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Introduction

The Uganda Value Chain workshop was convened to share ILRI’s analysis of the pig value chain with a wide group of stakeholders. This was an effort to lay out what had so far been uncovered by research processes, and the nature of reactions of some pig interest parties so far.

The objectives were stated as seeking to:

- Communicate and validate intervention logic in the development of the pig value chain, clearly identifying the roles of different actors in the value chain.
- Question and clarify potential for achieving impact on the intended beneficiaries and map out the key risks and assumptions of the program.
- Begin to lay the building blocks for designing a framework for subsequent monitoring, evaluating and learning of an intervention program

The event was structured into three phases. These were to:

- **Scan what we know:** Review understanding of the value chain system
- **Focus on what to do:** Converse and expand the analysis with stakeholders, and validate or change understanding. In the process, create shared ownership of the analysis and inspire wider action to collaborate to tackle issues that block value chain system function
- **Decide on what to do.** Initiate broad based action about what could and should be done, who might be interested to form a set of wider value chain system action, and define next steps to build a value chain system platform

The morning of day 1 opened with three presentations namely

1) Smallholder pig value chains in Uganda; Danilo Pezo;
2) Results of the Outcome Mapping workshop; Emily Ouma
3) Validating the Uganda Pig Value Chain Impact Pathway(s); Michael Kidido

Stuart Worsley laid out some principles to frame discussions. These were

- We want to achieve understanding of whole systems
- Value chains offer a framework for approaching work holistically and systemically
- Multi stakeholder processes offer a framework for action and learning across systems
- Partnerships that emerge from such process demand that we form around issues, define roles, work as a team, work for collective results, and learn together.
- Start small and grow together through learning and joint action
Session 1

Following these presentations, the gathered participants were invited in small groups to review what they had seen and heard, and use their own knowledge of the pig sector to answer 5 questions:

1. What rings true
2. What does not ring true
3. What is missing (issues, actors, data, etc.)
4. What do we need to know more about
5. What are important assumptions being made

The groups each responded as follows

Group 1

What rings true?
1) Pig production can eradicate poverty. There is an increased demand for pig meat and pork products in Uganda. Pigs multiply fast and there has been a significant increase in household level production of pigs. The initial cost of investment to get started is relatively low.
2) Among all of the challenges presented, the issue of feed quality, availability and cost is particularly important.

What does not ring true?
1) It is not convincing that pigs are not yet a priority within the national agricultural development plan. The National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) is in fact promoting pig production among other enterprises.
2) The figures used are from 2008, and do not present an accurate picture of today’s pig sector in Uganda.

What is missing?
1) There is no breeding system in place or implemented for pigs in Uganda.
2) The presentation did not offer possible solutions to the challenges faced in the pig sector.
3) Aspects of health and nutrition relating to pork consumption were not covered.
4) The national statistics on the pig sector were limited. For example, they did not cover data on export demand, or production within the formal and informal sub systems.
5) The way in which pig by-products are used was not adequately covered.
6) There was no real analysis of the way in which gender influences pig sector dynamics

What we need to know more about
1) We need to understand better the reasons why pigs value chains are not part of national strategic intervention.
What important assumptions are being made?

1) It is assumed that the current political environment will remain unchanged. For example, the reported low level of pig production and marketing in northern areas may be a consequence of the political insecurity that these areas have faced. This is in fact changing.
2) It is assumed that demand for pig products will continue to rise.
3) It is assumed that the climate, physical environment and factors of production are favourable for pig production.

Group 2

What rings true?

1) Forging functional partnerships is critical to improve the performance of the pig value chain.
2) Although it has potential to improve livelihoods, the pig industry is not well developed.
3) At producer level, there is limited organisational capability to exploit economies of scale.
4) The constraints identified were accurate.

What does not ring true?

1) It does not make sense that, at the moment, the contribution of the formal commercial sector is not significant.

What is missing?

1) There was not enough detailed disaggregated information presented. For example, there was no data around the size of the breeding herd as opposed to commercial stock.
2) There was no information on how many animals are slaughtered countrywide.
3) There was no information on innovations to improve the industry, currently underway, by different value chain actors.
4) There was no information on the issues that arise in the pig sector due to gender roles and access.

What we need to know more about?

1) There is a need for information on the factors that influence the distribution of pig production.
2) There is a need for information on marketing of pigs and pork products. For example, what volumes are being sold? What value added products are being demanded, and by whom?
3) What are the links between strong value chain function and the environment?
4) What is the performance of the various breeds under local conditions?
5) How have other value chain development initiatives undertaken the task of value chain improvement?
What important assumptions are being made?

1) It is assumed that the policy environment is in fact conducive and supportive to the development of the pig value chain. This is in turn assuming a certain level of priority for pig production, and that in the current context the pig value can be competitive in Uganda.

2) It is assumed that there are incentives for producers and wider pig value chain actors to cooperate easily.

Group 3

What rings true?

1) There is considerable potential within the agriculture sector for pig value chain improvement, in terms of scope, scale (there are many households that can produce pigs), significant population growth, and the potential that pig value chain development has to reduce poverty.

2) The geographical mapping of the current state of the value chain looks right.

3) The mapping of demand looks right. However, more could have been said about the export potential of the sector.

What is missing?

1) There was inadequate information on the role of gender and youth in the different pig value chain segments.

2) What are the primary and secondary education levels of youth involved in pig value chains? It is sensed that agricultural capacity development currently starts too late to be effective.

3) There was insufficient information on the current organisational set up. It seems that there are few organised groups at producer level.

4) There was little information on specific interventions that are being undertaken in the pig value chain in Uganda.

5) What pig and pork products are in demand in Uganda?

6) What information is there on the quality of meat being produced?

7) What is the current capability (professionalism) of pig value chain actors? It would be useful to have a capacity assessment of key stakeholders and an indication of a response strategy.

8) We need to know more about access to capital and financial services for pig value chain actors. We believe that farmers are not organised to access such services, and that interest rates for loans are high. Who is it that works to help producers form groups? Is this something that BRAC does?

9) There was not enough information around extension and business development services available at subnational and local levels.
**Group 4**

**What rings true?**
1) Many of the issues raised resonate well with those found in other countries and other value chains.
2) Information on pig production is misused.

**What does not ring true?**
1) It is strange to see an approach that allows for partners to be different and to change roles

**What is missing?**
1) No data was presented on the gender dimensions of the pigs value chain.
2) There was no data on the special nature of demand
3) There was no market differentiation in terms of product type and quality
4) There was no information on the nature of involvement and participation by national government offices, and the media.
5) There was inadequate understanding of the commitment of partners to this process, and an inadequate projection of the objectives of this meeting
6) There was no information regarding the process whereby stakeholders would be continuously engaged
7) We miss partners that represent food safety and consumer issues.
8) We did not see linkages made to value chains beyond Uganda, for example the pig value chain in Uganda.
9) We missed description of processes that would feed-back information to farmers and stakeholders. (We recommend that this be done quickly, not waiting until the end of the survey process).
10) We missed information on the issue of the way in which farmers estimate the weight of their pigs.

**What we need to know more about**
1) We need to know the capacity development requirements of the pig value chain system and its actors.
2) We need to know techniques of how to deliver information from scientists to farmers.
3) We need greater technical knowledge before getting ready for interventions in feed, breeding, health, marketing etc.
4) We need greater understanding of waste management in all chain segments, from farm, to abattoir and on to the market.
5) We need to know where future funding will come from for intervention in this process.

**What important assumptions are being made?**
1) It is assumed that the value chain approach will deliver results in the Uganda pig sector
2) It is assumed that small holder pig systems will be sustainable
3) It is assumed that pig production in multivariate
4) It is assumed that the pig value chain is a single chain. In reality, it is made up of multiple interconnections and is part of a much more complex system.

**Group 5**

*What rings true?*

1) There is significant growth in the production and consumption patterns of the pig sector in Uganda
2) Most growth potential is localised in the central region of the country
3) Many value chain actors are working independently of one another
4) The quality of pig meat processing is poor by and large
5) There are few pig meat processors
6) Pig breeding is neither organised or structured
7) The pig sector is predominantly smallholder based, each with between 1 and 5 pigs
8) Pig production can lift the poor out of poverty
9) There is an absence of pig policy within wider government agricultural policy

*What does not ring true?*

1) Extensive production is not widely practiced in some areas of Uganda
2) Some of the statistics are not true!

*What is missing?*

1) Good analysis of the pork market, labour, transport of live animals and meat,
2) No assessment of the role of the Ministry of Agriculture. They are “missing in action”
3) Accurate statistics are not there
4) There are few pig scientists around
5) There is no information on feed, input suppliers, financial service providers or capital requirements
6) There were no national feed tables

*What we need to know more about*

1) What are the effects of cultural and religious beliefs on the sector and its policy?
2) What is it that enables small holders to “bounce back” after a wipe-out?
3) Are there any quality standards in Uganda for pork
4) What are the gross margins for various forms of pig enterprise? What evidence is there of profitability?
5) What is the policy on the use of boar semen, and on importation of live animals?
6) We need to have a better analysis of the ways that profit and value added is allocated along the chain.

**What important assumptions are being made?**

1) There is assumed funding stability for a multi-stakeholder platform
2) It is assumed that governance and leadership issues are not problematic
3) It is assumed that there is a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities of all partners
4) Better organised markets (with scales and MIS) may not be attractive to traders and middlemen

At the close of the session, there was a strong sense that the analysis of the pig sector was broadly accurate but that there were key elements that needed review, change or inclusion. Most importantly, this review was a first step in sharing a common understanding of the analysis, and taking ownership from CGIAR and into a wider local space.
Session 2

Based on the findings of session 1, participants were invited in plenary to identify key issues that were causing dysfunction in the Uganda value chain. The following 12 issues were highlighted in broad terms:

1) Diseases (including ASF) are killing our pigs
2) Getting the right quality and quantity of feed
3) Genetic decline of the pig population
4) Limited access by small holder farmers to quality extension services
5) Farmers do not get the right price for their pigs
6) VC actors (especially farmers) are not organized to exploit potential
7) Value chain actors and their ability to access financial services
8) The pig industry is apparently not a national interest
9) Value chain actors and government do not understand the full scope and potential of current policy
10) Social and cultural barriers stop equitable consumption
11) Pig waste is not disposed of or exploited well
12) Value addition processes are not happening well or efficiently

Within Groups, participants were introduced to the concept of systemic mapping, and asked to map the relationships between actors, issues, facts, assumptions and relationships between elements. These were constructed around specific issues listed above. The findings of these groups follow. The diagrams below portray using red ink for issues, blue for actors, black for assumptions, green for observations, and a boxed area for comments from wider participants.
1) **Diseases (including ASF) are killing our pigs**

African Swine Fever, cysticercosis and mange were highlighted as being particularly significant pig diseases in Uganda. Pig farmers and piggery workers use unsafe biosecurity practices including sharing boars, visiting between farms without any controls, open grazing their animals and feeding swill. Traders likewise visit from farm to farm, and compound matters by selling on diseased animals. Veterinary officers themselves are also believed to be a source of infection transmission between farms. The overwhelming demand for veterinary services means that service levels are very limited. Feed processors contribute to disease load through the re-use of sacks and other packing materials. Abattoirs and slaughter slabs only inspect meat in limited ways, resulting in the transportation and processing of diseased animals. The ministry of agriculture (MAAIF) and the animal law enforcement actors fail to implement movement controls, or to effectively enact existing policy. To some extent, this is compounded by corruption within the enforcement agencies. There is a pharmaceutical industry that can supply effective treatment to farmers. However, dealers in veterinary supplies are believed to trade in substandard products, so farmers are not able to secure reliable medication for diseased stock. This leaves consumers exposed to higher meat prices (due to scarcity), and exposure to food borne diseases, the latter of which is compounded by poor biosafety practice in the home:
2) **Getting the right quality and quantity of feed (in a cost effective manner)**

Pig farmers operated independently and are not normally organised into collective associations. This means that their bargaining power on purchasing feeds (as well as for selling live animals) is low, and consequently they pay higher prices than otherwise need be the case. Feed processors and their input supply chains produce substandard feed, and use either extraneous bulking material (such as sawdust) or use infested feed. Yet the prices charged remain high. The Ministry of Agriculture does not effectively implement feed standards policy and as such the feed processing sector is essentially unregulated. Feed traders seem to be able to determine feed prices. Domestic research efforts do not focus on generating feed formulations that are appropriate for small holders. However, this analysis is seen as partial, for it focuses on the commercial feed sector, yet a large proportion of feed used in extensive pig production is forage based. There is therefore a need to explore ways and means to improve the farm-grown feed base.
3) **Genetic decline of the pig population**

The decline in the Uganda pig gene pool is underpinned by high rates of inbreeding, a limited supply of genetic material and unmanaged breeding practices. Farmers seem to have little knowledge about effective breeding. There are few breeding companies around, and the National Animal Genetic Resources Centre & Data Bank (NAGRIC&DB) of the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) does not gather or keep pig progeny records. There are few pig breeding centres around, which means that Artificial Insemination services are essential unavailable. It is believed that, in effect, negative genetic selection is practiced by farmers through the selling on of faster growing piglets. On farm breeding practices are not robust enough to prevent closely related pigs from mating. Our poor understanding of the actual genetic diversity of the Uganda pig population means that we do not have a sense how far germplasm has to move to avoid inbreeding. Yet there is the sense that the breeding work that does occur focuses only on very few traits, and is leading to a reduction in overall genetic diversity. Moreover, health controls on animal movement effectively limit genetic movement. Right now, we do not know what new genetic material is needed, nor the genotypes that are suited to the various Ugandan production systems. There is potential to address this through government and non-government extension services, through input suppliers and with the support of training and research institutions.
4) **Limited access by small holder farmers to quality extension services**

Smallholder farmers do not have acceptable access to decent livestock extension services because they are scattered over wider areas, the state has no clear policy on providing agricultural extension services, and suffers from limited skills and knowledge required to build and operation extension services. Farmers engage with private extension service providers, microfinance institutions and the National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS). Here, it is assumed that these are poorly facilitated. Farmers are arranged to some extent into associations, and relate with input suppliers and local government. It is assumed that coordination between such actors is poor.
5) **Farmers do not get the right price for their pigs**

Small holder pig farmers struggle to get fair prices for their pigs. This is caused by a significant information asymmetry between farmers and their associations, and the wider market. Distress selling depresses prices, and comes from a cash flow induces time pressure to sell pigs. Pig prices are determined by animal, whereas the real price is per kilogram of weight. Farmers do not practice collective bargaining, and deal independently with traders. Negotiation is undertaken in the moment that cash is needed, and pigs are sold forward to butchers or to traders. Pig value chain actors do not operate contract farming mechanism. Transportation costs are relatively high because there are no livestock storage facilities at market places.
6) **VC actors (especially farmers) are not organized to exploit potential**

Within pig value chains, value chain actors are not organised so as to be able to exploit market potential. The focus of pig production is either for local consumption, or local sale. Within the chain, there are no drivers or champions for such organisation, nor is there any apparent incentive to get organised. There are no national or local forums or platforms whereby pig value chain actors can come together. Here, it is assumed that information does need to flow freely for effective organisation. Without organised institutions with whom value chain actors might relate, there is significant distrust between chain actors. There is seen to be significant opportunity to build sector resilience with the formation of a platform that could advise policy. BRAC (the Bangladesh based international development organisation) has started to work to foster local group organisation for the purpose of providing loans, and this work may offer impetus for group formation at local levels.

* BRAC serves 1,500 – 2,000 households using 20 model farmers in each village.
* It offers 1 – 3 days of training
* Community promoters
* Group loans through self-managed group model without collateral
* Groups attain skills and capability and make new loan deals with collateral
7) Value Chain Actors and Their Ability To Access Financial Services

Value chain actors in Uganda struggle to access decent financial services. Lending services are not well distributed around Uganda, underpinned by the assumed absence of local micro finance initiatives. Yet BRAC operates with 1,890 volunteer community mobilisers in 49 districts to offer short term lending. Most loans from banks require collateral that is difficult for small holders to come up with.

The subsistence orientation of farmers means that they use their finance for subsistence as opposed to production. Transaction costs for financial services are very high for most chain actors. Lending does not seem to take in to account the nature of the borrowing enterprise, and consequently there is a disconnect between cash flow and loan terms. Agricultural insurance does not exist in Uganda. Other financial services that might be of use to small producers and small enterprises however are beyond their reach. In most cases, documentation is in English, and low income actors fear to enter financial institutions with their old clothes. There is scope for better and more appropriate financial services packages for poor value chain actors to help them avoid selling off their animals during distress periods. This could be linked with extension services, and farmers would need to be sensitized to the availability of such financial services and how to access them.
8) The pig industry is apparently not a national interest

9) Value chain actors and government do not understand the full scope and potential of current policy

The pig sector has not been prioritised by the Ugandan government as a national strategy interest. This is because grass roots information is not available to the Ministry (MAAIF) and to wider policy makers. The Ugandan Bureau of Statistics (UBOS) maintains inadequate and unreliable data on the contribution of the pig sector to GDP. It is assumed that they have data from all actors. Religious and cultural groups lobby intensively against pigs. Here, it is assumed that vocal minorities have considerable influence. The media has promulgated a lot of negative publicity, have misused information, and seem to lack accurate information. However, it is assumed that they are impartial. They are seen as a force for change. Within the private sector, government gives priority to large international investors as opposed to national ones who remain incipient. There are Ugandan organization who would take up the case for greater strategic focus on pigs, including the Uganda Piggery Association. Despite its great growth, pig keeping remains relatively limited in scope. It is assumed that producers do not know what they earn from pigs, and seek to hide any pig based income from UBOS, for fear of taxation. As pig rearing tends to be culturally deemed women’s work, it is assumed that policy has favoured the sector less. Pigs are believed to compete with people for food. Pig meat processing is still in early stages of development. There is growing consumer demand for pork products, especially among the middle classes. On the one hand, pork is seen as healthy
meat, while on the other hand, pigs are seen as dirty. Development partners have not invested in pig value chains, and it is assumed that, as the principle investors in Uganda, they are the ones that set the agenda.

Government does not understand the full scope and potential of current pig sector policy, informed as they are by partial statistics. In that neither government nor influential development partners prioritize pigs, and in that the pig sector is traditionally volatile, finance institutions and donors have not so far invested.
10) **Social and cultural barriers stop equitable consumption**

There are considerable social and cultural barriers that affect the consumption, display, slaughter, processing and cooking of pork products, and skew the way in which pork products are accessed by women and children. As a consequence of significant pressure from religious institutions (Adventists, Orthodox Christians and Muslims), pork restaurants (pork joints) are not visibly advertised. Pork has become the subject of euphemism, and is associated with watching football and drinking beer. This effectively means that it has become a men-only food, with women and young children effectively precluded from its consumption. Public meat inspectors have limited training exposure to pork products, and food safety issues are therefore concerning. Abattoirs do not handle both pork and non-pork slaughter, and consequently most good facilities are not used for pig slaughter. Pork remains a “speciality” product that is never marketed at the front. Sold in the back streets, it regarded as being “out of sight, out of mind”. In Indian owned hotels, it is rarely served on the menu on the assumption that pork offends, can lead to conflict and is dirty.
11) Pig Waste is Not Disposed of or Exploited Well

Pig waste is not handled well. On the one hand, it is not disposed of properly. On the other hand, its substantial value is not exploited. Around production units, bad smell creates conflict with local residents and neighbours. In and around farms, untreated waste gives rise to health risks and disease, including worm infestation. Some crop traders have been known to query the use of pig manure on crops that they buy. There are no public regulations to guide the disposal of pig waste and this means that poor waste management has effectively isolated butchers who slaughter on site. There are opportunities to address these issues through extension services, and through better local authority regulation. NGOs that promote green energy solutions such as pig slurry biogas are seen to offer meaningful solutions. There is seen to be scope to develop skills and knowledge on the use of pig waste.
12) **Value addition processes are not happening well or efficiently**

Value addition processes to pork do not happen as much as they might. Fresh meat is highly regarded by consumers, whereas refrigerated meat is seen as somehow substandard. By products such as soap, leather, insulin, brushes etc are not produced in part because the knowledge of how to do make these products is not there. There is scope here for research institutions to bridge this gap. Here, a possible trajectory could involve traders and training institutions to create demand for input and equipment. However, such suppliers of value addition processes are bedeviled by erratic electricity supplies. This high cost of production combines with current low demand for value added products, and necessary quality certification processes to thwart significant value addition processes. The Makarere University School of Food Science and Technology has one plant for value addition of meat products but cannot handle pork because of religious and cultural barriers. They need support to establish a second plant for only pork products if there is an interested investor.
Session 3
From the perspective of each of three sets of stakeholders, i.e. the poor, wider value chain actors, and wider non chain stakeholders, the workshop determine that each stakeholder group broadly would seek to achieve a set of results. Having defined these results, groups laid out a series of objectives that might guide the achievement of such results

A. What do Poor Value Chain Actors Want?

Poor value chain actors really would like to see better
a. Income, (sustainable and reliable)
b. Voice (to be heard and to be able to influence)
c. Capability (to produce, market, organise)
d. Support (technical, marketing, financial)
e. Connection to the wider value chain

**Income**: Reliable and sustainable income is compromised by
- High transaction costs, mainly related to transport and connecting to buyers
- Distress selling
- Poor availability of market information
- High cost of inputs that forces reliance on only locally available inputs
- A culture of spending, not saving
- Low productivity

**Objective**: Farmer incomes from pigs are increased, sustained and reliable. (Women’s access to pig production processes must be maintained).

**Voice**
Being heard and having influence in affected by
- The poor being dispersed and scattered over far flung settlements
- The poor are not well organised into collectives and groups
- There is no platform to shape pig policy, let alone take into account power asymmetries between gender, age and interest groups
- There are few champions to spark initial momentum
- General awareness as to the potential of pig value chains is low, with a lot of misinformation
- There is not a lot of information around that can be used to advocate for change

**Objective**: Stimulate and enhance farmers and farmer groups to influence the pigs sector

**Capability and Support**
Farmer capability to produce, market and organise and the financial, technical and marketing support that they can rely on is compromised by
- Poor agricultural extension services
- Poor access to financial services, compounded by limited ability to offer collateral
- No agricultural insurance products available
- Limited technical knowledge
- Limited access to appropriate technologies, including germplasm, feed, health and marketing

**Objective:** Increase the capability of poor value chain actors to access technical, marketing and financial services.

**Connecting to a wider value chain**

Ability to connect to other value chain actors and across value chains is affected by
- Weak linkages between value chain actors
- Low levels of organisation by producers and their groups
- Orientation towards subsistence as opposed to towards markets
- Hardly any information on the potential of the pig sector
- No mechanisms (such as a platform) to bring actors together for innovation and change

**Objective:** Initiate and strengthen linkages between farmer groups and other actors in the value chain

B. **What do wider value chain system actors want?**

Wider value chain system actors would like to see
a. Safe and high quality pork products
b. Consistency of supply and demand
c. Reliability of supply and demand
d. Legal and policy arrangements that support contracts etc (Note: much remains informal)
e. Reduce negative environmental effects
f. Reduce transaction costs and increase coherence between chain segments

**Safe and high quality pork products**

It is important that consumers understand the range of pork pig products and the quality standards that are required. In addition, awareness on quality and safety standards should be shared and understood by other value chain actors. Here, if the sector is to be able to reach niche markets and comply with health and safety standards, there is scope to foster the formation of a code of conduct for pig handling, and to strengthen the system of meat inspection.

**Objective:** The reaching of wider domestic and international markets through increased supply of quality and safe pork and pork products.

**Consistency and reliability of supply and demand**

**Objective:** To assure a consistent and reliable supply of pigs and pig products.

Assuring reliable and consistent supply and demand requires better understanding of current status and information. A baseline of current supply and demand, trends, geographical variations, flows of goods and services, and market dynamics and constraints, is required to understand who the actors
are, and the constraints that effect production and demand. Such dynamics need to be better understood for each market and chain segment, ranging from local through to national and international arenas.

Given the poor connections between value chain actors, there is significant scope to develop and build market information systems.

In order to increase demand, there is need for more positive publicity for pork and pork products, that highlight the volumes that are available and the health benefits that ensue.

**Reduce transaction costs and increase coherence between chain segments**

**Objective:** To develop effective and efficient supply chains

More effective value chains can be supported through the formation of multi actor networks and or platforms, to foster actor interaction, across the private and public divide, and assure representation around important issues.

A regularly updated profitability analysis for all actors on the would improve information on efficiency and would give information that would enable intelligent action

Establishing collection points for pigs and pig products would greatly enhance efficiency.

Exploration of new marketing avenues and strategies would create new focus for multi-stakeholder action

Alongside the formation of a multi stakeholder platform, the establishment of a virtual system would strengthen communication and knowledge management.

C. **What would attract wider stakeholders to the Uganda pig value chain**

Wider stakeholders would be drawn to supporting

a. High potential to consume services and products

b. High return on investment / value for money

c. Evidence of potential

d. Potential for scale

Wider stakeholders that could be attracted into supporting the pig value chain in Uganda include researchers, new investors (including local farmers that would enter the sector, institutions and NGOs), philanthropists, the media, financial institutions, new businesses, new development actors, government and ministries, and export firms.

To be more attractive, there are a number of issues that need to be handled. Principally these relate to the nature and quality of evidence that is available around

- The impact of pigs on livelihood, especially for women and youth
- The trends of increase in consumer demand
- The profitability of pig enterprise and its potential to bolster economic growth
- The nature of issues relating to pig product nutritional value and food safety
- Pig value chain constraints
- Actual levels of initial (low) investment required to start pig production

In these areas, there is need for better data and evidence, perhaps requiring more robust statistics (data base and survey data)

Such evidence must be effectively communicated through publications, websites, workshop gatherings, media events, and donor and scientific conferences.

There is a need to better incorporate pig value chain operations in school, university and other training curricula.

There is a need to develop investment opportunities that are attractive. This could be achieved through publications and concept notes.

It is important that new business connections are made with respect to such opportunities.

To begin with, there is need therefore to
- Generate the evidence
- Create a pig value chain platform and/or a national pig forum. These could offer support in developing curriculum, convening business conferences and national agricultural shows.
- Develop a communication strategy and concomitant implementation process.

**Objectives**

1) Establish a strong, vibrant, functional and sustainable pig value chain platform in Uganda
2) Secure the inclusion of the pig value chain in the national strategic agenda
3) Attract and sustain investment in the pig sector. Here the platform would influence regulations and policies on favourable terms of trade
4) Enhance access to information, communication and advocacy for all stakeholders
Session 4
Following statement of broad objectives above, each participant was asked to consider what they could themselves undertake within the coming period. This was stated as a declaration of individual position within the framework of what had been so far discussed, and given the scope and potential of each participant within their respect organisation. The question simply was to each respond to the self-posed question “What can I do?”
Actions sought were those that are realistic and specific and that lead towards a result that we can see. The following guidelines were offered:

- **Principles for action:**
  - Organizing around enthusiasm and interest
  - What is it that should be done?
  - What is it that I can do?
  - What is it that we can do?

- **Action Types**
  - Quick Wins: Something that is obvious and makes an immediate difference
  - Shapers: Bending current interventions to better address issues
  - Unlocking complexity: Processes that enable the chain to adapt to emerging reality

David Mutetikka (Makarere University)
Diana Brandes van Dorresteijn (ILRI)
Fred Owera (CARE)
Simon Lugega (Wambizzi Cooperative)

A collective statement by the above 4 indicated that they would
- Improve education and capacity development curricula for selected subjects
- These would be piloted in 700 farmer groups in Northern Uganda CARE program areas
- Organise exchange visits for CARE farmers with small holder processing units (Wambizi) to develop capacity and make market linkages

Geofrey Insingoma (Heifer International)
- Organise farmers into cooperatives
- Scale out the pig population by providing pigs to farmers
- Follow up with pig farmers to help them perform well

Michel Dione (ILRI)
- Generate data on pig health and management in the 3 SPVCD sites
- Participate in designing interventions in disease control and management in the value chain

Zachary Nsadha (Makarere University)
- Generate information on economically important pigs diseases in Uganda
- Participate in disease control and intervention strategies and train farmers in good husbandry practices

Emily Ouma (ILRI)
- Generate evidence on the contribution of pig enterprise on the livelihood of small holder farmers and other value chain actors.
- Assess performance (cost/benefit) along the value chain
- Participate in designing interventions to improve small holder access to services and product markets
- Contribute to the assessment of the economic impact of pigs diseases

Martin Muwanika (NAADS Kamili)
- Identify pigs farmers and the pig population through census in Kamuli District
- Organise pig farmers into groups for training
- Organise pig breeding associations and strengthen their activities
- Organise farmers in “higher level farmer organisation”
- Provide advisory services, including breeding, feeding, husbandry etc
- Use the concept of the “projected income statement” to assess pig enterprise profitability
- Initiate a multi-stakeholder innovation platform for the pig value chain

The above five individuals felt that as a result of their actions, they forecast that the following might happen:
- Increased production and productivity
- A common voice leads to the exploration of better marketing opportunities
- The capacities of value chain actors will increase
- There will be improved market linkages and income
- Evidence that can be used for policy and influence will be generated

Denis Mujibi (ILRI)
- Develop an innovative weight assessment tool
- Design a simple animal selection program
- Help de characterize best-performing production breed types

Lawrence Mayega (Masaka Municipality)
- Identify a pig collection centre
- Design an appropriate (model) pig house
- Mobilise farmers and other stakeholders for the platform
- Communicate and advise on best practice

Iain Wright (ILRI)
- Generate evidence of a) value chain potential and b) resource mobilisation opportunity
- Create a link between Uganda value chain actors and those in other countries
- Facilitate the linkage of the program to the media

Richard Bakkade (The Agro Empowerment Centre)
- Organise other farmers and groups to link to other service providers
- Extend information to other farmers
- Introduce appropriate feed technologies

Michael Kidoido (ILRI)
- Generate evidence of appropriate practices
- Generate evidence of the contribution of the sector to fighting poverty in terms of economy, household performance, and intra household effect.
- Provide information for program learning during implementation
- Provide evidence of impact

Nancy Rapando (VEDCO)
- Facilitate a multi stakeholder platform and community/village and district level
- Research multi-stakeholder platforms
- Information dissemination to farmers
- Provide linkages between pig value chain and other (Vedco) value chains

Patrick Sekimpi (Uganda Piggery Organisation)
- Organise platform with national scope (already started on this)
- Help to disseminate information to farmers on markets (professional and personal) of different products, including piglets
- Foster market linkages between farmers and buyers
- Help farmers develop a program on disease control

Gerald Kiyalo (CIP)
- Evaluate if sweet potato vines can be used for pig feeding
- Evaluate the use of sweet potato silage (subject to fund availability)
- Research in feed innovation (around the sweet potato)

Christopher Mulindwa (PPM Ltd)
- Provide market to farmers
- Feasibility study and business plan development (on profitability)
- Linkages between farmers and input providers (feed stockist and agro vet shops etc)
- Farmer organisation for product aggregation
- Information dissemination through social networks, websites if receive from ILRI

Robinson Kabanda (KCCA)

- Provide a good source of breeding material within Kampala
- Disseminate knowledge on IMO (Indigenous Micro Organisms) and other production technologies
- Multi-stakeholder pig platforms (Kampala area) if NAADS funds are released. (One of NAADS priorities)
- Be part of documentary evidence on pig feed within the city (if get funding).
Nicholas Ssekabunga (CHAIN Uganda)
- Framer training on management aspects, feeding, breeding and housing; This is intended to improve knowledge and empowerment, and increase the number of pigs produced
- Improved breeding – A.I; This is intended to stimulate a higher turnover of pigs

Sarah Mubiru (SNV)
- Multi stakeholder platforms; This is intended to improve functional partnerships
- E-Platforms: Agri Hub Uganda; This is intended to reduce transaction costs and boost information sharing
- Inclusive business support

Joseph Masaba (NaLIRRI)
- Evaluation of genotypes; this will entail the clear documentation of pig genotypes in Uganda, and is intended to lead to the effective support for breeding interventions and the ultimate improvement in productive pigs breeds
- Assessing inbreeding and design interventions
- Research on African Swine Fever; This is intended to improve management and control mechanisms for Africa Swine Fever.

Danilo Pezo (ILRI)
- Generate evidence on the constraints and opportunities in the pig value chain; profitability of the activities at small holder level, contribution of activities to poverty alleviation etc.
- Development of tools and methodologies for research
- Facilitate training and capacity development
- Linking Uganda to other countries with similar conditions and problems

Pat Rainey (ILRI)
- A communication strategy for the promotion of the Uganda pig value chain. This will entail effective use of M&E systems and data.

Brigitte Maas (CIAT)
- Begin a 12 month project to assess forage use for pigs and develop alternative feeding
- Capacity building

Jane Nakiranda (VEDCO)
- Production extension services to the farmer groups
- Capacity building on food safety
- Strengthen value chains formed, especially linkages

Prodip Chandra Baishnab (BRAC)
- Ensure meat quality
- Find ways to recover pig by-products such as bristles, bone and fat

Alex Tatwangire (TAMK)
- Conduction more research and produce publications that can help make a contribution towards the effort to unlock the prevailing value chain complexities in the pig sector.

The above statements formed an initial set of individual positions that participants were asked to review and

• Look for actions that
  — You like and are interested in
  — Seem similar in some way
• Swap contact details with the champion
• Arrange to meet
• Get going
• Record what you want to do, and what happens
Session 5

The workshop concluded with a short discussion as to how we might take this process forward in a collective manner.

We determined that the next steps should be to form a multi stakeholder platform from within ourselves to act and learn together towards addressing Uganda pig value chain challenges. Such challenges seem to be strongest with farmers and traders. Discussion explored the level of formality and leadership that such a platform should have, the extent to which it could be sustainable, and whether it should be clearly structured. It was agreed that the platform should be driven by shared vision. The existing platform convened by UPO was seen as a great example for us to watch, but that this platform would operate at a different level. We need to have some capacity to design such a platform, and noted that a virtual element could be part of this.

A task force was formed to propose a structure, process of operation, objectives and the next meeting. Individuals volunteering for this were

- Sarah Mbiru (SNV)
- Nancy Rapondo (VEDCO)
- Michel Dione (ILRI)
- Richard Bakkade (AEC)
- Patrick Sekimpi (UPO)
- Robinsom Kabanda (KCCA)