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AU-IBAR
The African Union/Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU/IBAR) is a specialist technical agency of the AU mandated by member states to promote livestock development in Africa. Based in Nairobi, Kenya, AU/IBAR implements major livestock development programmes including, amongst others, the Pan African Programme for the Control of Epizootics (PACE) and Farming in Tsetse Controlled Areas (FITCA).

The objectives of AU/IBAR are to:
- Co-ordinate activities of all AU member states in the field of livestock development
- Collect, collate and disseminate information in all aspects of livestock development
- Initiate, develop and execute livestock development projects
- Liaise with appropriate authorities of member states, regional groups, inter-governmental and international organisations.

For many years, AU/IBAR has been an African success story, attracting donor funds and providing technical and policy support to the AU’s member states, particularly state veterinary services. In the new millennium, the bureau understands that livestock issues are becoming increasingly complex due to forces such as globalisation, rapid technological advances and the demands of stakeholders. Stakeholders at all levels are becoming more vocal, influential and now demand to be involved in governance, priority setting, financing and evaluation of development interventions. AU/IBAR provides effective responses by having a clear vision of its direction, policy and strategies.

IPST
The Institutional and Policy Support Team (IPST) is the successor to the ‘Community-based Animal Health and Participatory Epidemiology (CAPE) Unit’ in AU/IBAR. The CAPE Unit’s policy work focused on primary animal health care in Africa. The Institutional and Policy Support Team (IPST) was formed in July 2004 to address a broader range of key policy issues affecting the livestock sub-sector and strengthen the capacity of AU partners in the policy reform process. Our key partners are Regional Economic Communities in Africa, AU member states and relevant international standard setting agencies. Approaches that promote direct interaction between livestock keepers and policy makers are central to our work. The new IPST also assists government to implement existing policies, most commonly through better public-private sector partnerships. This includes working with government to fully implement privatization policies in the livestock sub-sector.

IDS
The Institute of Development Studies based at the University of Sussex in the UK is an internationally-renowned centre for research and teaching on development, established in 1966. It is a self-funding institute with experience of policy relevant research and training on a range of development issues.

IDS researchers and collaborating partners have long experience of working on policy issues in Africa, including livestock and pastoral policy. IDS has been a leader in applied research on pastoralism and livestock development, including long-standing work on rangeland management, crop-livestock integration, drought contingency planning and pastoral institutions. IDS has more recently been working in East Africa on how to ensure pastoralists get a say in policymaking, exploring ways of making policy more inclusive and participatory.

This work has been set within a broader set of concerns about the relationships between livelihoods, institutions and policies. Work on institutions and uncertainty, environmental entitlements and sustainable livelihoods has provided conceptual and empirical insights into these issues. Related to this has been a concern to understand policy processes and how they unfold in practice. This has highlighted the linkage between science and policy and the politics of policymaking in different contexts.
## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AU-IBAR</td>
<td>African Union Interamerican Bureau for Animal Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSE</td>
<td>Bovine Spongiform Encephalitis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAH</td>
<td>Community-based animal health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAHW</td>
<td>Community-based animal health worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPE</td>
<td>Community-based Animal Health and Participatory Epidemiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBPP</td>
<td>Contagious bovine pleuropneumonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBT</td>
<td>Commodity based trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMESA</td>
<td>Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC</td>
<td>East African Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMD</td>
<td>Foot-and-mouth disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross domestic product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDS</td>
<td>Institute of Development Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGAD</td>
<td>Intergovernmental authority on development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPST</td>
<td>Institutional and Policy Support Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KVA</td>
<td>Kenya Veterinary Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIE</td>
<td>World Animal Health Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>Pan-African Programme for the Control of Epizootics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLP</td>
<td>Pastoralist Livelihoods Programme of AU-IBAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>Regional Economic Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADC</td>
<td>Southern African Development Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Introduction** This report describes a pilot training programme on policy processes for veterinary services in Africa targeted at middle to senior level public sector livestock and animal health technocrats. The pilot training programme ran between September 2004 and February 2005 and was a collaborative venture between the Institutional and Policy Support Team (IPST) of the African Union-Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) and the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) at the University of Sussex, UK.

The training initiative consisted of three phases:
1. Understanding policy processes: a training workshop held in Mombasa, Kenya from 20th to 22nd September 2004.
2. Case study analysis of a particular policy process by individual course participants (October to December 2004).

**Objective**
At the completion of this training cycle the objective was for the participants to:
- have a conceptual understanding of policy processes
- be familiar with a series of tools used to analyse policies
- be able to apply their enhanced understanding of policy processes and analytical tools in a case study and thereafter in the course of day to day work.

**Background**
It is increasingly recognised that a major constraint to delivery of effective and sustainable animal health services and facilitation of livestock trade in Africa is getting the institutional and policy framework right. Even the best technical solutions will fail to achieve their intended purposes unless institutional and policy issues are also addressed.

In Africa today the contexts for livestock management and trade are changing fast: increasing sedentarisation and integration of livestock with cropping systems, highly skewed patterns of often absentee ownership, changing herd/flock structures, increasing demand for meat, milk and eggs from urban markets, and changing movement patterns. All these trends shape the way livestock and animal health are both thought about and managed. At the same time, service delivery systems and veterinary care arrangements, often designed in the colonial era or with large-scale commercial systems in mind, may not be the most appropriate today, or may have already broken down. And trade regimes and their associated consumer, public and animal health requirements and standards for marketing and export are increasingly defining the way livestock are integrated in local, national and international economies.

National disease status places enormous constraints on trade possibilities. African countries currently earn about $1 billion from the export of livestock commodities although they spend three times this amount to import the same: every year the continent loses US$2.2 billion on imports of livestock commodities and this deficit is slowly increasing. African exports of livestock commodities account for less than 2% of the total value of world trade in these commodities. But without a stable market for livestock commodities and a larger share of world trade, many African countries cannot face the challenge of growing poverty and food security, let alone meet the
Millennium Development Goals of halving the proportion of people experiencing poverty and hunger by 2015.

For all these reasons, animal health and disease control – and veterinary science more broadly – must today be thought about in a different way. Understanding the interaction between the scientific and institutional/policy domains in the African livestock context is essential. Policies and institutions govern the way different people gain access to resources and facilities, including veterinary services, drugs, vaccines, capital for investment, license to trade and tax breaks. Understanding how they work, and how and by whom they are shaped and developed should help in encouraging a more focused, effective, efficient and – critically - pro-poor framework for development.

As a first step to increasing capacity in this important area, the African Union–Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resource's (AU-IBAR's) new Institutional and Policy Support Team (IPST) initiated a pilot training programme in collaboration with the UK’s Institute for Development Studies (IDS at the University of Sussex). Financial support for the initiative was provided by the UK’s Department for International Development. The pilot phase targeted middle and senior level public sector animal health and livestock professionals from eight eastern, central and southern African countries. It consisted of three main components: an initial workshop, individual case studies and a follow-up workshop.

The participants
Participants in this pilot training programme came from eastern, central and southern African countries (Ethiopia, Kenya, Namibia, Tanzania, Uganda, South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe; additional participants from Botswana and Sudan attended only the first workshop) who were all middle to senior level public sector livestock and animal health professionals. They were joined by staff members and consultants from AU-IBAR's IPST. The training programme was principally facilitated by two staff members from IDS, Professor Ian Scoones and Dr William Wolmer.

The Mombasa workshop: understanding policy processes (September 2004)
In the introductory session participants highlighted their expectations of the training programme. Many of these, unsurprisingly, focused on gaining a better understanding of policy processes, development of policy analysis skills and learning how to bring about policy change. In addition they highlighted some of their experiences with, and thoughts and concerns about, policy processes. These included:

'I thought all I had to do was explain the science and all would change – I was wrong'

'Policy says something and implementation on the ground is something else. How do you reconcile these?'

'We’ve seen government policy change but it is slow. Seeing things on the ground helps change policy'

'Governments used to run everything but they are now shrinking. What should we do now?'

'The seeing is believing method helps change policy'

'When we started the veterinary services we had a lot of subsidies but now we must get the community to take some of the burden'
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‘There are so many interests around policy. It's like moving a big wheel. It's a long struggle.’

‘The challenge is to balance the interests of cattle producers with the need for an animal health policy being maintained.’

‘Trade issues are becoming more and more important but they are new. Our bosses don't know what to do.’

‘Where there is not policy you can actually do quite a lot … government is stopping things getting done.’

‘Enabling things to get done requires a good understanding of constraints and of the way governments work.’

‘Without enabling policies you can only do so much a the field level’

‘We have influenced policy. But with hindsight how could we have done it better?’

‘We have learned that stakeholder involvement in policy processes is essential’

‘I have mostly been an end-user of poverty. Sometimes I have even been consulted.’

Participants' experience varied from field-level implementation to national and international level policy formulation but there was universal recognition that ‘policy mattered’. But what is policy? And how does it change? This was the focus of the first training workshop, the content of which is summarised below.

**Mombasa workshop content**

The Mombasa workshop started from the basics by considering: what is policy? Both a conventional definition as well as a variety of alternative ones was provided. The concept that policy making was not a rational process but rather a dynamic, messy and, above all, political process was introduced. Having defined policy the participants were next introduced to policy processes. It was emphasised that there are always overlapping and competing agendas and that there may not be complete agreement among stakeholders over what is the really important policy problem. The idea was introduced that policies are ‘framed’, i.e. boundaries are drawn around problems, including some issues/interests and excluding others.

Three key concepts/tools were introduced that facilitate analysis and understanding of policy processes:

- **policy narratives** (stories with a beginning, middle and end that describe events, or define the world in certain ways, and that shape policy decisions)
- **actors/networks**
- **politics/interests**

The reasons why some narratives (‘received wisdoms’) stick with great tenacity, despite contrary perspectives and practices were examined. These included that they suit certain political interests, are easily communicated and become embedded in particular institutional structures or actor-network groups.

The example of BSE in the UK was used to examine how narratives can be used by governments to suppress debate. This led to a wider consideration of how politics shapes policy processes.
It was explained how understanding policy processes through an examination of knowledge/narratives, actors/networks and politics/interests can help with identifying ‘policy spaces’. For example, the articulation of alternative narratives is possible where there is a weakness in the articulation of a dominant narrative. This in turn requires identification of spaces within networks (spaces to join networks or key actors in networks that can be enrolled into an alternative network).

Six types of policy spaces were identified:

- **Invited spaces** [e.g. consultations on policy led by government agencies involving selective participation of stakeholders]
- **Popular spaces** [e.g. protests, demonstrations led by social movements put pressure on formal policymaking]
- **Practical spaces** [e.g. pilot field based projects initiated by NGOs/fieldworkers, providing opportunities for ‘witnessing’ by policymakers]
- **Bureaucratic spaces** [e.g. formal policymaking spaces within the government bureaucracy/legal system, led by government civil servants with selected input from external experts]
- **Electoral/political spaces** [e.g. formal participation in electoral system allows voting on policy position of competing candidates]
- **Conceptual spaces** [or discursive spaces, e.g. where new ideas are introduced into debate, and circulated through various media]

After receiving a grounding in the basics of policy and policy processes, and equipped with some appropriate tools, participants considered key policy issues relevant in their home countries or regions. Across regions and countries some common issues emerged:

- **Poverty/livelihoods**: how do livestock contribute to poverty reduction and livelihood enhancement? Is this through trade, or local on-farm production? Or both? What is the role of livestock in contributing to food security strategic objectives?
- **Post/pre-land reform**: what are the priorities of livestock owners in settings that have recently undergone land reform? Are these the same as in the pre-land reform setting?
- **Settlement/movement**: How can policy accommodate the need for livestock movement? What is the role of settlement policy in this regard, and how can this be squared with the challenges of ensuring a vibrant livestock sector?
- **Foreign exchange/markets/trade**: How can livestock contribute to increased trade with foreign exchange earning opportunities? How does this focus match with a poverty/food security objective?
- **Land use**: What are the implications for land use of different visions of livestock development? How are livestock to be integrated with cropping, wildlife management or (peri)urban development?

Using the example of the foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) outbreak in the UK in 2001, the roles of science, uncertainty and risk in relation to policy was considered and discussed.

On the final day of the first workshop participants selected topics for individual policy analysis case studies, which they completed between October and December 2004. Case studies were selected that fell into a number of thematic groupings:

- **Disease focus** – control policies, prioritisation of diseases etc.
- **Trade/marketing focus** – export oriented or informal/local community-based etc.
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- **Organisational focus** – restructuring, centralisation/decentralisation etc.
- **Delivery focus** – CAHWs vs professionals, privatisation, willingness to pay etc.
- **International focus** – donor policies, OIE, RECs, African harmonisation etc.

In preparing the case studies a number of different techniques were applied:
- **Sampling** – from a range of different actors to elicit different perspectives.
- **Historical** – time-depth; how does the past affect the present? What are the cycles of policy interest?
- **Triangulation** – cross-checking results with different methodologies; comparing different perspectives.
- **Critical (self) reflection** – recognising that the analyst is also an actor, with views of their own

**Case study titles**
The following were the titles of case studies selected by the Mombasa workshop participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adela Mroso</td>
<td>What are the policy processes around Newcastle disease control for traditional poultry keepers in Tanzania?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alec Bishi</td>
<td>Understanding the Policy Processes Involved in the Expansion of the Foot and Mouth Disease Free Zone of Namibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Tembo</td>
<td>CCBP control in Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Catley</td>
<td>Where This Is No Policy: the case of developmental relief in the livestock sub-sector in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asegid Shiferaw</td>
<td>Trade of Livestock and Livestock Products, Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berhanu Admassu</td>
<td>Understanding the Policy process on regulation of veterinary professional and para-professionals in Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Mvula</td>
<td>Understanding the Organisational Rearrangement in the Provision of Animal Health Services in Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin Thompson*</td>
<td>Politics of policy at the OIE (tbc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Gitau</td>
<td>Rinderpest control policy in Kenya and current status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kasirye</td>
<td>Challenges associated with rolling out Community Animal Health Service Providers in marginal areas in Uganda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Iles*</td>
<td>Training methodology in development of CAH services: the case of Southern Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidanemariam Awoke</td>
<td>Centralization or decentralization implications on Animal Health services in Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moerane Rebone</td>
<td>Analysis of the policy on the control of Avian Influenza disease in the Republic of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohamed Abdel Razig*</td>
<td>Understanding constraints to improve livestock marketing and export in the Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poncho Mokaila</td>
<td>Bovine Brucellosis Eradication Scheme in South Africa, why is the battle not won yet?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulualem Tarekegne</td>
<td>Assessing the policy process of veterinary privatization in Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo Mapitse*</td>
<td>An analysis of Newcastle Disease control policy in poultry, Botswana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Aberdare workshop: strategies for policy change (February 2005)
The Aberdare workshop focused on presentations of and discussions around the individual policy process case studies that participants had worked on since the Mombasa workshop. The workshop also included:

- A presentation by IPST on pro-poor policy research findings
- Exercises and discussions on strategies to change policy
- Consideration of what next?
- Evaluation of the training programme and self-assessments of individual's progress

Presentation: Pro-poor policy research findings and conclusions
This IPST study on policy and institutional issues and poverty for the livestock sector covered five countries in eastern Africa: Ethiopia, Kenya, Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda. However, based on these results and the institutional knowledge gathered by AU-IBAR over many years, the researchers believed that the findings of the study reflect the status of policy and institutional change issues in the whole of Africa.

The main conclusions of the study were:

- There is a need to:
  - enable adequate grassroots consultations to ensure proper participation of the poor in policy making
  - create in-country awareness on the need for pro-poor policies and the need for the involvement of the poor
  - build the capacity of grassroots organizations to advocate for poor livestock keepers and in the dissemination of relevant information.
- Support is required in capacity building of government on policy making and policy making processes.
- There is a need to put in place a pro-poor and pro-livestock institutional framework that will enable policy review, formulation, harmonization and implementation.
- The capacities of partners to utilize a livelihoods approach needs to be built in order to identify key policy and institutional constraints affecting the use of livestock in poverty reduction.
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- Institutional analysis of key partners (government structures and definition of core functions) needs to be done in order to effect the institutional and policy changes required.
- There is need to establish government/private sector linkages as well as broader stakeholder participation in implementation of livestock programmes and projects.
- AU-IBAR as an international technical and policy organ of the AU is willing to work and collaborate at a regional level to support pro-poor policy and institutional development for Africa’s livestock sub-sector.

Key points from the discussion following the presentation were:
In South Africa it was a big challenge to convince government to understand pro-poor policy – they were used to thinking only about the commercial livestock sector. A big change is needed to adopt a pro-poor focus.

The process of involving all voices in a policy development process is expensive. Can it be speeded up, made more practical and realistic? Extensive consultations put pressure on limited resources and financial allocations

Output/return from the livestock sector is usually slower and considered less attractive than from crops, so crops are usually favoured by politicians.

In Tanzania policy is often regarded as something ‘high’ with no link between policy and poor people. The poor are not part of the policy process and people tend to be content with this situation, so there is a need to educate communities as to how policy development can affect them.

The livestock sector is already underfinanced and given less attention by policy makers. Why fragment its funds further by addressing separately pro-poor and commercial livestock farmers’ interests?

The problem is not always with policy; implementation of the policy can be the problem. If the implementers are stuck in traditional mind-set, this makes it difficult to bring about change even with a clear policy edict from above. It is not enough just to change policy, but also the mechanisms, rules, organisations – the cogs in the wheels of policy change.

Implementation is the biggest problem; pro-poor policies are not backed up by adequate human and financial resources.

The poor are sometimes reluctant to give information during consultations, e.g. they may be worried about tax implications.

The poor are usually not aware of the options available or what they can demand from policy makers. Also policy makers don’t know what is happening at grassroots. There is a two-way lack of information and a massive disconnect between information and power.

Good policies in one area may be contradicted by, for example, the prevailing land tenure policy, illustrating the need to ‘join-up’ policy areas.

Sometimes there is a need to target policy on a regional basis within a country, e.g. in the rangelands the mainstay is livestock but the situation is very different in tea growing areas.
POLICY PROCESSES FOR VETERINARY SERVICES IN AFRICA

It is not just a matter of limitations of existing policies but also in some cases total absence of policies.

The expression ‘pro-poor’ is often used. But the importance of livestock for the overall economy can be different to securing livelihoods. There are likely to be trade-offs and the criteria used for measuring success will vary:

- Overall economy: livestock contribution to GDP, forex earnings, tax revenues, etc. Growth in GDP can have trickle impact for the poor but may not.
- Livelihoods: criteria for impact on the poor (who survive on less than $1 day), providing the types of services and products of interest to the poor, e.g. draft power, chickens.

Trade-offs between different objectives need not necessarily be either/or - they can be both/and.

Debate around policy options is a political one.

Case studies
To encourage frank and open analysis of policy processes – and recognising some may contain sensitive information and opinions - it was agreed that the detailed case study papers and presentations would not be circulated beyond the workshop participants. However a number of recurrent themes and issues emerged:

There is often considerable scientific uncertainty about a livestock or animal health issues which, when combined with political and commercial interests/pressures, makes it very hard to know what to do.

Polarisation/conflict of interests between large-scale commercial and livelihood focused livestock production.

Vaccination or slaughter policies.

Appropriate types of vaccines, e.g. cold chain dependent or thermostable.

Full-cost or subsidised services/disease control programmes.

Consultation across ministries, producers and vets: what does this entail? What are the practical policy spaces? How can the debates be convened to resolve these trade-offs.

Disease prioritisation: what's important, for whom, where and when?

Disease outbreaks: disease dynamics affect policy (‘after outbreaks the consultants arrive’) and policy processes.

Disease control solutions sometimes emerge as a ‘coincidence of interests’ between, e.g. private vets, donors and vaccine manufacturers.

‘Lines and sieves’: is quarantine and movement control realistic? Movement control does works but is it manageable? It is subject to great pressures and strains: refugees, powerful individuals, corrupt police, illegal trade, drought movements, nomadic systems.
Regional cross-border politics of disease control: endemism or eradication; disease free zones or commodity-based trade; cross-border control v national control.

Making choices: ‘pro-poor’ (fundamental policy trade-offs). May be compatible or incompatible: commercial/export or livelihoods (pastoralism – impacted by policies other than disease control, e.g. trade, land reform)

Eradication paradigm – what is likelihood of success?

Wildlife – livestock interaction: epidemiological; land-use options, changing market conditions; high cost of disease control. Consideration of wildlife introduces new actor networks

Zoonoses: new risks/fears in global markets; new networks: Ministries of Health, WHO, new political and public pressures on vet services.

Vaccine uptake/coverage and delivery systems: vaccine development and capacity/options for delivery.

Commercialisation of vaccine delivery: consequences – public money affecting nature of emergence of these markets.

Tactics and strategies for changing policies
Participants shared their experiences of influencing policy change. This resulted in the following list of tactics and strategies, categorised by type of policy space:

Conceptual spaces
Research findings
Data, statistics and assessments
Publish papers on proposed policy in scientific journals
Develop a sound, logical scientific argument and basis for new policy
Responding to questionnaires
Before bringing the proposed policy to the wider public, bounce ideas to experts
Use external expertise to assist preparation of proposal
Clearly research and identify the target group to which to deliver the argument
Quote other important, influential people
Influencing consultants ‘after hours’
Present ideas to policy makers via the Veterinary Association (legitimacy)
Learn the ‘official language’ and use it

Bureaucratic spaces
Lobbying interest groups
Lobby peers
Informal lobbying/priming of key players
Internal champion
Get the boss to relay new ideas and to get praise for it
Encourage networkers and facilitators
Write proposals at request of policy makers
Inform higher officials about the issue
Use government vets to present ideas to government
As KVA Executive influenced policy on whether Kenya needs CAHWs
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Invited spaces
- Arrange stakeholder meetings
- Negotiate in meetings
- Workshops, conferences, seminars, meetings
- Gatecrashing other people’s meetings and hijack agenda
- Influence/write opening speech
- Videos in workshop to introduce stakeholders’ opinions
- Avoid resolutions being made at the same meeting at which new ideas are presented or developed
- Present topical papers at workshops
- Get official blessing – write the speech
- Negotiate in meetings
- Clear recommendations by committee/rapporteur
- Written comments on draft documents

Popular spaces
- Audio/tv
- Shows
- Protest
- Armed struggle
- Balloting
- Petition
- Banners
- Posters
- Radio programmes for target groups
- Joining change agent movements and actively being involved
- Participate in membership organisations, e.g. farmers’ fora

Practical spaces
- Pilot project
- Case studies
- Study tours

Chaotic and opportunistic spaces
- Timing: key moments

Political spaces
- Informal lobbying of politicians
- Referendums
- Balloting
- Invite politicians to our office to understand issues better
- Identify and lobby politicians who control the budget
- Encourage beneficiaries to contact politicians directly

Open spaces
- Informal networks
- Class mates
- Drinking partners, etc

Illegal spaces
- Bribery
- Cheat in workshop ranking exercises
Discussion
Few practical spaces were identified in the above exercise. With considerable scientific uncertainty surrounding many issues it is useful to try out something new. Clearly this is rarely done, most likely due to lack of funding; it is difficult to get government funding for something out of the ordinary. More often this is done by NGOs or groups/individuals on the edge. As more donor support is going to budgetary support, rather than via projects, it is likely to become even harder to get money for such innovative, risky work.

‘Participation’ was not mentioned explicitly on any of the cards. There is a lot of talk about participation/consultation but, as observed previously, it is easier said than done, and easy to ignore.

If one understands policy processes one can identify where the opportunities are what the alternative narratives might be and what tactics and strategies to employ: alliances, new stories, influencing political interests, etc.

For chaotic/opportunistc spaces could include droughts and other natural or manmade disasters. In these situations the norms often don’t apply – there is a pressing need for speedy responses.

Some of the best examples of CAH systems have happened where there is no government, in the absence of any regulations, i.e. an opportunistic space. Another example of an opportunistic space could be when you hear a meeting is taking place and just turning up.

AU-IBAR works in different countries and uses different approaches to influence policy. Rarely is just one approach used. More often a basket of complementary approaches is used. Some won’t work, so it is more effective to use different methods simultaneously. As the new political order is established in Southern Sudan it will be challenge to maintain the process of innovation. In Zimbabwe, with the new agricultural order, this is a key time for policy innovation and new thinking.

It is important to package information appropriately for policymakers, e.g. two page summary briefing paper with an interesting photograph rather than a 200 page report. Communication skills are very important; information is presented in many different ways for different audiences, from scientific paper through to more popular formats.

The emphasis is often on elite expertise. But how do you bring in new stakeholders, test out the basis and effectiveness of a new narrative? How can you link new ideas emerging from research with a broader more participatory process? Unfortunately there is no easy answer.

Questioning the legitimacy of an organisation can be useful, e.g. in some countries veterinary associations are small, elitist groups that don’t solicit opinions from or represent the wider veterinary community.

If you want to bring about change you must be part of the minority who speaks out and is heard.

Field visits for groups of parliamentarians have effectively raised profile of pastoralist and livestock issues.

Policy change examples
Three contrasting policy change stories were presented:
1. Tanzanian reforms of state veterinary services: decentralisation
The sequence of tactics and strategies used to bring about policy change in relation to decentralisation of veterinary services in Tanzania included:

- A literature review to identify gaps
- Identification of the target group
- Research
- Development of a new model - decentralisation
- Establishment of pilot in four districts
- Study tours to pilots
- Report on pilots
- Workshops at different levels
- Stakeholder conference – all players: to achieve ownership
- Involvement of different media, e.g. radio spots, to publicise acceptance of decentralised approach
- Findings adopted as guidelines
- Feedback on reform to national level

Discussion
What is a workshop for? In this case there were a series of workshops for information sharing at different levels and to build stakeholder ownership. But workshops often have too much emphasis on presenting data and not enough on building networks. The latter often happens mainly during the breaks.

The commodity based trade concept was first presented at a workshop. But often workshop conveners try to reach too far in a workshop. If try to force decisions prematurely can get very conservative/mild consensus.

How can interactions between very different groups, such as small-scale farmers and the elite, be made effective? Workshops are a useful tool but, like all tools, have limitations and are not an end in themselves. They can be fora for following up issues, presenting information, critiquing issues, etc, and they may need complementing with other methods. Tanzania has the advantage of one national language but in other countries, such as Ethiopia, different groups of pastoralists can not communicate with each other, and simultaneous translation is practically impossible in local languages. Short videos interview of farmers and pastoralists, perhaps supplemented with posters of images and sound bites taken from the videos, can be used as an effective way of presenting their opinions at workshops or meetings.

Workshops don’t have to be formal, e.g. they can take place in field settings.

Participants often come to workshops with preconceived opinions. To facilitate a process of open deliberation the design of the workshop is key, as is a good understanding of underlying dynamics.

Workshops are now fashionable. There is a danger of ‘workshop fatigue’.

2. Agriculture in Northern Cape, South Africa
Prior to 1994, agriculture was not taken seriously in the Northern Cape. The emphasis was all on mining. After the 1994 elections more emphasis was placed on social rather than economic development. The change of political leadership in the Province offered an opportunity to change the Province’s Growth and Development Strategy. The new key politicians were identified and invited to visit agricultural
projects. Also time was spent with consultants after office hours, offering input and ideas. The result is that now agriculture is regarded as main driver of development in the Province. The proposals for agriculture in the Province were framed so at to be in line with the as yet unlaunched growth and development strategy, which was a great advantage and led to a higher budgetary allocation than would otherwise have been made.

**Discussion**
Seeing the bigger picture of policy beyond your narrow sectoral interest is important.

In this case, when political statements were made, opportunities were quickly identified for agricultural proposals which were then fed back to politicians.

How to deal with consultants in regard to policy making? Clear ToRs for consultants are important. Most consultants think that the bigger report, the better and they all need information. If you can supply them with well prepared, electronic copies of documents they may include them in their reports. Consultants often have preconceived opinions.

Relative ease of access of people from bureaucratic spaces to political spaces varies. It is usually easier at provincial level.

3. **Commodity based trade**
The factors influencing the development of the concept of commodity based trade (CBT) in livestock and livestock products included:

- The PACE project’s perceived lack of a ‘pulling force’
- Donors increasingly thinking about trade
- The increased prominence being given to disease free zones and concern that these would be difficult to establish and manage.

The idea for CBT was initially bounced of key scientists. Gradually more people came to think the same way. Various meeting were used to raise awareness about CBT and prior to meetings attempts were made to influence the key player. At a major livestock meeting Egypt, CBT was mentioned in the opening speech as a possible way forward which increased its acceptability.

When new ideas such as CBT are introduced at meeting, don’t expect an immediate resolution to be passed. Allow time for the idea to take root and then hold a follow-up workshop. Don’t push too hard initially.

A scientific paper explaining the scientific basis of CBT was published in the Veterinary Record which gave the idea legitimacy. After publication the paper can be referred to; it is no longer just a ‘crazy idea’. Informal lobbying of veterinary services took place which gained support in various ‘power blocks’. Also a two-page policy briefing paper was produced, targeted at policy makers. No use has been made to date of popular spaces.

CBT is still just an idea – it is not yet implementable. For this it is necessary for OIE to develop technical guidelines.

A key factor in gaining support for CBT was the fact that the originator of the idea (the champion) was well placed as an employee of an international organisation who personally knew many of the key players.
Discussion
CBT is a global policy process with many diverse actors and entrenched interests, which makes it very challenging.

Increasingly national level officials have to engage at the international level. This involves different ways of working and different rules and norms apply. Knowledge is needed of how the international systems operate, which is a capacity building challenge.

CBT is in the conceptual space (it is an idea), but it has to move beyond this if it is to have impact: to bureaucratic space, political space, etc. Need to combine spaces – start in one but then move to other spaces.

In policy processes a variety of ideas are discussed and the ones that don’t make sense can be filtered out. But the right one may not always be selected.

Financial benefits and cost implications of alternatives are part of the bureaucratic space. However, cost-benefit analysis not an entirely rational tool. It can be manipulated, e.g. by adding in more costs.

The way forward for the policy process training initiative
Berhanu Admassu of IPST first explained how this initiative came about before describing how AU-IBAR sees the way forward.

AU-IBAR initiated training in policy processes following on from its experience of implementing technical programmes, especially concerning primary animal health care in the Horn of Africa. It increasingly realised that policy and institutional change was critical – often the decisive factor for sustainability. It therefore started to engage in policy processes and institutional change and had some success, e.g. for community-based animal health services regulatory frameworks were developed and legislative change initiated. In some countries AU-IBAR has facilitated the establishment of CAH Units in the relevant Ministries to oversee and standardise requirements.

Following consultation with senior policy makers in 2004, and the adoption of a new AU agricultural strategy, AU-IBAR now want to increase capacity through training in policy processes. A major output of the new IPST is to help develop regional and national organisations which are able to develop effective policies.

AU-IBAR considers that the pilot training initiative has gone well. Now IBAR wants to further test and refine the training approach, to run more such courses, and to build capacity of both AU members and regional bodies. This supports the strategy of the AU which is to facilitate integration of African countries through Regional Economic Communities (RECs), such as EAC, IGAD, COMESA, SADAEC, etc.

In future IPST will also focus on additional issues such as privatisation and public-private partnerships, working with RECs which are able to design and implement pro-poor policies in the livestock sector. Participants were urged to go and convey what they had learned to policy makers and friends and colleagues in academia, research and animal health service delivery systems. Meanwhile IPST will refine and test the training methodologies at the next, higher level.

Participants’ views of the training initiative
At the start of the Mombasa workshop, participants listed nearly 50 expectations of the training process they were about to embark upon. Many of these concerned
gaining better understanding of policy processes and learning from other countries’ experiences.

At the end of the Aberdare workshop, participants were invited to comment on the training experience. Suggested improvements to training process included:

- Still not clear what is pro-poor policy, who are the poor and how to help them
- Not clear how to embrace all the stakeholders
- More critical feedback should have been provided by the facilitators on the case studies; not sure if did the right thing.
- Public-private partnerships were not covered.

Other comments made during the wrap-up session included:

In future IPST won’t just be doing training. It will identify key policy areas and help the actors apply these skills, knowledge and approaches.

Role of political economy in policy making. During the training process didn’t talk about incentives. It is useful to understand incentives and rewards, e.g. people are not usually rewarded for coming up with great ideas but rather for maintaining the status quo.

It was useful to discover what other countries are going through in regard to policy changes. This helps us to appreciate our own situation and see the bigger picture.

It will be critical to have effective follow-up with the current delegates: how are they doing after the course? How are they analysing policy processes? This will help develop the training methodology. It will also be useful to identify certain policies that are applicable at the regional level, e.g. SADC.

There needs to be a follow-up to build on the theoretical knowledge gained and move to practical application. This could include identifying policy gaps and building up mentoring programmes between IBAR and individual trainees. The measure of success of the training initiative should be the number of policies influenced; specific goals should be identified with a defined timeframe.

The training has been useful. It has broadened understanding of policy processes and integration of policy spaces to effect change.

How will IBAR continue to support the participants?

Policy formulation is not easy! Previously thought it was just a matter of writing but now realise there is more to it than that and that policy change can only come about where/when there are policy spaces.

Used to get very frustrated when I couldn’t get things going – but now realise process not easy. If not successful at first, then this is just part of the process. Learning what is happening in, for example Ethiopia and South Africa was useful. Used to think they were totally different to South Africa – but now realise there are both similarities and differences. There are areas where they might be doing things better.
What is pro-poor? At the macroeconomic level in Uganda things are improving, GDP is increasing, but the purchasing power of the ordinary person in Uganda is getting worse.

'I came with an open mind. But previously I thought I was not within the policy making system, that policy issues were not my concern. I appreciate now that I am a potential 'space' in the policy system. There are lots of issues from which I can generate a lot of policy change. I have realised my potential. Lots of administrators don't know about policy processes and issues either. The same policies go around from beginning so clearly no-one has appreciated need for policy change, e.g. keep vaccinating. With the policy analysis technique I can now consider all the options. The training experience has shifted me to a high ladder. '

'This is my second training on policy processes. Previously I attended a 10-day course in Ethiopia. After the first training nothing came into my vision. But after this training I can visualising trade-offs, actors, etc. And in doing the case study I learned so many things. Although feedback was not given by the facilitators, through the presentation and discussion of the other case studies I know what I did well and what I did not do well.'

'Before the Mombasa workshop I thought policies were made by politicians. Now I realise there are so many policy spaces. In my position I will try to push what will be important policies for agricultural development in Ethiopia. Now I realise policy is a dynamic process with many actors and that the stakeholders are an important aspect. As the case studies were presented I saw some similarities and some differences with Ethiopia, for example related to different production systems.'

IPST and IBAR needs to be known beyond eastern Africa, for example in southern Africa.

'The training experience has energised me to push some policy issues using these tools and tactics to bring about change. Now we need similar training held in Ethiopia.'

'Even within IBAR, many people who work on policy don’t have a good understanding of policy processes, so there is a need to train IBAR staff.'

This workshop has reconfirmed the critical role of policy.

'This is my first training on policy processes. I have learned something new that was not previously part of my professional skills. But how to integrate policies and practical implementation. Often implementation is wanting.'

'Role of private sector is important. For example IBAR’s PLP project has linked traders in the Horn of Africa with those in the Middle East, together with respective governments to see how livelihoods of poor pastoralists can be improved.

Need to extend training initiative to include West Africa.

Comments from the facilitators, Ian Scoones and Will Woolmer
The case studies were critical to the learning process, but we underestimated the amount of time needed to provide individual feedback and advice, although this was
compensated for in part by e-mail follow-up to the concept notes. But it would have been good to provide more individual feedback during the workshop. However, collective learning of the whole group worked well. Participants have learned from each other and could now do the case studies better. The case studies should be regarded as works in progress.

There is inevitably a trade-off between depth and breadth of the subjects covered. In this training process we went for breadth rather than depth. Next should go for country/regionally focused groups engaged in common policies – to achieve tangible policy change. We are keen for IDS to continue being involved with IPST and the individual participants.

Unfortunately there is no neat policy training package; no four-step process to influence policy – only broad conceptual tools. Training in this area is not an easy thing to deliver.

It was intriguing to see how ‘sticky’ some narratives are, e.g. the seemingly universal desire to ‘graduate’ to European focused export, cost of achieving. Narratives are a simple concept to talk about but it is hard to be objective and step outside one’s own policy narratives, to think objectively what other actor networks are saying. In the case study actor networks presented here, one person mentioned a named individual. It is essential to know where and with whom power lies, e.g. within your own veterinary departments.

**Closing remarks on behalf of IPST**

The exchange of information and learning from other participants was good. Gives us hope that participants will utilise their training. Sometimes there are no policies or policies are hangovers from colonial era. You are resource people, who we can now link with to bring about change.

Networking, exchanging ideas and experiences, should continue. We all have e-mail addresses, so should communicate and regularly update each other. We need coherent, pro-poor policies in Africa. IPST is for all of Africa – we have addressed eastern and southern first due to their common language. See website [www.cape-ibar.org](http://www.cape-ibar.org) for more information on IPST.

There are many contentious issues concerning livestock and livestock product trade. Policy processes show us the need to consider all stakeholders.

IPST is very happy. We have learned a lot from you, which will be useful to IBAR in the future. And don’t forget IBAR is here to assist you.

The workshop closed with a vote of thanks delivered on behalf of the participants.
Self-evaluation by participants
Participants evaluated their individual progress as a result of the training programme. They were asked to plot their status against a 10-point scale both before and after the training initiative. The four bar charts below show the average scores for four parameters for the 14 participants who completed the programme (in the following order):

- My understanding of policy processes was/is now
- My policy analysis skills were/are now
- My knowledge of strategies for bringing about policy change was/is now
- My appreciation of pro-poor policy issues was/is now
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