

Assessing the Inclusion of Livestock Sector in NAIPs

Preliminary case study of Uganda, Mozambique, Kenya, Rwanda and Nigeria

Joseph Karugia and Paul Guthiga
International Livestock Research Institute

AU-IBAR workshop, Naivasha, Kenya, 31 October 2019



Outline

- Introduction
- Livestock Sector in the NAIPS
- Criteria for Assessment
- Preliminary findings
- Conclusions

Introduction (1)

- Generally, the contribution of the livestock sector in socio-economic development is not fully appreciated
 - partly due to lack of empirical evidence to counter the prevailing perception
- Emerging empirical evidence ==> potential contribution of livestock sector much larger than is currently believed
- It has big potential to contribute to economic growth, poverty reduction and food security
- Livelihoods and income generation for smallholder farmers through production of high value products

Introduction (2)

- Contribution to household asset base for finance and insurance
- Contribution to household nutrition security especially for vulnerable members (children, the sick, and the elderly)
- Direct contribution to soil fertility through manure and organic matter

Livestock sector in the NAIPs

- In CAADP/Malabo framework, NAIPs are the blue print investment documents for the agriculture sector
- NAIPs ought to capture investment commitments of both the government (public sector); private sector, other non-state actors and development partners
- Evidence-based planning and stakeholder consultation embedded in CAADP/Malabo principles should be used in NAIP development
- This would lead to identification of challenges, prioritization of investment and policy measures required for agriculture growth and development
- Therefore, the NAIPs process offers a good opportunity to capture the critical role of the livestock sector and direct adequate investment to the sector

Criteria for assessment of livestock sector inclusion in NAIPS (1)

1. Recognition of importance/contribution to economic growth, Livelihoods etc.
 - Existence of actual statistics/figures
 - Quality of statistics (sources, date and methodology used)
2. Clear identification of challenges, constraints and opportunities
 - Methods used (e.g. SWOT)
 - Are institutional, policy & capacity challenges captured in addition to technical ones?
 - Are there differentiated by commodity, region, value chain actors, scale of operation, gender etc.
3. Stakeholder consultation in NAIP preparation (based on independent reviews)
 - Diversity of representation
 - Representativeness by region, gender, minority, private sector etc.

Criteria for assessment of livestock sector inclusion in NAIPS

4. Use of evidence and type of analysis
5. Livestock specific programs and how they are linked with identified constraints and opportunities
 - Central vs local decision-making process
 - Does public funding complement private funds
 - What is the mix of program funding (external vs local funds)?
6. Resource allocation (budgets)
 - Proportion allocated in the NAIP compared to other sub-sectors e.g. crop
 - Actual expenditures incurred
 - Monitoring of activity implementation

NAIPs assessed

1. Nigeria

ECOWAP/CAADP Process: National Agricultural Investment Plan (NAIP)-2011-2014

2. Mozambique

National Agriculture Investment Plan 2014–2018 (Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme)

3. Uganda

Agriculture Sector Strategic Plan 2015/16-2019/20

4. Kenya

Agricultural Sector Transformation and Growth Strategy: Towards a sustainable agricultural transformation and food security in Kenya (2019-2029)

5. Rwanda:

*Strategic Plan for Agriculture Transformation (2018-2024)
(PSTA IV)*

Preliminary findings...(1)

	Observation in country NAIPs		
Criteria	Uganda	Mozambique	Nigeria
Recognition of importance/contribution to economic growth, livelihoods etc	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Livestock sector contributing 4.2% to GDP ▪ Average growth rates of 2.5% annual (2010-2014) ▪ Population of different livestock categories presented 	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ But explicit statistics/figures not provided ○ Contribution of livestock to nutrition recognized ○ Growth in pop. Of livestock indicated 	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution of livestock sector to Ag. Growth recognized (10%) • Production and demand figures presented (deficit)
Clear identification of challenges, constraints and opportunities	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Low productivity, inadequate pasture supply, unavailability of water, low numbers, of breeding stock, poor marketing infrastructure etc ▪ Weak policy and regulatory framework 	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Destruction of infrastructure; low level of production vs demand, low processing capacity etc 	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low domestic supply of livestock products compared to demand, poor research-extension linkage etc
Stakeholder consultation in developing the NAIP	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Key stakeholders consulted ▪ Organized into 26 thematic groups each with several consultation meetings under each theme 	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stakeholder consultation undertaken 	<p>Yes. The NAIP document indicate stakeholders were consulted</p>

Preliminary findings...(2)

	Observation in country NAIPs		
Criteria	Uganda	Mozambique	Nigeria
Use of evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not clear but data and some analysis used (situational analysis is mentioned) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not clear but technical team including international institutions involved <p>Data and some analysis applied</p>	<p>Not clear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> But some data was used
Clearly defined Livestock specific programs	<p>Yes. Some level of matching with identified challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Control of vectors and diseases, disease surveillance, water provision, provision of superior genetic materials, enhancing local capacity to produce and market feeds 	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several clearly defined livestock specific programs on mandatory vaccinations, pest and disease control, strengthening Vet services, construction of marketing infrastructure, improving production and productivity 	<p>Yes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many livestock specific programs included in the NAIP Examples; construction of model abattoirs, model livestock markets, fattening schemes, model grazing reserves, cold rooms

Preliminary findings...(3)

	Observation in country NAIPs		
Criteria	Uganda	Mozambique	Nigeria
Resource Allocation (Budgets)	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Total NAIP budget was UGX 6.969 trillions ▪ A costed budget of UGX 793.82 billions for livestock programs representing 11.4% of the total NAIP budget ▪ Direct crop-related budget was about 5.35 trillions accounting for 77.1% 	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Total NAIP budget is 111,959,841 Meticaais ○ Clear budgets for all livestock programs at a total of 2,754,090 Meticaais representing a low 2.5% of the total NAIP budget ○ Direct crop-related budget was about 21,165,241 Meticaais accounting for 18.9% 	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total NAIP budget is 235,094.2 billion Naira. • Total for the livestock programs of about 16,374 billion Naira • Representing about 7% of the total NAIP budget • Direct crop-related budget was about 123,398 billion Naira accounting for 52.5%

Preliminary findings...(4)

	Observation in country NAIPs	
Criteria	Kenya	Rwanda
Recognition of importance/contribution to economic growth, livelihoods etc	<p>Yes explicitly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 15% contribution to GDP ➤ Contribute to 14% of employment in agriculture ➤ Huge growth potential (at 8% p.a. since 2012) ➤ Socio-cultural roles of livestock recognized 	<p>Yes explicitly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 12% contribution to GDP ➤ Through investments in PSTA IV livestock to contribute to 30% more employment in the sector ➤ Huge growth potential (at average 5.2% p.a. between 2000-2016)
Clear identification of challenges	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Low productivity, diseases, drought, insecurity, market access etc 	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Low productivity, vulnerability to diseases, drought (low availability of feed and water especially in Eastern regions)
Stakeholder consultation in developing the NAIP	<p>Yes. Many & diverse stakeholder groups consulted in the NAIP process.</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Key stakeholders consulted

Preliminary findings...(5)

	Observation in country NAIPs	
Criteria	Kenya	Rwanda
Use of evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Data and some analysis used from various studies ➤ No robust empirical analysis for livestock sector was done. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Data and some analysis used from various studies ➤ No robust empirical analysis for livestock sector was done.
Clearly defined Livestock specific programs	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Several specific programs are identified for implementation. ➤ Examples include, post-harvest investment for dairy (chilling stations, cooling centers, bulking centers); hatcheries, feedlots, e-voucher subsidy programs, subsidized insurance for livestock farmers 	<p>Yes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Several specific programs are identified for implementation. ➤ Examples include; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Sustainable animal nutrition, feeding and husbandry practice, ➤ Animal disease control and health management and ➤ Improved and high-quality animal genetic resources

Preliminary findings...(6)

	Observation in country NAIPs	
Criteria	Kenya	Rwanda
Resource Allocation (Budgets)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Not clear. ➤ Estimated cost of the NAIP (2019-2024) is estimated at 35-45 Billion Kenya Shillings ➤ The NAIP does not recommend substantial increase in government budget ➤ Investments are expected to come from private sector ➤ No explicit data on livestock sector budgets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Clear budget for livestock programs ➤ Estimated cost of the NAIP (2018-2024) is estimated at Rwf 2,776,091,679,586 ➤ Costed budget for livestock programs of Rwf 149,198,458,542 representing 5.4% of the budget ➤ Direct crop-related budget was about Rwf 1,704,818,828,057 accounting for 61.41%

Conclusions

- All the 3 NAIPs reviewed capture the role and importance of livestock sector in economic growth
- They articulate challenges faced by the sector well
- Use of robust evidence to guide investment prioritization is not clear
- Resource allocation is explicit in several NAIPs but its adequacy to address the challenges is not clear

better lives through livestock

ilri.org

ILRI thanks all donors and organizations which globally support its work through their contributions to the CGIAR Trust Fund

Patron: Professor Peter C Doherty AC, FAA, FRS

Animal scientist, Nobel Prize Laureate for Physiology or Medicine–1996

Box 30709, Nairobi 00100 Kenya
Phone +254 20 422 3000
Fax +254 20 422 3001
Email ilri-kenya@cgiar.org

ilri.org
better lives through livestock
ILRI is a CGIAR research centre

Box 5689, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Phone +251 11 617 2000
Fax +251 11 667 6923
Email ilri-ethiopia@cgiar.org

ILRI has offices in East Africa • South Asia • Southeast and East Asia • Southern Africa • West Africa



This presentation is licensed for use under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence.