



EXTRAPOLATE

**Un outil d'animation et de prise de
décision au sein des filières**

Cheikh LY

Regional animal production and health officer

FAO Regional Office for Africa - RAF

Accra - Ghana

Atelier de formation collective

Systemes d'information et outils de pilotage du secteur élevage

dans les pays du Sud : Postures et méthodes

Montpellier, 11-13 juillet 2011

Cirad-Lavalette

EXTRAPOLATE

Ex-ante tool for ranking policy alternatives





EXTRAPOLATE

Ex-ante tool for ranking policy alternatives





EXTRAPOLATE

Ex-ante tool for ranking policy alternatives

Timothy Robinson, PPLPI-AGAL, AGA, FAO, Rome, Italy.

and

Peter Thorne, Stirling Thorne Associates, UK.

Philip Thornton, ILRI, Nairobi, Kenya.





Objectives

After reading this module, you should know about:

- Formulating pro-poor livestock policies
- Evaluating alternative policy components using the EXTRAPOLATE programme




See notes for required background



Overview

- Part I: Introduction
 - Policy process and analysis
 - EXTRAPOLATE summary
- Part II: Example
 - Dairy policy in Uganda
 - Lessons learned
- Part III: Practical
 - Step by step interactive demonstration






Overview

- Part I: Introduction
 - ◆ Policy process and analysis
 - ◆ EXTRAPOLATE summary

- Part II: Example
 - ◆ Dairy policy in Uganda
 - ◆ Lessons learned

- Part III: Practical
 - ◆ Step by step interactive demonstration





What constitutes a good policy?

- **Equitable**
Pro-poor - not based purely on profitability
- **Inclusive**
based on broad stakeholder consensus
- **Evidence-based**
policy analysis
- **Practical**
appropriate instruments, institutions and funding



How do we arrive at a good policy?

Consensus
proposal for
new policy or
legislation


Clarify disputed issues

Involve stakeholders

Engage in policy process

Identify policy issue(s)

Livelihoods analysis



How can EXTRAPOLATE help?

Developed by the Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Initiative
to assist policy analysis and design

www.fao.org/ag/pplpi.html

- **Set up a ‘coalition for change’**
participation in the policy process
- **Analyse the status quo**
common understanding of stakeholders and their constraints
- **Identify policy options**
policy analysis
- **Select optimal combinations of policy intervention**
participation / negotiation / communication







FIGURE 5.1: SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOODS FRAMEWORK (H=Human capital; F=Financial capital; N=Natural capital; S=Social capital; P=Physical capital) Source: DFiD, 2000.

A Livestock Based SL Approach




Extrapolate: Ex-ante Tool for Ranking Policy Alternatives

Home Model Data Summary Graphs Policy Analysis

Control Centre
 Home Help
 Extrapolate Home Exit

Import Export
 Exchange Models



Pro-Poor Livestock Policy Initiative A Living from Livestock

Ex-ante Tool for Evaluating Policy Alternatives - Extrapolate

EXTRAPOLATE (EX-ante Tool for RAnking POLicy ALTErnatives) arose out of the need for a decision support tool to assess the impact of different policy measures. By disaggregating the effects of policy interventions the tool facilitates discussion of the relevant issues and enables users to visualize the predicted impacts of policy interventions, based on numerical analysis. The tool serves as a filter that allows the user to sift through, in an *ex-ante* fashion, a range of policy measures to identify those that could be applied in a specific situation to achieve particular outcomes that further particular policy objectives. This would be the first step in assessing potential impact before looking at identified policy options in more detail. Mainstream economics has a wide array of tools to assess these sorts of policy changes in a rigorous and quantitative fashion (such as policy analysis matrices, computable general equilibrium models, etc.). The tool has the further characteristic that it is participatory in nature, encouraging stakeholder involvement and discussion around the likely impact of policy change.


In essence, for a particular theme (e.g. a dairy sector) relatively homogeneous stakeholder groups are first identified (a commodity chain approach can be helpful in deciding who is involved and where), and these groups are assigned a livelihood status (or some other currency of wellbeing). The constraints that they face in relation to the particular theme are then identified and linked by scoring their relevance to the different groups. Outcomes are then identified as the measurable effects of relaxing these constraints, and the impact of these outcomes on livelihood status is estimated. Thus the present *ex-ante* situation is described, and policy or institutional interventions can then be introduced. Their effects are estimated in terms of their impacts on constraints, which result in certain outcomes, which, in turn, influence the livelihood status of the different stakeholder groups.

The development of Extrapolate was conceived and financially supported by FAO's Pro-poor Livestock Policy Initiative (PPLPI). For more information on the project, go to the PPLPI [website](#).

Current model: Promotion of Lactoperoxidase Milk Treatment

Windows Internet Ex... Microsoft Word Extrapolate


FR 19:48



Stakeholders need essentially to be fairly homogeneous groups of individuals, households or communities, of similar welfare levels and who face similar constraints. For each stakeholder group in the model, think about a characteristic example and specify a “typical household”. Are the stakeholders in the model all sufficiently different? If not, you may need to reduce the number of stakeholders. Are all the major system types accounted for? Are all stages of the marketing chain accounted for? If not, you may need more stakeholder groups. You might think about aiming for 10-20 stakeholder groups in total.


Outcomes are the measurable effects of relaxing constraints, and act directly on the welfare of a group of stakeholders. If an outcome reads as the reverse of a constraint, it needs to be reformulated. If you have more than 6-8 outcomes in the model, consider if the things you have as outcomes really are things that directly affect welfare. The outcomes need to be highly specific, cover only one outcome each, and should be as independent of each other (and of particular constraints and stakeholder groups) as possible.

Constraints should be specific and deal with one thing only each. They should not overlap, in fact they should be independent, as far as possible. If two constraints are very similar it is likely that either they can be reformulated as a single constraint or that one is a direct result of the other, more fundamental constraint. Each constraint should be of some relevance to at least one stakeholder group, otherwise throw it out. You might think about aiming for 10-20 constraints in total.





EXTRAPOLATE: Graphic output





EXTRAPOLATE: Summary

- Simple PC-based programme
- Promotes a participatory approach
- Easy to use, well documented
 - ◆ User Guide
 - ◆ Reference Manual
- Not data-intensive
- Simple graphic output
- Can evaluate different combinations of policies
- Can be used at a range of policy levels




Built around 4 elements and their linkages

- 1. Stakeholder groups** – the individuals on which policies have an impact (livelihood status);
- 2. Constraints** – that prevent stakeholders from achieving desirable outcomes;
- 3. Outcomes** – measurable effects of relaxing constraints (contribute to the livelihoods of stakeholders); and
- 4. Policies** – that impact on constraints.




EXTRAPOLATE: Model diagram





EXTRAPOLATE: Stakeholders


Step 1





EXTRAPOLATE: Constraints


Step 2





EXTRAPOLATE: C → S


Step 3





EXTRAPOLATE: Outcomes


Step 4





EXTRAPOLATE: O → S


Step 5






EXTRAPOLATE: C → O

Step 6






EXTRAPOLATE: Current situation





EXTRAPOLATE: Policies


Step 7





EXTRAPOLATE: P → C


Step 8






EXTRAPOLATE: P → O

Step 9





EXTRAPOLATE: Impact of policy change on different stakeholders





End of Part I





Overview

- Part I: Introduction
 - ◆ Policy process and analysis
 - ◆ EXTRAPOLATE summary

- Part II: Example
 - ◆ Dairy policy in Uganda
 - ◆ Lessons learned


- Part III: Practical
 - ◆ Step by step interactive demonstration





Dairy policy in Uganda – origins

- 1993 Dairy Master Plan
- Request to help develop a dairy policy
 - MAAIF
 - DDA
 - PMA Secretariat
- The challenge:
 - To develop policies based on equity, rather than just on profitability
 - To ensure that marginalized groups are represented




Credit: ILRI



Dairy policy in Uganda – process

- Dairy policy task force
 - MAAIF; PMA Secretariat; DDA; UBOS; NAGRC
- Stakeholder workshops using EXTRAPOLATE
 - Uganda Dairy Farmers Association
 - Uganda National Dairy Traders Association
 - Uganda Dairy Processors Association
 - NGOs
 - Individual milk producers
 - etc.....




Credit: ILRI



EXTRAPOLATE: Stakeholders


Step 1





Stakeholder analysis - commodity chain

Informal



Source: ILRI 2003



Stakeholder groups

- **Producers**
 - Smallholder intensive (4)
 - Smallholder extensive (2)
 - Mediumholder intensive (7)
 - Mediumholder extensive (4)
 - Large-scale producers (9)
 - Pastoralist (3)
 - Agro-pastoralist (6)
- **Processors and traders**
 - Informal traders (5)
 - Formal traders (8)
 - Informal small processor (6)
 - Formal small processor (7)
 - Large processors and exporters (10)
- **Consumers**
 - low-income rural consumer (1)
 - low-income urban consumer (1)
 - High income consumer (9)





EXTRAPOLATE: Model elements

Extrapolate: Ex-ante Tool for Ranking Policy Alternatives

Home | Model Data | Summary Graphs | Policy Analysis

Stakeholders | Outcomes | Constraints | Policies

View or Edit Data

Stakeholder Group Data

List of stakeholder groups | Edit description of current group | Pairwise comparisons

Drag a column header here to group by that column

Stakeholder group	Livelihood status (0 - 10)
501 smallholder intensive	4
502 smallholder extensive	2
503 mediumholder intensive	7
504 mediumholder extensive	4
505 large scale	9
506 pastoralists	3
507 agropastoralists	6
508 informal traders	5
509 formal traders	8
510 informal small processors	6
511 formal small processors	7
512 large processors & exporters	10
513 low-income rural consumers	1
514 low-income urban consumers	1
515 high-income consumers	9


Print stakeholder group list | Show stakeholder group descriptions in list

Current model: [Policy screening for the dairy sector](#)



EXTRAPOLATE: Constraints

Step 2






Constraints

- Production and processing
 - Knowledge and skills
 - Access to fixed inputs
 - Cost and availability of variable inputs
 - Animal health and nutrition
 - Low-yielding cattle breeds
- Consumption
 - Poor quality of milk and dairy products
- Institutional constraints
 - Low demand
 - Market access
 - Quality control
 - Insecurity
- Other constraints
 - Healthy labour force



EXTRAPOLATE: C → S

Step 3





EXTRAPOLATE: Model linkages

Extrapolate: Ex-ante Tool for Ranking Policy Alternatives

Home | Model Data | Summary Graphs | Policy Analysis

Stakeholders | Outcomes | Constraints | Policies

View or Edit Data

Constraints Data

List of constraints | Edit description of current constraint | Impacts of constraints on outcomes | **Relevance of constraints to stakeholder groups**

Stakeholder group:

Constraint	Relevance (0 - 10)
- Stakeholder group : S01 smallholder intensive	
C01 lack of knowledge and skills	0
C02 poor access to land	8
C03 poor access to water	3
C04 high costs and low availability of inputs	2
C05 low yielding cattle breeds	6
C06 insufficient labour force	3
C07 cattle theft	1
C08 poor access to credit and capital	4
C09 poor utilities (water and electricity)	2
C10 poor dairy infrastructure	8
C11 seasonal variation in milk production / price	4
C12 lack of effective demand	4
C13 poor access to markets - physical	6
C14 poor access to markets - institutional	6
C15 poor quality of milk and dairy products	5
C16 poor animal nutrition	5
C17 poor animal health	4
+ Stakeholder group : S02 smallholder extensive	
+ Stakeholder group : S03 mediumholder intensive	
+ Stakeholder group : S04 mediumholder extensive	
+ Stakeholder group : S05 large scale	
+ Stakeholder group : S06 pastoralists	
+ Stakeholder group : S07 agropastoralists	
+ Stakeholder group : S08 informal traders	


Print list of constraint relevancies

Current model: Policy screening for the dairy sector



EXTRAPOLATE: Outcomes

Step 4






Outcomes

- Increased production and sales
- Increased profit margins
- Increased security of livestock assets
- Improved nutritional status
- Increased employment opportunities
- Reduced environmental degradation



EXTRAPOLATE: O → S

Step 5



EXTRAPOLATE - Ex-ante Tool for Ranking Policy Alternatives

Current model: 01 -Ethiopia dairy Value Chain Model basis: Stakeholder livelihood status

Models
Model Data

Satkeholder groups
Outcomes
Constraints
Policies
Policy - constraint impacts
Constraint - outcome impacts
Outcome - stakeholder impacts
Constraint - stakeholder relevance

Data Management

Relevance of Constraints to Stakeholder Groups

Constraint	Relevance (0 - 10)
Stakeholder group : S02 smallholder extensive	
C01 lack of knowledge and skills	6
C02 poor access to land	5
C03 poor access to water	3
C04 high costs and low availability of inputs	4
C05 low yielding cattle breeds	2
C06 insufficient labour force	2
C07 cattle theft	2
C08 poor access to credit and capital	3
C09 poor utilities (water and electricity)	0
C10 poor dairy infrastructure	6
C11 seasonal variation in milk production / price	4
C12 lack of effective demand	6
C13 poor access to markets - physical	7
C14 poor access to markets - institutional	6
C15 poor quality of milk and dairy products	5
C16 poor animal nutrition	4
C17 poor animal health	5
Stakeholder group : S03 mediumholder intensive	
Stakeholder group : S04 mediumholder extensive	
Stakeholder group : S05 large scale	
Stakeholder group : S06 pastoralists	
Stakeholder group : S07 agropastoralists	
Stakeholder group : S08 informal traders	
Stakeholder group : S09 formal traders	
Stakeholder group : S10 informal small processors	
Stakeholder group : S11 formal small processors	
Stakeholder group : S12 large processors & exporters	
Stakeholder group : S13 low-income rural consumers	
Stakeholder group : S15 high-income consumers	


Model Summaries
Analysis Tools
SLATE
System

FR 22:08




EXTRAPOLATE: C → O

Step 6





EXTRAPOLATE: Current situation






EXTRAPOLATE: Model summaries





EXTRAPOLATE: Model summaries




Constraints

Stakeholder groups



EXTRAPOLATE: Policies

Step 7






Policy changes

- Promote genetic improvement
- Strengthen delivery of veterinary services
- Provide appropriate extension services
- Improved market infrastructure and information
- Ensure quality control along the chain
- Increase local consumption to build a strong domestic market
- Promote efficiency in the input supply system
- Increased access to credit facilities



EXTRAPOLATE: P → C


Step 8






EXTRAPOLATE: P → O


Step 9





EXTRAPOLATE: Model diagram





P01 Promotion of lactoperoxidase for local use
P02 Legislation of LP for international trade


C01 Access to preservation technology
C02 Access to milk markets
C03 Electricity and cooling facilities
C04 High tariffs on electricity
C05 Economies of scale in cooling facility use
C06 Seasonal milk supply (idle capacity)
C07 Hazardous preservatives in milk

O01 Household milk consumption
O02 Milk sales
O03 Household nutrition
O04 Access to cash by women
O05 Profitability

S01 Milk bulking agents
S02 Large scale plants
S03 Small scale plants
S04 Dairy processors
S05 Producer households
S06 Producer households, women
S07 Consumer households
S08 Hired transporters
S09 Distributors
S10 Sedentary retailers
S11 Mobile retailers




EXTRAPOLATE: Analysis tools






Promote genetic improvement






Provide appropriate extension services






Enforce quality control






Promote consumption





Optimal combination of policies



Key elements of a pro-poor policy

- Promote genetic improvement
- Strengthen delivery of veterinary services
- Provide appropriate extension services
- Improved market infrastructure and information
- Ensure quality control along the chain
- Increase local consumption to build a strong domestic market
- Promote efficiency in the input supply system
- Increased access to credit facilities



Key elements of a pro-poor policy

- Promote genetic improvement
- Strengthen delivery of veterinary services
- Provide appropriate extension services
- Improved market infrastructure and information
- Ensure quality control along the chain
- Increase local consumption to build a strong domestic market
- Promote efficiency in the input supply system
- Increased access to credit facilities



Key elements of a pro-poor policy

- This DOES NOT mean that genetic improvement and standards/regulation should be discouraged or dropped from the dairy policy
- This DOES mean that when these broad policy outcomes are disaggregated into their component parts (laws, strategies, institutions etc.) great care needs to be taken to ensure that the poorer producers are not disadvantaged, and that their needs are also addressed



Impact

- Already
 - more **analytical approach** to policy development
 - **increased capacity** within the livestock sector to analyse and formulate policies, and tools available to assist with this
 - broader **participation of stakeholders** in the policy process
 - **heightened awareness** among stakeholders of how their constraints can be addressed by policy and institutional change
- Expected
 - A suite of policies, and supporting legislation and institutional change, that address the needs of smallholder dairy producers and processors, and poor consumers



Lessons learned

- IF
 - people have strongly opposing views
- BUT
 - discussion is structured using a simple program (differences in technical capacity do not matter)
 - discussion is informed by data / background studies
 - a neutral and credible institution facilitates negotiation (FAO/PPLPI)
- THEN
 - **It is possible to reconcile positions and design broadly accepted pro-poor policies**



End of Part II





Overview

- Part I: Introduction
 - Policy process and analysis
 - EXTRAPOLATE summary
- Part II: Example
 - Dairy policy in Uganda
 - Lessons learned
- Part III: Practical
 - Step by step interactive demonstration



Screen 1: Model list screen of EXTRAPOLATE.

The screenshot displays the EXTRAPOLATE software interface. The title bar reads "Extrapolate: Ex-ante Tool for Ranking Policy Alternatives". The main menu includes "Home", "Model Data", "Summary Graphs", and "Policy Analysis". A secondary menu contains "Control Centre", "Help", "Exit", "Import", and "Export". The "Control Centre" section is active, showing sub-tabs for "List of Models", "Model Details", and "Model Diagram". Below this is a table of models with columns for "Model name" and "Country".

Model name	Country
Promotion of Lactoperoxidase Milk Treatment	Kenya
Policy screening for the dairy sector	Uganda
Meat marketing policy environment for the Tabaski festival.	Senegal
Policy screening for the small ruminant sector in Andhra Pradesh	India
Dairy production in the coastal zone	Kenya

At the bottom of the interface, there is a "Print model list" button, a "Show model descriptions in list" checkbox (which is currently unchecked), and a status bar indicating the "Current model: Promotion of Lactoperoxidase Milk Treatment".

Extrapolate_Base_de_données_systemesProd [Compatibility Mode] - Microsoft Excel

Home Insert Page Layout Formulas Data Review View Add-Ins

Cut Copy Paste Format Painter Clipboard

Times New Rom 12 Font

Wrap Text Alignment Merge & Center

General Number

Conditional Formatting Format as Table Cell Styles Styles

Insert Delete Format Cells

AutoSum Fill Clear Sort & Filter Find & Select Editing

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
1	Tabaski								
2	Bénéficiaire		Contraintes		Résultats		Politiques		
3	n°		n°		n°		n°		
4	1	Collecteurs de peaux	1	Difficile accès aux inputs	1	Commercialisation efficace	1	Accès au crédit	
5	2	Commerçants intermédiaires (tefanké)	2	Caracteristiques du mouton	2	Possibilité de vente de moutons	2	Amelioration genetique	
6	3	Commerçants occasionnels	3	Circulation de l'information	3	Prix remunerateur du producteur	3	Informatio sur les archés	
7	4	Commerçants traditionnels (dioulas)	4	Condition de transport	4	Revenu des petits métiers	4	Organisation des marchés	
8	5	Consommateurs	5	Contrôle routier	5		5	Ouverture des frontières	
9	6	Eleveurs emboucheurs ruraux	6	Fonctionnalité des marchés	6		6	Suivi sanitaire des animaux	
10	7	Eleveurs emboucheurs urbains	7	Formation des prix	7		7	Service au producteur	
11	8	Eleveurs extenifs	8	Manq de moutons sur le marché	8		8	Subvention des intrants	
12	9	Femmes éleveurs naisseurs	9	Mauvaise organisation des marchés	9		9	Suspension des taxes	
13	10	Imprtateurs	10	Faible revenu du consommateur	10		10		
14	11	Petits métiers temporaires	11	Pathologies	11		11		
15	12	Professionnels vétérinaire	12	Securité des lieux de vente	12		12		
16	13	Transporteurs	13		13		13		
17	14	Vendeurs d'aliments	14		14		14		
18	15	Vendeurs de médicaments	15		15		15		
19	16		16		16		16		
20	17		17		17		17		
21	18		18		18		18		
22	19		19		19		19		
23	20		20		20		20		
24	21		21		21		21		
25	22		22		22		22		
26									

Bases Tabaski Poulets chair Pondeuses Lait Viande

Ready 100%

Extrapolate EasyPol ... EXTRAPOLATE_FAO... Microsoft Excel - Ext...

08:42

Tabaski

Bénéficiaires	Statut	Contraintes/impacts des contraintes sur les bénéficiaires												
		C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	
Collecteurs de peaux		2	1	5	0	6	1	1	1	9	0	0	3	0
Commerçants intermédiaires (tefanké)		3	2	3	2	0	1	2	5	9	1	3	5	2
Commerçants occasionnels		7	5	4	4	7	1	4	6	9	1	5	6	5
Commerçants traditionnels (dioulas)		8	7	7	8	9	9	6	9	9	8	8	9	9
Consommateurs		6	2	2	7	2	5	7	1	10	1	1	9	9
Éleveurs emboucheurs ruraux		4	6	6	3	6	6	5	5	6	2	5	5	5
Éleveurs emboucheurs urbains		5	7	8	6	1	1	6	6	7	5	6	6	7
Éleveurs extensifs		4	5	2	5	6	5	5	4	5	3	5	4	6
Femmes éleveurs naisseurs		2	3	2	3	5	3	3	4	3	3	4	3	5
Importateurs		8	7	9	9	9	9	8	9	10	9	9	9	9
Petits métiers temporaires		1	1	1	1	0	1	2	2	3	2	2	1	2
Professionnels vétérinaire		4	2	3	1	3	0	1	2	4	2	2	6	2
Transporteurs		5	2	2	6	2	3	6	5	5	0	6	2	6
Vendeurs d'aliments		7	9	6	7	8	2	6	6	10	6	7	8	6
Vendeurs de médicaments		4	5	5	4	1	1	3	2	6	4	0	9	2

Résultats/impacts des contraintes sur les résultats

Commercialisation efficace	7	10	6	2	4	8	6	9	10	2	9	9
Possibilité de vente de moutons	3	10	7	6	3	9	7	2	10	9	10	9
Prix rémunérateur du producteur	8	9	5	7	8	9	7	5	9	10	10	10
Revenu des petits métiers	4	2	0	3	3	4	1	8	3	9	2	5

Impacts des résultats sur les bénéficiaires

Résultats	R1	R2	R3	R4
Collecteurs de peaux	3	5	2	8
Commerçants intermédiaires (tefanké)	5	6	6	6
Commerçants occasionnels	6	6	5	6
Commerçants traditionnels (dioulas)	6	9	6	9
Consommateurs	9	6	3	3
Eleveurs emboucheurs ruraux	8	7	7	5
Eleveurs emboucheurs urbains	8	8	9	6
Eleveurs extenifs	5	6	7	6
Femmes éleveurs naisseurs	4	5	6	5
Imprtateurs	9	10	5	1
Petits métiers temporaires	3	3	5	9
Professionnels vétérinaire	2	3	4	2
Transporteurs	5	5	3	0
Vendeurs d'aliments	7	9	9	2
Vendeurs de médicaments	3	5	5	2

Impacts des politiques sur les contraintes

Contraintes	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12
Accès au crédit →	3	0	2	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	0
Amélioration génétique	0	5	0	0	0	3	4	0	1	0	2	0
Information sur les marchés	2	1	3	0	1	5	4	2	5	0	0	2
Organisation des marchés	5	2	4	2	2	5	4	1	4	0	1	4
Ouverture des frontières	2	3	3	0	3	1	-2	-2	2	4	0	0
Eradication des maladies animales	1	4	0	3	0	2	3	0	1	2	5	0
Service au producteur	0	3	1	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	2	3
Subvention des intrants	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	1	4	3	0
Suspension des taxes	2	0	0	0	0	-3	4	2	-4	4	1	-3


End of Part III





Further reading

- Thorne, P., Thornton, P.K. & Robinson, T.P. (2009) *EXTRAPOLATE: Ex-ante tool for ranking policy alternatives*. PPLPI Reference Manual, Version 2.0. Rome: FAO.
- Thorne, P., Thornton, P.K. & Robinson, T.P. (2009) *EXTRAPOLATE: Ex-ante tool for ranking policy alternatives*. PPLPI User Guide, Version 2.0. Rome: FAO.
- Kasirye, F., Saamanya, J.P., Emwanu, T. & Robinson, T.P. (2006) *Supporting the Formulation of a pro-poor dairy development policy in Uganda*. PPLPI Summary Report. Rome: FAO.



see FAQs in the notes



Links to other EASYPol modules

This module is part of FAO Training Course on Policies and Strategies for the Agriculture and Rural Development.

*For more information see the **EASYPol training path:***

[Training Course on Policies and Strategies for the Agriculture and Rural Development](#)

