategic entry-points into existing network of livestock-environment scholars,

development practitioners and decision makers. The engagement contributes to the inclusion of the PPLPI perspective and competencies into the environmental agenda, bringing about the convergence of different and often conflicting agendas: livestock sector growth, poverty reduction, and environmental sustainability. Infusion of the PPLPI perspective and expertise will also increase the capacity of AGAL to deliver these types of services.

Another example of in-house collaboration is the joint preparation of the "Livestock Chapter" for the NEPAD CAADP II and of training modules for policy makers with TCA. This engagement will be intensified further through the implementation of the IGAD-LPI for the Horn of Africa. Partnership with TCA has enhanced the presence and profile of the livestock sector in the TC portfolio.

A prominent partnership example at the country level is the pro-poor livestock policy programme in South Asia, implemented jointly with the Indian National Dairy Development Board (NDDB). Partnership with FAO through PPLPI marks a significant departure from the norm for the NDDB - one of the most influential political players in the Indian and South Asian livestock sector. The collaboration is thought to have large potential to contribute to livestock-sector mediated poverty reduction in a notoriously difficult environment. Specifically, this unique partnership envisages to achieve pro-poor technological and institutional change in the livestock sector in India, and aims to expand to Sri Lanka and Bangladesh in the South Asian region.

At the regional level, examples of partnerships are those with the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD), the Programme Against African Trypanosomiasis (PAAT) and related Pan African Tsetse and Trypanosomiasis Eradication Campaign (PATTEC) in the Horn of Africa, and with the Union Économique et Monétaire Ouest Africaine (UEMOA) in West Africa. PPLPI is the implementing agent for the EC-funded IGAD Livestock Policy Initiative. This Initiative is designed to strengthen the capacity of the Regional Economic Community (REC) and member states to use the livestock sector for policy and institutional change with socially desirable outcomes. PPLPI will be a facilitating agent at different levels of decision-making, in stakeholder engagement, in knowledge sharing, and capacity strengthening for negotiation and policy dialogues.

The PATTEC/PAAT collaboration with PPLPI has resulted in the development of a methodology for spatial targeting of interventions for trypanosomiasis control, and a methodology to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of different control methods and strategies. Partnership with PATTEC/PAAT has resulted in PPLPI contributing to more informed decision making on policies for trypanosomiasis intervention, that goes beyond the use of the Sterile Insect Technique (SIT) - an expensive and cumbersome approach that currently dominates PATTEC policies and strategies.

PPLPI's partnership with UEMOA, has been instrumental in the process that led to the adoption of harmonized zoo-sanitary standards, and in the design of livestock services reform proposals by its member nations. In this engagement the initiative played a brokering role using its information base and the convening power of FAO to facilitate discussion and to negotiate implementation. This partnership engagement in West Africa is likely to be expanded to the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) to address a similar range of problems with the addition of regional transhumance and conflict prevention issues.

At the international level, some key examples are the partnerships with ILRI, UNU-MERIT, and ALive of the WB. Relations between PPLPI and ILRI has recently transformed from that of a largely contractual to a more synergistic rapport. This new agreement aims to combine resources to produce mutually owned, complementary outputs. At a global scale, the latter comprise region-specific projections of livestock sector development pathways, while for the IGAD region, risk-based assessments of trade in livestock and derived products (intra-regional and with the Near East), targeting of pro-poor livestock interventions and a detailed study on

the potential evolution of livestock systems were envisaged. For the medium term future PPLPI and ILRI are developing a major project proposal focusing on the 'conversion' of livestock research to livelihoods outcomes.

UNU-MERIT provides an entry-point into the international community of scholars and policy experts working on innovation policy studies in developing countries. Partnership with the organization will be instrumental in guiding the generation of policy relevant resources on pro-poor innovation for a New Rural Economy. The organization will also provide this type of support to the SA PPLPP and the IGAD LPI. The collaboration has recently culminated in the joint establishment of Learning, Innovation and Knowledge (LINK) network ([www.innovationstudies.org](http://www.innovationstudies.org)) covering South Asia, East Africa and Latin America

Collaboration with the African Livestock (ALive) initiative focuses on the preparation of Livestock Policy Notes and the formulation of 'Livestock' PRSP guidelines. This collaboration has firmly established the PPLPI as the main partner in the ALive platform. Through this platform, and based on its of information, knowledge and experience, PPLPI plays a significant role both in setting the agenda for Sub-Saharan Africa livestock sector capacity strengthening and the establishment of policy dialogue platforms, and on the World Bank SSA livestock sector investment and activity portfolio, as well.

Through its partnership strategy PPLPI contributes to building capacities and competencies and facilitates access to broad information and knowledge stocks in PPLPI and beyond, influencing and setting agendas, that facilitate interaction and change. The strategy is to work in promoting alliances and tapping into networks to link different sources of knowledge and different areas of social, economic and political activity, thus providing an enabling environment for the interactive learning required for policy and institutional changes that contribute to socially desirable outcomes.

## Overview of the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD) Livestock Policy Initiative (LPI)

By Tim Robinson

The IGAD LPI covers seven countries in Horn of Africa: Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan, and Uganda. A regional programme was first proposed in the Kampala meeting of the representatives of the East African public livestock services sectors and donors in 1997. With the establishment of the PPLPI Horn of Africa 'hub' in 2001, preliminary studies and stakeholder workshops were conducted with AU/IBAR in 2002, and negotiations for the IGAD LPI commenced among FAO, EC, IGAD and AU/IBAR in 2003. In 2005, the IGAD LPI agreement was signed by the negotiating parties, and declared operational at FAO in January 2006.

The objective of the IGAD LPI is the enhanced contribution of the livestock sector to sustainable food security and poverty reduction in the IGAD region. The purpose of the regional initiative broadly follows that of the PPLPI, but at a regional level, in strengthening the capacity in IGAD, member states, other regional organizations and stakeholders to formulate and implement livestock sector and related policies that sustainably reduce food insecurity and poverty.

There is a number of key livestock policy issues that the IGAD LPI intends to address. These include: poor capacity for policy analysis and implementation, poor participation in the policy processes at the national and international level; existing trade rules and marketing standards restricting the market participation of poor livestock keepers; poor harmonisation of trans-boundary disease management; inappropriate policy and institutional frameworks to accommodate trends in

privatisation and decentralisation of livestock services; changing requirements for livestock services and changing roles of livestock service providers; and the existence of anti-pastoralist policies that lead to resource use conflicts (e.g., restricted movement, land tenure restrictions).

In this initiative, the international partners include FAO's Technical Cooperation Division (TC), the African Union (AU) through the Department of Rural Economics and Agriculture (DREA) and the Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources (IBAR), the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), the Partnership for livestock development, poverty alleviation, and sustainable growth (ALive) of the World Bank, and the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI).

In preparation for engagement in the policy processes in the region, and in close collaboration with PPLPI's partners, the IGAD LPI has initiated a series of activities towards each of four major project outputs.

Towards raising awareness of the role of livestock in countries in the IGAD region, the project has initiated activities in both Kenya and Uganda. From this will be developed a framework for assessing policies to address the constraints faced by different groups of livestock-dependent households.

Under the project output on the development of policy options and institutional change and implementation mechanisms, analyses of the political economy of livestock policy making in IGAD and in selected member states have been commissioned under letters of agreement with the University of California at Berkeley (UCB) and the Institute of Development Studies (IDS). The project will engage in policy dialogue initially for two major issues identified, in collaboration with a United Nations University (UNU-MERIT), unit based in Addis Ababa. Livestock policy analysis on the dairy sector will be continued in Uganda, in collaboration with the International Farm Comparison Network (IFCN). The project will also take forward work initiated under the PPLPI in Uganda to develop planning support tools for trypanosomiasis control, through cost-benefit analysis of alternative interventions and tools for spatial targeting of interventions. This is being done in collaboration with PAAT, in support of PATTECs policy recommendations. Livestock emergency guidelines will be developed in partnership with FAO's Animal Production Service, linking to on-going efforts in the region by a consortium comprising: Tufts University, the African Union (AU), the International Commission of the Red Cross (ICRC) and Vétérinaires Sans Frontières (VSF). An analysis of emergency response capacity is also being developed for the region in collaboration with UNU-MERIT.

Under the output on development of information systems, analysis and decision support tools, the project is compiling and collating baseline spatial datasets, including information on livestock, population, welfare, transport networks etc. for the IGAD region. Preliminary data analysis in support of policy development includes determination and characterization of livestock production systems, poverty mapping and estimating accessibility to markets and to services. In collaboration with FAO's AGAP the project is developing a Decision Aide for Livestock Disaster Mitigation Interventions, and tools for policy process monitoring in collaboration with UNU-MERIT.

Under the output of building networks for stakeholder representation in policy negotiations, links to existing networks are being used (e.g. the Livestock Market Information System (LMIS) network in IGAD and the existing the PPLPI network in Uganda). The project will support the development of grassroots organizations for stakeholder representation, in collaboration with UNU-MERIT. The capacities for representation and negotiation on SPS negotiation in the international arena on trade related matters will also be developed.

The project is at an advanced stage of establishing project offices in the region and recruiting staff, has already convened a meeting of major international partners in

Rome (February 2006), and an initial inception meeting of the IGAD LPI Steering Committee is scheduled for September 2006.

## Lessons Learned from PPLPI's Engagement in South Asia

By Vinod Ahuja

South Asia presentation drew on PPLPI experience in India over the last three years. The presentation began with a reminder of (i) the original purpose of country-level engagement which was stated as 'to facilitate the establishment of informed, transparent, inclusive and participatory policy making processes at the sub-national, national and international level', (ii) the first steering committee recommendation that hubs were to be seen as agents for 'instigating' change, not just transferring information, and (iii) the Mid-term review reminder that the country work was to be seen as a part of a wider process of learning about, and informing policy processes at a greater scale. Lessons from these experiences should translate to developing the capacity (of AGA) to inform policy making.

The presentation also reminded of the four key elements in policy process: research and analysis, communication and information, stakeholder engagement, and negotiation and conflict resolution; but pointed out that the 'somewhat removed view of the policy making' presented in the PPLPI concept note gets very messy when combined with ground experience. Despite the messiness, however, it is important to adhere to some guiding principles: adherence to bottom-up participatory process to strengthen the role of 'non-state' parties; partnering for learning and experience sharing; and nurturing the coalitions of change.

SA experience provided an opportunity to add ground experience to the above framework and generate some lessons for influencing policy processes. PPLPI country engagement in India involved partners at the national level and at the state level. At the national level, the partner was the National Dairy Development Board. At the state level, for Andhra Pradesh (AP), the partners were the Capitalization of Livestock Program Experiences India (CALPI), Natural Resource Management Program, Andhra Pradesh (NRMPA), State Management Institute for Livestock Development of Andhra Pradesh (SMILDA), the Government of India, and selected NGOs. In the state of Orissa, the partners were NRMPO and the Government of Orissa.

The experience in AP, the activity engaged in was the PPLPI-CALPI-AHD Initiative on Livestock Services Delivery. The objective of the engagement was to identify, through a consultative process, the gaps and deficiencies in animal health and breeding services delivery system, and to create a conducive environment for facilitating policy and structural changes to address those gaps and deficiencies.

Andhra Pradesh provided an appropriate setting to engage in policy processes within the PPLPI framework. The rural and urban poverty incidence in the state is relatively high. It has a vibrant and articulate civil society which creates meaningful opportunities for wider stakeholder dialogue. From the government side, there are well trained animal health services staff, and the state has a complex political and social history of elites dominating the power structure.

The PPLPI-CALPI-AHD stakeholder engagement process in AP was consultative, multi-tiered, and multi-stakeholder. The process involved farmers, farmer organizations, NGOs, the government department on livestock services, the AP Livestock Development Agency, the State Management Institute for Livestock Development, tribal communities, breeder cooperatives, and shepherds. The process involved the engagement of national consultants to carry out field studies; the provision of guidance by a steering committee chaired by the Principal Secretary on Animal Health of the Government of AP; the engagement of a task force to draft recommendations

and organize meetings; and the engagement with an expert committee to propose legislation for policy and institutional changes.

There are certain features of the consultative process in AP that have been the key to fostering positive engagement. The process was flexible, open, and allowed to evolve. The process was open to review, reflection, and mid-course correction. The government, with its influential position, was active in guiding and steering the consultative process. The existence of other willing partners resulted into a consortia of stakeholders, sharing resources into the pool. The issues taken up in the policy process had a root in reality as these were founded on research and field evidence.

As the policy process was consultative and multi-tiered, the activities were also tailored according to the level of engagement with the stakeholders. Meetings were held at the district and village levels. There were separate consultations with tribal households and shepherds, traditional healers, government veterinarians, and field officers. There were separate meetings for the steering committee and the task force. Two studies were carried out to support the information base. One was on the problems and potentials of para-veterinarians and animal health workers. The other evolved a strategy to control animal diseases of economic importance for the poor. A number of expert group consultations were held. Programmes were implemented for capacity building. A state-level workshop was held. Individual high-level meetings were held to inform and support high-level decision making.

The policy process in AP has brought about changes as evidenced by the new openness in the establishment to the alternative animal health delivery systems. The overall process was quite demanding and threw up a number of challenges. These included ensuring effective participation and keeping interest alive, building consensus in the wake of diverse and even opposing views and perspectives. Maintaining momentum under frequent changes at the senior government levels, dealing with historical baggage of consultants, dealing with a legacy of mistrust among interest groups and shortening the duration of the participatory process.

At a more general level, the PPLPI engagement in South Asia threw up a number of other questions that need to be debated. The presentation pointed out that in South Asia, the stakeholders often questioned the utility of 'pure dialogue processes' in influencing policy. Given that policy is often subject to political capture, there is perhaps a need to supplement 'policy dialogue' with some 'action on the ground'. To handle this, the change 'instigator' should know how far the programme of stakeholder engagement is committed to with its resources.

One is also confronted by the tension between doing research or doing advocacy, and by the question on which activity matters. The experience in AP shows that advocacy gets credibility and taken seriously when grounded on evidence.

Ultimately, the stakeholder engagement and policy process should create and foster a 'learning environment', where the barriers created by 'power and accountability relations' could be recognized and understood, and where the processes of consultation and reflection could take place. There is also a need to better understand government's own development efforts instead of simply bringing in relatively newer/different ideas from other country experiences.

When convening interest groups, the legacy of mistrust between or among themselves must be recognized. Transparent processes must be developed in the engagement that will build and raise the confidence levels that these interest groups hold for the other.

The presentation also put a 'question mark' on the utility of 'somewhat linearized' logframes when stakeholder engagement is more of a process. Within these evolving policy process, a question was also posed on what is the role of FAO, and what can it do as one of the partners in the engagement.

The presentation closed with the search for new directions in the light of the recent creation of the NDDDB-PPLPI alliance in the South Asia Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Programme (SA PPLPP). This alliance has the potential to synergize the global and neutral role of FAO and the strengths of the national and sub-national partners. This alliance constitutes a shift from 'information sharing and dissemination' to 'interactive learning' with enhanced emphasis on the 'process' and continued emphasis on 'field evidence' for informing policy debates. The processes engaged in from this alliance can lead to discovering the 'iterative model' of policy making. This partnership will constitute an opportunity to both 'work on the ground' and 'influence policy'

## Likely Impact of FAO Reform on AGA and Livestock Related Policy Work in FAO and Report of the PPLPI Management Board (MB) on Activities Undertaken in Response to the Mid-Term Review and SC Recommendations

By Samuel Jutzi

The on-going FAO reform process is likely to impact on AGA on two fronts: decentralization and the AGA programme in headquarters. The decentralization would likely result in the 'thinning' of AGA HQ staff. On the programme side, first, the animal health programme may be merged with the plant health programme in one unit. Second, the animal production programme may be confined to looking only at 'on-farm' issues. Issues outside the farm would be taken up by other units across the Organisation. Thirdly, issues on livestock policy, information, sector analysis, value-adding along the market chain, may be devolved from the AGA to be located under other units.

The report covered the activities of the PPLPI MB for the period June 2005 to June 2006. The composition of the MB consisted of the Division (AGA) Director as Chair, the six AGA Programme Entity Managers, and the PPLPI Coordinator as secretary. The MB was able to convene four meetings over the period.

The report consisted of three parts: i) The Terms of Reference (TOR) of the MB; ii) Major Decisions/Guidance Provided by the MB; and iii) Issues not or partially addressed by the MB.

The TOR of the MB were agreed in the first meeting of the Board. The TOR addresses the major items in support of the PPLPI objectives. The MB gave particular emphasis to advancing on the core guidance provided by the SC and Mid-term Evaluation (refer to Item 2 of the Report). Main areas of guidance were given on the following: i) providing focus to country and regional activities; ii) the development of the Communications Strategy and Elements of a Communications Plan; iii) the design of a Partnership Strategy; iv) the design of the Information Systems Strategy; and v) exploring opportunities for substantial success and impact on areas beyond the ones so far worked on.

Primarily as a consequence of the FAO-Reform process initiated in August / September 2005, and also due to time and staff constraints, progress on some of the SC / Evaluation action items has been slow and could not yet be reported.

*(Refer to PPLPI MB Report on Activities 6/2005 - 6/2006)*



## Expectations of India's NDDB's for the South Asia Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Programme

The NDDB-FAO PPLPI constitutes a partnership at the ground level, stemming from NDDB's conviction that if the programme (SA PPLPP) is to influence policy, nothing is more convincing than demonstration through work on the ground. Thus, the expectation that the SA PPLPP will strike a balance between stakeholder engagement, ground action, and strong analytical field evidence.

Smallholders constitute the largest segment of farmers. Their space (markets), however, is becoming smaller and smaller. The programme should work toward expanding that space.

There are concrete opportunities for expanding the scope and activities of the programme. For one, the NDDB has been asked by the World Bank (WB) to organize dairy producers in Sri Lanka, to organize the marketing side of dairy, for small producers to get access to markets even for their small volumes of output at the individual level. The WB is also asking NDDB to do work along similar lines in Ethiopia and Bangladesh.

One concern of farmers relates to Trade and Codex/Standards. They have no voice in the standard setting processes at high levels. The NDDB expects that the programme will work toward developing that voice of smallholders. For this to happen, there needs to be a structure on the ground to represent them. Furthermore, the issue of ecological sustainability needs to be addressed in South Asia. This requires rationalized water and land use regimes and policies.

### 3. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

#### General

The SC discussed the issues presented and made the following observations and recommendations:

1. PPLPI in the context of the reform process within FAO: Implications for the project purpose, choice of activities and required management arrangements:
  - a) While maintaining the project's strong technical 'anchor', encourage mainstreaming of PPLPI processes across wider constituency of FAO units: FAO reforms both require and facilitate moving away from narrow focus on AGA - need to transmit PPLPI messages and feedback to other units of FAO.
  - b) Establish and monitor milestones for the project's impact on wider FAO units.
  - c) Management Board needs to embrace and manage this challenge.
  - d) SC recommends a broader base for the Board, recognizing / encouraging linkages across the organization, and need to manage the integration of the project into the wider FAO.
  - e) The SC appreciates that FAO reform is 'work in progress', and that therefore difficult to be prescriptive at this stage, but by next SC meeting it will be necessary to assess progress in mainstreaming PPLPI across the wider FAO.
2. The vision for the project over the coming final period of 2.5 years and thereafter:
  - a) Impact (implementing policy change) on the ground is essential - but need to ensure and manage learning from, and communication of, those field activities in an intelligent and structured way - both within FAO and to FAO's wider membership.
  - b) The SC recommends that by the end of the project:
    - i. PPLPI achieve tangible successes on the ground, which should have encouraged and embedded:
    - ii. A focus on pro-poor livestock policy throughout relevant units of FAO;
    - iii. An interactive learning platform for the sharing of policy experiences and impacts.
3. The balance between new research and consolidation of impact on the ground
  - a) Focus on processes and approaches that serve to influence and facilitate policy-making processes determining poor people's livestock-related livelihoods;
  - b) Document and communicate lessons learnt.
4. The role of the hubs and the balance between national, regional and global public goods produced (IGAD hub, South Asia hub, sub-regional offices of FAO)
  - a) The IGAD hub should rapidly engage in policy processes, building on experience of other hubs / focal countries;
  - b) Link into [other pre-existing] initiatives (within and beyond FAO) supporting capacity-building in trade negotiation in the context of SPS.

5. The communications strategy; next steps.
  - a) Reinforce urgency of, and priority to be afforded to, implementing effective communication strategy;
  - b) Properly engage regional / focal-country programmes in 2-way dialogue;
  - c) Endorse improvements to website (etc) aimed at more effectively conveying project news, analyses and impacts;
  - d) Start thinking about content, target audience and style of robust 'final report', consolidating PPLPI experience.
6. The partnerships strategy, stakeholder engagement
  - a) Evolution of Partnership Strategy needs to:
    - i. Focus on priorities established above (particularly engagement on the ground and policy implementation);
    - ii. Be founded on FAO's comparative advantage.
7. The new issues: HPAI in Vietnam.
  - a) Endorse approach taken. Keep it close to policy implementation.
8. Gender
  - a) SC reaffirms centrality of gender in any consideration of pro-poor livestock policy;
  - b) Project should report, specifically, on gender dimensions of its work and its policy recommendations (internally and externally).
9. Livestock development goals and indicators
  - a) Not seen as a high priority within remaining resources. If project is to proceed with this, they should be re-cast as livestock's contribution to the existing MDGs, and/or livestock-specific indicators of the MDGs, rather than as a separate set of goals.
10. Overall assessment of achievements to date and future challenges
  - a) Recognise solid progress made at Output level;
  - b) As project approaches its latter phase, focus must be on securing its impact in terms of higher-level objectives - notably the environment in FAO into which the project delivers;
  - c) Need to consider now what / how post-project continuation will be funded / managed.

## 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 OF THE 4TH PPLPI STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday 27 June		
09:00 - 09:15	Welcome	P. Pingali
09:15 - 10:00	Modelling of poverty impacts of livestock policy change - experiences from Viet Nam and Senegal	Prof. D. Roland-Holst
10:00 - 10:15	Discussion	
10:15 - 10:45	Tea / Coffee	
10:45 - 11:00	Adoption of agenda and election of chair	J. Otte
11:00 - 11:15	Likely impact of FAO Reform on AGA and livestock policy-related work in FAO	S. Jutzi (AGA), P.Pingali (ESA), Merritt Cluff (ESC), and Mafa Chipeta (TCA)
11:15 - 11:30	Discussion	
11:30 - 11:45	Report of PPLPI of activities undertaken in response to the Mid-Term Review and SC recommendations and future PPLPI directions	J. Otte
11:45 - 12:00	Discussion	
12:00 - 12:15	Report on PPLPI MB on activities undertaken in response to the mid-term review	S. Jutzi
12:15 - 12:30	Discussion	
12:30 - 14:00	Lunch	
14:00 - 14:30	Discussion (Continued)	
14:30 - 14:45	PPLPI Partnership Strategy	J. Dijkman
14:45 - 15:00	Discussion	
15:00 - 15:30	Tea / Coffee	
15:30 - 15:45	Overview of IGAD LPI	T. Robinson
15:45 - 16:00	Discussion	
16:00 - 16:15	Lessons learned from PPLPI's engagement in South Asia	V. Ahuja
16:15 - 16:30	Discussion	
16:30 - 16:45	NDDDB's expectations of SA PPLPP	A. Patel
16:45 - 17:00	Discussion	
17:00 - 17:30	General Discussion	S.C. Chair
17:30 - 19:00	Cocktail	
Wednesday 28 June		
08:30 - 12:30	S.C Discussions	S.C. Chair
12:30 - 14:00	Lunch break	
14:00 - 15:00	Report of SC	S. Chair
15:00 - 15:30	Closure	A. Mueller

## ANNEX C: PARTICIPANTS OF THE 4TH PPLPI STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

Steering Committee Members	
Bazeley, Peter	LID
De Haan, Cees	private
Henninger, Norbert	WRI
Jutzi, Samuel	FAO - AGAL
Leonard, David	UC Berkeley
Seré, Carlos	ILRI
Patel, Amrita	NDDB
Steinfeld, Henning	FAO - AGAL
Viatte, Gerard	private
Invited Guests	
Pingali, Prabhu	FAO - ESA
Chipeta, Mafa	FAO - TCA
Cluff, Merritt	FAO - ESCB
Mochoge, Benson	IGAD
Maarse, Lucy	ITC and SA-PPLPP
Regional Co-ordinators	
Ahuja, Vinod (South Asia)	IIMA
Kuan, Judith (Andean Region)	CONDESAN
Ly, Cheikh (West Africa)	EIMVS
Project Personnel (HQ Staff & Consultants)	
Costales, Achilles	
Dijkman, Jeroen	
Kazybayeva, Saule	
Miceli, Antonella	
Otte, Joachim	
Robinson, Tim	

### PPLPI Management Board (MB)

#### Report on Activities 6/2005 - 6/2007

##### *1. Terms of Reference of MB*

The MB, established as per the guidance of the mid-term PPLPI Evaluation Panel, met on 22 June 2006 and agreed on its Terms-of-Reference (Annex) which address five action items in support of the PPLPI objectives:

- Ensure coherence and complementarity between the work of PPLPI and AGA's Regular Programme Entities;
- Ensure coherence and complementarity between the work of PPLPI and AGA's external interactions and relationships;
- Facilitate collaboration and complementarity between the work of PPLPI and other relevant units within FAO;
- Ensure the sustainability of PPLPI impacts by managing the mainstreaming over time of PPLPI activities and staff profiles 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 appraisal.

##### *2. Major Decisions/Guidance Provided by the Management Board*

The MB met four times since the third Steering Committee Meeting of 14/15 June 2005 [22 June 2005 / 5 October 2005 / 19 December 2005 / 5 June 2006]. The Minutes of these meetings are attached in the Annex.

The MB gave particular emphasis to advancing on core guidance from the SC and the External mid-term Evaluation:

- Analysis of the likelihood of success in the focus countries (see Country and Regional Activities, September 2005)
- Communication (increasing visibility of PPLPI in AGA and beyond); five target groups and communications means were identified: project staff, AGA staff, FAO staff, collaborators/potential collaborators for the project, and general development actors (see Communication Strategy and Elements of a Communication Plan, January 2006).
- Linking up with "international institutional architecture" (Partnership Strategy, presented to SC 2006): Examples are:
  - NDDDB collaborative commitment on the South Asia Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Programme
  - Collaborative Agreement with AU/IBAR (as per discussions with Dr. Traoré, Director, AU/IBAR, this is to be an agreement which covers all areas of actual and potential collaboration: animal production, health and institutions/policy).
  - PPLPI collaboration with AU/IBAR's Institutional and Policy Support Team (IPST) in the preparation of a facility for pro-poor livestock policy advice to the AU membership.

- Confirmation of PPLPI's "Horn of Africa - project" as a core activity on ALive platform.
- PPLPI authorship of / inputs in ALive "Policy Notes" to be confirmed.
- PPLPI inputs in preparation of methodology for negotiation of "Livestock - PRSPs" (link with TCI / WB (ALive secretariat)).
- Information systems, decision support tool and M&E indicator development and deployment (see Information Systems Strategy, May 2006)
- Exploring opportunities for substantial success/impact in areas beyond the ones so far worked on (ref. item 10 of SC recommendations); this has reference to livestock policy interventions in the scenario "Coping with growth and structural change"; PPLPI involvement in LEAD agenda (international conference November 2006).

### ***3. Issues not or partially Addressed by the Management Board***

Primarily as a consequence of the FAO-Reform process initiated during August / September 2005, but also because of time / staff constraints, progress on some SC/Evaluation action items has been slow or can not be reported:

- Establish a global (and possibly regional) network in support of pro-poor livestock policy making (not done)
- Define the required elements that constitute the capacity to provide 'pro-poor livestock policy support', where they should be located in AGA / FAO, and how they can be implemented (not done)
- Review of the PPLPI log-frame in light of the re-stated project purpose of concentrating on developing AGA's / FAO's capacity to provide 'pro-poor livestock policy support' (partially addressed)
- Organise a 'specific' meeting, at least at director-level, between PPLPI and key international institutions involved in the ALive initiative (not done)
- Organise a 'high-level meeting' with WB, ILRI, OIE and other important international actors concerned with poverty alleviation and / or the livestock sector (not done)
- Devise a formal mechanism for linking AGA at the ADG and Director levels to wider policy and economic services in FAO (not done beyond the FAO-Reform context: ESA/ESC)
- Mainstream pro-poor approaches and pro-poor livestock policy support capacity in AGA, FAO and beyond (partially brought about by FAO-Reform)
- Gradually transfer responsibility for PPLPI work to RP staff, eg through redefining existing posts and / or seeking to place project staff on RP vacancies (not done as post - freeze is in place)
- Increase attention to gender issues and institutional development (recruitment of institutional development specialist?) - not done

26 June 2006



## ANNEX E: STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING PARTICIPANTS' CONTACT DETAILS

**Ahuja, Vinod**

Regional Coordinator, South Asia  
Indian Institute of Management  
[ahuja@iimahd.ernet.in](mailto:ahuja@iimahd.ernet.in)

**Bazeley, Peter**

Consultant to the UK (DFID) Permanent Representation to FAO  
[peter.b@zeley.com](mailto:peter.b@zeley.com)

**Costales, Achilles**

Livestock Economist  
FAO - Livestock Information, Sector Analysis and Policy Branch (AGAL)  
Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPF)  
[achilles.costales@fao.org](mailto:achilles.costales@fao.org)

**de Haan, Cornelius**

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

**Dijkman, Jeroen**

Livestock Development Officer  
FAO - Livestock Information, Sector Analysis and Policy Branch (AGAL)  
Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPF)  
[jeroen.dijkman@fao.org](mailto:jeroen.dijkman@fao.org)

**Henninger, Norbert**

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

**Jutzi, Samuel**

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

**Kazybayeva, Saule**

Consultant  
FAO - Livestock Information, Sector Analysis and Policy Branch (AGAL)  
Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPF)  
[saule.kazybayeva@fao.org](mailto:saule.kazybayeva@fao.org)

**Kuan, Judith**

Regional Coordinator, Andean Region  
Consortium for the Sustainable Development of the Andean Region (CONDESAN)  
[judithkuan@amauta.rcp.net.pe](mailto:judithkuan@amauta.rcp.net.pe)

**Leonard, David**

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

**Ly, Cheikh**

Regional Coordinator, West Africa  
Director General  
International Trypanotolerance Centre (ITC)  
[cheikh.ly@itc.gm](mailto:cheikh.ly@itc.gm)

**Miceli, Antonella**

Operations Clerk

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

Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPF)

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

**Prof. Benson Mochoge**

Director, Agriculture & Environment Division, IGAD Secretariat

Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD)

**Mueller, Alexander**

Assistant Director General

FAO Sustainable Department (SD)

Acting Assistant Director-General

FAO - Agriculture Department (AGD)

[alexander.mueller@fao.org](mailto:alexander.mueller@fao.org)

**Nasskau, Elizabeth**

First Secretary (Development)

UK Permanent Representation to the UN

Food and Agriculture Agencies in Rome

[E-Nasskau@dfid.gov.uk](mailto:E-Nasskau@dfid.gov.uk)

**Otte, Joachim**

PPLPI Co-ordinator

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

Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPF)

[joachim.otte@fao.org](mailto:joachim.otte@fao.org)

**Pingali, Prabhu**

Director

FAO - Economics and Agriculture Development Division (ESAD)

[prabhu.pingali@fao.org](mailto:prabhu.pingali@fao.org)

**Robinson, Tim**

Livestock Information Officer

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

Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Facility (PPLPF)

[tim.robinson@fao.org](mailto:tim.robinson@fao.org)

**Seré, Carlos**

Director General

International Livestock Research Institute

[c.sere@cgiar.org](mailto:c.sere@cgiar.org)

**Steinfeld, Henning**

Chief

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

[henning.steinfeld@fao.org](mailto:henning.steinfeld@fao.org)

**Viatte, Gerard**

Former Director of Agriculture of OECD

[gerard.viatte@ubiquando.com](mailto:gerard.viatte@ubiquando.com)