



**IGAD CENTRE FOR PASTORAL AREAS AND
LIVESTOCK DEVELOPMENT (ICPALD)**

IGAD REGION SANITARY AND PHYTOSANITARY (SPS) STRATEGY AND PLAN OF ACTION

2017 - 2022



**REGIONAL PASTORAL LIVELIHOODS RESILIENCE
PROJECT (RPLRP)**

IGAD RPLRP
IGAD Centre for Pastoral Area and Livestock Development (ICPALD)
Jadala Place, 1st Floor,
Ngong Lane,
P. O. Box 47824-00100,



TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	v
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	vii
1.0 BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION.....	1
2.0 STATUS OF SPS IMPLEMENTATION	2
2.1 Implementation of SPS at global level.....	2
2.2 Implementation of SPS in Africa	3
3.0 IMPLEMENTATION OF SPS IN THE AGRICULTURE VALUE CHAIN	6
3.1 Measures Related to Livestock and their Products	6
3.2 Measures related to other agricultural products.....	6
4.0 STATUS OF AGRICULTURE AND ANALYSIS OF SPS RELATED COMPLIANCE BY COUNTRY	7
4.1. Ethiopia	7
4.2 Kenya.....	10
4.3 Uganda	14
4.4 Djibouti.....	17
4.5 Eritrea	18
4.6 Somalia	19
4.7 South Sudan.....	20
4.8 Sudan.....	21
5.0 STATUS OF CURRENT SPS SYSTEMS IN IGAD MEMBER STATES	23
5.1 SPS Capacity in IGAD Countries	23
6.0 VISION AND MISSION	25
6.1 IGAD SPS Vision.....	25
6.2 IGAD SPS.....	25
.....	25
7.0 STRATEGY AND INTERVENTIONS TO MAINSTREAM SPS WITHIN IGAD FOR EXPANDED TRADE	25
7.1 The IGAD SPS Strategy for Expanded Trade.....	25
7.2 Log frame: A 5-year focused intervention	28
8.0 SPS PRIORITY SETTING FRAMEWORK	33
8.1 IGAD- SPS Priority Setting Framework.....	33
8.2 The Model for Prioritization	34
9.0 IGAD MONITORING, EVALUATION AND REPORTING TOOL.....	35
9.1 Purpose.....	35
9.2 Strategic Control Mechanism	36
9.3 Indicators for National Monitoring of the Performance at National Level.....	36
10.0 ANNEX.....	37

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: A log-frame for the 5-year SPS Intervention.....	29
Table 2: Steps for the Prioritizing SPS Investments for Market Access	34
Table 3: Livestock Support Institutions in Ethiopia	37
Table 4: The Livestock Development Support Institutions in Kenya	40
Table 5: Livestock Support Institutions in Uganda.....	42
Table 6: Kenya Animal Statistics (2010-2013).....	43
Table 7: Production of Dairy Products in Kenya, 2011-2015.....	43
Table 8: Animal Production in Uganda 2010-2014	44
Table 9: Milk, Beef and Egg Production in Uganda 2013-2015.....	44
Table 10: Hides and Skins Statistics in Uganda	44
Table 11: South Sudan Animal Statistics 2014	45

PREFACE

The IGAD region is a key producer of livestock and its products for local consumption and export trade within and outside the region. The sector is however faced with challenges from OIE listed trans-boundary animal diseases (TADs), other diseases and food safety issues that usually lead to export trade bans. Inadequate compliance with SPS measures by IGAD member states following the outbreak of rift valley fever in 1998/99 and 2000/2002 led to two consecutive trade bans of live animals export to the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) countries especially to Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates. This heavily affected the livestock industry. Somalia alone had an economic loss of 435 million USD. Even domestically, closure of some markets like Garissa market in Kenya, resulted in a more than 25% decrease in the price of cattle inducing a total loss of USD 10 million for the value chain.

To address the issues and increase consumer consciousness on food safety and animal health problems, IGAD/ICPALD, through a consultancy developed a regional SPS strategy to guide member states consolidate and grow markets for livestock and its products. The strategy seeks to domesticate the provisions of the WTO-SPS Agreement while at same time deal with weaknesses identified for the region so as to be competitive in the world and regional markets. Usually, SPS guidelines allow countries to set their own standards that should be scientifically based to the extent necessary to protect human, animal or plant life / health against food-borne risks, animal or plant-borne diseases and other pests or diseases but at the same time promote international trade between countries.

This SPS regional strategy was developed with the support of a consultant; Dr. Philip Njoroge in consultation with the Directorate of Veterinary Services, SPS committees and the private sector in Kenya, Ethiopia and Uganda during field visits. A pre-tested questionnaire was sent to the remaining IGAD MS (Djibouti, South Sudan, Somalia and Sudan) chief veterinary officers and SPS committees who comprehensively responded enabling the consultant develop a regional strategy which was validated by representatives from member states SPS committees, the private sector and other partners including FAO, OIE and AU-IBAR. We are grateful to the World Bank for the financial support of the regional project “Regional Pastoral Livelihood and Resilience Project (RPLRP) being implemented in Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda” and coordinated by IGAD Center for Pastoral Areas and Livestock Development; that made the study and publication possible. We are confident that the strategy will be a useful tool to improve capacity and mobilize resources at regional and member states’ level to implement the proposed interventions and support the public and private sectors to comply with SPS measure so as to spur regional and international trade.

Dr. Solomon JM Munyua
Director, ICPALD

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADLI	Agricultural Development Led Industrialization
ASAL	Arid and Semi Arid Lands
AU	African Union
AU –IBAR	African Union – Inter African Bureau of Animal Resources
CAADP	Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Plan
CAC	Codex Alimentarius Commission
CODEX	Short form of CAC – Codex Alimentarius Commission
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
DVS	Director of Veterinary Services
EAC	East African Community
ECCSA	Ethiopian Central Chamber and Sectoral Associations
EFMHACA	Ethiopian Food, Medicine and Health Care Administration
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FYGTGP	Five Year Growth and Transformation Plan
GATT	General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GSP	Generalized System of Preferences
ICPALD	IGAD Centre for Pastoral Area and Livestock Development
IDDRSI	IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative
IGAD	Inter-governmental Authority on Development
IPPC	International Plant Protection Convention
ISSOs	International Standard Setting Organizations
KAGRB	Kenya Animal Genetics Resources Board
KAGRC	Kenya Animal Genetics Resource Centre
KMC	Kenya Meat Commission
KEPHIS	Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service
KEVEVAPI	Kenya Veterinary Vaccines Production Institute
KenTTEC	Kenya Tsetse and Trypanosomiasis Eradication Council
LVCPPD	Livestock Value Chain Public and Private Dialogue
MOALF& C	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Fisheries and Cooperatives
MTI	Meat Training Institute
NARS	National Agricultural Research System
NEP	National Enquiry Point
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
OIE	<i>Office International des Epizooties</i> (World Animal Health Organization)
PASDEP	Plan for Accelerated and Sustained Development to End Poverty
PIF	<i>(Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector) Policy and Investment Framework</i>
REC	Regional Economic Community
RPLRP	Regional Pastoral Livelihoods Resilience Project
SADC	Southern Africa Development Community
SPS	Sanitary and Phytosanitary
STDF	Trade and Standards Development Facility
STSD	Surveillance of Trade Sensitive Diseases
TBT	Technical Barriers to Trade
UNBS	Uganda National Bureau of Standards
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WHO	World Health Organization
WTO	World Trade Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

IGAD SPS Strategy

A Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) strategy for the IGAD region is presented in this report. The strategy was developed following a review of the current status in all the Eight IGAD countries. Apart from Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda where visits and interviews were undertaken, in the five other countries namely; Djibouti, Eritrea, Somalia, South Sudan, and Sudan questionnaires were administered through the Regional Pastoral Livelihoods Resilience Project (RPLRP) contact points and the chief veterinary officers. The strategy has reviewed operational laws, implementation of SPS measures by the member states as well as roles played by private sector in assuring safe trade in agricultural sector inclusive of the livestock. In addition, the strategy has identified interventions required to boost productivity and market access. The action plan on SPS for the IGAD region has been proposed after review of the World Trade Organization (WTO) SPS agreement requirements together with SPS strategies of the regions and countries that successfully developed and implemented SPS related market access initiatives. Such good practices, together with lessons learned, challenges; and opportunities have shaped the strategy development. The Strategy has proposed four broad areas of focus within the five-year period. These are:

- i. Coordination, collaboration and regulatory review and alignment that entails legal reform, harmonization, establishment of SPS structures at member state level and at secretariat, as well as coordination of joint decisions at regional and at multilateral level.
- ii. Strengthening public and private sector for SPS Compliance. This will entail enhancement of both private and public sector through training, mentorship and provision of necessary infrastructure including laboratories and framework for collaborations etc)
- iii. Managing trans-boundary pests, diseases and food safety hazards through establishment of early warning systems, traceability systems among others.
Communication, Education, Advocacy and Awareness which includes notifications in line with WTO-SPS agreement and relevant ISSOs and competency development advancement.

To ensure the right mix of investment in regional SPS projects and programs the strategy also proposes evaluation of SPS needs through tools developed by international standards setting organizations, (*Office International des Epizooties* {OIE}, Codex Alimentarius Commission {CODEX} and International Plant Protection Convention {IPPC}) followed by use of the Priority investment model for market access (P-IMA) developed by WTO through the Trade and Standards Development Facility (WTO-STDF).

Finally, a framework for monitoring and evaluating progress on implementation of priority programs and projects at member state and regional levels is proposed to ensure focus to the strategy.

The following SPS vision and mission statements guide the strategy.

Vision

The Lead Facilitator of SPS-Compliance

Mission

Promoting market access, improvement of economic wellbeing, public health, agricultural and environmental protection through improved management of pests and diseases, and maintenance of food and feed safety across the value chain

1.0 BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

The Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures sets out the basic rules for food safety, and animal and plant health standards. It allows countries to set their own standards. These regulations must be science based and applied only to the extent necessary to protect human, animal or plant life or health. The agreement provides that standards should not arbitrarily or unjustifiably discriminate between countries where identical or similar conditions prevail. Member countries are therefore encouraged to use international standards, guidelines and recommendations where they exist. In circumstances where members use measures which result in higher standards, they must be based on scientific justifications which are essentially designed to address the appropriate assessment of risks, so long as the approach is consistent, not arbitrary (WTO-SPS Agreement, Article 2 (3))¹.

The IGAD region is an eight-country trade block comprising Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan and Uganda, with headquarters in Djibouti. The focus of IGAD is both development and environmental control, of which application of SPS is a key pillar in both so as to promote trade. To develop the IGAD SPS strategy, funds were sourced from the World Bank that is funding a Regional Pastoral Livelihoods Resilience Project (RPLRP). The project is being undertaken in three IGAD member states, namely Kenya, Ethiopia and Uganda. The RPLRP operates within the framework of the IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI). In identifying need for an SPS strategy, the secretariat of IGAD intends to enhance livestock value-chain support and improve livestock mobility and trade. The strategy was developed through a consultative process that entailed analysis of what is in place and what needs to be done in the region based on a sample of the three countries.

The strategy proposes strategic intervention to improve trade and market access while ensuring protection of human health, protection and enhancement of health and safety of plants and animals. In developing the strategy definition of sanitary measures as provided by the Agreement on Application of Sanitary and phytosanitary measures was considered. The Agreement defines SPS measures to include all relevant laws, decrees, regulations, requirements and procedures including, inter alia, end product criteria; processes and production methods; testing, inspection, certification and approval procedures; quarantine treatments including relevant requirements associated with the transport of animals or plants, or with the materials necessary for their survival during transport; provisions on relevant statistical methods, sampling procedures and methods of risk assessment; and packaging and labelling requirements directly related to food safety.

¹ The WTO Agreement on The Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement); Text of the Agreement- https://www.wto.org/english/tratop.../sps.../spsagr_e.h

2.0 STATUS OF SPS IMPLEMENTATION

2.1 Implementation of SPS at global level

Before conclusion of the Uruguay round of negotiations (1986-94), which ushered in the WTO, world leaders were more concerned with reduction of trade tariffs to facilitate free flow of goods. Agriculture goods were hitherto not considered. With the formation of the WTO, several new agreements were made which became part of others that had been agreed upon under the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT, 1947), which ceased to exist with the establishment of the WTO. Among the new agreements that were concluded included the Agreement on Agriculture (AoA) and the Agreement on Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary (WTO-SPS) Measures. Although a lot of work has been undertaken to operationalize the Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) and SPS agreements, there are still concerns of WTO members adopting non-tariff barriers (NTBs) that may hinder trade. The WTO annual report for 2012 identified some of these as being related to application of Agreements on Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (WTO-SPS-Agreement) and WTO Agreement on TBT Agreement².

The Agreement on SPS measures among other things sought to provide a structured manner to facilitate safe trade without applying unjustified protectionist measures in the guise of application of legitimate SPS measures. The agreement under Article 2.1 gives members the right to take SPS measures necessary for the protection of human, animal or plant life or health as long as the measures chosen are in alignment with the provisions of this agreement. These are further amplified under Articles 2.2 and 5.2 which identify legitimate reasons such as national security requirements, protection of human health or safety, protection of animal or plant life or health, and protection of the environment. Article 2.2 further provides that members must base applied measures on scientific principles and apply them only to the extent necessary to protect human, animal or plant life or health (least trade restrictive), but it is against maintaining such measures without sufficient scientific evidence. Therefore, members have latitude to apply legitimate measures to:

- a. Protect human and animal health from additives, contaminants, toxins or disease-causing organisms in their food, beverages and feedstuffs;
- b. Manage plant or animal-transmitted diseases (zoonoses);
- c. Prevent pests, diseases or disease-causing organisms; and
- d. Prevent damage caused by the entry, establishment or spread of pests (including invasive species).

SPS measures may take the form of protective measures on human or animal health from food-borne risks, protection of human health from animal or plant-borne diseases, and protecting animals and plants from pests or diseases. Some notable SPS concerns relate to pesticide residues and food additives. Under Article 3.3, the agreement provides for the use of international standards, though countries can be more stringent so long as they provide scientific justification or risk assessment. The three recognised standard setting bodies are Codex Alimentarius Commission (CODEX) on food safety, *Office International des Epizooties* (OIE) on animal health, and the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) on matters related to plant health.

In the same agreement under regionalization (Article 6), members can apply measures that are specific to a localised area or region³. In other words, if members can maintain certain disease or pest free areas, they should be allowed to export from such areas even if the whole country is not free of the problem. The SPS

² World Trade Report 2012; World Trade Organization:
https://www.wto.org/english/res_e/booksp_e/anrep_e/world_trade_report12_e.pdf

³ AuSAID, 2013: *Sanitary and Phytosanitary building program; WTO Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) Agreement* -<http://seafood.oregonstate.edu/pdf%20Links/The-WTO-Sanitary-and-Phytosanity-SPS-Agreement.pdf>

agreement further recognises the need for all WTO-members to notify within reasonable time all measures that have the potential to disrupt trade so that affected members can comment on such measures before they become operational. The guidance on notifications including providing a 60-day comment period to enable other members provide comments is contained in the committees guide document reference G/SPS/7/Rev.3⁴.

2.2 Implementation of SPS in Africa

The WTO Agreement on Application of SPS Measures among other requirements allows adaptation of regional conditions and establishment of regional approaches. In this regard, the African Union Commission (AUC) has been working on a coordinated approach to SPS management. The African Union has a number of specialised technical agencies, two of them deal with SPS issues. These are the AU - Inter-African Bureau of Animal Resources (AU-IBAR) and the AU - Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (AU-IAPSC). These organisations deal with animal health and plant health respectively, although their mandates also cover aspects of food safety. At the international level, issues pertaining to food safety are handled by Codex Alimentarius Commission.

AU-IBAR pursues four thematic areas:

- Animal health, disease prevention and control systems;
- Animal resource production systems and ecosystem management;
- Access to inputs, services and markets for animals and animal products; and
- Animal resources information and knowledge management.

Reflecting the broad mandate of the organisation, and wider scope of the new strategy, SPS issues now fall mainly under the first area. The strategy identifies Regional Economic Communities (RECs) and their Member States as its key clients.

Regarding the continental phytosanitary commission, four areas of focus are currently being addressed. These are:

- *Phytosanitary accordance*: to facilitate market access but also to prevent the incursion of exotic plant pests into the continent;
- *Plant pest risk reduction*: early detection, response and management of plant pest risks, including sharing of information;
- *Human capacity development*: ensuring an adequate supply of trained plant protection personnel at all levels; and
- *Awareness creation*: to ensure plant protection issues are on national, regional and continental agendas.

Though there is no single AU agency addressing food safety issues, some aspects fall within the mandates of AU-IAPSC and AU-IBAR, but there is ongoing discussion about the possibility of establishing an African food safety authority. Together with the above stated developments the African Heads of state have directed the Member states to embark on discussions that should lead to a continental free trade soonest.

Since member states of IGAD participate in many regional and international trading blocs, the agreements reached in these trading blocs and their implementations are often factored into government external trade policy measures. The participation of IGAD member countries in activities, particularly in

⁴ World Trade Organization, 2008: Recommended procedures for implementing the transparency obligations of the SPS Agreement (Article 7): <https://docsonline.wto.org/dol2fe/.../DirectDoc.aspx?...t%3A%2Fg%2Fsps%2F7r3...>

agricultural products market access, is taken seriously because agriculture forms the backbone of their economies. A key concern for these countries is that market access for agricultural products is constrained for export by the high cost of compliance to standards including SPS measures and related TBTs; this means the products are not able to compete in the international trade arena. Similarly, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Somalia, South Sudan and Sudan have high dependency on agriculture and more so on livestock.

The IGAD countries are also active in regional trade activities and have membership to diverse trading blocks. In the case of Kenya and Uganda, they are active members of IGAD, EAC and COMESA. Ethiopia, Eritrea, South Sudan, and Sudan are members of both IGAD and COMESA. Somalia, which has had no effective central government since 1991, is largely dependent on IGAD. The EAC to which Kenya and Uganda belong operates under the Customs Union, which was ratified in July 2000 and became operational on 1st January 2005. The Customs Union was further strengthened with the coming in force of the EAC Common Market Protocol that was signed in November 2009 and its implementation began in July 2010. It established a common external tariff and zero rating of customs duties for intra-regional trade.

Mainstreaming of the application of uniform and harmonized SPS measures by IGAD member states is at different levels. For instance, the EAC region SPS protocol was approved in 2012 after a rigorous consultative process as provided by the community processes. It is envisaged that when all the partner states ratify the protocol and all the requirements are met, the region will operate harmonized SPS systems. Under COMESA, already an operational SPS committee and desk within the secretariat has been established. Up to now, COMESA has initiated several projects geared towards mainstreaming of SPS measures. One such project is the on-going project, "Breaking Barriers, Facilitating Trade" with funding from the WTO-STDF. The IGAD countries are also involved in cross-regional trade arrangements, including the European Union Economic Partnership Agreement (EU-EPA) with EU among other arrangements geared towards facilitating trade.

Like all other African countries, IGAD region has experienced many SPS related challenges. The challenges are summarized in a study commissioned in 2010 by the AU through funding from the WTO-STDF. These include:

- i. Weak framework and inadequate resources to deal with food safety, animal and plant health measures; inadequate provision of technical measures to develop and uphold standards together with the ability to scientifically justify SPS measures; insufficient coordination at the national level among the relevant ministries, agencies and institutions dealing with SPS;
- ii. Weak public and private sector capacities to deal with food safety, animal and plant health measures; inadequate SPS measures, often without legislative basis, which severely limit export capacity and the ability to control imports;
- iii. Existence of RECs regional SPS policy frameworks which mirror the WTO SPS Agreement, raising risks of duplication and questionable added value;
- iv. Weak or non-existent national and regional SPS committees that are needed to play a central strategic role;
- v. Lack of clear SPS strategies and plans by individual countries and the RECs;
- vi. Inadequate participation by RECs, AU and member countries in the SPS committee;
- vii. Existence of some regional standards which either overlap or contradict the international standards, resulting in unnecessary trade restrictions;
- viii. Poor or weak coordination and harmonization of SPS policies and strategies among the RECs, including participation in the work program of Codex, OIE and IPPC;

- ix. Weak regional standard setting organizations necessitate the strengthening of AU/IBAR and AU-IAPSC to play important management roles with respect to animal health and plant protection while looking into the possibility of setting up a continental body to deal with food safety matters;
- x. Weak private sector;
- xi. Need for the AUC and RECs to address a number of weaknesses to ensure member states implement policy frameworks, and establish clear strategies for future action.

The study undertaken at AU level agrees to a large extent with the report on the EAC undertaken on behalf of STDF⁵ that established the following:

- i. Efforts are being made to enhance food safety, animal health and/or plant health capacity across both the public and private sectors. Such initiatives include the updating of legislative frameworks, enhancement of laboratory facilities, etc.
- ii. Some exporters have enhanced their food safety controls, including the implementation of internationally recognized systems such as Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) and Good Agricultural Practice (GAP). It is not evident, however, that such efforts have followed a coherent and sequenced process, both within and across the public and private sectors, while processes of reform have often been protracted. There is also great variation in the capacity building efforts, both within and across the three study countries.
- iii. Recognition of the roles and importance of SPS management capacity is limited, which raises concerns about the sustainability of the capacity development efforts that are observed. Although historic compliance problems in key export markets and ongoing concerns have served to raise awareness, it is not evident that this has been translated into a broader strategic focus on building and sustaining capacity, backed up with the necessary ongoing resources.
- iv. Institutional structures for SPS management tend to be fragmented and with inadequate coordination of functions and responsibilities. As a consequence, the scarce resources available are often not used to the greatest effect.
- v. EAC countries have rather weak ability to represent and defend their national interests at WTO and at standard setting bodies. This could be addressed by provision of adequate budgets and discussion of the agenda of meeting in the region way ahead of the international meetings to forge a common unified position.
- vi. EAC countries have weak food safety, animal health and/or plant health controls, and where there is adequate capacity, this tends to be focused on key export commodities, with little or no spill over to the supply chain directed at domestic markets.
- vii. There is a critical need for capacity to be enhanced for both export and domestic markets.

⁵ Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF), 2010: Regional Sanitary and Phytosanitary frameworks and Strategies in Africa

3.0 IMPLEMENTATION OF SPS IN THE AGRICULTURE VALUE CHAIN

3.1 Measures Related to Livestock and their Products

Livestock and livestock products trade is one of the business drivers in international trade. It is estimated that trade in livestock and their products accounts for over 40 percent of the agricultural value added and for about 11 percent of the gross domestic product (GDP) of the region. In spite of this growth, in the Horn of Africa over 61 percent of the poor – or about 43 million people – keep some livestock as a source of food, cash income, manure, draught power and hauling services, savings, insurance and social status⁶. The main export products are live animals, animal products and by-products. These include cattle, pigs, fish, camels, sheep, goats and poultry. Consumption of livestock products in the developing world has over the years expanded. Despite this, barriers to breaking into lucrative markets – local, regional and global – remain high. This is because live animals, meat and livestock products can transmit pathogens, which are a significant risk to the health of both animals and humans. Such trans-boundary animal diseases can cause enormous damage in importing countries.

Management of trans-boundary animal disease transmission is essential and should be guided among others by the WTO's SPS agreement. It is therefore instructive that African and other developing countries participate fully in setting standards, which at the moment is constrained by inadequate provision of budgets to facilitate participation. To succeed in meaningful livestock and livestock product trade, participation by the private sector is crucial. A strong private sector can provide capital, management and entrepreneurial flair. Efforts must be made to maximize on export of products rather than live animals, while at the same time developing strong brands that have inbuilt quality, safety and dependability.

For growth in the livestock industry to be sustained, it is necessary to have vertical integration of systems which should incorporate small and medium-scale out-producers. Further, a shift to value-added products is the way to go, as has happened with the leather industry in Ethiopia. It is also important to critically analyze and address animal welfare issues, as failure to do so may pose a threat or deny opportunity to developing countries' participation in global livestock markets. Many northern markets – more recently even some in South Africa – for premium-priced “welfare enhanced” products such as meats and eggs produced in less intensive systems is gaining popularity and demand. Although developing countries usually place less emphasis on animal welfare per se, their more extensive production systems provide for greater freedom of movement and opportunities to express their normal behaviour, and should appeal to ethically minded consumers. Livestock production systems in developing countries could probably pave the way for the introduction of premium-priced, welfare enhanced brands for targeted export markets.

3.2 Measures related to other agricultural products

Regarding other agricultural products, IGAD countries export an array of products such as coffee, tea and horticultural produce. The concern with the produce has been compliance with both food safety and plant health requirements. For instance the 2017 summary Europhyt interception report shows there were a host of interceptions ranging from presence of white flies, false codling moth in capsicums, psyllids and fruit flies⁷. Exceedance of maximum pesticide residues particularly in beans and peas in pods has been a concern in Kenya and Uganda.

⁶ Vivien Knips, 2004; Livestock sector report Horn of Africa: review of the livestock sector in the horn of Africa (IGAD countries) - http://www.fao.org/ag/againfo/resources/en/publications/sector_reports/lsr_IGAD.pdf

⁷ http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/plant_health_biosecurity/non_eu_trade/non_compliance_en

4.0 STATUS OF AGRICULTURE AND ANALYSIS OF SPS RELATED COMPLIANCE BY COUNTRY

4.1. Ethiopia

The agricultural sector greatly influences economic performance in Ethiopia. About 11.7 million smallholder households account for approximately 95 per cent of agricultural GDP and 85 per cent of employment. About 25 per cent of rural households earn some income from non-farm enterprises, but less than three per cent rely exclusively on income from such enterprises. With a total area of about 1.13 million km² and about 51.3 million hectares of arable land, Ethiopia has tremendous potential for agricultural development. Out of the available arable land, only about 11.7 million hectares of land, however, were being cultivated in 2010, constituting just over 20 per cent of the total arable area. Overall, nearly 55 per cent of all smallholder farmers operate on one hectare or less. The agricultural sector accounts for roughly 43 per cent of GDP, and 90 per cent of exports. Cereals dominate Ethiopian agriculture, accounting for about 70 per cent of agricultural GDP. On the other hand, livestock production accounts for about 15 per cent of agricultural GDP and draught animal power is critical for all farming systems. Over the past decade, cereal production has more than doubled to nearly 15 million tons as a result of horizontal expansion and increased yields⁸.

Livestock's role in Ethiopian agriculture, as well as in economic and social development at the household and national level cannot be ignored. At the national level, livestock contributes a significant amount of export earnings in the formal market (10 per cent of all formal exports per annum), roughly 150 million USD. Livestock on the overall contributes about 15-17 per cent of all agricultural GDP. Pastoral output underpins almost all of Ethiopia's live animal and meat exports. Animal and meat exports combined with hides, skins and leather exports (which are sourced primarily from highland animals) constitute about a fifth of all of Ethiopia's exports.

At the household level, livestock provides 70 percent of the livelihood of the Ethiopian population. Livestock is a key pillar to provision of livelihood and earnings in the market place. According to the Ethiopian Central Statistics Agency, in 2012 Ethiopia had 52,129,000 cattle; 24,221,000 sheep; and 22,613,000 goats. FAO recorded similar numbers for the year before, placing Ethiopia as having the eighth largest overall livestock population in the world. Though low herd productivity is cited as a major concern, improvement of productivity and commercialization provides an opportunity to increase market participants and total contribution to Ethiopian GDP.

One of the stated government policy interventions in promotion of non-farm activities is recommended in drought-prone highland areas to increase food security. Newly cultivated lands in lowland rainfall-sufficient areas offer some prospects for national production gains, but infrastructure and marketing constraints must be overcome, and great care will be required in those areas to avoid environmental degradation⁹.

⁸ Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia; Ministry of Agriculture And Rural Development; Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF)-2010-2020, Draft Final Report, 15 September 2010 -www.agri-learning-ethiopia.org/wp-content/.../Agriculture-Policy-MTR_FINAL.pdf

⁹ International Food Policy Research Institute: In Food and Agriculture in Ethiopia: Progress and Policy Challenges, Paul Dorosh and Shahidur Rashid : <https://www.ifpri.org/.../food-and-agricult...>; International Food

Ethiopia is among the few countries, which have been recording double digit growth rate in the last 10 years except for the years 2012 and 2016. This rapid growth, especially in agriculture, can be attributed to policy initiatives undertaken by the government. For instance, the recent Plan for Accelerated and Sustained Development to End Poverty (PASDEP), derived from the Five Year Growth and Transformation Plan (FYGTP), and the Agricultural Development Led Industrialization (ADLI) are focused on transformation of the agricultural sector to be the engine of growth. One of the pillars of ADLI is improvement of access to domestic and export markets, which is linked to Compliance to Standards and SPS Measures. Overall, initiatives in all productive sectors are geared at making the country a middle-income economy by 2020¹⁰.

According to a report prepared by the Central Statistical Agency (Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Central Statistical Agency, Agricultural Sample Survey 2012/13), Ethiopia is a major supplier of live animals to Somalia, Djibouti, Kenya, and Sudan, as well as Saudi Arabia. Most live animal exports from Ethiopia go through informal channels to Djibouti, Somalia, Kenya and Sudan. The majority of these livestock are shoats. Many of these animals (almost all lowland sourced) end up in Yemen, often as being 'sourced' from Djibouti or Somalia. Exported animals from the highland (mostly Amhara and Tigray) almost all end up in Sudan for consumption in Sudan or for re-export to Egypt and other countries in the Gulf. Exporters collect animals from secondary markets supplied by big and small traders, livestock trading cooperatives, collectors and producers. Ethiopia has put in place laws (proclamations), regulations and directives to support agricultural development, namely:

- Proclamation No. 117/1998: Animal, Animal Products and Bi-products Marketing Development Authority;
- Proclamation No. 206/2000: Seed Production;
- Proclamation No. 660/2009: Agricultural Resources Development and Protection;
- Proclamation No. 267/2002: Animal Diseases Prevention and Control;
- Proclamation No. 315/2003: Fisheries Development and Utilization.

In addition to the enabling laws, other strategies have been put in place such as:

- The Agricultural Development Led Industrialization (ADLI);
- Five Year Growth and Transformation Plan (FYGTP);
- Plan for Accelerated and Sustained Development to End Poverty (PASDEP) for 2005/06, 2009/10;
- Rural Development Policy and Strategies (RDPS);
- CAADP Compact framework;
- National Action Plan on Gender (NAPG);
- Economic Growth Corridor strategy;
- Industrialization Development Strategy;
- Water Sector Strategy; and
- National Nutrition Policy.

4.1.1 Agriculture and Livestock Support Institutions in Ethiopia

Policy Research Institute: In Food and Agriculture in Ethiopia: Progress and Policy Challenges, Paul Dorosh and Shahidur Rashid

¹⁰ Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia; Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development: Ethiopia's Agricultural Sector Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), 2010-2020: http://gafspfund.org/sites/gafspfund.org/files/Documents/Ethiopia_1_of_6_Proposal_for_GAFSP_Financing.pdf

Government ministries, specialised agencies and private sector undertake the delivery of SPS in Ethiopia. These include the ministries of Trade (MoT), Science and Technology, Industry (MoI), Agriculture and Natural Resource Development (MoA&NRD), Livestock and Fishery Resource Development, Ministry of Education (MoE), Health (MoH), Environment, & that of Forest and Climate Change. Other agencies are also involved including: Agricultural Transformation Agency (ATA), Ethiopian Standards Agency (ESA), Livestock Agency (LSA), Food, Medicine and Healthcare Administration and Control Authority (FMHACA), Veterinary Drugs and Feeds Administration and Control Authority (VDFACA), the National Animal Health Diagnostic and Investigation Center (NAHDIC) and Regional laboratories Regional Trade and Transport Bureaus Agriculture and Rural Development Office (ARDO) & City Administrations Agriculture Office (CAAD) see table 3.

4.1.2 Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats of the Value Chain in Ethiopia

The Ethiopia agriculture and livestock is undergoing rapid transformation through government and donor funding interventions. Despite this there are areas of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats that have been identified. These are as summarized below.

4.1.2.1 Strengths

Some identified strengths include:

1. A standards body exists that spearheads standard development. Under the authority, one hundred technical committees or working groups have been established. Work of committees is funded by government through the standards bureau;
2. A national SPS committee is in place;
3. Membership to IGAD and COMESA (founder member of both);
4. Memorandum of understanding/ bilateral agreements signed with neighbouring countries (Kenya, Djibouti and Sudan);
5. Member of Tripartite (EAC-COMESA-SADC) negotiation forum;
6. Membership to International Standard Setting bodies (OIE, IPPC & Codex);
7. Available specialized laboratories (federal and regional laboratories some of which are internationally accredited under ISO 17025);
8. Training institutions available in the country (public and private universities, colleges and tertiary institutions);
9. Existence of Saudi approved quarantine centre for animals;
10. Vaccine production centre is in place;
11. HACCP/ISO Accredited Export Abattoirs
12. Existence of 15-year livestock development master plan (in operation);
13. LVCPPD project which has initiated IT and smart phone notifiable animal disease platform with an initial 300 smart phones programmed and distributed;
14. Kenya-Ethiopia one stop border point is under construction;
15. Government funding available to agriculture – over 10 percent of budget.

4.1. 2.2 Weaknesses

Key challenges include:

1. Ethiopia is not yet a member of WTO though accession processes are in progress;
2. Some of the national laws have not been reviewed to incorporate current sanitary and phytosanitary best practices. Some of these laws have been noted to provide for overlapping mandates of competent authorities;
3. Slow process of enacting laws (proclamations), regulations (issued by Council of Ministers), and directives (issued by Line/ Sector Ministers);
4. National SPS committee inadequately funded;

5. Lack of enabling over-arching SPS Law to govern value chain issues across the food, and feed chain;
6. Lack of delineated free zones for both plants and animals;
7. Agriculture still largely subsistent, hence not fully integrated to a best practice import-export structure;
8. Inadequate product traceability system (plants, food, feed and animals), though ongoing livestock identification and traceability project in selected areas under IGAD is attempting to do so for livestock;
9. Limited SPS-dedicated human resources to ensure implementation of policy frameworks and established strategies for future action;
10. Lack of Veterinary Statutory Board.

4.1.2.3 Opportunities

Opportunities include:

- i. Improving animal health to lower incidences of diseases and death rates;
- ii. Diversifying live animal exports to value added products such as choice meats, shoes leather products (formal hide, skin and leather (HSL) value chain);
- iii. Investment in the improvement and regulation of slaughtering practices and locations;
- iv. Coding and tagging of all livestock and their meat, by products and hides/skins to establish traceability, animal record-keeping, herd management, vaccination scheduling, breed and feed records, food security investment in the animal health sector to extend the reach and benefit of animal health research, drugs, clinics and services;
- v. Proximity to markets especially Middle East and North Africa (MENA).

4.1.2.4: Threats

- i. High cost of compliance to private standards stringent and dynamic requirements set by Importing countries;
- ii. Emerging pest and disease threats including trans-boundary diseases (TADs);
- iii. Climate change leading to severe weather such as perennial drought that is not supportive of livestock enterprises;
- iv. Porous borders that permit informal movement of livestock that may lead to increase threats to TADs.

4.2 Kenya

4.2.1 Agriculture & Livestock development and the legal environment

Kenya is home to 44.2 million people. With a per capita GDP of US\$ 1,455.60 in **2016**, Kenya is classified as a middle-income country. The GDP of Kenya is valued at around US\$ 32 billion (2010/11) and had been growing at the rate of around 5% per annum on average in the five years prior to 2008. The growth rate achieved in 2014-15 was above 5%¹¹.

Kenya is heavily reliant on agriculture to support the GDP and create employment. The livestock sector is very important. Over 60% of all livestock in Kenya is found in the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASAL), where it employs about 90% of the local population. The livestock sub-sector accounts for about 10% of the entire GDP and about 42% of the agricultural GDP. It also supplies the domestic requirements of meat,

¹¹ Kenya Economic Survey, 2016: Kenya National Bureau of Statistics-
www.knbs.or.ke/index.php?...economic-survey-20...

milk and dairy products, and other livestock products, while accounting for about 30% of the total marketed agricultural products. The sub-sector earns the country substantial foreign exchange through export of live animals, hides and skins, dairy products, and some processed pork products. It also employs about 50% of the country's agricultural sector labour-force. The sub-sector also contributes substantial earnings to households through sale of livestock and livestock products; and provides raw material for agro-industries. The true proportion of the contribution by the sub-sector to the economy is likely to be even higher if unrecorded slaughter and home consumption is taken into account.

Many policy documents support livestock development and have direct or indirect links with implementation of SPS measures in Kenya. These include The Constitution (2010), and Acts of Parliament including:

- The Dairy Industry Act Cap 336 (1958);
- The Livestock Policy;
- The Veterinary Policy;
- The Fertilizer and Animal Foodstuff Act Cap 345 (1967);
- The Meat Control Act Cap 356 (1972);
- The Branding of Stock Act Cap 357 (1907);
- The Cattle Cleaning Act Cap 358 (1937);
- The Hides and Skins and Leather Trade Act Cap 359 (1948);
- The Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Cap 360 (1962);
- The Pig Industry Act Cap 361 (1945);
- The Kenya Meat Commission Act Cap 363 (1950);
- The Animal Diseases Act Cap 364 (1905);
- The agricultural Exports Act, Cap 319;
- The Plant Protection Act, Cap 324;
- Pest control products Act, Cap 346;
- Agriculture, food and fisheries Act, 2013;
- Crops Act, 2013;
- The Fisheries Management and Development Act, 2016;
- The Seeds and Plant Varieties (Amendment) Act, 2012;
- Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service Act, 2011;
- Biosafety Act, 2009; and
- The Rabies Act Cap 365 (1932).

All of these provide a framework to which livestock development is anchored. For example, the Draft Veterinary Policy (2015) seeks to align developments in the animal resource industry to Kenya Vision 2030 and the international animal health laws, treaties, agreements and conventions ratified by Kenya. The Policy recognizes the Agreement on Application of Sanitary Measures of the WTO as the overarching international covenant. The policy further recognizes membership of Kenya to COMESA, EAC and IGAD, and therefore harmonizes with the relevant provisions of the constitutive treaties for these RECs. It is noted under the draft Veterinary Policy that animal resources by their nature are varied and their functions straddle different institutions and departments. Livestock, fisheries and wildlife constitute the three broad functional domains managed by different institutions; aspects of human, animal and environmental health require cooperation across departments.

The Veterinary Policy thus provides for operational linkages among these institutions while recognizing and preserving their functional specialties. The main problem with the policy is its stand-alone nature since the enabling laws have themselves not been amended, besides the fact the policy attempts to subsume the livestock policy of 2008. In this regard, it appears the other operators within the livestock

value chain were not adequately consulted in formulation of the policy (from personal interviews with respondents).

One key observation of the policy though is that the legal framework for animal health, welfare, production, food safety and trade certification in Kenya which is currently based on three categories, namely Acts of Parliament that are solely implemented in Veterinary Services, Acts whose objectives cut across several professions and sectors including Veterinary Services, and thirdly by-laws developed and applied by local authorities in collaboration with Veterinary Services. Since there are inconsistencies, it is recommended the laws be reviewed and consolidated to address contemporary challenges so as to align conformity with the Constitution and relevant international treaties ratified by Kenya.

The comprehensive livestock census done in 2009 established Kenya's animal resource base to be 17.5 million cattle, 27.7 million goats, 17 million sheep, 3 million camels, 31.8 million domestic birds, 1.8 million donkeys, and an undetermined number of companion, game and aquatic animals (table 6). Animal resources provide livelihoods and wealth for a majority of Kenyans and significantly contribute to the national economy. In totality, the animal resource industry contributes 16% of the GDP¹². In terms of product development in respect to products such as milk and beef there has been steady increase in production. By 2015 official records indicate 600.4 million litres was produced, 296.5 tons of cheese produced (table 7), and 6,650,800 goats and sheep slaughtered, whereas cattle and calves slaughtered were 2,274,500¹³.

Despite the impressive livestock statistics and value addition developments, quite a number of constraints have made the sector lack major impact at international level. Some of the identified constraints include high production costs and administrative hurdles involved with testing and certification or a lack of proper certifying facilities. According to the International Trade Centre (ITC)¹⁴, Kenyan exporters have the capacity to produce up to the standards required by importing countries, but face obstacles in demonstrating conformity with these requirements. Overall the greatest success of Kenya's export has been on coffee, tea, horticulture and nuts, which have been exported in diverse markets. Despite the success though, compliance issues related to plant health issues, food safety have been reported.

4.2.2 The Agriculture and Livestock development support institutions

Kenya has institutions that offer various services geared towards improvement of Agriculture and livestock industry. These are Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and her specialized state departments of agriculture, livestock and fisheries, Kenya plant health inspectorate service, Directorate of Veterinary Services (DVS), Kenya Veterinary Board (KVB), Kenya Meat Commission (KMC), Kenya Animal Genetics Resource Centre (KAGRC), Kenya Animal Genetics Resources Board (KAGRB), Kenya Veterinary Vaccines Production Institute (KEVEVAPI), Kenya agricultural and livestock research organisation (KARLO), Agriculture, food and Fisheries Authority (AFFA), Kenya Tsetse and Trypanosomiasis Eradication Council (KentTEC). Additionally, Kenya has training institutions (universities and private sector institutions) such as the Kenya Flower Council (KFC), and Fresh Produce Exporters association of Kenya (FPEAK) among others (table 4).

¹² Kenya Veterinary Policy Draft, 2015; Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries: www.kilimo.go.ke/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/Draft-Veterinary-Policy.pdf

¹³ Economic Survey 2016; Kenya National Bureau of Statistics/Kenya Dairy Board/State Department of Livestock (: www.knbs.or.ke/index.php?option=com...view...economic-survey-2016).

¹⁴ Kenya: Company Perspectives, an ITC Series on Non-Tariff Measures (2014): www.intracen.org/Kenya-Company-Perspectives---An-ITC-Series-on-Non-Tariff-Measures...

4.2.3 Strengths, Challenges and Opportunities in Kenya

Livestock in Kenya has enormous potential. However, it is worth noting that there is need to harness the strengths and opportunities, and also address the weaknesses and challenges to achieve full potential. Some of the challenges and weaknesses, as well as opportunities for Kenya are summarized below.

4.2.3.1 Strengths

Some identified strengths include:

- i. SPS national committees in place;
- ii. Veterinary Board / Association with mandate of harmonizing training across the universities in place;
- iii. A standards body that spearheads development of standards exists;
- iv. Membership to IGAD and COMESA (founder member of both);
- v. Concluded negotiation on Article on SPS under the EAC-COMESA-SADC Free Trade Area negotiation forum;
- vi. Available specialized laboratories (DVS, Bureau, Government Chemist, KEPHIS, Universities, etc.);
- vii. Training institutions available in the country (public and private universities, colleges and tertiary institutions);
- viii. Kenya-Uganda one-stop border points (Busia and Malaba) in place; Ethiopia-Kenya under construction;
- ix. Government funding available to agriculture – (but below 10% of budget recommended by AU under NEPAD frame); and
- x. Negotiated EAC-SPS Protocol in place. The protocol seeks to harmonise animal health and food safety measures as well as coordinated border management and establishing a regional approach to technical assistance to address priority Sanitary and Phytosanitary concerns. Once implemented fully, the protocol will catalyse improvement of animal and plant based trade while addressing all food safety concerns;
- xi. Membership to COMESA which has both an SPS regional committee and a strategic plan to guide SPS implementation;
- xii. Member of Tripartite (EAC-COMESA-SADC) negotiation forum. Already EAC-COMESA-SADC SPS/ TBT annex concluded;
- xiii. National plant protection organisation in place (KEPHIS);
- xiv. Accredited laboratories (Both public and private);
- xv. Approved accredited slaughter houses (Eight in number);
- xvi. Available specialized laboratories (DVS has Central Veterinary Referral Laboratory, National FMD Reference Laboratory, Regional Veterinary Investigation Laboratories at Eldoret, Garissa, Karatina, Kericho, Mariakani and Nakuru and Satellite Laboratories at Ukunda and Witu. Other laboratories include ANALABS private laboratory, Bureau, Government Chemist, KEPHIS, Universities, etc.);
- xvii. Training institutions available in the country (the public institutions of higher learning includes University of Nairobi and Egerton University and the private universities include KEMU and Mt Kenya University, Baraton private college and Animal Health Industry Training Institute (AHITI) and Meat Training Institute (MTI) tertiary institutions);
- xviii. Kenya-Uganda one-stop border points (Busia and Malaba) in place; Ethiopia-Kenya (Moyale) under construction; Kenya – Tanzania OSBP (Lungalunga)
- xix. Government funding available to agriculture – (but below 10 percent of budget recommended by AU under NEPAD frame);
- xx. Existence of 10 year ASDP and CAADP development strategies (in operation);

- xxi. Seasonality of production for livestock and livestock products;
- xxii. Strengthened digital epidemio-surveillance system (VETINFO-DVS group) connecting all 47 counties in Kenya and private sector driven iCow project which has also initiated IT and smart phone notifiable animal disease platform with an initial 300 smart phones programmed and distributed;

4.2.3.2 Weaknesses

Weaknesses include the following:

- i. Overlapping mandates of competent authorities;
- ii. Slow process of enacting agricultural laws, whereas those enacted sometimes do not undergo adequate critique and consultations by stakeholders e.g. the Agriculture, Food and Fisheries Act No. 13 of 2013;
- iii. Lack of enabling over-arching SPS law to govern value chain issues across the food and feed chain;
- iv. Lack of delineated free zones for both plants and animals. It is noted that the situation is being addressed through setting of quarantine zones where the animals for export are vaccinated and checked for target diseases to ensure freedom of the same;
- v. Lack of harmonized documentation and non-streamlined procedures in agencies that are in charge of clearing imports and exports, leading to high compliance costs;
- vi. Agriculture still largely subsistent, hence not fully integrated to a best practice import-export structure;
- vii. Lack of product traceability system (plants, food, feed and animals), though on-going livestock identification traceability project in selected areas under IGAD is attempting to do so for livestock;
- viii. Limited SPS-dedicated human resources to ensure implementation of policy frameworks, low usage of ICT and smart phone technology for animal disease notification;

4.2.3.3 Opportunities

- i. Existence of new markets for value added and primary products subject to meeting SPS requirements, development financing from friendly countries and donors;
- ii. Better market access with coming in force of EAC-SPS protocol and other initiatives such as continental free trade area currently under discussion.

4.2.3.4 Threats

- i. Proliferation of private standards which increases cost of compliance;
- ii. Emerging pest and disease threats;
- iii. Climate change leading to severe weather such as perennial drought that is not supportive of livestock enterprises.

4.3 Uganda

4.3.1 General

Uganda is a landlocked country in East Africa, lying on a total of 241,551 square kilometers, 17 percent of which is lakes and wetlands. The estimated population in 2015 was 40,197,832 distributed equally between males and females (Uganda Population, 2016). In 2014 Uganda had caught 461,726,000 fish from all the fresh water lakes of Uganda. Production of other livestock was as follows: cattle 13,623,000;

sheep 3,842,000; goats 14,011,000; pigs 3,584,000; and poultry 44,698,000¹⁵ (table 8). Similarly, by 2014 Uganda recorded 1,550 million litres of milk; 202,929 metric tonnes of beef (table 9); whereas hides and skins were 856.8 million. The production of bovine hides rose by 28.87% from 2003 to 2012, while that of sheep/lamb skins in the same period rose by 75% and that of goats/kids skins rose by 16.67 %¹⁶ (table 10).

4.3.2 Agriculture and Livestock development and the legal environment

Uganda has over the past years formulated policies aimed at protecting the lives and health of humans, animals and plants; and improving the competitiveness of Uganda's products. Such policies include:

- The Food and Nutrition Policy, National (2003)
- Animal Feeds Policy (2005),
- National Meat Policy (2003),
- National Trade Policy (2008),
- National Industrial Policy (February 2008),
- National Health Policy, (2009),
- National Drug Policy and Authority Act (1993), and
- The National Agricultural Research System (NARS) among others.

The National Development Plan 2010/11 – 2014/15 and the Agriculture Sector Development and Investment Plan (DSIP) are clear on the need to create compliance mechanisms on SPS. Compliance with SPS measures assures competitiveness as well as providing for food safety and health of the population. In addition to the National Policies related to SPS measures, Uganda is a member of a number of international organizations such as the WTO, International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), the OIE, and the FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius Commission for Food Safety whose activities relate to SPS. Uganda is mainly engaged in trade of agricultural products, which are directly affected by SPS requirements. These requirements mainly affect the non-traditional exports (such as fish and fish products). While engaging in international trade signatories of WTO Agreement on Application of SPS Measures, countries are obliged to comply with certain minimum SPS requirements. The Draft Uganda SPS Strategy (2011), developed in an effort coordinated by the Ministry of Trade and Industry, which is currently under revision with participation of the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries and private sector-identified players in the implementation of SPS in Uganda.

4.3.3 Agriculture and Livestock support institutions in Uganda

A number of Government ministries, private sector and specialized institutions play a critical role in advancement of SPS compliance in Uganda. These include The DVS, National Agricultural Research Organisation (NARO), the Ministry of agriculture and private sector institutions (Table 5).

4.3.4 Strengths, Challenges and Opportunities of the Livestock Value Chain in Uganda

The livestock industry is fast growing with high potential (strengths). However, there are challenges and weaknesses, and also opportunities that need to be dealt with to achieve full potential. Some of these are summarized below.

¹⁵ Uganda Bureau of Statistics, Statistical Abstract, October, 2015.
www.ubos.org/onlinefiles/.../ubos/statistical_abstracts/Statistical%20Abstract%202015...

¹⁶ The Regional Integration Support Programme II continuation (RISP II); Good Practices & Lessons in the value chain of hides and skins in IGAD region: *IGAD Consultancy on Hides and Skins (Adopted and compiled from FAO, World Statistical Compendium, 2012)*.

4.3.4.1 Strengths

Some identified strengths include:

- i. SPS national committee in place (though part of SPS/TBT Committee);
- ii. Veterinary Board/Association with mandate of harmonizing training across the universities in place;
- iii. A standards body exists that spearheads standards development;
- iv. Membership to IGAD and COMESA (founder member of both);
- v. Concluded negotiation on Article on SPS under the EAC-COMESA-SADC Free Trade Area negotiation forum;
- vi. Available specialized laboratories (DVS, Bureau, Universities, etc.);
- vii. Training institutions available in the country (public and private universities, colleges and tertiary institutions);
- viii. Kenya-Uganda one-stop border points (Busia and Malaba) in place;
- ix. Government funding available to agriculture – (below AU under NEPAD frame recommended 10 percent of national budget);
- x. Negotiated EAC-SPS Protocol ratified and deposited with EAC Secretariat.

4.3.4.2 Challenges

Key weaknesses and challenges include:

- i. Overlap in institutional mandates as result of lack of coordinated legislation;
- ii. Slow process of enacting agricultural laws;
- iii. Lack of enabling over-arching SPS Law to govern value chain issues across the food, and feed chain;
- iv. Disease free zones for both plants and animals not established;
- v. Agriculture still largely subsistent, hence not fully integrated to a best practice import-export structure;
- vi. Inadequate product traceability (for plants, food, feed and animals);
- vii. Limited SPS-dedicated human resources to ensure implementation of policy frameworks, and
- viii. Low usage of ICT and smart phone technology for animal disease notification;
- ix. National single window which is nearing commissioning,
- x. Completed PVS evaluation on performance of veterinary services
- xi. Veterinary policy and inspection system in place (facilitated by AU-IBAR);
- xii. Member of International Standard Setting Organizations (OIE, IPPC, Codex).

4.3.4.3 Opportunities

- i. Regional integrations and harmonization of SPS Measures / Harmonization of SPS issues under EAC (EAC SPS Protocol), COMESA and tripartite;
- ii. Uganda being a member of the international community through WTO, UN, AU, etc., can tap on available International Best Practice models in application of SPS;
- iii. Technical assistance and cooperation to improve sanitary and phytosanitary compliance available from donors and friendly countries;
- iv. New markets for products that are produced.

4.3.4.4 Threats

- i. High cost of compliance to private standards;
- ii. Emerging pest and disease threats;
- iii. Climate change.

4.4 Djibouti

Djibouti has a large coastline making it benefit from sea trade; however, in terms of arable agriculture it has approximately 10,000 hectares which are arable, of which roughly 1,000 are cultivated. The country has also in the past experienced civil strife which compromised productivity. The country also does not have well trained personnel and the state of abattoirs is such that a lot of improvement is required. Government funding has been low leading to poor implementation of central services including equipment maintenance. A critical analysis shows the following:

4.4.1 Strengths, Challenges and Opportunities in Kenya

4.4.1.1 Strengths

- i. Membership to IGAD and COMESA (founder member of both);
- ii. Member of Tripartite (EAC-COMESA-SADC) negotiation forum;
- iii. Training institutions available in the country (public and private universities, colleges and tertiary institutions);
- iv. Quarantine facilities for livestock available;
- v. National laboratory for foods of animal origin
- vi. Good regional animal quarantine with established laboratory;
- vii. Government reference laboratory that supervises other laboratories.

4.4.1.2 Weaknesses and Challenges

- i. Weak private sector;
- ii. Poor quality animal products;
- iii. Inadequate funding to manage trans-boundary animal diseases;
- iv. Poorly facilitated National Codex committee;
- v. Agriculture still largely subsistent, hence not fully integrated to a best practice import-export structure;
- vi. Inadequate traceability system (plants, food, feed and animals);
- vii. Inadequate capacity to undertake sustained pest and disease surveillance as well as risk analysis.

4.4.1.3 Opportunities

- i. Member of EAC-COMESA-SADC¹⁷ free trade area, has potential to access more African markets;
- ii. Potential for value added products from Fishery products as well as hides and skins;
- iii. Investment in the improvement and regulation of slaughtering practices and locations;
- iv. Potential for foreign investments in livestock sector. Investment could be in value addition, fodder production/feed manufacture and animal health.

4.4.1.4 Threats

- i. private standards which increase cost of compliance;
- ii. pest and disease threats;
- iii. Proliferation of informal markets and illegal trade
- iv. Climate change.

¹⁷ Communiqué Of The Third COMESA-EAC-SADC Tripartite Summit-
https://www.tralac.org/Images/Resources/Tripartite_FTA/Third_Tripartite_Summit_Communique_10062015.Pdf

4.5 Eritrea

The economy of Eritrea in general is supported by the agricultural sector. The sector was in the recent past seriously affected by the combination of the prolonged war and recurrent droughts and degraded lands. The military conflict displaced farmers, reduced the availability of agricultural inputs and destroyed government support services. Despite these challenges, ruminant rearing, which includes cattle (beef, dairy and draught), small ruminants and camels, plays a significant role in the Eritrean economy and is essential for the food security of the rural population. It is basically closely integrated with crop production; it is estimated that over 20 percent of cattle (oxen) are kept for traction, mainly for crop cultivation. According to government estimates the livestock sub-sector accounts for about 25 percent of agricultural GDP and a significant part of the country's export earnings. Livestock is closely integrated with crop production and has a significant role in the socio-economical life of the rural population in Eritrea for provision of draft power, food security, manure and on-farm savings bank from sales in both local and export markets.

- a. Livestock are nearly the only activity for the pastoralist and agro-pastoralist in Eritrea;
- b. Livestock offers one of the most promising opportunities for foreign exchange earnings (export to Middle East Countries).

Export of non animal products is low; however potential to develop and export coffee, cotton, flowers, high-value nuts, sesame, gums, resins, lentils exists.

4.5.1 Strengths

- i. Agriculture (livestock, fisheries and crops) are strategically important sector for GDP, employment and food security. The country, for example, boasts of a long, healthy and unpolluted sea that guarantees both offshore and deep water resources;
- ii. Strong government commitment to support the agricultural sector which includes management plans that are documented especially in the fisheries subsector;
- iii. Valuable traditional knowledge, skills and technologies (e.g. irrigation);
- iv. Interest amongst farmers to increase productivity;
- v. Strong local demand for agricultural produce;
- vi. Large areas of potential irrigable land (surface and pressurized).

4.5.2 Weaknesses and challenges

- i. Low and erratic rainfall and frequent droughts;
- ii. Insufficient management system across the sectors including fisheries;
- iii. High levels of poverty and malnutrition still persist in some areas;
- iv. Severe land degradation in many areas (deforestation, over-grazing, soil nutrient depletion, limited soil organic content, soil erosion);
- v. Weak land tenure system that results in lack of collateral to support investment;
- vi. Limited access to modern inputs (seeds, fertilizer) or services (credit);
- vii. Limited private sector development and unattractive investment climate;
- viii. Limited institutional capacity to support agriculture coupled with poor infrastructure.

4.5.3 Opportunities

- i. Strategic location and access to important regional and international markets for livestock, livestock products, fishery products as well as crop products
- ii. Reduction of rural poverty and household and national food insecurity resulting in demand for locally produced products together with ability to market quality products in export markets;
- iii. Increase resilience to drought and irregular rainfall;
- iv. Improvement of existing water harvesting/storage and irrigation infrastructure;

- v. Expansion of area under surface and pressurized irrigation;
- vi. Improvement of soil and water conservation and sustainable agricultural practices;
- vii. Close proximity to important markets, i.e. COMESA, Middle East, and other Gulf states, which can be exploited to increase incomes;
- viii. Income diversification to reduce household vulnerability and growing urban market demand for milk, meat and eggs which is presently partly supplied by many small-scale commercial livestock producers¹⁸;
- ix. Investment in Scientific research in all agricultural sectors.

4.5.4 Threats

- i. Climate change leading to frequent droughts;
- ii. Continued land degradation;
- iii. Political instability;
- iv. Renewed border conflict with neighbouring countries;
- v. Restrictions on private sector operations;
- vi. Labour shortages (skilled and unskilled).

4.6 Somalia

Somalia is among the few countries with very long coastline and natural ports. However, despite these strong points the country has had instability since 1991. Despite the civil war, livestock is the backbone of the country's economy and supports the largest production community of the Somali people who raise their animals under a harsh production system. In 2014, Somalia exported 5 million livestock to markets in the Gulf of Arabia. The export was as a result of assistance from both the European Union and the United Kingdom in animal disease prevention¹⁹. Non animal agriculture is not well developed though huge potential exists for banana, other fruits and fish.

4.6.1 Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats

4.6.1.1 Strengths

- i. Many natural ports that can be used to export both value added products and live animals;
- ii. Large livestock population;
- iii. Availability of irrigable swaths of land along the seasonal rivers;
- iv. Availability of modern abattoirs producing chilled meat, though majority of them are closed except the Mogadishu modern slaughter house.

4.6.1.2 Weaknesses and Challenges

- i. Challenges in meeting private standards requirements (NB: These increase cost of compliance);
- ii. Management of new trans-boundary pest and disease threats;
- iii. Overstocking leading to deaths and poor quality animal products;
- iv. Export bans occasionally done by major export destinations of Saudi Arabia, Oman, etc.;
- v. Unstable central government;
- vi. Poor road network.

4.6.1.3 Opportunities

- i. With international community investing in peace, there is potential for growth of legitimate and regulated trade which complies with SPS requirements;

¹⁸ <http://www.fao.org/ag/agp/agpc/doc/counprof/eritrea/Eritrea.htm>

¹⁹ FAO, 2014: <http://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/283777/icode/>

- ii. Investment in the improvement and regulation of slaughtering practices and locations;
- iii. Potential for foreign investments in animal sector especially quarantine stations and export slaughterhouses;
- iv. Return of Diaspora Somalis to invest at home - investment in the animal health sector;
- v. Huge potential for fish and fisheries products;
- vi. Huge potential for development of fruits industry.

4.6.1.4 Threats

- i. Proliferation of private standards which increase cost of compliance;
- ii. Emerging pest and disease threats;
- iii. Climate change.

4.7 South Sudan

South Sudan is a landlocked country of approximately 640,000km² and a total population of about 8,079,000. Approximately 80% of the population lives in rural areas and works in agriculture. A large section of the White Nile river flows through it, and these wetlands are a vast swamp area formed by the White Nile, a main tributary of the Nile River, and make up more than 15% of the country's total area. The country is bordered by Sudan, Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, Democratic Republic of Congo, and Central African Republic. South Sudan is divided into 10 states, with the capital being Juba. South Sudan has large oil revenues, with nearly 98% of the country's budget revenues from oil. Nevertheless, livestock rearing is a major occupation of the South Sudanese. The cattle population is estimated at 17.7million, with an estimated 12 million each of sheep and goats. Sale of livestock, especially small ruminants is the main source of cash for households (table 11). While the domestic cattle market is growing, cattle sales, unless forced by circumstances, are considered taboo²⁰.

4.7.1 Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats

4.7.1.1 Strengths

- i. Dominant livestock population;
- ii. Availability of large swaths of land that are irrigable and rain fed.

4.7.1.2 Weaknesses and Challenges

- i. Poor infrastructure;
- ii. Proliferation of private standards which increase cost of compliance;
- iii. Access to extension and veterinary services is low;
- iv. Trans-boundary animal diseases and pests;
- v. Political instability;
- vi. Conflict and insecurity leading to loss of agricultural production and livestock;
- vii. Cattle rustling, competition over water points and grazing lands;
- viii. High livestock morbidity and mortality rate;
- ix. Spread of disease and increased disease outbreaks;
- x. Disruption of trade routes due to conflicts;
- xi. Dysfunctional cold chain;
- xii. Restrictions on mobility of livestock population as a result of political instability, insecurity and community tensions;

²⁰ WFP, 2014; WB, 01/2013 - FAO/WFP crop and food security assessment mission to South Sudan, February 2014

- xiii. Poor public and private veterinary services, due to a lack of means and adequate human resources, resulting in an inability to respond to the deteriorating in animal health situation;
- xiv. Weak institutional capacity and limited competence of staff in the animal industry.

4.7.1.3 Opportunities

- i. With international community investing in peace, there is potential for growth of legitimate and regulated trade which is compliant with SPS requirements;
- ii. Acceptance of the country to EAC provides for greater market and knowledge that is available from the other partner states;
- iii. Investment in the improvement and regulation of slaughtering practices and locations;
- iv. Potential for foreign investments in livestock sector; investment could be in value addition and investment in the animal health sector.

4.7.1.4 Threats

- i. Climate change;
- ii. Emerging pest and disease threats.

4.8 Sudan

Livestock sector forms an important component of the agricultural sector, with production mainly based on traditional pastoral systems. Livestock are the largest subsector of the Sudanese domestic economy and are a growing contributor to exports. The great bulk of all livestock production – possibly 90% of the total, though no one really knows the actual figure – comes from small holders and migratory producers. To a remarkable extent, the Sudanese economy is based on a combination of mobile and sedentary pastoral and agro pastoral production by farming and herding households in almost every region and state. It is essential that Sudanese policy makers recognize the centrality of pastoralism to their economy and take practical steps to support the livestock sector²¹. Livestock provide milk, meat, hides and skins, hair, manure, animal draught and transport, subsistence and income²². Crop production is mainly under irrigation, however challenges of SPS compliance especially on products exported to Europe is still a concern.

4.8.1 Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats

4.8.1.1 Strengths

- i. Large livestock population;
- ii. Relatively well organized animal quarantine systems;
- iii. Membership to IGAD and COMESA (founder member of both);
- iv. Member of Tripartite (EAC-COMESA-SADC)²³ negotiation forum;
- v. Marine and freshwater fisheries resources;
- vi. Underground and surface water supplies;
- vii. Well established surveillance system;
- viii. 1 National laboratory and 16 regional laboratories in place and functional;
- ix. PVS laboratory evaluation by OIE undertaken; National SPS committee in place;

²¹ The Contribution of Livestock to the Sudan Economy [ICPALD 6/CLE/8/2013].

²² Mahgoub G. Zaroung: Country /Pasture resource profiles; Sudan-
<http://www.fao.org/ag/agp/agpc/doc/counprof/sudan/sudan.htm>

²³ Communiqué of the Third COMESA-EAC-SADC Tripartite Summit, 10 June 2015; Sharm El Sheikh, Arab Republic of Egypt: Third Tripartite Summit, 2015:m Third_Tripartite_Summit_Communique
https://www.tralac.org/images/Resources/Tripartite_FTA/Third_Tripartite_Summit_Communique_10062015.pdf

- x. Rich Biodiversity and genetic pool.

4.8.1.2 Weaknesses and Challenges

- i. Poor infrastructure;
- ii. Weak extension and veterinary services;
- iii. Severe weather conditions;
- iv. Occasional export bans by major export destination markets such as Saudi Arabia and Oman;
- v. Trans-boundary animal diseases;
- vi. Low uptake/poor strategies for disseminating research findings resulting in large yield gap between research centres and farms;
- vii. Poor land tenure system;
- viii. Climate change;
- ix. Emerging pest and diseases;
- x. Low funding and inadequate representation in Codex activities;
- xi. High cost of compliance to private standards.

4.8.1.3 Opportunities

- i. Investment in the improvement and regulation of slaughtering practices and locations;
- ii. Potential for foreign investments in the animal sector such as in value addition and animal health sector;
- iii. Great potential to increase inflow of foreign direct investment;
- iv. Close proximity to important markets, i.e. COMESA, Middle East, and other Gulf states, etc;
- v. New approaches to value addition available thus increasing prospects for better markets;
- vi. Development of technical and functional capacity for policy and planning;
- vii. Enhancement of agriculture productivity and production;
- viii. Increasing public and private sector agricultural research and development;
- ix. Reforming land tenure and land-use systems;
- x. Improvement of data collection and analysis for food and nutrition security;
- xi. Public and private investment in rural infrastructure, e.g. irrigation systems, slaughterhouses, agro-processing facilities and markets;
- xii. Rehabilitation of rangelands (i.e. pastures and water supplies) and facilitation of fair resource sharing;
- xiii. Increasing monitoring and provision of veterinary services for better trans-boundary animal disease outbreak management;
- xiv. Expanding disaster risk management to include challenges arising from climate change.

4.8.1.4 Threats

- i. Climate change leading to severe weather that is not supportive of livestock enterprises.

5.0 STATUS OF CURRENT SPS SYSTEMS IN IGAD MEMBER STATES

5.1 SPS Capacity in IGAD Countries

The IGAD Countries (Djibouti, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Kenya, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Somalia and Uganda) have different SPS related infrastructure. Nonetheless, the countries benefit from programs and expertise available from IGAD, African Union Bureau for Animal Resources (AU-IBAR). Other initiatives are those of COMESA and individual countries and donors. Despite the availability of the above-mentioned strengths a number of areas require improvement. These include the following:

5.1.1 Legislation for effective SPS controls

The eight countries have basic legislation that has helped establish institutions in the entire agricultural chain (Animals including veterinary services, plant health and food and feed safety. It is however noted that most of the laws and procedures have not been reviewed to be in line with requirements of the WTO-Agreement on Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (WTO-SPS Agreement) and guidelines set by the three standards setting organizations recognized by the WTO-SPS Agreement – OIE, CODEX and IPPC. A detailed capacity analysis on the weaknesses of the laws should be undertaken using tools already developed by the standards setting organizations such as the OIE-Program on Veterinary Services (OIE-PVS), IPPC-Phytosanitary capacity evaluation tool (PCE- Tool) and FAO-WHO- Codex tools. While doing so existing overlaps and deficiencies shall be addressed to optimally utilize resources and ensure sustainability.

5.1.2 Human Capacity

The recruitment and retention of essential staff is necessary for delivery of an efficient and effective SPS system. It is noted that though all countries have staff undertaking SPS controls, clear functions with job descriptions are not well elaborated. The PVS, IPPC and Codex tools need to be undertaken in those countries that have not done so for purpose of recommending the necessary skills mix required at both country and regional level. Furthermore, there is need to link the IGAD strategy to the Tripartite one of SADC-COMESA-EAC together with the proposed Africa wide Continental Free Trade Area (CFTA).

5.1.3 Coordination and participation in relevant standards setting activities

The eight countries, being members of IGAD, benefit from policy interventions provided by the organization. It is also noted most of the IGAD member countries are also members of COMESA and Tripartite free trade area. In addition, Kenya and Uganda are also members of EAC. But it is observed that coordination is fairly weak. Most of the countries have SPS committees though such committees are established that they are not a requirement under existing laws hence they are weak and may require strengthening through enabling legislation, funding and provision of necessary infrastructure. In general terms, most of the countries as summarized in the SWOT table participate in OIE, CODEX and IPPC standard setting but there is little evidence of adequate consultations prior to such meetings.

The inadequacy in SPS delivery infrastructure in all the IGAD countries has in the recent past resulted in market access restrictions for livestock and livestock products. Regarding market of livestock in the Gulf States, there have been failures and successes registered. For example, from 1998 to 2009 a number of IGAD member states were unable to market livestock to United Arab Emirates, Oman and Saudi Arabia due to outbreak of Rift Valley Fever (RVF) in Kenya, Somalia and Sudan. Though RVF was not in all the countries in the region the ban applied to all countries. To regain the market, these countries had to

establish and operationalize export quarantines, which was an expensive undertaking, though it enabled resumption of trade.

Laying strong SPS infrastructure is crucial for market access. For instance, Kenya and Uganda, despite occasional bans on exports of fish from Lake Victoria in 2008, resumed exports after establishing a traceability system and HACCP systems that meet the stringent EU requirements. Within the IGAD region and the rest of Africa, Sanitary Measures are yet to be harmonized resulting in SPS related trade barriers. For example, currently Kenya is unable to market fresh milk to Zambia, neither is she able to export avocados to South Africa on account of perceived SPS concerns, this is despite the fact the three countries are members of SADC-COMESA-EAC free trade area (TFTA). Trans boundary pest and disease problems require a coordinated approach for effectiveness and efficiency. To address these shortcomings, it is proposed IGAD assists member states in strengthening their competent authorities responsible for plant health matters, animal health matters, food safety matters and any other discipline geared to implementation of the SPS strategy. The Member state institutions identified above shall be responsible for regulating and enforcing Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures under their jurisdiction, issuance of required import and export permits, health certificates and certificates of compliance in relation to the sanitary and phytosanitary matters as well as surveillance risk assessment and compiling market information. In addition, representatives of such organizations shall constitute Regional SPS committees that will be responsible for harmonization of SPS measures and any other action required by the IGAD strategy.

5.1.4: SPS Infrastructure, laboratories and Quarantine Systems in IGAD Countries

The IGAD region is endowed with animal resources that could be exploited to improve the livelihoods of the farming communities including those in the pastoral areas. All the countries have government ministries that are responsible for policy. Some countries also have institutions (public and private) dedicated to promoting the industry. In Ethiopia for example, Ministry of Trade, Ministry of Science and Technology, Ministry of Agriculture and specialized agencies such as Livestock Agency, National Animal Health Diagnostic Center among others are crucial in development of the animal industry. Private sector players include the Ethiopian Central Chamber and sectoral associations. Ethiopia still needs to improve their capacity.

Though systems are in place within IGAD to deal with SPS issues within the framework of IGAD projects, AU-IBAR projects and individual country action plans, there is need to prioritize the requirements and to link individual country needs with the goals of regional integration in the management of trans-boundary SPS concerns etc. Laboratory infrastructure in the IGAD countries requires further assessment to determine which laboratories should become national or regional reference laboratories. A clear collaborative approach including certification and sharing of test results and associated costs should be undertaken.

Overall strengthening of SPS infrastructure for certifying animal products, plant products for local consumption and exports is recommended. This could include Laboratories, certification infrastructure, identification of national and regional centres of excellence (for plant health, animal health, food and feed) and provision of cold chains for both fresh produce and food. Deliberate policies geared towards improving private sector involvement on trade and value addition and managing trans-boundary diseases, strengthening of institutions are necessary pre-requisites for sustained growth.

6.0 VISION AND MISSION

To derive an IGAD SPS vision and mission, an analysis of the overall IGAD vision and mandate was undertaken in order for the SPS strategic focus; this is seen as supplementary to the main strategy of IGAD. Areas of focus derived from IGAD strategy and vision identified to guide the derivation of SPS vision and mission are: *“Food security and environmental protection, economic cooperation and integration, as well as initiation and promotion of programmes and projects to achieve regional food security and sustainable development of natural resources and environment protection.”* Having considered relevant provisions under the global IGAD mandate relevant to Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures, the proposed SPS Vision and Mission for IGAD are as follows.

6.1 IGAD SPS Vision

The Lead facilitator of SPS-Compliance.

6.2 IGAD SPS

Promoting market access, improvement of economic wellbeing, public health, agricultural and environmental protection through improved management of pests and diseases, and maintenance of food and feed safety across the value chain.

7.0 STRATEGY AND INTERVENTIONS TO MAINSTREAM SPS WITHIN IGAD FOR EXPANDED TRADE

7.1 The IGAD SPS Strategy for Expanded Trade

The IGAD region has potential to grow her trade amongst member states and the rest of the world subject to addressing weaknesses and threats identified. Some of the areas that require focus include human capacity needs, improvement on coordination, reviews of legislations, regulations as well as enhancing private public dialogue and growth. The 2016/17 - 2021/22 strategy will thus address four broad strategic objectives to enable IGAD region and member states expand trade and also promote compliance with sanitary and phytosanitary measures. These areas are:

- i. Coordinated collaboration on SPS measures including review of regulatory instruments;
- ii. Strengthening of public and private sector institutions for assurance of SPS compliance and market access;
- iii. Managing trans-boundary pests and diseases for enhanced market access and integration based on scientific risk management approaches;
- iv. Communication and awareness.

The identified areas have further been broken down to activities and timeliness suggested through a log-frame approach.

7.1.1 Strategic Objective 1: Facilitate a coordinated collaboration on SPS measures including review of regulatory instruments

The IGAD region is endowed with a lot of agricultural resources that can be used to feed the ever-rising population and also provide food in form of exports to the rest of the world. Indeed, both live animals and animal products are being exported to many countries particularly in the Middle East. One of the identified bottlenecks to a unified approach to marketing agricultural products, including livestock and livestock products, has been weak and uncoordinated legal and policy environment including laws that may be outdated and therefore not compliant with international best practices. As part of the strategic intervention within the next 5 years, the following will be addressed:

- 7.1.1.1 IGAD secretariat and participating partner states shall endeavour within 5 years to establish a framework for SPS legislation that promotes harmonization and consistency of regulation for trade in food, feed, live animals, animal products and plant products within participating member states and the rest of the world, while respecting the requirements of international agreements and in particular the SPS agreement. This could involve undertaking review with an aim of harmonizing SPS laws / proclamations / subsidiary legislations and directives to enable the region to trade more effectively. IGAD and member states could also consider appointing an SPS regulatory focal person at member state level and SPS focal person at Regional/ICPALD level to oversee the review of relevant legislation after national and regional prioritization.
- 7.1.1.2 Establish or strengthen regional SPS committees as well as national SPS committees to be vehicles of analysis with a view of recommending action by the competent ministries and sectoral committees of IGAD as well as reasoned opinions in negotiating strategies and programs designed to actualize the proposed continental free trade area for Africa (CFTA).
- 7.1.1.3 Strengthen coordination at regional level and at national level. A coordinated approach at regional standards setting within the framework of Tripartite (EAC-COMESA-SADC), African Union (AU-IBAR, AU-IAPSC, proposed continental free trade area for Africa- CFTA) and in standards setting activities of international standards setting organizations i.e. at CODEX, OIE and IPPC.
- 7.1.1.4 Participation on SPS committee meetings together with regional forums designed to enhance food safety, animal health and plant health in the region and at international level including at WTO Headquarters.
- 7.1.1.5 Establishment and management of one-stop borders including sharing information and undertaking joint certification of produce.

7.1.2 Strategic objective 2: Strengthen public and private sector for assurance of SPS compliance and market access

Capacity development for both public and private institutions is crucial for market access. It is necessary that both public and private sectors are kept informed of new developments in the field of SPS. Furthermore, SPS requirements evolve rapidly as new scientific methods are developed. Private sector being the driver of exports, it is important that IGAD and partner states make deliberate efforts to grow and develop the private sector to drive value addition of agricultural products as well as assure compliance with market requirements. The following are focus areas:

- 7.1.2.1 Training for public and private sector to enable compliance with SPS related market requirements related to animal health, food safety and plant health as well as environmental protection.
- 7.1.2.2 Provide necessary laboratory infrastructure in public sector as well as training. Also promote setting up of private laboratories which should be facilitated to have their methods certified under recognized certification schemes such as ISO 17025.
- 7.1.2.3 Establish holding facilities for fattening animals and vaccination.

7.1.3 Strategic objective 3: Address trans-boundary pests and diseases for enhanced market access and integration based on scientific risk management approaches.

Sustainable market access relies on ability of a country to meet market requirements. Special attention will be given to management of trans- boundary animal diseases such as foot and mouth disease (FMD) among others through strengthened establishment of a robust system for predicting, management and control of agricultural trans-boundary pests and diseases. The areas of focus are as follows:

- 7.1.3.1 Establish and commission warning systems for pests and diseases. This could entail establishing national and regional agreed standards and plans for the collection of surveillance data for priority pests for the purposes of early detection and market access (development of manuals, standard operating procedures, protocols and joint management pests and diseases). This will also entail developing a system of quarantine pests and diseases within specific member states and the IGAD region. The database will assist in developing a robust surveillance system that will safeguard the IGAD region from external threats while managing threats already in the region. Development of national and regional surveillance protocols linked with quality assurance systems and accreditation to act as a driver for creating capacity and capability will also be developed;
- 7.1.3.2 Synchronize national policies regarding management of trans-boundary pests and diseases to regional policies to ensure better results at least cost;
- 7.1.3.3 Facilitate the development of a nationally and regionally coordinated and targeted surveillance system that provides intelligence, supports the early detection of exotic pests, reports evidence of area freedom, enhances pest incursion responses and supports the effective management of established pests;
- 7.1.3.4 Map and zone regions within Member States and within IGAD region where similar climatic and other ecological similarities exists with the aim of better management of risks. A mechanism to engage industry, regions, county governments and communities to ensure broader recognition of the importance of surveillance and collection of surveillance data geared to having effective pest and disease surveillance and reporting shall be formulated and implemented;
- 7.1.3.5 Development or up-scaling of existing traceability systems. Already IGAD and AU-IBAR, under a pilot program with Sudan and Ethiopia, are undertaking livestock identification and traceability (LITS) program in selected areas. The positive achievements of the program shall be up-scaled with participation of private sector and public sector in each member states and development partners. The up-scaling could also cover food safety traceability. Further, if found desirable and practical, the IGAD sub-region could pioneer traceability in the entire bio-security system (animal health, food safety and plant health).

7.1.4 Strategic objective 4: Enhance Communication, Education, Advocacy and Awareness

Communication and awareness creation is necessary to improve compliance with SPS during the strategy implementation period IGAD Secretariat and Partner States will be expected to mainstream ICT and also optimize data sharing. The focus areas include:

- 7.1.4.1 Establishment of or up-scaling a regional SPS information system. The system to be used in communication and transmitting necessary SPS related information and trade documents such as permits, sanitary and phytosanitary certificates;
- 7.1.4.2 Up-scaling existing platforms such as e-ping currently in use in Uganda and Ethiopia linking SPS and TBT related activities such as notifications among others. E-Ping enables countries to easily access information and to facilitate communication on changes in SPS and TBT regulations of trading partners. From pilot studies in Uganda and Gambia, a gap was identified in that it was observed that national stakeholders are poorly informed about changes in SPS and TBT regulations of trading partners. Communication flow among and between the public and private sector on SPS and TBT topics are often fragmented or non-existent;

- 7.1.4.3 Empowering private sector, farmers, non-governmental organizations and civil society organizations to negotiate for better working conditions, social sustainability programs, marketing, inculcating ethical practices including animal welfare;
- 7.1.4.4 Providing an e-learning platform.

7.2 Log frame: A 5-year focused intervention

Since it is not possible to fund all areas identified, it is suggested for incomes and livelihoods to improve through targeted SPS related interventions focus should be made on the areas highlighted below in table

Table 1: A log-frame for the 5-year SPS Intervention

Results Chain	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of verification	Assumptions
Impact: Livelihoods and incomes improved through market access achieved by greater compliance with SPS requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Market access by IGAD countries improved by 20-30% in five years Incomes increased by 20 % in 5 years 		8 IGAD member states	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legal frameworks available Trade records by the participating countries and from IGAD and FAO statistics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Member states are willing to participate Funds will be available
Outcome: Increased export volumes of SPS compliant products (livestock, fish, honey, and plant products) from IGAD countries to external and inter-IGAD markets	An SPS system established at IGAD and in member states	IGAD data exports	Grow exports at least by IGAD member states at the end of 5 years	Export records	Countries will adopt strategy and implement
Outputs					
1.0 Facilitate a Coordinated Collaboration on SPS Measures including Review of regulatory instruments					
Activity 1.1: Establish framework for SPS legislation	Strategy on SPS legislation established by 5 years		Legal framework undertaken and in use by IGAD Member States	IGAD and member states reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No delays will be encountered in the development of the strategy Funds will be available on time to undertake task

<p>Activity 1.2: Establish/ strengthen regional SPS committees as well as national SPS committees</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPS forum committee established with clear Terms of reference at IGAD Secretariat • SPS committee strengthened in Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda • SPS committees established in the other IGAD countries 		<p>SPS forum in place and functional by 2 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPS committees strengthened by 2017 • SPS committees in other in Somalia and Eritrea established by 2018 	<p>Published TORS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting reports • Meeting reports 	<p>Funds and support by member states will be provided</p>
<p>Activity 1.3: Strengthen coordination at regional level and at national level including participation in WTO meetings in Geneva.</p>	<p>A coordinated mechanism established to comment on standards and related matters.</p>	<p>Status report at initiation</p>	<p>Coordinated framework in place by 2017</p>	<p>Reports</p>	<p>Support by member states is provided</p>
<p>Activity 1.4: Establishment of one-stop borders sharing information and undertaking joint certification of produce</p>	<p>Mechanism for managing one-stop border points established</p>	<p>Status report</p>	<p>Mechanism in place by 2018</p>	<p>Reports</p>	<p>Support by member states is provided</p>

Results Chain	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of verification	Assumptions
Output 2: Strengthen public and institutions for assurance of SPS compliance and market access					
Activity 2.1: Training for public and private sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training needs assessment (TNA) undertaken Hold workshops to discuss TNAs • Undertake identified training 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training needs undertaken for the IGAD countries by 2017 • At least one regional meeting by end of 2017 • At least 8 persons trained from the 8 member states by year from 2018 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training needs report • Report • Reports 	Support for survey will be provided by IGAD and member states
Activity 2.2: Establish animal holding facilities for fattening and vaccination before slaughter by private sector.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Upscale animal holding facilities and develop animal holding facilities in countries where they do not exist. 		Prototype developed and shared with private sector by 2018		Support by private sector will be provided
Output 3: Address trans-boundary pests and diseases for enhanced market access and integration based on scientific risk management approaches					
Activity 3.1: Establish and commission warning system for pests and diseases	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early warning system established and functional by 2018 		Early warning system in place	Reports	Funds will be available
Activity 3.2: Development of national and regional surveillance protocols	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertake priority list of protocols to be developed • Develop protocols for priority disease and pests 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority list established • At least 10 protocols established 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports • Reports 	Funds will be available

Results Chain	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of verification	Assumptions
Activity 3.3: Coordinate and target surveillance system	Targeted surveillance system for identified diseases in place		Needs assessment undertaken	Needs assessment report	Funds will be in place
Activity 3.4: Zone regions within partner states climatically for better management of risks	Acquire Climex and other systems		Modeling system in place and in use by 2018		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support by partner states • -Funds availability
Out Put 4: Establishing and up scaling regional SPS information system.					
Activity 4.1: Undertake needs assessment	Hold at least 2 regional workshops to establish needs		Needs assessment completed by 2017	Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support by member states • Funds available
Activity 4.2: Up-scaling existing traceability systems including provision of e-learning capacity	LITS program in place; rolled in at least 4 other countries by 2019		4 reports	Reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of funds • Support by member states

8.0 SPS PRIORITY SETTING FRAMEWORK

8.1 IGAD- SPS Priority Setting Framework

Provision of adequate infrastructure including training, risk mitigation, pest surveillance, and twinning of laboratories, among other needs, requires planning and prioritization to allow for prudent use of limited resources on many identified needs. Funding would take the form of:

- a. Government subvention / funding from consolidated funds appropriated from taxes and grants;
- b. Public-private partnerships in which public and private sector jointly finance targeted SPS interventions;
- c. Twinning arrangements between institutions who have better capacity (may take form of analytical capacity, procedures, protocols, methods, etc.) and those that have the necessary infrastructure but lack adequate skills to optimally use them for assuring SPS compliance;
- d. Funding from donors either singly or through multi-donor approach.

Since the region and individual countries may place different emphasis on particular issues, it is recommended a detailed capacity assessment be undertaken for all the countries with a view of selecting a few lead institutions for particular SPS issues, for example:

- a. Testing of food and feed contaminants (mycotoxins, heavy metals and pesticide residues), such institutions include Conformity Assessment Authority in Ethiopia, KEPHIS in Kenya, KEBS in Kenya, etc., UNBS in Uganda;
- b. ICT HUBS with capacity to develop programs for traceability, product certification, livestock vaccination among others may include ILRI, LVCPPD, Ethiopia, etc.;
- c. Veterinary drugs, Vaccines and Immunologicals can be managed by KEVEVAPI in Kenya, etc., MOALF &C in Uganda, etc.

8.2 The Model for Prioritization

The model chosen should take cognizance of such tools as OIE-PVS, FAO bio-security tool kit, IPPC-PCE or other appropriate evaluation tool. It is suggested IGAD and member states utilize P-IMA model, i.e. the “Prioritizing SPS Investments for Market Access” (P-IMA)²⁴. The P-IMA Model is a seven-stage process as follows (table 2):

Table 2: Steps for the Prioritizing SPS Investments for Market Access

Steps	Details
Stage 1: Compile an information dossier	Available information on SPS capacity-building needs assembled to enable an informed selection of the options to be considered in the analysis.
Stage 2: Identify the SPS capacity-building options	Definition of the decision criteria for prioritizing the identified SPS capacity-building options and the relative weights to be assigned to each of these criteria.
Steps	Details
Stage 3: Define the decision criteria and weights	Definition of the decision criteria for prioritizing the identified SPS capacity-building options and the relative weights to be assigned to each of these criteria.
Stage 4: Compile information cards for the SPS capacity-building options	Assembly and profiling of each of the SPS capacity-building options to be prioritized that includes available information on the decision criteria.
Stage 5: Compare the options according to each of the decision criteria	Comparison of the SPS capacity-building options according to each of the decision criteria in turn. Use “spider diagrams” to get an initial sense of which options perform better with respect to particular criteria, and especially those to which more weight is attached.
Stage 6: Calculate the priorities using MCDA and diagnose the results	Calculation of priorities based on all the decision criteria simultaneously; Use computer software in obtaining an initial prioritization.
Stage 7: Discuss, review and validate the priorities with stakeholders.	Communication of the initial priorities generated to stakeholders. Based on feedback, refinement of the information on the SPS capacity-building options is undertaken through finding and incorporating better data, making any other necessary changes and recalculating the priorities. Finalization of the report and discussing how to use the findings.

The P-IMA model is proposed with stakeholder involvement because it is more likely that ownership will be passed to users without much hitch.

²⁴ P-IMA_Guide (2015): http://www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/P-IMA_Guide_EN.pdf

9.0 IGAD MONITORING, EVALUATION AND REPORTING TOOL

9.1: Purpose

The purpose of monitoring, evaluation and reporting is to ensure that the strategic plan implementation is according to schedule and in the event of any deviation, an appropriate and timely action is taken. The monitoring, evaluation and reporting process will be undertaken at both the board and management levels.

9.1.1 Monitoring, evaluation and reporting at the IGAD Secretariat Level

The implementation of the SPS strategy will be closely monitored to ensure its accomplishment. The monitoring process will help determine whether the implementation is on course. Monitoring, follow-up and control systems will be established. Bi-annual review meetings will be held between Member State SPS committee teams and IGAD at which time the regional SPS Implementation Committee will receive and review progress reports on overall progress made on key strategic objectives. This may include but not limited to:

- tracking how well member states have harmonized their operations to IGAD-SPS strategy;
- resources mobilization/ utilization for priority SPS activities; and
- capacity development within private sector and public sector.

Additionally, monitoring will be carried out to determine:

- Progress made in rolling out self regulation by private sector under guidelines set up by public sector competent institutions;
- Effectiveness of the regional forums initiated under the strategy in delivering value to member states and the region in terms of dealing with SPS concerns at both regional, Africa and international levels including managing transboundary pests and diseases.

The nature and scope of reporting will include:

- i. Progress made against the strategy;
- ii. Causes of deviation from strategy, if any;
- iii. Areas of difficulties and suggested solutions to problems that may adversely affect implementation; and
- iv. Corrective measures.

The biannual/quarterly reviews will generate data that form the output of the monitoring, evaluation and reporting at the national level.

9.1.2 Monitoring at Member State Level

Monitoring, evaluation and reporting provide the backup necessary to ensure that the set objectives are achieved. During the formulation of the Strategic Plan, the implementation plan indicators and projections are sometimes based on past experiences. Monitoring will involve routine data collection and analysis on the progress of the strategic plan implementation. The results from the analysis will then be used to inform decision making, including taking corrective action where deviations in implementation have been noted. The National SPS Committee will coordinate collection of M&E data, analysis and reporting. The national SPS committees will take responsibility for overseeing the implementation of the IGAD Strategy over the entire implementation period. The committee will continuously monitor and evaluate all strategies, activities and outcomes with a view to advising on the implementation status as well as offering feasible policy and strategy alternatives. This will be done on quarterly basis and will inform IGAD Secretariat and ministries responsible for SPS implementation in the respective countries. During implementation of the

strategy and, a large extent possible, ensure this information is available on real-time basis. A system of disseminating the lessons learnt to users will be developed as part of the M & E strategy.

The national SPS committee, as part of its overall M & E coordination, will be expected to monitor the documentation and effective utilization of lessons learnt. The SPS Strategy will be evaluated during and after it is implemented to gauge the extent of achievement of the planned targets. The evaluation will determine relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact of the SPS measures. A mid-term review will also be carried out. The implementation matrix will help track and monitor progress in the implementation of the plan.

9.2 Strategic Control Mechanism

The control mechanisms that the IGAD and the member states will deploy include:

- a) Development of annual work plans;
- b) Assessment of whether results produced by the implemented activity were those forecast as outputs; and,
- c) Achievement of the expected performance standards / measures.

9.3 Indicators for National Monitoring of the Performance at National Level

Monitoring of the performance will be done on the basis of the following indicators:

- a) Compliance with relevant policies and legal frameworks;
- b) Implementation of laws, SOPS or other harmonized requirements;
- c) Baseline report on reference laboratories for diagnostics, risk assessment, etc.;
- d) Level of participation of labs in competence analysis and validation of methods of analysis;
- e) Level of harmonized opinions, strategies for use by participating countries in work of ISSOs and WTO-SPS committee meetings (regional and at WTO-Secretariat).

10.0 ANNEX

Table 3: Livestock Support Institutions in Ethiopia

No.	Institution	Function related to SPS
1	Ministry of Trade (MoT)	The MoT handles all domestic and international trade matters. The MoT and its respective offices act as the responsible body for trade related issues, and have as one of its operational objectives to promote and facilitate the leather and leather products trade, both in the domestic and international market arenas. The ministry is also responsible for establishment of proclamations, regulations, policies, strategies, and agencies; and also for promotion and facilitation of wholesome and safe food trade, including <u>Trade Practice And Consumers Protection Authority</u> .
2	Ministry of Science and Technology:	Responsible for quality infrastructure and technology transfer to compete and conform to SPS measures and food safety requirements, etc., including Ethiopian Standards Agency (ESA), Ethiopian Conformity Assessment Enterprise (ECAE), Ethiopian Metrology Institute (EMI), etc.
3	Ministry of Industry (MoI)	The MoI promotes the production of industrially manufactured goods. It also facilitates and creates a policy environment conducive to the expansion of agro-processing and manufacturing facilities, which transform raw agricultural products, such as hides and skins, into industrial and consumer goods. The MoI supports the leather and leather products industry through promoting value added manufacturing; facilitating business investment; enhancing processing and manufacturing capacity; promoting productivity, skills and benchmark projects; and market-led product development and manufacturing. The ministry is also responsible for promotion and transfer of food technologies, development and production of safe food, including Food, Beverages and Pharmaceutical Industries Development Industry (FBMIDI), and Meat and Dairy Development Institute (MDDI).
4	Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resource Development (MoA&NRD)	The MoA&NRD has a role in implementing sanitary and phytosanitary related measures in Ethiopia at national, regional and Woreda level. Other roles are registration and control of pesticides use and application, etc., including Ethiopian Horticulture Development Agency (EHDA). The MoA&NRD also oversees the overall implementation of the strategy, and coordinates participation of other major stakeholders in various areas, for example, through developing guidelines and manuals and facilitating linkages among development partners.
5	Ministry of Livestock and Fishery Resource Development	Responsible for overall policy development in areas related to SPS measures in animal health, as well as proper use and application of veterinary drugs, etc.
6	Ministry of Education (MoE)	The MoE implements both formal and informal education programs in the country. Some of the functional adult literacy programs have relevance to the agriculture sector. The MoE also collaborates with the MoA&NRD in developing occupational standards for FTC trainings. Moreover, the MoE has radio stations for educational programs which can also be used to transmit agriculture-related information.

No.	Institution	Function related to SPS
7	Ministry of Health (MoH)	The MoH has oversight on SPS and food safety as well as public health and preventive tool for human health challenges (including EPHI). The MoH has health extension agents deployed up to local level (Kebele). Some of the interventions by the ministry have a direct relationship with the agricultural sector.
8	Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEFCC)	The MoEFCC was established in July 2013 by Proclamation No. 803/2013, and renamed in October 2015. It has a broad mandate covering environmental matters at federal level, as well as social and economic development policies, strategies, laws, and programs of federal level functions, and provides advice and technical support to the regional environmental agencies and sectoral institutions.
9	Agricultural Transformation Agency (ATA)	The ATA serves as a catalyst for positive, transformational, and sustainable change. The ATA's primary aim is to promote agricultural sector transformation through the support of existing structures of government, private sector and other non-governmental partners. This is to address systemic bottlenecks in delivering on a priority national agenda for achieving growth and food security.
10	Ethiopian Standards Agency (ESA)	The ESA establishes quality standards for all industries.
11	Ethiopian Metrology (EMA)	EMA sets the guidelines for all industries on size and measurement standards.
12	Livestock Agency (LSA)	LSA is an important regional agency answerable to the Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries. LSA are regional offices, which facilitate livestock development through extension, health, public relations and management. Activities performed by LSA include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Intensive and practical training planned for the livestock subsector, including feed ration formulation; ii. Laboratory analysis; iii. Rearing centers for sheep and chicken; iv. AI production and training; and v. Feed Research.
13	Food, Medicine and Healthcare Administration and Control Authority (FMHACA)	FMHACA is responsible to accommodate regulatory powers on food safety and administration, and to control pharmaceuticals and traditional medicines, cosmetics, and medical device, as well as healthcare services and health professionals.
14	Veterinary Drugs and Feeds Administration and Control Authority (VDFACA)	VDFACA is responsible for control, registration and certification of feeds and veterinary drugs and the newly established laboratories.

No.	Institution	Function related to SPS
15	The National Animal Health Diagnostic and Investigation Center (NAHDIC) and Regional laboratories	NAHDIC and regional laboratories are responsible diagnostics, investigations and advisory services.
16	Regional Trade and Transport Bureaus	Regional Trade and Transport Bureaus function as an extension of the National Ethiopian government. The main mandates of the Regional Trade and Transport Bureaus include livestock market promotion, livestock market linkage, and infrastructure development for livestock market and market research.
17	Agriculture and Rural Development Office (ARDO) & City Administrations Agriculture Office (CAAD)	The ARDO and CAAD utilize standardization manuals to oversee the construction of storage facilities for hides and skins and its handling. They also provide technical support during the construction of storage and handling facilities, and a "Letter of Competence" to collectors who meet the criteria set in the standards manual.

Table 4: The Livestock Development Support Institutions in Kenya

No.	Institution	Role
1	State Department of Livestock of the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries	To promote, regulate and facilitate livestock production for socio-economic development and industrialization in Kenya.
2	State Department of Fisheries of the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries	To provide leadership in the management and development of aquaculture and fisheries resources. The department coordinates, develops, and manages the fisheries and aquaculture sectors by making it innovative and commercially-oriented so as to increase earnings and improve livelihoods in addition to addressing food security and unemployment.
3	The Directorate of Veterinary Services (DVS)	The veterinary authority as defined by the OIE and provisions of the WTO and CAC. The head of service is the competent authority on animal health matters in Kenya. The directorate has specialized functional units for the purpose of delivering veterinary services. The department provides regulatory services; international veterinary certification services; diagnostic services and disease investigation, prevention & control; capacity building; and quality and safety assurance of animal products.
4	Kenya Veterinary Board (KVB)	KVB was established under the Veterinary Surgeons and Veterinary Paraprofessionals Act No. 29 of 2011 with the following mandates: a. registration and licensing of veterinary surgeons and veterinary paraprofessionals; b. regulation of training of veterinary surgeons and veterinary paraprofessionals; and c. inspection of veterinary service providers.
5	Kenya Meat Commission (KMC)	KMC was established in 1950 under the Kenya Meat Commission Act, Cap 363. The institution was set up to: a. promote the country's meat industry through the purchase and slaughter of livestock, and b. Act as a strategic drought management agent as a buyer of last resort. Currently the facility is producing below capacity.
6	Kenya Animal Genetics Resource Centre (KAGRC)	The institution was created on 5 th September 2011 as a State Corporation vide Legal Notice No. 110. The roles are: a. Controlling venereal diseases and providing genetic improvement of exotic dairy cattle through collection and distribution of quality bull semen. It runs the Bull Station at Kabete, Nairobi, for the production of bull semen. b. The facility also collaborates with other international facilities in sourcing high quality semen. The work of KAGRC is supplemented by imports of semen by private sector actors.
7	Kenya Animal Genetics Resources Board (KAGRB)	KAGRB is responsible for regulating all breeding services and giving direction on breeding strategies.
8	Kenya Veterinary Vaccines Production Institute (KEVEVAPI)	KEVEVAPI was established by the Government of Kenya as a commercial parastatal institution through Legal Notice No. 223 of 4th June 1990, for the purpose of producing vaccines for disease management. The institute currently produces fifteen different types of livestock vaccines.

No.	Institution	Role
9	Kenya Tsetse and Trypanosomiasis Eradication Council (KenTTEC)	The institution was established under the State Corporation Act on 27th July 2012 vide legal Notice No. 77. It is mandated to strategize, mobilize resources, as well as providing linkages and coordination for tsetse and trypanosomiasis eradication matters in Kenya.
10	Training institutions	<p>These include public universities such as University of Nairobi and Egerton University. Others comprise tertiary specialized institutions including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Animal Health and Industry Training Institutes in Kabete, Nyahuru and Ndomba established in 1963, 1979 and 1984 respectively, which train categories of veterinary para-professionals for government veterinary services. Meat Training Institute (MTI) at Athi River. The institution was founded as a Regional Training Centre for meat inspection and hygiene personnel by the Government of Kenya and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) in 1972. It trains personnel for English speaking Sub-Saharan African countries. Its curriculum includes meat hygiene standards among others Dairy Training Institute (DTI) in Naivasha was established in 1963. It offers training on value addition to milk and dairy products.
11	Scientific research institutions	<p>These include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Kenya Agricultural & Livestock Research Organisation (KARLO) which is a corporate body created under the Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Act of 2013²⁵. The institution has specialised research institutes such as Beef Research Institute and Dairy Research Institute among others. International research institutions such as International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI). ILRI is headquartered in Kenya and works to improve food security and reduction of poverty in developing countries through research for better and more sustainable use of livestock. ILRI is one of the global research centres established to deliver research partnerships for a food-secure future.

²⁵ Kenya Law Reports: [Kenya law.org/kl/index.php?id=2762](http://kenya.law.org/kl/index.php?id=2762)

Table 5: Livestock Support Institutions in Uganda

No	Institution	Role
1	Ministry of Agriculture Livestock, Fisheries & Cooperatives	To promote, regulate and facilitate agriculture including livestock fisheries and cooperatives in Uganda.
2	Ministry of Trade, Industry and Cooperatives (MTIC)	The Ministry implements many laws including business registration laws, cross border trade laws, investment laws, tax laws, laws regulating standards and laws facilitating general trade. It is also the National Notification Authority for Uganda (NNA). Personnel handle WTO and regional issues especially COMESA and Tripartite (EAC-COMESA-SADC).
3	The Directorate of Veterinary Services (DVS)	The veterinary authority as defined by the OIE and provisions of the WTO and CAC. The head of service is the competent authority for the country on animal health matters in Uganda. The directorate has specialized functional units for the purpose of delivering veterinary services. The department provides regulatory services; international veterinary certification services; diagnostic services and disease investigation, prevention and control; capacity building; and quality and safety assurance of animal products.
4	Uganda Veterinary Board (UVB)	The UVB was established in 2012. It is a government board representing all the veterinarians working in government, private and corporate practice, industry, academia, and uniformed services. It is structured to work for its members, and acts as a collective voice for its membership and for the professional veterinary acts in Uganda. UVB mandate includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. protecting consumers and animals through development and maintenance of professional standards, b. licensing of veterinarians, registered veterinary technicians, and premises, and c. enforcement of the Uganda Veterinary Medicine Practice Act.
5	Uganda Meat Producers Cooperative Union Ltd.	Mandate is promoting the country's meat industry through the purchase and slaughter of livestock.
6	National Animal Genetics Resources and Databank, Uganda NAGR & DB	The institution has the mandate of optimizing livestock production and productivity through animal breeding to improve food security and eradicate poverty in Uganda.
7	Uganda National Bureau of Standards (UNBS)	UNBS is a statutory organization established by an Act of Parliament of June 1983 and became operational in 1989. The mission of the bureau is to provide standards, measurements and conformity assessment services for improved quality of life.
8	Training institutions	These include public universities such as Makerere University. Others include tertiary specialized institutions such as Bukalasa Agricultural College.
9	National Agricultural Research Organization (NARO)	NARO is the apex body for guidance and coordination of all agricultural research activities in the national agricultural research system in Uganda. It is a public institution established by an Act of Parliament, which was enacted on 21st November 2005.

Table 6: Kenya Animal Statistics (2010-2013)

Product	2010	2011	2012	2013
Beehives	1334023	1717347	1800000	
Camels	3091200	2864732	2899244	293,7262
Cattle	18173500	19129800	18138500	1781185
Chicken	30966	34583	39872	42413
Goats	28,860,700	22,181,935	24,637,393	25,430,055
Horses	1900	2000	2050	2050
Pigs	344,155	408,703	432,929	430,844
Rabbits & Hares(1000Heads)	787	782	872	875
Sheep	17,821,600	16,115,701	16,600,911	17,420,207
Cattle & Buffaloes	18,173,500	19,129,800	18,138,500	17,811,845
Poultry Birds (1000Heads)	30,966	34,583	39,872	42,413
Sheep & Goats	46,682,300	38,297,636	41,238,304	42,850,265

Source: **FAOSTAT**—FAOSTAT 2013: <http://faostat3.fao.org/home/index.html>

Table 7: Production of Dairy Products in Kenya, 2011-2015

Unit	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015*
Recorded milk production	549.0	495.2	523.0	541.3	600.4
Milk and cream (processed)	374.0	331.6	406.7	419.6	437.9
Butter and ghee (processed)	1,995.1	1,800.7	1,231.0	1,444.5	1,646.4
Cheese (processed)	290.3	254.9	267.4	265.7	296.5
Slaughtered Cattle and Calves	2,103.4	2,194.2	2,147.3	2,076.7	2,274.5
Slaughtered Sheep and Goats	5,837.5	5,924.2	6,084.8	6,138.5	6,560.8
Slaughtered Pigs	223.5	235.4	264.3	257.2	282.9

Source: Kenya National Bureau of Statistics/Kenya Dairy Board/State Department of Livestock, 2015

Table 8: Animal Production in Uganda 2010-2014

Category of livestock produced	Unit of Measure	Year				
		2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Fish	Number	408,066	479,620	407,119	419,248	461,726
Cattle	Thousands (000)	12,104	12,467	12,480	13,020	13,623
Sheep	Thousands (000)	3,621	3,730	3,842	3,937	3,842
Goats	Thousands (000)	13,208	13,604	14,012	14,614	14,011
Pigs	Thousands (000)	3,378	3,480	3,584	3,692	3,584
Poultry	Thousands (000)	44,200	40,904	42,131	38,064	44,698

Source: Economic Survey 2016, Uganda

Table 9: Milk, Beef and Egg Production in Uganda 2010-2015

Product	Unit of Measure	Year				
		2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Beef	Metric Tonnes	180,300	185,709	191,280	197,019	202,929
Milk	(000,000 litres)	1,377	1,418	1,461	1,505	1,550
Eggs	Millions (000,000)	761.3	784.1	807.6	831.9	856.8

Source: Uganda Bureau of Statistics, Statistical Abstract, October, 2015

Table 10: Hides and Skins Statistics in Uganda

Unit	Bovine hides			Sheep/lambs skins			Goats/kids skins		
	2003	2012	% growth	2003	2012	% growth	2003	2012	% growth
Million	0.7	0.9	28.57	0.4	0.7	75.00	2.4	2.8	16.67

Source: IGAD Consultancy on Hides and Skins (Adopted and compiled from FAO, World Statistical Compendium, 2012)

Table 11: South Sudan Animal Statistics 2014

ID	Animal type	Population
1	Cattle	17,729,188
2	Goats	12,307,686
3	Sheep	11,682,172
4	Camel	23,582
5	Pig	14,406
6	Donkeys	222,671
	Total	41,979,705

Source: *Policy Brief on the Contribution of Livestock to South Sudan National GDP Jan 2016*

IGAD Centre for Pastoral Areas and Livestock Development (ICPALD)
Jadala Place 1st Floor, Ngong Lane, Off Ngong Road
P.O. Box 47824-00100 Nairobi, Kenya.
TEL: +254 20 2573743 / +254 73777742
Email: icpald@igad.int
www.icpald.org