



## IGAD Livestock Policy Initiative

# What Should the Priority Targets for the IGAD Livestock Policy Initiative be?

David K. Leonard

Professorial Fellow

Institute of Development Studies (Sussex)

With contributions from Jennifer Brass, Dan  
Fahey, Michael Halderman, Brendan  
McSherry, and Robin Turner (Institute of  
International Studies, University of California,  
Berkeley), Devra C. Moehler (Cornell  
University) and Wilson Prichard (IDS, Sussex)



A Living from  
Livestock



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction .....	1
Part I: Why Should the IGAD LPI Pay Attention to Political Economy in Setting its Targets for Policy Change? .....	3
Part II: What are the Most Common Needs for Livestock Policy Change in the IGAD Region? .....	4
Part III: Should the IGAD LPI Focus on Cross-Border Problems, Take a Regional Approach to a Set of Common Issues, or Target Different Policies in Selected, Receptive Member States? .....	6
Part IV: If the IGAD LPI Opts to Work on Cross Border Issues, which Ones Should it Prioritize? ...	8
Part V: If the IGAD LPI Takes a Regional Approach to Issues that are Fairly Common to the IGAD Membership, which Ones Should it Choose? .....	9
Part VI: If the IGAD LPI Focuses on 'Targets of Opportunity' for Policy Change in a Few Selected Member States, What Should those 'Targets' be? .....	10
Part VII: Conclusion .....	12
Appendix: Table 1 - The Livestock Policy Issues Facing the IGAD Region .....	13
Bibliography & References .....	16



## INTRODUCTION

Livestock are vital to the economies of many developing countries, and especially those of the Horn of Africa. Animals are a source of protein for human diets and can serve to provide income, employment and foreign exchange within a country. For many low-income producers, livestock also serve as a store of wealth, provide draught power and organic fertilizer for crop production, acts as a means of transport, and serve as a vital component of social functions and exchange. Consumption of livestock and livestock products in developing countries, though starting from a low base, is growing rapidly. This sector growth could provide opportunities for the livestock-dependent poor to improve their livelihood. Yet such growth often is inhibited not just by technologies and investments but also by the policies under which they are deployed. The purpose of the Intergovernmental Authority on Development Livestock Policy Initiative (IGAD LPI) is to facilitate the policy and institutional changes needed for the region's poor to benefit from enhanced livestock production. This paper seeks to facilitate the deliberations of the IGAD LPI Steering Committee as it sets its priorities and selects a broad strategy for the pursuit of this goal. As such, it indicates some of the questions the Committee would do well to answer, suggests alternatives it might consider, and provides relevant information and analysis. This paper does not make recommendations on specific decisions; that is the province of the Committee itself.

As the IGAD LPI was getting underway, the Institute of International Studies at the University of California, Berkeley and the Institute of Development Studies, Sussex were commissioned to undertake a series of studies on the political economy of livestock policy reform in the IGAD region, with myself as Research Director. These studies were directly patterned on a similar, world-wide set of case studies that the same research group had undertaken for the FAO Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Initiative<sup>1</sup>. The purpose of these papers was to explore strategic political economy issues that would facilitate or inhibit livestock policy reforms that would benefit poor producers.

Specifically, this paper and the set of country studies our research team undertook within IGAD seek to understand where and how the IGAD LPI would have the best chance of facilitating such policy changes in the Horn of Africa. Unlike many policy papers, our reports explicitly examine the political and institutional contexts in which livestock are produced, and aim to identify entry points that are truly feasible given these political and organizational realities. The reports seek to identify key national and international actors, institutions and processes that surround formal and informal policy-making relevant to livestock production, the institutional bases of existing policies, and finally, strategies and resources required to make the politically feasible changes and creations possible. The recommendations made in these papers are therefore based on strategic choices, and not the technical or economic merits of various policy options.

To arrive at their recommendations, the case studies employed the analytic tools of political science so as to determine policies that would be truly feasible in particular real-world political contexts. Most of the authors were neither economists nor specialists in livestock production and they have not used the criteria of those disciplines in making their suggestions. The reports instead sought to select on the grounds of political feasibility from among the recommendations that local and international experts had already made on technical or economic grounds.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.fao.org/ag/againfo/projects/en/pplpi/home.html>

Methodologically, the country papers (plus a study of IGAD and its international partners) were based on several weeks of field work in each of the IGAD member countries, supplemented with a thorough review of government documents, newspapers and recently published research. The authors relied foremost upon the informed observer method of research, conducting interviews with individuals and groups of people in a position to understand the political economy of the livestock sector, including the processes that shape its policies and their reform. Thus interviews were held with those in the government, the donor community, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), academia, and the leadership of relevant livestock and other civil society organizations (CSOs). These interviews were not a 'random sample' nor even necessarily 'representative'; the authors sought those who had knowledge drawn from their own work and experience.

## **Disclaimer**

The Because the material in these studies is necessarily political, we would like to make it absolutely clear that the designations employed and the presentation of material in them do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of either the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations or the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or its authorities concerning the delimitations of its frontiers or boundaries.

Similarly, the opinions expressed in each paper are those solely of the author and do not constitute in any way the position of the FAO, IGAD, the Livestock Policy Initiative nor the governments of the respective member states.

## PART I: WHY SHOULD THE IGAD LPI PAY ATTENTION TO POLITICAL ECONOMY IN SETTING ITS TARGETS FOR POLICY CHANGE?

In any policy domain and in any country there always are a number of policies that the experts tell us could beneficially be changed. The question is: which ones are going to receive our priority attention? We could focus on those policy or institutional changes that the experts tell us would have the greatest impact on production, national income or the welfare of the poor if they were adopted. Indeed this is what technical experts usually recommend that we do. The problem with this approach, however, is that it could lead us to spend a great deal of effort on something that has little prospect of happening, so that in the end we accomplish nothing. An alternate approach is to focus on those policy changes that both will have a reasonable impact and have a good prospect of being adopted. This is the strategy we are urging on the Steering Committee.

In the course of our research on IGAD we discovered that most donors see IGAD as diplomatically important but organizationally weak (Prichard, 2007). This perception of weakness is particularly strong in the development arena. The IGAD LPI gives IGAD a chance to prove itself and to strengthen its capabilities to promote economic growth and poverty reduction.

To prove itself, however, IGAD LPI is going to have to produce noticeable results. That means it either has to produce a significant policy change somewhere among the IGAD states or it is going to have to do something that is highly visible in setting the agenda for change in the future.

The IGAD LPI is now into its second year. If it is not well on its way to producing a significant policy change initiative by its fourth year it may fail to attract renewed donor funding. Given the difficulties in getting the project off to a fast start, if the IGAD LPI comes to an end in its fifth year there is a risk that the capacity it will have built at the regional level may be lost.

It therefore is very important that IGAD LPI choose targets for its reform efforts that have a high probability of short-term success or at least of having a big impact on the state of public debate about how to address a very visible problem. The political economy analyses that we have done are important to choosing such 'targets of opportunity', for they tell us what the local political processes and institutional constraints are and how they affect the likelihood of achieving change.

## PART II: WHAT ARE THE MOST COMMON NEEDS FOR LIVESTOCK POLICY CHANGE IN THE IGAD REGION?

In each IGAD member country government officials, representatives of donors, NGOs and CSOs, and citizens in the livestock industry were invited by our researchers to identify their priorities for sectoral reform and action by the IGAD LPI. Generally, the issues raised were selected on technical and economic grounds. Table 1 summarizes these issues, as presented in the various case studies. The table helps to identify the areas in which policy reform is most likely to enjoy a priority. (Caution should be exercised in interpreting the table, however. The absence of an issue in it does not mean that there is no problem in that policy area, only that it did not feature prominently in local discussions about things that a project such as the IGAD LPI might address. For example, drought was often mentioned as a problem and many member states would welcome donor help with drought relief and water infrastructure to address it. The only aspects of drought that were seen as policy problems, however, were land and water rights. Similarly, only one state gave prominence to governmental capacity-building as a problem area, but that does not mean that many of them wouldn't benefit from and welcome assistance from IGAD LPI in that area as a means of addressing the policy problems to which they did give prominence.)

Despite (or perhaps because of) the fact that many IGAD member states have highland livestock production systems to which their governments are politically committed, especially in dairy, a minority of the policy issues raised concerned them. It is the pastoralist production systems IGAD member states share in common, and which are indeed where IGAD's origins lie, that produced the greater number of policy issues - although no consensus emerged on how to deal with them.

Policy issues around international trade (#1 in Table 1) are almost universal within IGAD. All member states, save Uganda, export animals to the Saudi peninsula and had experienced problems from the Saudi ban on imports from eastern Africa. (The topic did not come up in the Sudan research, but the country is known to have been affected as well.) The problem has been how to assure the Saudi authorities (and, less urgently, other trade partners on the peninsula) that their livestock exports are disease free, particularly in the face of frequent cross-border movements within the Horn and weak animal health systems, especially in pastoralist areas. Various member countries faced different aspects of the problem. For the Somali ports in the north and north-east this issue is fundamental to their prosperity. Djibouti now has a quarantine facility which reduces its export problems but it still has to obtain livestock from Ethiopia and Somalia, and is dependent on imported feed from Ethiopia. Ethiopia is deeply concerned that it receives very little of the foreign exchange generated by animals grazing within its borders and then exported through its neighbors. For Eritrea the problem is that it is no longer receiving Ethiopian stock for export, due to the war. Livestock exports are not economically attractive in two of the member states due to over-valued currencies (but these do not wish to change this policy). The various trade issues generally are highly important to IGAD member states but they also are frequently contentious and evoke competitive strains.

The aspects of *animal health* (#2) of greatest concern within IGAD generally are related to international trade. Almost all the member countries have inadequate systems for disease surveillance and control, especially in pastoralist areas, and therefore struggle with the health certification of exports. The issue is most urgent for the Somali ports, particularly now that Djibouti has found a solution that Saudi Arabia will accept for imports. Related to this issue is the question of restructuring veterinary services in pastoralist areas (generally through accepting reduced skill levels and privatizing) - a process of change that is not complete in any of the member states.



*Land issues* (#3) related to pastoralist production also are nearly universal within IGAD, although only the south and east of Sudan seem keen to address this aspect of the problem. Some member states (or parts of them) have little sympathy for pastoralists and favor their sedentarization.

*Livestock raiding* (#4), especially across international borders, is a matter of widespread concern but the perception is that IGAD's Conflict Early Warning and Response Network (CEWARN) project is making reasonable progress in dealing with it.

*Domestic markets* (#5) also have widespread problems, but the issues are not uniform. Some concern pastoralists and others sedentary dairy production. Some markets seem under-regulated but others are dysfunctionally over-regulated. In a few member countries information about prices in distant markets would help herders selling their stock or produce. These issues are not as controversial or divisive as some of the other policy areas but they seem to be a priority mainly in Kenya and Uganda.

Finally, issues were raised (although usually not by the governments) about improving the quality of participation by livestock producers, processors and traders in the sector's policy-making processes (#6). In a few places a livestock policy is not in place and the relevant ministries could benefit from IGAD LPI intervention in formulating appropriate policies.

### PART III: SHOULD THE IGAD LPI FOCUS ON CROSS-BORDER PROBLEMS, TAKE A REGIONAL APPROACH TO A SET OF COMMON ISSUES, OR TARGET DIFFERENT POLICIES IN SELECTED, RECEPTIVE MEMBER STATES?

There are three possible approaches that could be taken by the IGAD LPI: (1) give attention to cross-border issues, which therefore are inherently regional in substance and approach; (2) use regional fora (supplemented with some national work) to address issues that are common to a number of member countries; or (3) focus on wholly distinct national-level issues in two or three<sup>2</sup> member states. Although these distinctions are not absolute, and the politics of reform for regional issues will still be driven largely by the mobilization of national political interests, there is a major choice to be made here. Regional issues broadly include those that are cross-border, ones that demand regional coordination to be successful, or national issues that are common to many states in IGAD and might be more easily and effectively addressed in regional fora than in stand-alone national ones. Purely national issues, on the other hand, are those which can be pursued independently by individual member states and for which the success of reform is relatively less affected by the activities of other member states. They also can be unique to a single country.

1. A focus on cross-border issues would be justified by several factors. First, IGAD's formal mandate is explicitly focused on addressing regional issues. Second, IGAD has a comparative advantage in addressing such issues due to its ability to convene high-ranking officials within the region. Third, most stakeholders immediately associate IGAD, and thus the IGAD LPI, with work on cross-border issues. Finally, other national and international actors have been particularly unsuccessful in addressing regional issues, owing both to the nature of the issues and to institutional factors that make it difficult for most actors to address regional issues effectively.

On the other hand, cross-border livestock issues inevitably intersect with concerns about security and sovereignty, and are thus more controversial and less likely to be easily amenable to reform, especially in the short-term. Two IGAD member states have exceedingly tense diplomatic relations at the moment. And given that there are key Somali entities with ambiguous international status, the sovereignty issues seem particularly difficult for formal diplomatic initiatives. It is true, however, that entities in the IGAD region have shown ingenuity and flexibility in fostering discussions at the informal, technical level (Leonard, 2007).

2. An approach centered on regional-level discussions of issues that are common to the authorities in the IGAD area offers the possibility of bringing new perspectives to one or more issues that are locked up in deep disagreements within the individual states.

On the other hand, some member states might be very sensitive about discussing issues that are domestically divisive in regional fora. And in any case action ultimately would have to take place at the national level.

3. A focus on issues at the national level may allow for: a) more immediate, and more significant, poverty-reduction benefits; b) a greater likelihood of success; c) the potential to demonstrate immediate success and build momentum; d)

---

<sup>2</sup> If different issues are to be addressed in different countries, it is our judgment that it would unduly stretch the IGAD LPI technical staff to take up more than 2 or 3 of them.

greater correspondence with established national priorities; and e) the potential to provide a solid foundation on which to build regional harmonization.

The down-side with such an approach is that any high salience cross-border issues would be neglected. Also, inevitably, a few member states would receive a lot of IGAD LPI attention and resources and the others possibly little or none at all.

## PART IV: IF THE IGAD LPI OPTS TO WORK ON CROSS BORDER ISSUES, WHICH ONES SHOULD IT PRIORITIZE?

(#s 1a & 2a) International trade and the related aspects of animal health are matters of wide concern in the region. A majority of the political authorities within IGAD derive considerable direct or indirect benefit from livestock trade both within and outside the region.

- a. the trade to the Middle East has been particularly fraught and several different initiatives have been undertaken within the region to restore, protect and improve access to those markets. The IGAD LPI might provide a beneficial, neutral forum for maintaining dialogue among these initiatives and developing a common negotiating stance on appropriate health certification standards with Middle Eastern trade partners (see Brass, 2007; Halderman, 2004; Leonard, 2007; Prichard 2007).
- b. the larger problems in trade also involve the challenges of providing disease surveillance and control as well as animal health certification when livestock are moving across intra-region borders. The only sustainable way to finance such animal health services is likely to be through export fees collected at the ports.<sup>3</sup> This would require cooperation within IGAD both in collecting a common set of fees and in distributing the income to the places where public-sector animal health improvements would be most beneficial (see Leonard, 2007).
- c. although livestock informally move across most borders within the IGAD region, Ethiopia is particularly concerned that it is losing revenues as a result. Regional discussions on how intra-regional trade could be liberalized to mutual benefit, on a "Transhumance Certificate" of movement, and on ways to certify the health of animals moving across borders could be quite useful (see Brass, 2007; Halderman, 2004; Leonard, 2007; Moehler, 2007; Prichard, 2007).

The difficulties with all the above possible foci are: that the political authorities in the region not only share common interests in trade but also are competitors with each other and that these kinds of negotiations require improvements in dialogue at least at the technical level between Ethiopia and Eritrea and with Somaliland and Puntland. Formal diplomacy among all these entities is not likely to succeed at this time.

---

<sup>3</sup> In principle one might imagine collecting taxes or fees at other points along the chain of production and trade. In practice, however, livestock producers and traders are so skilled at evading in-land check-points, the only reliable place for collection is at the ports. Also, since value-added is created by health certification mainly only for exported animals, it makes sense to concentrate the associated fees at the points at which the animals are being sold overseas.

## PART V: IF THE IGAD LPI TAKES A REGIONAL APPROACH TO ISSUES THAT ARE FAIRLY COMMON TO THE IGAD MEMBERSHIP, WHICH ONES SHOULD IT CHOOSE?

(#2b) Most of the IGAD member states have been struggling to find and approve appropriate models for delivering animal health services to pastoralists. There has been considerable experimentation with the use of para-professional CAHWs in arid and semi-arid areas, but formal national veterinary codes have not yet been modified accordingly. A different model for veterinary service-provision is generally held to be appropriate for highland, sedentary livestock production and in most IGAD member states the interests of these latter producers and the professionals who cater to them are dominant over pastoralist ones. This makes reform difficult at the national level. Pastoralists are what most IGAD member countries have in common, however, and IGAD therefore is a uniquely beneficial forum in which to address their common problems (see Leonard, 2007; McSherry and Brass, 2007). Can a regional approach develop enough momentum to overcome reform inertia on this matter in some Member States?

(#3) Land tenure issues (and related ones of water and grazing access) affecting pastoralist production systems also are common across IGAD. Although land reform is on the agenda in a few member states (e.g. Kenya), only in Southern and Eastern Sudan is the political context likely to be sympathetic to the distinct needs of pastoralists. A regional forum for discussing access to land and water and its relation to the productivity of pastoralism is more likely to be effective in raising the critical issues than any single national one is. On the other hand, the national political equations are such that real reform is unlikely at the present time outside Southern and Eastern Sudan, and even there concerns arise relating to the quite different interests of northern Sudanese (see Brass, 2007; Fahey, 2007; Halderman, 2004; Leonard, 2007; McSherry and Brass, 2007).

(#5) Domestic markets and their regulation represent a further set of issues common across member countries. Some national markets are said to be over-regulated and others under-regulated. Thus member states might provide beneficial insights to each other if these issues were discussed regionally. On the other hand, the problems may be too different for easy cross-national learning. In any case, momentum for any useful final action would have to be built at the domestic level (see Halderman, 2004; Leonard, 2007; McSherry and Brass, 2007; Moehler, 2007; Turner, 2005).

(#s 6a & 6b) Four of the country studies noted the need and possibility for strengthening popular participation in setting livestock policy, particularly by pastoralists. By and large these issues probably are best addressed at the national level. To the extent that a regional forum is effective, the need seems to be met at present by the Horn of Africa Regional Pastoralist Gathering<sup>4</sup> (see Halderman, 2004; McSherry and Brass, 2007; Moehler, 2007; Prichard, 2007; Turner, 2005).

---

<sup>4</sup> DFID (2006) Peace, Trade and Unity: Reporting from the Horn of Africa Regional Pastoralist Gathering, Qarsaa dembi, Yabello, Ethiopia. London: Department for International Development.

## PART VI: IF THE IGAD LPI FOCUSES ON 'TARGETS OF OPPORTUNITY' FOR POLICY CHANGE IN A FEW SELECTED MEMBER STATES, WHAT SHOULD THOSE 'TARGETS' BE?

Here we turn to the recommendations of the individual country studies undertaken by our political economy group. Below are thumb-nail sketches of the policies that might be politically feasible and pro-poor. Of course, particularly if the individual state 'targets of opportunity' strategy is chosen further broad stakeholder consultations will need to be conducted in these countries to identify relevant livestock policy issues, and that analysis will have to be used also to help prioritise issues for engagement.

**Djibouti:** The country succeeded in having the first port in the Horn of Africa to be reopened for livestock exports to Saudi Arabia. This gives the country a substantial competitive advantage, at least in the short-term. To sustain this advantage, however, it will have to resolve potential disputes with Ethiopia about the cross-border movement of its livestock. It also will have to continue to access fodder from Ethiopia, though if an agreement were reached on how part of the animal health quarantine requirements could be carried out in Ethiopia it may reduce the requirements for feed. Djibouti itself has few feed resources and during the hotter months the heat at the port is stressful for the animals. Djibouti has a strong incentive to resolve these problems; Ethiopia, less so but more than it did before the Djibouti holding facility opened. The main issue is whether to address these matters as part of a purely bi-lateral or a more regional effort (see Brass, 2007; Prichard, 2007).

**Ethiopia:** International trade is a major issue for this land-locked country. It already is experimenting with the export of chilled meat. It remains to be seen how viable this option is, given the belief of many experts that the competitive advantage of east African producers resides with the export of live small ruminants. This is particularly true for animals exported for the haj, where live animals are a necessity. If the chilled-meat option is insufficient to absorb the Ethiopian supply, the government may well have an interest in negotiating cross-border trade and animal health arrangements with the countries controlling its neighboring ports (see Halderman, 2004).

**Eritrea:** As with other IGAD member countries, competitive pressure from Djibouti should enhance the pressure it already feels to reform its disease surveillance, control and health certification process to meet Middle East standards. The Eritrean Ministry of Agriculture has expressed interest as well in land reform and restructuring of animal services but a hard look at the interests the existing policies serve does not make one optimistic (see Moehler, 2007).

**Kenya:** Reform of the regulations governing the marketing of dairy products in such a way as to facilitate still greater participation by small producers is well underway but seems stalled and could benefit from IGAD LPI attention. There also are good possibilities for extending still further the organization and participation in livestock policy making of producers (including pastoralists). There is much discussion of land tenure issues in Kenya at the moment, but the political prospects of turning this to the advantage of pastoralists are not at all good (see McSherry, 2007; Brass, 2007).

**Somalia/Puntland:** With the larger issues of political control still unsettled in the Transitional Federal Government areas of the south, meaningful policy reform is improbable there at the present time. Nonetheless it is unlikely that any stable government in the south would differ from the north and northeast in its approach to livestock policy. Therefore reforms accomplished in Puntland and Somaliland will eventually pave the way for similar changes in the south.

**Puntland** gives formal allegiance to the TFG but effectively is self-governing at the moment. Continued success in trade in livestock into the Middle East is absolutely central to its economic viability. Now that the port of Djibouti has reopened to

exports to Saudi Arabia for the haj the politically powerful traders of the port of Bosasso will be ready to negotiate on the reforms needed to regain their share of this highly-valued trade. Puntland would be receptive to regional negotiations involving Djibouti, Ethiopia, and Somaliland on common approaches to Middle East trading partners, reduction in restrictions on intra-regional movement of livestock, and the creation of an internationally-acceptable system of disease surveillance, control and health certification (see Leonard, 2007).

**Somaliland:** The interests of this internationally-unrecognized political authority are almost identical to those of the rest of the former Somalia. It too would be receptive to regional negotiations involving Djibouti, Ethiopia, and Somalia (TFG and Puntland) on common approaches to Middle East trading partners, reduction in restrictions on intra-regional movement of livestock, and the creation of an internationally-acceptable system of disease surveillance, control and health certification. Unlike Djibouti and Puntland, however, it does have upland grasslands from which fodder can be cut, so that it can more economically put animals in a holding ground while quarantine requirements are being met. Somaliland therefore can think of animal health services on a territorial basis and it currently is reforming its veterinary code and resurrecting its training facilities for animal health personnel. Assistance with these policy processes would be likely to be productive (see Leonard, 2007).

**Sudan: Land Tenure and Water Rights:** Livestock producers have been disadvantaged over a considerable period in Sudan by the government's promotion of grain production, particularly by mechanization. The decentralization of authority to Southern and Eastern Sudan put a new set of interests in control in these two regions, ones that have considerable interest in policy reform in this area and in righting historical inequities. Nonetheless, any process anywhere involving land reform is likely to provoke some contention — in Sudan's case with northern interests (see Fahey, 2007).

**Uganda:** The most promising initiatives are improvements in domestic livestock markets, particularly through the provision of market infrastructure (weighing stations, cattle dips, milk collection centers) and the supply of urban market price information to producers (see Turner, 2005).

## PART VII: CONCLUSION

We have deliberately refrained from drawing conclusions in this paper. Our intention has been to provide an aid to the decision-making of the IGAD LPI Steering Committee, not to argue for what those decisions should be. We have sought to frame the questions that we believe that Committee needs to answer and to provide information and analysis that are relevant to them. We do think that political feasibility should be taken into consideration along with purely economic or technical criteria. But Steering Committee Members appropriately will bring technical and political considerations to the decision process which were beyond our knowledge when we wrote our studies.



# APPENDIX: TABLE 1 - THE LIVESTOCK POLICY ISSUES FACING THE IGAD REGION

## IGAD Member States and associated authorities

<b>Livestock Issues</b>	Djibouti	Ethiopia	Eritrea	Kenya	Somalia - TFG	[Somalia - Puntland]	[Somali-land]	Sudan	Uganda	IGAD
<b>1. Intl. Trade</b>										
1a. Cross-border trade		x	x due to war	x		xx	xx			xx
1b. Over-valued currency	x		x							
<b>2. Animal Health</b>										
2a. Disease surveillance, control & certification	x		x		x	xx	xx	x		xx
2b. Restructure veterinary service system	x		x	x		x	xx	x		
2c. Pharmaceutical supply	x					x	x			
<b>3. Land</b>										
3a. Land tenure/ policy	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	xx east & south		
3b. Sedentarization of pastoralists		x						x		

3c. Anti-pastoralist policy bias		x	x							
<b>4. Inter-group livestock raids</b>		x		xx				x east & south?	(x)	xx
<b>5. Domestic Markets</b>										
5a. Market regulation		less	less	xx less for small dairy	more	more	more		more	
5b. Market infrastructure									x	
5c. Market information			x					x	x	
<b>6. Process</b>										
6a, Improve popular participation in policy formation		x	x	xx build on existing					x	x
6b. Strengthen pastoralist organization		x		xx					x	
6c. Need livestock policy/ plan	x	x	x							
6d. Capacity building in Min.	x									

**Key:**

x = an issue raised as important for that entity

xx = an issue where the prospects for change seemed promising

**Note:** In each IGAD member country government officials, representatives of donors, NGOs and CSOs, and citizens in the livestock industry were invited by our researchers to identify their priorities for sectoral reform and action by the IGAD LPI. Generally, the issues raised were in the various case studies. The table helps to identify the areas in which policy reform is most likely to enjoy a priority. Caution should be exercised in interpreting the table, however. The absence of an issue in it does not mean that there is no problem in that policy area, only that it did not feature prominently in local discussions about things that a project such as the IGAD LPI might address. For example, drought was often mentioned as a problem and many member states would welcome donor help with drought relief and water infrastructure to address it. The only aspects of drought that were seen as policy problems, however, were land and water rights. Similarly, only one state gave prominence to governmental capacity-building as a problem area, but that does not mean that many of them wouldn't benefit from and welcome assistance from IGAD LPI in that area as a means of addressing the policy problems to which they did give prominence.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY & REFERENCES

- Brass, J.N. (2007) The Political Economy of Livestock Policy: The Case of Djibouti, IGAD LPI Working Paper. Addis Ababa: IGAD Livestock Policy Initiative.
- Fahey, D. (2007) The Political Economy of Livestock and Pastoralism in Sudan, IGAD LPI Working Paper. Addis Ababa: IGAD Livestock Policy Initiative.
- Halderman, M. (2004) The Political Economy of Pro-Poor Livestock Policy-making in Ethiopia, PPLPI Working Paper No. 19. Rome: Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Initiative, Food and Agriculture Organization.
- Leonard, D.K. (2007) The Political Economy of Livestock Policy  
Among the Somalis, IGAD LPI Working Paper. Addis Ababa: IGAD Livestock Policy Initiative.
- McSherry, B. and Brass, J.N. (2007) The Political Economy of Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Reform in Kenya, IGAD LPI Working Paper. Addis Ababa: IGAD Livestock Policy Initiative.
- Moehler, D. (2007) The Political Economy of Pro-Poor Livestock Policy in Eritrea, IGAD-LPI Working Paper. Addis Ababa: IGAD Livestock Policy Initiative.
- Prichard, W. (2007) The Role of IGAD in Shaping Livestock Policy in the Horn of Africa: Understanding the International System, International Actors and Implications for Reform, IGAD-LPI Working Paper. Addis Ababa: IGAD Livestock Policy Initiative.
- Robin L. Turner, R.L. (2005) Livestock, Liberalization and Democracy: Constraints and Opportunities for Rural Livestock Producers in a Reforming Uganda., PPLPI Working Paper No. 29. Rome: Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Initiative, Food and Agriculture Organization.