



Policy Processes in the Livestock Sector: Experiences from the African Union

William Wolmer and Ian Scoones

February 2005



Citation: Wolmer, W. and Scoones, I. (2005). Policy Processes in the Livestock Sector: Experiences from the African Union. African Union/Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources, Nairobi.

For more information contact:
Institutional and Policy Support Team (IPST)
African Union /Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources
PO Box 30786, 00100 Nairobi, Kenya
<http://www.ipst-ibar.org>

About the authors

William Wolmer is a geographer and Ian Scoones is a biologist by original training. Both are members of the Environment Group at the Institute of Development Studies based at the University of Sussex in the UK. They have long experience of applied research on pastoralism and livestock development, including long-standing work on rangeland management, crop-livestock integration, drought contingency planning and pastoral institutions. Over the last decade they have been working on institutional and policy issues in Africa surrounding agriculture, natural resource management and conservation.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the following for giving up time to be interviewed and providing relevant literature: Berhanu Admassu, Yacob Aklilu, Wondwosen Asfaw, Andy Catley, Jeroen Dijkman, Peter Gathuru, Richard Grahn, Gigs van Klooster, Tim Leyland, Solomon Hailemariam, Solomon Munyua, Jotham Musiime, Keith Sones, Mtula Otieno and Gavin Thomson. In addition to those above, and amongst many others, papers by Darlington Akabwai, Gideon Bruckner, Belachew Hurrissa Dadi, Stuart Hargreaves, Jeffrey Mariner and Larry Minear proved very helpful. Special thanks are due to Loise Kimani and Tim Leyland for facilitating this study. The study was funded by AU/IBAR using a grant provided by the Department for International Development, UK.

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Context, Challenges, Strengths | 1 |
| Case study 1: Privatised community animal health systems in Ethiopia | 4 |
| Case study 2: The recognition and use of participatory epidemiology | 10 |
| Case study 3: Building peace through livelihood security in pastoral areas | 13 |
| Case study 4: Changing global standards: recognition of veterinary para-professionals in the OIE Code | 17 |
| Case study 5: Changing standards for livestock trade – the commodity-based approach | 20 |
| Lessons Learned | 23 |

Contexts, challenges, strengths

This report was produced as part of a process of reflection and forward planning at the end of the Community-based Animal Health and Participatory Epidemiology (CAPE) Project of the African Union/Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU/IBAR). This project was established in early 2000 with funding from the Department for International Development of the United Kingdom, together with complementary support from United States Agency for International Development Regional Economic Development Services Office and Office for Foreign Disaster Assistance. Through work in the Greater Horn of Africa, the objectives of the project have been:

- Development of primary-level veterinary services in pastoral ecosystems
- Promoting policy changes and legislation to create an enabling environment for community-based animal health services
- Dissemination of information regarding experiences of community-based delivery systems
- Strengthening regional capacity to promote changes in formal and informal institutions that shape service delivery in pastoral areas

In July 2004, recognising the critical focus on policy and institutional change, the CAPE project evolved into the Institutional and Policy Support Team (IPST) of AU/IBAR to support the emerging needs for capacity building and policy analysis within the African Union and its member countries. This document offers some insights into the lessons since 2000, and the implications these have for next steps.

This section offers a quick summary of some of the contexts for the work of AU/IBAR in terms of both field level and policy challenges, and the organisational setting for change. In so doing, it highlights some of the key challenges and strengths of the approach. The report then presents five case studies which illustrate specific aspects of the CAPE approach to policy and institutional change.

Livestock: a key to poverty reduction

Globally, livestock contribute to the livelihoods of approximately 70% of the world's poor. In Africa livestock are vital for poor households, and must be a key part of meeting the Millennium Development Goal targets by 2015. As highlighted in a recent AU/IBAR publication:

- Livestock are one of the most important sources of cash income for poor households. They also provide food: goats provide milk and poultry provide eggs in small but readily available and regular amounts.
- Livestock are one of the few assets owned by poor households and can be crucial in maintaining household survival in times of crisis. Livestock are both an inflation-proof and productive investment.
- Livestock are central to farming systems used by the poor, providing draught power and manure – often when the purchase of substitutes is impossible.
- Livestock are often central to major social events and ceremonies. In many African societies, livestock are the basis for traditional social support systems.
- Livestock provide a range of other benefits including hides and skins, fuel for cooking and appropriate transport for carrying water, goods and people.

Critically, livestock offer an important potential way out of poverty acting as a driver of pro-poor growth. In an era of trade globalisation, predictions of future global demand for livestock products indicate considerable opportunities for African producers, particularly through exports to parts of Asia. Some workers have hailed a future 'livestock revolution'. This, analysts argue, presents a major opportunity for livestock-driven poverty reduction in Africa.

Increased demand for livestock commodities in growing urban and peri-urban areas could provide markets for small-scale producers and consequently, increase their incomes.

However, many of the emerging challenges are not technical, but in the complex area of policies and institutions. Yet most past investments in livestock and animal health have been dominated by a 'technical-fix' approach. Many of these have not worked out. The challenge is to develop the capacity of African governments and partners - through training, information sharing and research - to meet the new policy and institutional challenges across a range of scales, from national to regional to international settings. A strategic player in this effort will be the African Union (AU).

The African Union - a strategic player

At the 2004 AU Summit held in Addis Ababa, the AU responsibility to provide continental leadership in the integration, co-ordination and establishment of close co-operative relationships with Africa's Regional Economic Communities (RECs) was reinforced. This will involve the establishment of AU delegations in each REC, and the start of a process of reflection and dialogue with the RECs on their role, capacity and ability to deliver on regional integration programmes. Bearing in mind the importance of agriculture in poverty alleviation in Africa - a key strategy of the AU - the strengthening, co-ordination and harmonisation of REC policies and institutions will be crucial. As the RECs in turn work hand-in-hand with their member states, there is a need for strong support in terms of how to develop appropriate policy and institutions.

In the livestock sub-sector, AU/IBAR has been actively promoting change in key areas, most notably veterinary privatisation and primary animal health service delivery in marginalised areas over the last 15 years. Focusing in particular on policy and institutional issues, the Institutional and Policy Support Team (IPST) of AU/IBAR plans to support such AU efforts, building in particular on the work since 2000 documented here. For example, IPST is one of several groups advising the AU's New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) and will ensure integration of IPST activities in the emerging livestock strategy of NEPAD and the AU Directorate of Rural Economy and Agriculture (AU/DREA) through the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), particularly its livestock component.

Past achievements, new challenges

Building on the extensive field level experiences of others, particularly in the non-government sector from the 1980s and 1990s, over the last four years CAPE has been a unique project of AU/IBAR working in the Horn of Africa and East Africa regions to improve policy and institutional arrangements with government and global partners.

This project has learned some important lessons, as documented in the case studies that follow. Some of the main achievements include:

- *Creating an enabling environment for pro-poor primary animal health services.* AU/IBAR has prompted and provided technical direction to change both national policies and the international standards on veterinary services to recognise, for the first time, the role of privatised veterinary para-professionals as appropriate service providers in rural areas of Africa (case studies 1 and 4).
- *Appropriate methodologies for disease assessment and surveillance.* Conventional approaches to epidemiological surveillance have relied on complex models and high levels of expertise. These are seen to be either inappropriate or impossible to implement in many pastoral settings. With others, AU/IBAR has developed a suite of 'participatory

epidemiology' techniques and engaged in training of these in a number of countries, improving the capacity of veterinary services (case study 2).

- *Linking development and conflict management.* AU/IBAR's work on veterinary services in pastoralist areas of east Africa highlighted the negative impact of persistent low level interethnic conflict on service delivery and development as a whole. Consequently, AU/IBAR developed and tested approaches to community-based conflict resolution in trans-boundary pastoralist systems. These approaches were based upon improving a local demanded service (animal healthcare) in return for local management of conflict – so called 'peace dividends' (case study 3)
- *Changing international standards to improve market access for African livestock keepers.* In 2003 AU/IBAR and partners completed a substantive analysis of international animal health standards, from the perspective of access to markets for African countries. This peer-reviewed analysis has prompted renewed international interest, from both north and south, in commodity-based approaches to livestock trade and the need for radical revision of standards (case study 5).

Policies and institutions that benefit the poor

This range of activities has highlighted the importance of understanding and changing policies and institutions in ways that poorer livestock producers benefit. This is the core objective of the new Institutional and Policy Support Team (IPST) of AU/IBAR.

During 2003-4 AU/IBAR consulted senior policy makers in the Greater Horn of Africa region to assess policy and institutional constraints in the livestock sub-sector, and begin the process of formulating a regional programme focussing on policy reform to impact poor producers. Key findings from the consultation included commitment from policy makers on the urgent need to change, and the need for much improved understanding of the reasons behind the low profile of livestock in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs).

Everyone is talking about policy engagement these days, yet the capacity to engage with policy processes - whether at national level through budgetary, priority setting or departmental restructuring processes or at international level in relation to trade, standards and certification issues - is limited. Responding to this need, in AU/IBAR, in collaboration with the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) in the UK, started during 2004 the process of improving the capacity of AU member states and RECs to understand, design and manage policy change processes in the livestock sub-sector through a series of tailor-made training courses focused at mid-senior management level in government service.

The challenges for the future are great and the potential impacts are significant. AU/IBAR and its partners have learned many lessons over the past few years during their engagement in a range of initiatives emerging from experiences from very local to truly international scales. This document aims to capture some of these lessons through a series of case studies. It is based on a series of reflections by AU/IBAR staff members, partners in various organisations and an extensive review of the array of documents produced. But this is not a formal review or evaluation; it is instead an attempt to capture lessons learned, with the aim of looking forward to new challenges and next steps.

The following five sections offer short insights into a series of cases. For more details on each of these consult the IPST website at <http://www.cape-ibar.org/> which provides access to extensive materials. The final section offers a summary of lessons learned, and highlights some possible ways forward.

Case study 1

Privatised community animal health systems in Ethiopia

The policy challenge

In the late 1980s a new paradigm for the delivery of animal health services in remote pastoral areas of Africa started to emerge. This built on the extensive experiences in a range of countries of field-based projects, often run by NGOs. In countries such as Ethiopia lack of infrastructure, difficult terrain, wide-ranging pastoral and agro-pastoral production systems, limited and dwindling funding for veterinary services, and sometimes insecurity meant conventional animal health care provision was largely lacking. This had negative impacts on livestock production and pastoral livelihoods and the emergence of an illicit trade in veterinary drugs.

Community-based animal health workers (CAHWs) are trained to recognise and treat (or prevent) the common and predictably occurring local animal diseases on a fee-for-service basis. This way, it is argued, communities can realise substantial animal health improvements, even though access to the full array of clinical services potentially available from a fully trained veterinary professional may still be lacking.

This pragmatic approach to delivering animal health services has encountered a history of strong resistance from the veterinary profession and Ethiopia has been no exception. Despite a long and well-documented history of using various types of primary-level veterinary worker proponents of CAHWs have been heavily criticised in fora such as the annual meetings of the Ethiopian Veterinary Association – with fears that professional veterinarians were being undermined and quality compromised.

Another area of controversy in Ethiopia, and elsewhere, has been the notion that for CAHWs to be financially sustainable they must be 'privatised'. This has been perceived by some NGOs as contrary to the benevolent and charitable nature of their work and has been particularly controversial in the Ethiopian political context.

It is these entrenched attitudes that AU/IBAR together with other proponents of CAHWs set out to shift.

What did AU-IBAR and partners do, and with whom?

The uptake and mainstreaming of privatised community animal health systems has been particularly effective in Ethiopia and AU/IBAR can claim a key role in this process. How did this come about?

Evidence of success from the rinderpest campaign

In the Afar region the Pan-African Rinderpest campaign had been struggling to vaccinate cattle and failed to control the disease. In 1994, 20 CAHWs were trained and supplied with heat-stable rinderpest vaccine. Moving on foot they vaccinated 73,000 cattle in one season and achieved 84% vaccination efficiency (compared with 72% vaccination efficiency of Ethiopian government teams). There were no reports of rinderpest outbreaks in the region after November 1995 and Ethiopia was able to declare provisional freedom from the disease. This clear evidence of success became a key part of the ammunition used to make the case for CAHWs.

Policy champions

In the 1980s, the Pan-African Rinderpest campaign had a dynamic leader who recruited able and enthusiastic young staff. Unusually they were largely retained post Masters training and, as this cohort has got older and gained more authority, the CAHW concept they trail-blazed has been pushed into the mainstream. Also, in the wake of the rinderpest experience, many CAHWs were trained in Ethiopia by a wide range of organisations, and increasing numbers of vets working with NGOs gained professional field experience of working with CAHWs. Thus a critical mass of experience and opinion began to form.

AU/IBAR has had very high level of influence within the Ethiopian government in pushing this agenda. In large part this can be attributed to the fact that Berhanu Admassu – a key AU/IBAR employee, former government veterinarian, and President of Ethiopian Veterinary Association – has been able to champion and achieve change. As Berhanu puts it, "I became known as a CAHW expert. As President of the Ethiopian Veterinary Association I got the chance to write in the media about CAH. It became an issue." Other lobbying techniques included making presentations to the Ministry of Agriculture using laboratory and surveillance results to demonstrate the effectiveness of CAHWs and taking policy makers to the field (see box).

'Seeing is believing'

In 2002 AU/IBAR co-organised a workshop on animal health and pastoralist livelihoods for Federal Members of Parliament. Over 60 MPs from the Pastoral Standing Committee (PSC), rural development committee and the Ethiopian Veterinary Association participated in the workshop. This was the first workshop of its kind in Ethiopia carried out in a pastoral area. As Berhanu Admassu puts it: "the Pastoral Standing Committee became our supporters. Now the minister gets a strong reaction from PSC people and this keeps the livestock issue on the agenda, it has become the main agenda". Indeed pastoral MPs regularly follow up CAH issues in Parliament.

Similarly in 2003 sceptical Ethiopian policy makers from three regional states were taken on a study tour to Zambia by AU/IBAR to see privatised livestock services in action. They returned with a unanimous verdict that the tour had provided 'enormous lessons' and a commitment to formulate a comprehensive veterinary privatisation strategy for Ethiopia. This trip also clearly illustrated the importance of a good local understanding of channels of power and influence. AU/IBAR organised for invitations to Ethiopia's regional agricultural bureaus for the trip should come directly from the Prime Minister's Office rather than the Ministry of Agriculture. This proved very persuasive. The trip also meant AU/IBAR thereafter had close relations with these regional heads and easy access to commissioners.

There has been a gradual shift of thinking within the Ethiopian Veterinary Association accompanied by on-going lobbying of government. By 2003, for example, the Annual Conference on Animal Health and Poverty Reduction Strategies (co-funded by AU/IBAR) and attended by over 400 veterinary professionals from public and private sectors, research and higher learning institutions and international organisations, highlighted the need to support privatised CAHWs through policy and legal reform. In Ethiopia AU/IBAR has thus successfully been able to establish close relations with a wide range of contacts within government – including contacts outside the Ministry of Agriculture (e.g. the Office of the PM) – as well as within academia and the national professional association. This mainstreaming of CAH has been aided by AU/IBAR's parallel strategy of targeting influential veterinary journals to publish research on community-based animal health care. This was complemented by the production of a widely distributed book on the subject, and extensive popular materials.

From winning the argument to institutionalisation

In some respects CAH in Ethiopia has been a victim of its own success – a large number of people were being trained as CAHWs, but there was no coordination at the ministerial level, with very varied curricula and lengths of training, inadequate supervision, poor reporting and high drop-out rates. Often this was a donor-driven rather than community-based process. AU/IBAR has supported a range of national fora, bringing the varied range of stakeholders in Ethiopia together to share experiences of CAH and harmonise policies, including setting minimum standards and establishing a curriculum and guidelines for training CAHWs.

One key event was the 2003 workshop on 'Integrating of Community-Based Animal Health Services into the existing animal health delivery in Ethiopia'. This brought together a wide range of CAHW practitioners operating in different regions and capacities drawn from NGOs, federal and regional animal health implementing partners, the federal Ethiopia parliamentary Pastoral Standing Committee, relevant animal health institutions, the professional veterinary association and funding agencies. This gathering produced an action plan that led to the endorsement of CAHWs as fourth layer of service provider in Ethiopia and recommended that the Ministry of Agriculture, AU/IBAR and FAO together draft national minimum guidelines for CAH services

Central to the process of institutionalising policy shifts has been to sustain and enable linkages between field experiences and policy-makers and senior government officers through impact assessments and training events (see box).

Exposure for policy-makers

Recognising that the lack of an appropriate policy environment threatens the sustainability CAHW systems, in 2002 AU/IBAR invited representatives from numerous Ethiopian governmental and non-governmental agencies to come together to form a national team for assessing the impact of CAHWs and identifying the key lessons for policy-makers. As well as demonstrating positive results from CAHWs – including reduced disease prevalence and incidence and dramatically improved access to services – the participatory impact assessment methodology has proved to be a useful way of linking communities with influential professionals, bringing veterinary professionals in the NGO, state, research and education sectors together to share experiences, and for bringing senior officials more into contact with the realities in remote and often harsh environments in the field. One of the first participatory impact assessments was reported back to the Ethiopian Veterinary Association conference and was influential in changing the minds of many CAHW sceptics. The impact assessments have also highlighted the deficiencies of CAHW systems, highlighting where better policies might help to overcome weaknesses. To complement such efforts, AU/IBAR has also conducted CAH training-of-trainer courses for veterinary inspectors drawn from all regional bureaux of agriculture, NGOs, and the private sector.

National policy interventions

AU/IBAR has been instrumental in establishing a national impact assessment team with representatives from the Ministry of Agriculture, the veterinary faculty, the national animal health research institute, NGOs and the private sector. This team, which reports directly to policy-makers, is investigating specific issues related to the sustainability and quality of CAHW systems, including lack of supervision by veterinary professionals and lack of harmonised training curricula.

A Community Animal Health Coordination Unit has now been established in the federal Ministry of Agriculture, paid for by the federal government. This is an important achievement as it marks the handing over of ownership of the CAH agenda to the ministry. For the first time there is a unit in central government for the quality control and harmonisation of

CAHWs. In collaboration with AU/IBAR the Unit has now agreed the national minimum standards and for CAHWs.

In early 2004 the Veterinary Services Team in the newly established Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development was upgraded to departmental level. In the light of these changes AU/IBAR was approached by the new ministry to assist them to review and define the core functions of government veterinary services, and develop a structure at federal, regional and district levels that better supports national-level epizootic disease control, international trade and privatised services. Technical support was provided to develop a new centralised animal health system for veterinary services in the country. Core principles include making maximum use of CAH systems and concentrating public veterinary services on core functions, whilst divesting non-core functions to the private sector.

Thus with this formal recognition of the centrality of CAH systems in the new restructuring of veterinary services in the country, a decade of experience had come to fruition in an institutionalised new policy, owned by the government.

Lessons and the future

The former acting agriculture director of AU/IBAR Jotham Musime reports that he was told in Rome in 1999 that IBAR had "turned into bush veterinarians". This pejorative attitude CAH systems was – and still is in some quarters – a pervasive one. The former director of AU/IBAR, Walter Masiga, admitted that he himself had been extremely sceptical about the CAHW in action but described his first trip to the field to see them in action as "a religious experience".

Official attitudes towards privatised community animal health systems in Ethiopia have come a long way in a relatively short space of time. Now the federal minister acknowledges, in the draft Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development guidelines on minimum standards for CAHWs, that:

There are crucial roles for many other [non-governmental] actors in the provision of veterinary services. Indeed the future policy for animal health services shall emphasise partnerships between government, private sector and livestock keepers, with the aim of building a viable and self-sustaining delivery system. The key element to be embedded in the policy framework is the participation of livestock keepers themselves in service delivery. Such participation is an important factor for ensuring sustainability of service delivery.

There are now around 1500 government- and NGO-trained CAHWs in Ethiopia. Together with others, AU/IBAR has significantly contributed to the acceptance of CAH service delivery systems both by demonstrating results on the ground and, increasingly, its work in the policy arena – giving technical support to the establishment of enabling policy and legislation and national minimum guidelines for training, the development of privatisation regulations, and contributing to the restructuring of veterinary institutions.

Certain policy advocacy tactics and techniques have proved particularly successful, including:

- establishing multiple contacts in and outside government and exploring alternative channels of influence;
- active collaboration with NGOs at the federal, provincial and national levels;
- targeting of key policy makers and getting them out to the field; and
- producing a range of publications for different audiences.

In the future AU/IBAR will no longer be training CAHWs at the field level. However significant policy and institutional challenges remain. Despite improved communication and collaboration significant policy gaps still exist. The pastoral development policies of the Ministry of Federal Affairs, for example, are operating independently of the service delivery policies of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development. Notwithstanding the ongoing restructuring of veterinary services there are often poor links between central federal services and the autonomous regions and no forum for getting line ministries to share information. As Ethiopia's privatised system of community-based animal healthcare becomes more established, there will also be questions of affordability for poorer users: who is excluded and how can they be reached?

The story relayed here for Ethiopia has unfolded in different ways in a number of other countries, all with significant AU/IBAR involvement. For example in Uganda, Kenya and Sudan important policy breakthroughs have been achieved. For a variety of reasons in other countries where AU/IBAR has been engaged, such as Tanzania and Somalia, progress has been slower, but nevertheless significant (see Figure 1). The groundwork of experiences in both field and policy level processes has reached a watershed in a number of countries. The challenge now is to reinforce, extend and consolidate these achievements.

Table 1: Indicators and progress for institutionalising community-based animal healthcare in the Greater Horn of Africa

| Country or area | Before 2000 (pre-CAPE) | | | | | December 2004 (post-CAPE) | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|----------------------------------|--|---------------------------|---|---|----------------------------------|--|
| | Support at field-level ¹ | CAHW standards and guidelines published | Specialised CAHW Unit established in central government | Written policy on CAHWs endorsed | Enactment of pro-CAHW legislation ⁷ | Support at field-level | CAHW standards and guidelines published | Specialised CAHW Unit established in central government | Written policy on CAHWs endorsed | Enactment of pro-CAHW legislation ⁷ |
| Kenya ² | +++ | + | - | + | - | ++++ | ++++ | +++ | +++ | ++ |
| Ethiopia | +++ | - | ++ ³ | - | - | ++++ | ++++ | +++++ | +++ | ++++ |
| Eritrea | +++++ | - | - | - | - | +++++ | - | - | - | +++ |
| Somalia ⁴ | na | - | - | - | - | na | +++ | na | na | na |
| Somaliland ⁵ | +++ | - | - | - | - | +++ | +++ | - | - | - |
| North Sudan | +++ | - | - | - | - | ++++ | - | +++++ | ++++ | +++ |
| South Sudan ⁶ | na | +++++ | na | na | na | ++++ | +++++ | + | + | + |
| Tanzania | ++ | - | - | - | - | ++ | - | + | + | ++ |
| Uganda | ++ | - | - | - | - | ++ | +++ | +++++ | ++ | ++ |
| Africa (AU/IBAR) | ++++ | - | na | - | na | +++++ | ++++ | na | +++++ | na |
| Global (OIE) | na | - | na | - | na | na | - | na | ++++ ⁸ | na |

(source: Andy Catley)

Key: '-' no progress to '+++++' completed; na - not applicable

¹ Government officers may support or be actively involved in NGO projects at field level; this support is not always officially reported or acknowledged.

² CAPE's predecessor (the PARC-VAC Project) was heavily involved in supporting CAHW guidelines and policies with the Kenya Veterinary Board. CAPE continued this work in Kenya.

³ A CAHW Unit was established in the MoA in Ethiopia as part of the Pan African Rinderpest Campaign (of IBAR). However, this unit was 'projectised' and not a formal part of the veterinary service structure; the unit was formalised with CAPE support in 2004.

⁴ A Somalia government was not established until late 2004 and it continues to be based in Nairobi, Kenya. CAPE drafted the CAHW Code of Conduct for the Somali Aid Co-ordinating Body, endorsed by SACB members. Some zonal-level veterinary associations had endorsed the use of CAHWs.

⁵ CAPE worked with the Somaliland government, despite its lack of international recognition.

⁶ Pre-CAPE, this refers to rebel-held areas of southern Sudan and the guidelines developed by the UNICEF-Operation Lifeline Sudan Livestock Programme. The signing of a peace agreement in January 2005 gives official status to the Secretariat for Agriculture and Animal Resources (SAAR) of the Sudan People's Liberation Movement. Post-CAPE indicators reflect SAAR support to CAH services as of January 2005.

⁷ Post-CAPE, the OIE Code recognises CAHWs as a type of veterinary para-professional. An important principle of the Code is that all types of veterinary worker in a country should be licensed and governed by legislation.

⁸ This refers to changes in the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Code, under the SPS Agreement of the WTO.

Case study 2

The recognition and use of participatory epidemiology

The policy challenge

In the remote arid and semi-arid pastoral areas in which AU/IBAR has worked animal disease control is particularly challenging. These areas consequently often pose important disease risks to national livestock populations, jeopardising trade and endangering animals. Moreover, in these remote areas conventional livestock disease investigation and surveillance is extremely difficult. As Andy Catley and Jeffrey Mariner argue: "the quantitative and data driven epidemiological methods used elsewhere often prove untenable in large pastoral areas with relatively small and mobile human populations, limited modern infrastructure and frequently, insecurity". Further challenges are the lack of baseline data to inform sampling procedures and the difficulty of following herds during longitudinal studies.

In these circumstances AU/IBAR and others have argued that 'participatory epidemiology' potentially presents an appropriate technique for the rapid, economic and effective collection of epidemiologic information. Participatory epidemiology evolved from the principles and methods of Rapid Rural Appraisal and is essentially aimed at providing opportunities for veterinarians to use pastoralists' considerable indigenous knowledge regarding animal health.

Participatory epidemiology has served a broader purpose too, challenging attitudes and practices of professionals. Many academic researchers, expatriate technical assistants to donor projects and government vets have a low regard for qualitative methods based on pastoralists' own knowledge. Qualitative methods are considered unreliable, invalid and difficult to incorporate into official disease information systems. The reliance is on expert led surveillance systems implemented in a top-down manner, replicating systems developed elsewhere in the world and in sedentary agricultural areas. The problem is that such systems do not work in pastoral areas in Africa. Ignoring pastoralists' own ethnoveterinary knowledge means that the vast accumulated knowledge about livestock diseases, epidemiological and clinical patterns and livestock systems in pastoral settings is excluded from view. As Catley and Mariner point out in their 2002 paper:

In pastoral and agro-pastoral societies regular, even daily, meetings are held to discuss the health of livestock and decide how they should be managed. In part, decisions on livestock management are based on a constant reassessment of the animal health situation, including exposure to parasites on pasture, or proximity to diseased herds or wildlife. Livestock topics, including animal health, form a substantial part of everyday conversation in such communities.

What did AU/IBAR do and with whom?

Building on earlier work, AU/IBAR developed and popularised participatory methods as animal health survey tools for needs assessments or feasibility surveys. By the late 1990s numerous NGOs in Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania, Somalia and Uganda were using such approaches routinely in animal health projects and it was central to CAHW programmes established by Operation Lifeline Sudan Livestock Programme and PARC.

Subsequently such methods increasingly came to be used in animal health project monitoring, impact assessment and programme evaluation. But these approaches - known

collectively as 'participatory epidemiology' (PE) - also had important applications as disease surveillance tools (see box).

Some uses of participatory epidemiology

Participatory disease searching (PDS)

PDS enables veterinarians to collect information on specific disease situations. It has been an aid to locating the last cases of rinderpest during disease eradication. PDS practitioners are 'disease detectives', using livestock keeper's knowledge of the disease to find clinical cases in marginalised areas. Although often misunderstood by epidemiologists, PDS is now an accepted approach supported by the Food and Agriculture Organisation as well as AU/IBAR. PDS is currently in use in Sudan, Uganda, the Somali ecosystem of east Africa, and Pakistan.

Disease diagnosis and descriptive epidemiology

Information from participatory methods such as matrix scoring, mapping and seasonal calendars can be triangulated with conventional veterinary investigation methods to assistance diagnosis of 'new' diseases. This approach was used to confirm the diagnosis of a chronic wasting disease in cattle in southern Sudan, which was prioritised by livestock herders. Proportional piling can be adapted and repeated to estimate age-specific disease incidence and mortality in livestock.

Disease modelling

Computer simulations of disease spread can assist epidemiologists to understand the pros and cons of different disease control strategies. 'Participatory modelling' combines livestock keeper's expert knowledge of disease dynamics within and between herds, with computer modelling techniques. The approach has been used to improve understanding of major epidemic diseases in pastoralist areas of Africa.

Impact assessment

Methods such as proportional piling can be used to assess the relative importance of livestock diseases against locally-defined indicators of disease impact. This approach is particularly useful for understanding the social benefits of livestock (such as dowry payments) relative to the more widely perceived benefits of food, income, draught power and hides and skins.

Assessing linkages

For many years pastoralist communities in Africa have described sick cattle which develop long, woolly coats, avoid the sun and pant during the heat of the day. They explained that cattle with this strange disease had previously suffered from foot-and-mouth disease (FMD). In Tanzania, matrix scoring and proportional piling were adapted to explore possible association between these 'hairy panthers' and FMD.

Source: Andy Catley

Given the prejudices in the veterinary profession against qualitative methodologies and pastoralist knowledge, the extent to which attitudes changed is impressive. PE's advocates have tackled these prejudices head on by strategically publishing in peer reviewed mainstream veterinary journals to get ideas into the scientific arena. Articles in the journal *Preventative Veterinary Medicine*, for example, have show-cased participatory epidemiology alongside more conventional epidemiology with a quantitative, modelling focus showing that it is equally valid. This research has also addressed the reliability question directly and pointed out that in certain circumstances even the most state-of-the art diagnostic tests are not necessarily any more 'reliable' than herders' own assessments. Also, surveys with vets have shown that methods (such as interviewing, scoring, ranking and visualisation/diagramming tools) are frequently rated as more effective than questionnaires in the generation of data. This published research on PE meant that there is a growing body of peer-reviewed evidence to feed into policy change and training efforts.

AU/IBAR was able to move the agenda significantly forwards with a key workshop held in Addis Ababa in 2001. This brought together an international group of senior epidemiologists (including those with substantial field experience) and international staff – to review work to date on participatory epidemiology and draw lessons concerning the validity and reliability of participatory methods. A key turning point in the workshop was an intervention by the renowned British epidemiologist Mike Thrusfield from the University of Edinburgh who observed that disease modelling incorporating participatory epidemiology was a much better way to do modelling than was sometimes conventionally applied in the UK. Some foot and mouth disease modellers, for example, expressly avoided talking to farmers because they thought this would bias their model. In his view, farmers' own experience - in the UK as in Africa - would significantly enhance the accuracy of modelling efforts and the effectiveness of disease surveillance and control measures.

Lessons and the future

A key requirement for participatory epidemiology approaches is attitudinal change among experts. If the methods are to make a contribution, veterinarians need to take seriously local knowledge and insights from qualitative methods. This is a big leap, given the training that most have undergone. It is no surprise that scepticism has been rife. However the efforts of AU/IBAR and others have made significant in-roads. Once the practical benefits of such approaches have been demonstrated - in disease search, surveillance and modelling - and the limitations of high-tech, expert driven alternatives recognised, many have been ready to accept their value. This has not been easy, and it has been important to get peer recognition, whether through published papers or endorsements of well-respected authorities, for others to accept the change.

But there are some caveats to be observed. A particular difficulty faced by AU/IBAR has been its limited capacity to implement training in numerous countries and ensure a uniformly high standard. When poorly applied participatory epidemiology can lead to a fixation on methods rather than ends. Many reports have focused in great detail on methodologies – especially replicable ones that generate numerical data that can be statistically tested. The danger with this is that the tools come to be regarded as the main outputs and the whole procedure acts to close down rather than open up the investigations. Despite the label 'participatory' the core principles underpinning best practice are often overlooked and PE can become yet another exercise in top-down data extraction by epidemiologists.

Over the last few years, through the efforts of AU/IBAR and others, PE methods have now entered the mainstream:

- Veterinary schools in Ethiopia (University of Addis Ababa, Masters level), Kenya (University of Nairobi, Masters level), Uganda (Makerere, undergraduate and Masters level) and Tanzania (Sokoine University of Agriculture, Masters level) are now teaching PE.
- Following a regional training course in PE for senior government epidemiologists and academics, national epidemiology units are supporting studies and investigations based on PE approaches.
- Computer modelling of the epidemiology of livestock disease in pastoral systems in Africa has been enhanced by such data collection techniques. For example in southern Sudan a model was developed to estimate the vaccination coverage requirements for rinderpest eradication given the particular structure of herds and their mobility.

- Participatory disease searching has become standard practice in national epidemiology units in Horn of Africa countries. In addition, FAO, for example, has used participatory disease searching as in contexts as far ranging as Pakistan and Bolivia.

The PE approach and its associated methods - developed and tested in African pastoral contexts - is a challenge to underlying assumptions of many technically-oriented, resource-intensive, yet often ineffective epidemio-surveillance and modelling methodologies which are often prioritised as solutions to disease control in Africa. Mainstreaming PE further will require more effort by AU/IBAR and partners. This will require some major rethinking of assumptions and strategies in these programmes, challenging ways of working and professional expectations in often powerful and influential research, inter-governmental, donor and government organisations. As with the case of CAHWs, winning the argument is not enough: policy and institutional change takes time and persistence, and involves manoeuvring among complex webs of power and politics.

Case study 3

Building peace through livelihood security in pastoral areas

The policy challenge

An important and perhaps unexpected facet of AU/IBAR's work (given its ostensible animal health focus) has been on the management of pastoral conflict in the Karamojong Cluster, spanning pastoral areas in Uganda and Kenya. Alongside several NGOs, AU/IBAR has been at the forefront in developing flexible and innovative mechanisms for peace building and conflict resolution since 1999.

Conflict between ethnic communities, principally expressed in the form of violent livestock raiding, is endemic and long-standing in the Karamojong Cluster. In a marginal environment with highly variable rainfall, competition over dry season grazing areas and water points is fierce. Disputes over natural resource access are layered over a myriad of other culturally and historically rooted conflicts ranging from border disputes, attempts to raise bride-price via stock thefts to culturally-embedded notions of 'heroism'. The proliferation of small arms from regional conflicts (particularly the protracted wars in southern Sudan and Somalia) and the relative weakness of government in these remote and under-serviced areas have exacerbated the situation.

After several years supporting community-animal health care and vaccinating for rinderpest in the area it became apparent that insecurity was the key concern of local communities and a major constraint to livestock-orientated livelihoods, and – as one elder put it – to silence the rinderpest, 'first you must silence the gun.'

Yet conflict management is a field that has been viewed as in the realm of regional security issues and therefore off-limits for non-governmental institutions with very limited opportunities for engagement. One problem with a generic focus on 'security' is that it can obscure the root causes, contexts and institutions of particular conflicts. But what could AU/IBAR's veterinarians, untrained in conflict management techniques, possibly have to offer?

In an environment where livestock are critical to livelihoods and much conflict relates to and is expressed via livestock there was actually a significant rationale for AU/IBAR to undertake conflict management activities. As a Turkana elder, Akeno Loborak, explained, "The best friend of a livestock owner is the vet. By treating and keeping the animals alive, the vet

literally keeps the family of the livestock owner alive". Larry Minear concludes: "Livestock is the perfect vehicle to hang peace-building on". Linking improved livelihood security with peace building, AU/IBAR have seen animal health is a unique entry point for grassroots conflict management in pastoral societies, an approach that would not be an option for organisations setting up expressly for conflict management.

What did AU-IBAR and partners do, and with whom?

A precedent for the use of indigenous institutions as conflict mitigating mechanisms in the region was established by Oxfam in Wajir, north-eastern Kenya in the mid-1990s in response to inter-clan Somali fighting. In the Karamojong Cluster AU/IBAR's field vets also soon found themselves dealing with traditional institutions in their attempts to broker peace. Given their long-standing work in the area, their valued status given the importance of cattle, and their strong links to traditional authorities through their animal health work (such as elders, 'seers' and 'generals' who had been ignored by development interventions and government structures), the field officers became well-known and trusted within the communities.

Working with these traditional leaders AU/IBAR used the animal health entry point to develop a conflict management programme. This meant that vets were getting deeply involved in activities they did not always understand – and yet, perhaps fortuitously, this made for an iterative learning approach and a flexible, experimental and innovative programme which has explored a range of novel methodologies to broker and maintain peace. These have attempted to take on board informal power relations and strategically target previously excluded actors (including women and youths), creating new spaces for dialogue and peace building (see box).

Approaches to conflict management

Peace meetings in contested grazing areas focussing on resource sharing and outstanding grievances – often incorporating a ceremonial 'burial of the hatchet' to symbolise peace building. Having these meetings outside urban areas increases the role of traditional authorities and youths.

Women's Peace Crusades were an adaptation of the traditional social institution of *alogita* – the right of Karamojong women to air their grievances. Typically this involved moving in a convoy of vehicles with around 100 women and youths from one community through the contested grazing areas. The idea being that the women act as ambassadors of peace, bearing messages through songs, poems, dances and speeches performed for neighbouring communities. The neighbouring communities come together to open up dialogue at a series of meetings at which culpability, for example for inciting raids, was admitted and means for building trust discussed. The follow-up to the crusades – opening up space for further dialogue – was particularly important.

Cross-border meetings brought traditional authority figures together with local administrators at the district level to discuss cross border problems and plan for the future.

Village peace committees have been created and trained in many areas. These are community-owned bodies which build on indigenous institutions such as the councils of elders and are responsible for tasks such as disciplining youths who breach peace accords and tracking stolen animals.

Linking traditional and civil authorities has been a key strategy. The aim has been to ensure that the two systems do not become parallel and unrelated. A key issue is that regular follow-up of resolutions made during informal meetings and by traditional authorities is absolutely vital to ensure that civil authorities see things through.

Many at the field level saw AU/IBAR's involvement as strictly technical, and separate from its 'policy' work. Yet from the beginning, the work had a policy objective. In areas where formal policy is weak or absent, the challenge has been to create policy processes which emerge from the ground up. In conflict areas this is particularly challenging because of distrust, suspicion and sometimes fear. However, the learning that emerged from the animal health work on the ground was key in establishing policy processes that worked to build peace. A key lesson was that this could happen when the conflicting parties could become engaged in something that mattered to them, and improved their livelihood security. Animal health issues proved a perfect starting point, as disease problems inevitably increase in conflict areas as control systems break down. Improving the livelihood assets of people meant trust was developed, new institutional linkages formed and the policy environment for peace building created.

The Karamojong Cluster approach chimed with experiences elsewhere, whether in southern Sudan or northern Kenya. The long-running experience in Wajir for example provided key lessons for the establishment of the regional effort encapsulated in the regional pastoral conflict monitoring system (CEWARN) established by governments in the region through the Regional Economic Committee, IGADD. This became a focus for policy advocacy efforts in alliance with a range of other partners. AU/IBAR has been one of several actors involved in the peace building process in the region. Others include: ITDG, World Vision, Oxfam GB, Pax Christi Netherlands and the National Council of Churches of Kenya (NCCCK). These organisations all have slight differences in approach, with some focusing more on research and advocacy, others on the facilitation of dialogue, and still others on community capacity to handle conflict. This of course raises problems. The multiplication of un-coordinated peace initiatives with different organisations with different methodologies working in the same place over the past decades has been a source of confusion and rendered peace activities less effective than they might otherwise have been.

As one commentator put it, "There has been an increase in the number of peace meetings both in Karamoja and Wajir, to the point that people are tired of the practice". AU/IBAR has consequently been working with Oxfam, ITDG, NCCCK and others to establish district and national level mechanisms to get co-ordination and collaboration in place and establish common ground. The rationalisation of the proliferation of village level structures has been encouraged and joint government-civil society district peace and development committees have been established as co-ordinating bodies. This coordination has been reinforced further by an agreement at African Union level between AU/IBAR and the AU's Peace and Security Council.

Results and impacts

Whether by design or serendipity the use of animal health as an entry point into conflict resolution activities, building on established trust at the community level and use of hybrid institutions to open up space for dialogue across lines of conflict and between traditional authorities and government has undoubtedly been successful.

As one participant at a peace meeting put it: "Something that was burning is cooling down". A dedicated and energetic field team with a pragmatic approach has made great in-roads in raising community awareness of the problems caused by cattle raiding and the need to share scarce resources. An impact assessment of the programme in 2003 found that some inter-ethnic grazing of cattle was reported and large-scale raids are said to be less frequent between Turkana – Pokot and Turkana – Toposa. The stakeholders consulted commended the community-level efforts of AU/IBAR and wanted the peace initiatives to continue as the commentary in the box below demonstrates.

Elisha Plengun Pokot, Chemolingot, Kenya

I became the Chief in 1995. It is difficult being a Chief because this is a large location and there are many problems. The main one is the raids. We have to hold many meetings (barazzas), and they are effective. We sometimes have our own barazzas in the area, and then when there is conflict, we have what we call peace committees and border peace committees formed by the community. Sometimes, [projects] help out. [They] will bring a lot of changes, which brings us a lot of hope. We talk together now, old men, young men, women, even Chiefs. Raids are reducing because of [the projects]. The thing about peace is that it's hard to get the real thing.

Source: AU/IBAR Pastoral Visions photo gallery

However, the final qualifier here is crucial. Despite the successes, progress in peace building has been slow and erratic with setbacks hot on the heels of breakthroughs. As the 2003 review also points out communities still live in fear of one another and social and economic interactions are limited. Co-ordination amongst NGOs and between NGOs and government has been slow to develop (particularly around the peace committee approach), and AU/IBAR's own activities have been hampered by a lack of capacity to follow-up and enforce resolutions agreed at peace meetings. Statements of goodwill and intentions to graze peacefully are all very well, but they lack teeth in the absence of a commitment to penalise the breaking of agreements.

Sustainable peace may yet to be achieved in the Karamojong Cluster but AU/IBAR has been successful in developing, and widely disseminating and sharing (via training workshops etc.), innovative methodologies. This includes horizontally expansion to other organisations and vertically expansion to senior policy makers.

Lessons and the future

Several key lessons can be drawn from the successes and shortcomings of AU/IBAR's work on pastoral conflict in order to explore which pragmatic ways forward will deliver the greatest impact:

- AU/IBAR's close engagement at the field level has been both an asset and a weakness. The project has at times worked much like an NGO - to the extent of spending much time and money returning stolen livestock. This has perhaps not been the best use of resources, but the long-term engagement with field activities now allows AU/IBAR to comment in the policy arena with authority. It no longer carries out expensive field operations but there is a felt need to "keep our hand in with grassroots work". Channelling funds or technical advice through new, local-level peace structures to take up and implement practical lessons on the ground will enable AU/IBAR to retain this grassroots linkage via partnerships.
- The high profile and photogenic methodologies developed by AU/IBAR – particularly the women's peace crusades – were successful in opening up spaces for dialogue and attracting donor funding. However, the calls from donors to "do more crusades" confuse events and methods with results: in the absence of thorough follow-ups the gains from these events can quickly be undone.

The growing emphasis on policy and institutional issues by AU/IBAR is, in part, a response to the opening up of new policy space with a new willingness on the part of governments to engage with others on the issues of conflict management, cross-border co-operation and

development in arid and semi-arid areas. AU/IBAR's experience suggests several key areas for this emerging sphere of policy work:

- There is great scope for work to formalise the integration of customary community-based conflict management mechanisms into statutory legal systems. Currently the joint government-community district peace and development committees pioneered by Oxfam and adopted by the Government of Kenya, for example, remain legally ambiguous, even though some civil society organisations are already channelling funds for conflict management through them. In Kenya AU/IBAR has begun to lobby for their legal recognition with a clear definition of their mandate, roles and responsibilities – with the National Steering Committee as a focal point with co-ordinating powers.
- Customary penalties for cattle rustling and associated crimes are often effective in staving off the escalation of disputes into violent conflict. Integrating such customary systems into legislative frameworks throws up a range of tensions and will require safeguards to guarantee that penalties are proportionate, consistent and fair and respect human rights and to ensure that appeal mechanisms are in place.
- Work on conflict management policy will require on-going relationship building and working closely with bodies such as the AU Peace and Security Council. There is much to draw on from AU/IBAR's experiences in the field of conflict management, linking livelihood security issues with peace building. Animal health provided a strategic entry point for dealing with the central issue impacting on pastoral livelihoods in the Karamojong Cluster – insecurity. AU/IBAR has a specific mandate within the AU. As one staff member emphasised: "at the end of the day we need to keep with the cattle". But the lessons of the Karamojong Cluster work has been that linking this technical, livelihoods oriented work with wider questions of institutional and policy change around peace and security is key. This has wider implications for relationships within the AU, and the new links between Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture and the Department of Peace and Security are an important first step.

AU/IBAR is now looking to expand its cross-border conflict work from the Karamojong Cluster to look at issues related to insecurity and livestock related conflict across the Greater Horn of Africa. Some concerns noted in the recent review need to be heeded. If these approaches are to be replicated, more robust indicators of sustained progress are necessary, as is consideration of which lessons are site-specific to the peculiar characteristics of the Karamojong Cluster and which are more broadly applicable. Further reflection on this experience in relation to the broader practical and academic work on conflict and dispute resolution will also be necessary.

Case Study 4

Changing global standards: the recognition of veterinary para-professionals in the OIE Code

The policy challenge

Under the Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) Agreement of the World Trade Organisation, the *Office International des Epizooties* (OIE), the World Animal Health Organisation, is responsible for setting the global standards on animal health, from the perspective of enabling international trade in livestock and livestock products. These standards are documented in the OIE's Terrestrial Animal Health Code (the OIE Code), and include guidelines on the evaluation of veterinary services. The OIE is a membership organisation of

states, and each state is represented by its delegate, usually through its Chief Veterinary Officer (CVO). The OIE thus sets the benchmark against which the quality and effectiveness of a veterinary service is judged internationally. This has important ramifications for trade, as importing countries require at the minimum OIE standards to be met.

The move to accepting community animal health (CAH) approaches by a growing number of African countries in response to the challenges of service delivery (case 1) raised the question as to whether such para-professionals would be acceptable under the OIE Code. As discussed in case 1 and 2, the mainstream veterinary profession has been reluctant to change, arguing that new approaches to service delivery (such as CAHWs) or surveillance (such as participatory epidemiology) would undermine the quality of veterinary services, challenging the authority and expertise of veterinarians. The OIE, established in 1926 and based in Paris, represents perhaps the focal point of the mainstream veterinary profession globally, so discussions about changing standards for acceptable veterinary practice made for a challenging engagement.

What did AU-IBAR and partners do, and with whom?

Until recently the idea that the OIE might countenance recognition of para-professionals was dismissed out of hand. The OIE Code was assumed to rule it out. A paper presented by AU/IBAR staff Tim Leyland and Andy Catley at an OIE meeting in Tunis in September 2002 was the first attempt to relate CAHWs very specifically to the OIE Code. This was a strategic intervention showing the impact of CAHWs to a key audience of CVOs, scientists and policy-makers. Cleverly, the paper used the OIE guidelines on evaluation of veterinary services to show how CAHWs "can complement public sector veterinary activities and also help to develop private sector veterinary services under professional supervision" and thus help achieve the goal of the SPS agreement and the OIE standards: the promotion of trade in a safe and transparent manner.

The paper argued that developing countries – especially those areas with severe operational and resource constraints and veterinary services under organisational/financial pressure (in other words, most of Africa) - chances of attaining quality veterinary services as guided by the OIE are enhanced by the adoption of well-planned and well-regulated CAHW systems which allow for more effective monitoring, quicker responses, better surveillance, and the ability for information to be communicated rapidly from livestock keeper to the CVO, and on to the OIE for its global reporting system.

Indeed, the paper argued, it is doubtful that effective service delivery and surveillance systems – the prerequisite for participation in international trade – can exist in extensive production systems without community-based and participatory systems. Appropriate combinations of participatory, laboratory-based and analytical epidemiology will result in the strongest overall surveillance system that best represents the true epidemiological picture. The paper emphasised that community-based and participatory surveillance methods do not replace conventional surveillance and analytical capacities. Instead, they extend the capabilities of the system by enhancing the penetration of data collection activities into traditional communities, especially in remote areas.

Whilst the agenda has been to gain formal, legal recognition for CAHWs, AU/IBAR has been at pains to argue that CAHWs need not be a permanent feature. As systems develop a greater professionalisation of the service may be possible. But for now, AU/IBAR has argued forcefully the only route is to accept CAHWs and provide appropriate support and regulation for their role.

The AU/IBAR paper was well received and opened peoples' eyes to fact that CAHWs are not the threat they were often made out to be; indeed, they even may be an opportunity. As a follow-up to the Tunis workshop, AU/IBAR had already started planning for an international

conference to bring together the OIE, FAO and senior veterinary policy-makers from around the world to discuss policy and institutional constraints to primary animal healthcare.

This was a well-funded, meticulously planned and carefully stage-managed event. Initially conceived of as a typical scientific conference AU/IBAR decided not to go down the "just another big conference with a fat document on 'where we are now with primary animal health care'" route and grabbed the opportunity to use it as a more informal gathering which would bring together advocates and sceptics of participatory animal health care systems with a view to convincing the latter – and particularly the OIE.

The 2002 Mombasa conference was well attended, with 120 decision-makers and senior veterinarians from 21 African countries, as well as delegates from Asia, Latin America, Europe and the US. Such a gathering had the authority to come out with a statement that would really carry weight. A steering committee was set up a year before the event and had four meetings with representatives from AU/IBAR, FAO, OIE, NGOs, and donors. This meant that, by the time of the conference, there was already a large degree buy-in and there had been a great deal of careful planning concerning content and format. Each participant was carefully selected, as were the moderators and working group facilitators who were well briefed.

Rather than bringing in livestock owners in a tokenistic attempt to get the 'voice of the poor' which might have disrupted the flow, excerpts of film of them talking in their own environments were shown, and to keep people reminded of them and the question of delivering livestock services to them large billboard posters of the herders with quotes were placed around the conference room. A video on the importance of paradigm shifts and 'thinking out of the box' was shown and a cartoonist employed to lighten the mood - as one of the organisers admitted "we used all the tricks of the trade we'd learnt over the years".

A central theme of the conference was the inappropriate policies and weak institutional arrangements at national and international levels for the private delivery of veterinary services and the use of CAHWs. At the international level, for example, the conference recognised that the guidance provided by the OIE in the interests of creating high-quality veterinary services may not fit national pro-poor development policies.

Crucially, and at the instigation of the OIE itself, the conference recommendations included a call to the OIE to define the functions and responsibilities of private veterinarians and para-professionals (including CAHWs), in the provision of animal health services; and clarify the roles, links and regulations required to incorporate them into the structure of national veterinary services.

The OIE acted quickly on the recommendation and in February 2003 a working group of representatives from the public and private sectors in Africa (including AU/IBAR), Asia, South America and Europe, and the Chairman of the World Veterinary Association, was set up. AU/IBAR were able to share their extensive experience through various publications (see case 1), backed up by a recently completed video which was shown to the group. This OIE ad hoc committee officially accepted, for the first time, CAHWs as one type of veterinary para-professional. The committee recommended changes to the OIE Code so that, within each member country, a veterinary statutory body should be responsible for the licensing and registration of veterinarians and veterinary para-professionals (including CAHWs). In May 2004, member states at the OIE General Assembly endorsed the changes to the OIE Code to recognise veterinary para-professionals (the definition of which includes CAHWs), thereby creating new global standards to support CAHWs.

Lessons and the future

The Mombasa Primary Animal Healthcare conference was a critical moment for AU/IBAR work in this area. It was able successfully to scale-up the CAHW issue to the global policy arena and to get buy-in from an international organisation historically suspicious of community-based approaches. By extension this is and will be a powerful means of applying influence on national Chief Veterinary Officers from above.

Displaying an acute grasp of the policy process, AU/IBAR reasoned that veterinary policy-makers were more likely to be influenced by each other and the international standard setting body than by researchers and NGOs. Eschewing the conventional academic conference format, therefore, for a carefully planned and tightly controlled space - in terms of the number and type of participants, the invited presentations and the topics for working group discussions - was a means by which an agenda was able to emerge from a process of peer-to-peer learning.

Within two years of the Mombasa conference global standards had changed to recognise community-based approaches – a significant success for AU/IBAR.

Case Study 5

Changing standards for livestock trade – the commodity-based approach

The policy challenge

A very important, and potentially far-reaching, strand of AU/IBAR's recent work has been the challenge it has thrown down to the international animal health standards intended to facilitate safe trade in livestock and livestock products. These standards are set by *Office international des épizooties* (OIE) under the Sanitary and Phytosanitary Agreement (SPS) of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and documented in the OIE's Terrestrial Animal Health Code. The underlying intent of the SPS Agreement was to facilitate unhindered international trade in animals, plants and their products without endangering human, animal or plant life. However, measures related to the import of animals and animal products have increasingly been perceived as non-tariff barriers used to protect domestic markets.

Without the possibility of engaging in international trade due to transboundary diseases, the vast wealth of Africa's livestock remains substantially untapped. Without trade possibilities, it is argued, Africa cannot profit from the 'livestock revolution'. In the African context, many believe the proximity to Middle Eastern markets, demand for livestock and fresh meat regionally and an increasing preference for products from organically-raised livestock provide a great opportunity for the continent to develop its export industry should animal health standards permit it.

For this reason international standards matter. It is the OIE Code again sets the benchmark for international discussions (even if many importing regions set standards considerably higher than the OIE). The problem is that the principles underlying current OIE standards are for many countries in Africa unattainable. In particular, a core principle of the OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Code is the need for countries to eradicate important transboundary animal diseases in order to trade safely with international partners. This has resulted in substantial donor and national investments in disease eradication as a means to promote trade by achieving nation-wide disease-free status or establishing extremely costly disease free zones. However, the endemic nature of these diseases in most African countries effectively excludes these countries from international markets in livestock and livestock products.

Apart from rinderpest there is no immediate prospect of any transboundary animal disease being eradicated on a global basis.

If eradication is not the answer, is it possible to trade safely with a different set of principles guiding standard settings? AU/IBAR has been at the forefront of a proposal for an alternative 'commodity-based' approach to the formulation of international animal health and food safety standards, based on the fact that different commodities (such as live animals, tinned and processed meat and dairy products) pose very different risks when it comes to the spread of human and animal pathogens. Advocates argue therefore that the standards set and risk mitigation strategies required should equally be commodity dependent. Rather than requiring country or zonal freedom from diseases, a commodity-based approach would require sanitary guarantees for a set of import conditions for a specific product. Such an approach, it is argued, would improve access to international markets for all countries, and especially those in the developing world. Such a system would also encourage well-organised and regulated commodity processing in developing countries and, therefore, local capture of value-added benefits while concomitantly reducing risk of pathogen transmission.

However, the commodity-based trade proposal has not been universally well received and has provoked a vigorous debate. This issue is even more controversial even than the recognition of community animal health workers in the OIE Code and AU/IBAR and partners still have much policy advocacy work to do. The following sections tell the story so far.

What did AU-IBAR and partners do, and with whom?

In October 2003 AU/IBAR, with FAO, commissioned a study on the feasibility of disease-free export zones to promote exports of livestock and livestock products from eastern Africa. The report concluded that disease free export zones were not a feasible option, Instead, it argued that it need not be essential for export zones to be free of trade-sensitive diseases and that certain commodities from outside export zones should be able to access export markets. The OIE, it argued, should give priority to the various measures that will make different livestock commodities safe for trade, rather than emphasising the need for national or zonal freedom from any particular disease. In April 2004 a further consultancy report commissioned by AU/IBAR looked specifically at SPS issues. This argued for a de-emphasising of the (often hopeless) struggle for disease freedom in favour of more of a focus on surveillance and risk assessment.

These consultancy exercises generated much debate at country level. In the meantime the commodity-based concept was being introduced at various international meetings, largely by its main instigator – Gavin Thomson. A world-renown South African virologist, Thomson was a member of AU/IBAR's PACE team and then chair of the OIE FMD and other Epizootics Commission. He had started out looking at the issue of epidemiological surveillance, asking how it could be made sustainable. In so doing he started to explore how trade access should be linked to surveillance strategies. He had tried to get support for early elaborations of the commodity-based trade concept but without success. It became dubbed 'Thomson's crazy idea'.

Following the WTO ministerial meeting in Doha, debates on trade and development gained increased importance and purchase in policy circles, with the EU in particular putting a greater focus on trade issues. As a member of the OIE scientific commission, Thomson was able to lobby the OIE from within and – somewhat to his surprise – it was thought to be a good idea by many - both the Scientific Commission and Code Commission appeared to accept the concept. There was talk of convening an OIE ad hoc committee on the theme, with Thomson as member.

However, thereafter progress stalled and the OIE back-peddled on the initiative. No longer a commission chair of OIE, Thomson looked for other allies. This resulted in a shift in tactics, and the formation of a new coalition, including many from AU/IBAR. As one staff member put it: "we want things to change quickly – we don't want 12 years of discussion in committees". The fear was that shunting the issue into an ad hoc committee would be a means of marginalising and quietly killing off the issue. Instead, Thomson and colleagues decided to force the issue and publish a paper on commodity-based trade in the high-profile journal, the *Veterinary Record*. To their surprise, the *Veterinary Record* fast-tracked paper which came out in September 2004 and wrote a very supportive editorial calling the proposal a "pragmatic way of ensuring acceptable levels of risk for particular products without having to prove freedom from disease ... [which] would provide opportunities for trade and generating income, without threatening the importing countries with disease." The editorial concluded that "the system they propose would require a fairly fundamental change in approach but, nevertheless, the proposal has the potential to facilitate trade, and to allow developing countries better access to international markets. It deserves to be considered seriously."

In September 2004 IBAR also convened a technical consultation on 'African Animal Resource and Trade Development' with African Regional Economic Communities in Mombasa. Thomson again made the case for commodity-based trade. A key recommendation of this gathering was that SPS issues in the livestock sub-sector needed to be urgently addressed and that AU/IBAR should use the meetings in Cairo (October 2004) and Khartoum (February 2005) to: "continue to raise awareness and promote the concept of commodity-based trade as a major and Africa-friendly opportunity for improving access to international markets"; and "gain acceptance for improvement of African representation at SPS and related forums, including strengthening/ establishing regional and sub-regional offices of OIE and Codex".

To this end AU/IBAR put together a concise policy briefing paper on commodity-based trade for the October OIE/IBAR/FAO Cairo meeting and made further presentations. The result was that the Director General of the OIE was mandated to request the OIE Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases to develop an appendix to the OIE Code clarifying commodity-based issues by laying out "risk mitigation procedures that can be applied to specific animal products to render them safe for trade". Notwithstanding this recommendation the *Veterinary Record* paper elicited a long and defensive letter from the OIE supporting the status quo.

Lessons and the future

To date the commodity-based trade concept has been well-received in Africa, but continues to be resisted in some quarters. Getting it onto the policy agenda has been involved a combination of behind-the-scenes lobbying of the OIE and high-profile presentations and publications. Given the inherent challenge this concept poses to the international veterinary consensus it has required advocates unafraid to rock the boat, despite the potential professional consequences. With such controversy generated many are reluctant to comment in public, but gradually the argument is, it seems, being one, despite significant costs. As one IBAR staff member observed: "institutional survivors don't bring about change".

A key lesson for AU/IBAR is that there is a great need to improve African representation and involvement at SPS and related fora. The OIE is at root a collection of member states and there is a potential role for regional bodies such as AU/IBAR to organise African countries to look at and discuss OIE agendas before meetings in order to achieve a harmonised, and thus politically more weighty position. The EU, for example, speaks with one voice at the OIE, whereas Africa's 50 members are often split or absent from the discussions.

Where should AU/IBAR go next with commodity-based trade? One avenue is to lobby the WTO directly to get acceptance – this would, in turn, have an impact on the OIE. Another strategy would be to attempt to galvanise key players in the same way the Mombasa workshop did when advocating the inclusion of CAHWs into the OIE Code (see case 4). This would involve targeting a key group of people from the RECs, the private sector, agricultural and trade and industry ministries and the OIE and brainstorming ideas around commodity-based trade, culminating in an influential workshop.

There are also several key areas of research that AU/IBAR needs to continue working on in detail. A workable commodity-based trade approach hinges on having credible and independent certification systems. How to improve certification is going to be a key institutional change and trade policy issue in coming years. As a recent AU/IBAR briefing paper recognises: "finding a solution will require a thorough understanding of the current certification systems in other sectors, the vested interests of stakeholders and the capacity and willingness of international agencies to endorse a transparent, credible and trusted certification system for livestock commodities". This involves exploration of who should be responsible for certification and through what systems of accreditation. AU/IBAR will also need ongoing research to inform its understanding of the broader issues affecting global trade alongside standards – including vertically-integrated market systems and multi-national companies that unilaterally impose their own standards.

The concept of commodity-based trade has come a long way in a short space of time in large part due to AU/IBAR's efforts. However, there is still a long way to go to achieving official recognition of this concept and ensuring that African livestock commodities achieve greater acceptability internationally contributing to economic growth and the real development of pastoral areas.

Lessons Learned

Influencing policy and changing institutions: What has worked and why?

Many people talk about the need for policy change in the livestock sector, but few actually know how to do it. In the past, when a technically-driven approach dominated, specialist veterinary or livestock production expertise was seen as enough. But today, the scope and challenge has grown. Issues as far ranging as international trade, marketing, service delivery, private sector involvement, standards and certification all impinge on the day-to-day issues which occupy veterinary department officials in Africa. In addition, the challenge of linking livestock and animal health issues with broader policy objectives surrounding poverty reduction, sustainable development and economic reform, government officials must be on top of an increasing number of issues - all with their associated jargon, procedures and principles. No longer is the life of a vet confined to the technical realm: policy and institutional issues are increasingly central.

Everyone realises this, but the capacity to respond often remains limited. The experience of AU/IBAR over recent years has highlighted a range of lessons which help define more clearly what works and why when influencing policy and changing institutions. This section outlines some of these lessons, and suggests some implications for the future. As the five case studies outlined above have briefly explored, AU/IBAR has been instrumental – albeit to varying extents and with varying numbers of collaborators – in achieving concrete policy and institutional change. There has been a general recognition that policy change is both technical and political, that it requires processes of change that galvanise ideas and people around positions, and that it needs to link between field experience and wider change. AU/IBAR staff came with unique backgrounds: not only were they qualified vets, but also they had extensive field experience as development practitioners. In facilitating policy and

institutional change, they have deployed a range of tactics and strategies. Here we summarise seven of these.

1. *Telling persuasive stories*

Stories about policy change all have a beginning, middle and end: they describe events, or define the world in certain ways, and so define policy solutions. Such policy stories are embedded in particular institutional structures, bureaucracies or groups and can stick with great tenacity. However, these stories can be so taken-for-granted that they can drastically limit thinking. They thus may reduce the 'room for manoeuvre' or 'policy space' of policy makers, and so their ability to think about new alternatives or different approaches.

The AU/IBAR project has challenged a number of entrenched policy stories and their underlying assumptions. For example:

- Disease eradication - and the assumption that the only way forward is to create disease free zones (see case 5).
- Pastoralist ignorance - and the assumption that pastoralists are backward and that their insights and knowledge is of no use to development (see case 2).
- The need for experts - and the assumption that the only legitimate form of expertise is a qualified veterinarian (see case 1)
- Disease risk and trade - and the assumption that zero risk and disease free status is the only route to safe trade (see case 5)

But it is not enough to critique the status quo and the conventional wisdoms of the mainstream. In order to effect change, alternative storylines must be offered. AU/IBAR has had significant success in this, developing pragmatic, clear and simple policy stories that challenge dominant policy positions, suggesting, in turn, alternative policies and institutional structures. Grounded in field engagement, and involving coalitions, alliances and networks of players in making the case, these alternative policy stories have been deployed at district, national, regional and increasingly international levels. For example:

- CAHWs can offer the opportunity for improved disease surveillance and control (cases 1 and 4).
- Ethnoveterinary knowledge is a rich source of information and insight that can enhance veterinary services, epidemiology and surveillance (case 2).
- Commodity-based trade is a viable alternative to aiming for disease free status that offers the prospect of safe and prosperous trade in livestock products (case 5).

The simple storylines developed for these alternative positions have been supported in a variety of ways. Personal stories often provide support for the wider policy advocacy positions, providing particular experiences that others in similar positions can relate to. In presenting a new - sometimes challenging and far-reaching - position to a new audience, whether in a meeting, a one-on-one discussion, on a website or on TV or radio, having a personalised story to tell can make all the difference. In the same way, videos and other visual media can bring an argument to life. A simple story, with clear implications for how things need to change, is also ideal material for briefings with officials or presentations in key forums. Such positions, in turn, can be supported, elaborated and legitimated by more formal publications, whether books or journal articles, where different, more technical audiences are in mind. With its reputation and track-record (with a history of long-term field engagement and acknowledged technical expertise), AU/IBAR has been able to draw legitimacy and credibility for these alternative policy stories.

As with all stories language is crucially important. Certain words or phrases will ring bells with certain audiences, and fall flat with others. A good example is the strategic use of the term 'epidemiology' as in 'participatory *epidemiology*' (case 2). This immediately located PE

in a technical discourse, and is a term that appeals to a particular group of people who influence policy. In the same way, linking the CAHW debate with the preoccupations of epidemio-surveillance strategies also brought more people on board, and into a debate that had been populated mostly by NGOs (cases 1 and 4). Linking debates also requires linking languages and terminologies. Thus, in engaging with the OIE and issues of standards and trade, the terms of the OIE Code had to be taken into account when making the case for CAHWs (case 4) and commodity-based trade (case 5). Situating the whole debate within the wider concerns of the international community - whether at the level of the African Union, the Regional Economic Communities or different donors - is also important. For an issue not to get lost or dismissed, it must relate to the concerns of the day. Policy buzzwords have a huge impact - whether it is poverty reduction, sustainable livelihoods, peace and security, or the whole language associated with MDGs and PRSPs. AU/IBAR has been sure to highlight the livestock and veterinary services issues to this wider development audience in their work, making, what some see as parochial and technical, central and important to broader development goals and objectives.

2. Building networks and encouraging champions of change

It is one thing coming up with a convincing, snappy story, but convincing others that this is the idea to back - especially if it means abandoning other ideas which are backed by powerful players - is a more challenging task. Being effective in policy change means understanding where power lies – knowing which actors and institutions are important, both governmental and non-governmental, and understanding the jostling of positions and interests at the global, national and local levels and tracing the connections between them. With this knowledge it is much easier to target the right people, in the right places and at the right time. At the national and international levels AU/IBAR and partners have demonstrated this nuanced political understanding and put it to good effect. For example:

- In pushing for the acceptance of privatised CAHWs in Ethiopia (case 1), the trip to Zambia by Ethiopian policy-makers was an important turning point. To get this to happen, AU/IBAR were able to enlist the right people who could make a difference. They were able to use alternative channels within bureaucracies to get permissions and approvals, ensuring that things happened.
- In getting ideas around participatory epidemiology more widely accepted (case 2), AU/IBAR chose the participants carefully for a key workshop. Getting the endorsement of influential international academics at the Addis Ababa workshop was important in legitimising the emerging network. This encouraged others to buy into the idea further, thus expanding the network of advocates for change.
- A key facilitatory role of AU/IBAR has been to link networks of people who, although advocating broadly the same thing, did not usually interact. In the case of the conflict and peace building work (case 3), AU/IBAR has linked an established development-oriented network of NGOs working on conflict issues, with animal health technicians and projects, with the AU-level Peace and Security Department.

Building and linking networks is a key part of policy change. New ideas gain purchase when there is strong backing. Even brilliant new ideas may sink without trace without support and advocacy. AU/IBAR has learned how to facilitate this process, linking often very local networks to broader coalitions operating at national, continental and international levels.

3. Coordination, facilitation and networking

As a bureau of the African Union AU/IBAR has a mandate from member countries to coordinate efforts and harmonise policies and institutions. This is a unique position, providing both credibility and authority at the continental level. AU/IBAR has been well positioned to work through existing regional networks and convene new ones. This confers

an ability both to make connections and, should it be necessary, to circumvent established networks to explore new channels for influencing policy.

Through its work, AU/IBAR has built both formal and informal coalitions and partnerships with a broad spectrum of actors ranging from pastoralists, to professional associations of veterinarians, to national ministries, to NGOs, to the private sector and the donor community. Bringing these diverse groups together - as part of workshops, conferences, impact assessments or field visits - and sharing ideas among them has been key to AU/IBAR's work. But this has not been networking for the sake of it. There have been in each instance, as the case studies have demonstrated, strategic objectives and outcomes in mind. These align with AU/IBAR's overall mandate, but are specific enough to generate enthusiasm, commitment and the possibilities of change. The coordination and facilitation that AU/IBAR has offered in each of these cases has been time delimited and focused. Sometimes things have taken longer than hoped for, but nevertheless progress is tangible and outputs are clear, as the case studies have shown.

4. Learning by seeing

According to one AU/IBAR staff member "of the various methods used by the project, simply putting policy makers face-to-face with livestock keepers was probably the most influential in changing mindsets and thus influencing policy change". As the case studies have shown, AU/IBAR had access to a range of field experiences which demonstrated that alternative ideas actually worked in practice, and really made a difference on the ground.

Getting senior professionals out to the field to interact with remote pastoralist communities - sometimes for the first time - gave them direct experience of the isolation, limited facilities and, in some areas, insecurity of these regions. As one senior vet at an AU/IBAR training course put it, "We've seen government policy change but it is slow. Seeing things on the ground helps change policy". This 'witnessing' has been a powerful technique which was further developed by AU/IBAR during its CAHW Participatory Impact Assessment exercises (Case study 1) which have given teams of policy-makers from different agencies more extended periods working in the field. Policy-makers returned with their own personal stories and experiences which further extended the ability of AU/IBAR to make the case for policy change.

A complementary approach has been to make use of videos to relay the perspectives and experiences of pastoralists, veterinary service providers and others operating in remote rural areas. These days, videos are relatively cheap and easy to make. But the direct testimonies of people talking directly on camera can be immensely powerful. In a workshop they may provide key reference points, providing a way of ensuring discussion does not become too inward looking. The AU/IBAR project has made six videos aimed at diverse audiences, all of which have been well received in different settings, whether as part of small training events or large international conferences.

5. Convening key events – workshops and conferences

As case study 4 explored in depth, AU/IBAR has had great success with using well planned workshops, where policy makers could consider the issues for themselves, but in a directed way to "find out for themselves what needed to be done". By learning from each other, such events did not end up in attempts to force or fiddle agendas. Conclusions emerged organically through facilitated discussion and debate. The resolutions that emerged had, as a result, more force, being generated and owned by the participants. The convening was thus not just to share information and lecture from a podium, but centrally part of building networks around new ideas and positions.

The Mombasa gathering used, by its organisers own admission, "every trick in the book", including video messages from pastoralists, posters with sound-bites and an in-house cartoonist. But these 'tricks' had an intention. The aim was to generate an atmosphere of debate that ensured the issue of CAHW recognition was not lost, and the real experiences of remote pastoral areas were taken into account, even in the distant, comfortable conference room. Designing and facilitating an effective workshop requires enormous skill. As AU/IBAR have learned it is much more than just booking a room, handing out per diems and supplying pencils, paper, water and mints. Lessons have been learned from professional facilitators and workshop organisers who have passed on their skills in designing processes to enhance discussion.

Follow-up to events is often as important as the event itself. A key requirement is making sure that people are kept in touch and feel involved afterwards. As a result they feel part of the success of the workshop and so have a shared responsibility for conveying its message. A quick turn-around in report production is therefore key, as is its format (clear, accessible and simple). Ensuring contact details are shared, and messages sent round when people get home provides a sense that participants remain part of a network. Presenting the results to other forums may also help link success in one event with influence in another. Thus in relation to the debate about the commodity-based trade approach (case 5), resolutions at an AU/RECs meeting in Mombasa were relayed to an AU/OIE/FAO meeting in Cairo and to a Regional OIE Commission meeting in Khartoum within a period of six months.

6. Well targeted communications strategy

With the growing array of sites of influence and overlapping networks of advocates, AU/IBAR has had to develop a sophisticated communications strategy in support of its policy change work. Different audiences require different outputs in different formats. In communications one size definitely does not fit all. Thus, as the case studies have highlighted, the AU/IBAR team has produced a range of outputs in a range of different media.

Publications have ranged from strategic publication in key academic and professional journals, to short briefing papers, to consultancy reports, to books. Timing is often crucial: getting something out quickly and distributed - in English and French - can make all the difference. Making sure a briefing paper is at a key meeting and available to all participants may change the tenor of discussion and shift debate. A book or a peer-reviewed article can add weight and legitimacy to a position, especially when it is under attack. This was particularly successful when the paper on commodity-based trade in *The Veterinary Record* provoked both a very supportive editorial and a defensive rebuttal (case 5). Making sure mailing lists, and particularly e-mail lists, are up-to-date is an important, often underestimated, task. A good database allows targeted mailings, follow-up discussion and effective distribution. AU/IBAR's project also has gained exposure from its much visited website, which provides free access to numerous outputs and is well linked to other resources.

7. Opportunism and serendipity

Even the best laid plans go wrong. Sometimes new, wholly unexpected, opportunities arise; sometimes spontaneous, seemingly unconnected, actions or groups come together. Opportunism and serendipity are thus key aspects of any strategy. They are difficult to fit into fixed, formal plans or log-frames; administrators often are fearful of such apparent randomness; and donors are often reluctant to play along. Fortunately for the AU/IBAR project, this has not been the case over the past five years. Alongside the long-planned and well-prepared events and processes, AU/IBAR has shown an aptitude for opportunistically seizing particular policy moments or windows of opportunity as they have arisen to get policy messages on the agenda and argue for policy reform. For example:

- The instruction from the Ethiopian Prime Ministers office to the Ministry of Agriculture to formulate a strategy and structure for a centralised veterinary administration led to IBAR being consulted. Consequently an experienced CAPE staff member and consultant worked with the Department of Veterinary services and its stakeholders and a plan was formulated and presented within five weeks.
- Following the establishment of the new Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development in Kenya, IBAR staff met with the new Minister at an AU Summit. This led to a request for IBAR staff to advise senior officials from the Ministry on formulation of Kenyan livestock policy, strategy and objectives.

The small size of the AU/IBAR unit, the relative flexibility of its funding and the flexibility of its management has enhanced the capacity to respond in this way. This has been an enormous strength, and an important lesson when thinking about either replication or extension. Although in this document the main focus has been the AU/IBAR effort, of course they have not operated alone. Successes (and failures) must be attributed to a very diverse group. A small core team has been able to link up with many different partners - as consultants, trainers, co-implementers, joint authors, workshop participants and so on. This has meant the networks built around particular policy change areas have not been constrained. They could grow to fit the circumstances, and so be more effective, reaching people and places that other less flexible organisations could not. Although the project area was defined at the beginning as the 'Greater Horn of Africa', networks have reached to west, central and southern Africa, as well as international groups, making the ripple effect of policy change in one place spread outwards in opportunistic ways that were never imagined at the inception stage.

Ways forward?

What have been some of the key strengths of the approach adopted by AU/IBAR which we can draw from the case study experiences? How should this influence the way forward? We suggest four key factors:

- **Focus** - the project activities have focused on the livestock sub-sector and particularly veterinary service issues. This has been where the experience of its staff and immediate partners has lain. It has focused on one sub-region of the continent, although with significant spill-overs into other areas. It has thus been able to generate a critical mass, a momentum for debate and effective networking. This has been central to its success in policy and institutional change. With wider ambitions and expanded scope in the future, these lessons must be borne in mind when expanding either subject or geographical focus.
- **Field experience** - the linking between field experiences and policy change across scales has been a central feature of the AU/IBAR activities. Without a firm grasp of field realities the arguments for CAH systems or commodity-based trade could not be made so convincingly. Drawing on networks that range from CAHWs based in the remotest pastoral areas to policy-makers operating in the international arena has enriched and enhanced the capacity of AU/IBAR to influence change. A move away from the field towards the more rarefied settings of policy discussions in national capitals and international forums has its dangers. The origins and successes of the early phases of AU/IBAR's work must always be remembered.
- **Flexibility** - opportunism, serendipity and chance have all been important in the work of AU/IBAR as discussed above. This is based on a particular management and funding structure which recognises freedom and flexibility as a source of innovation and success. Agile, nimble, responsive and innovative have all been words used to describe the

AU/IBAR team. Such capacities should not be underestimated. There are many players in the agricultural policy area in Africa, and will no doubt be many more. But most are tied down by cumbersome bureaucracies, hierarchical management, inappropriate incentive systems and inflexible procedures. If it maintains its flexible approach, AU/IBAR can play an important role in liberating people from these settings - whether these are national governments or international organisations - to be more effective in policy change.

- **Follow-up** - commitment to seeing things through is a key lesson from the case study experiences described earlier. Very often a project, consultancy report or piece of research is not seen through. The results are not disseminated, the ideas not shared, the networks not built. The report sits lying on a shelf gathering dust, the initiative only a dim memory. AU/IBAR has been in a unique position to follow up, to link initiatives together and combine research with training with consultancy with policy advice with communications. This multi-faceted set of output-oriented activities is a key strength, and, again, central to the successes of AU/IBAR in policy and institutional change.

We would argue that all these four factors are essential to planning for the way forward. But what should be the emphasis of new activities? The recent work has established a rich agenda for the future. Many possible avenues could be pursued, and it is not for us to prescribe what these should be. However, building on the premise that next steps should always build on success and learn from failure, a few broad directions can be pointed to.

Relating lessons learned for the livestock sector to wider debates about agricultural policy change in Africa

Some of the generic lessons learned by AU/IBAR over the past few years have enormous relevance to wider questions being debated about the future of agriculture on the continent. With the implementation of NEPAD's Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), and firm links with the Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture, important questions arise about what shape a pro-poor approach to livestock - and indeed agricultural policy more broadly - should take: What are the fundamental trade-offs existing between market and export oriented strategies and poverty reduction and livelihood security? What are the indicators that define these? How can pro-poor efforts in the agricultural sector be more firmly linked into PRSP, budgeting and donor processes? What mechanisms can be developed that allow more voices - particularly of poorer, marginal livestock keepers - into the debate? And so on.

The AU/IBAR experience has provided both substantive insights into these debates in certain parts of Africa and has begun to explore processes and mechanisms for enhancing policy change. The challenge now is to both consolidate and expand this effort. This overarching concern suggests in turn three focal areas (among other candidates no doubt), building on the past work described in the case studies above.

- ***Linking livestock development to marketing and trade issues***
As the case studies above have explored, this linkage is an increasingly important, yet remarkably poorly elaborated, issue. Questions of SPS standards, marketing systems, product certification and so on are only just beginning to be discussed. These are issues where competencies of Ministries of Agriculture and Departments of Veterinary Services remain limited. Indeed, the debates are being so dominated by international trade and standards bodies, that there has been little opportunity for matching local realities with emerging requirements. Making the case for alternative approaches to standard setting and certification is a critical area in Africa, lest market opportunities for livestock - and other agricultural products - are lost. How should this be done, by whom and through

what channels? The AU is again in a unique position to facilitate the research, the policy debate and the subsequent policy advocacy in Africa's interests.

- **Livestock services: technology design, regulation and delivery issues**
AU/IBAR has made great headway in defining an agenda for privatised CAHWs as central to livestock delivery systems (case 1) and getting this approach accepted at international level (case 4). It has also encouraged the acceptance of alternative approaches to disease surveillance and research through participatory epidemiology (case 2). These initiatives have opened up an agenda for further policy and institutional change around the design of appropriate technologies for livestock areas (e.g. in the animal health area, new drugs or vaccines); the regulation of new products and new players (e.g. CAHWs, pharmaceutical products); and their delivery (e.g. private, public or partnerships; centralised or decentralised). AU/IBAR and its partners have substantial experience in these issues already. Expanding this geographically and engaging with new initiatives (e.g. veterinary service restructuring, drug/vaccine research, development and delivery) will be an important new challenge in the future.
- **Peace, security and development**
The experience of working on conflict issues and linking these with the delivery of much needed animal health services in the Karamojong Cluster (case 3) has highlighted a range of important issues for future work on peace building in Africa. With the continent so plagued by conflict of different types, practical, workable, field-based interventions that link building peace with building sustainable and secure livelihoods is essential. New challenges across the continent suggest a fruitful interaction between the AU's Department of Rural Economy and AU/IBAR and Peace and Security Department in the future.

Building capacity for understanding and influencing policy processes in Africa

AU/IBAR has found that the transition from a technically-focused approach to livestock development to one that encompasses a sophisticated approach to policy and institutional change (for example around any of the three areas highlighted above) requires substantial investments in capacity building. This has only just begun. To realise any of the ambitious goals listed above, this must be the first task. But capacity building is a term that trips of the tongue easily enough, but how, for who, and in what? The AU/IBAR experience highlights elements of a possible way forward.

Understanding the complexities of policy and institutional change in particular contexts, and being confident in approaches to influencing policy, at national and international levels, is not straightforward. Such skills related to understanding and confidence are not easily transferable. There are no neat and easy routines that can be followed. Choosing the right people to engage with is essential, as is the approach to training and capacity development. This has to be a hands-on, experience-led, practical approach. It must link with real issues of the moment, of tangible interest and importance to those involved; otherwise it will become yet another classroom-based training exercise. It must involve real field engagement and an opportunity to reflect, learn and share with a supportive group. Together with the Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex, UK, AU/IBAR has piloted such an approach with participants from ten countries in Africa. This first, small initiative, however, needs to be expanded and deepened to have lasting effect. Facilitating and convening this process, together with partners in Regional Economic Communities and member countries is an important future challenge for AU/IBAR and the AU Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture.