

Animal Welfare and Rights: The policy environment in Uganda

Prof. Charles Ssekyewa,
Centre for Ecosystems Research and
Development (CERD-UGANDA)
Email: centerecosystemsresearch@gmail.com
Tel. 256702616988



Aim of our Study

- To understand the policy environment in Uganda and how it is addressing concerns of Animal welfare and rights, factory farming.
- Generate key recommendations to inform policy

Current Status/Drivers of the Livestock sub-sector

- 45million people above the age of 18 years. Mostly young population
- GDP estimated at USD 607 per year (FAO, 2018)
- Agriculture contributes about 24.6 percent to the GDP
- About 71% Ugandans are employed by the Agriculture sector (UBOS, 2014)
- Uganda's agriculture is about 80% smallholder farming (UBOS, 2014)

Current status/Livestock sub-sector drivers

- East African Economic integration -with 468mill.people demanding
- Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA)-with 390mill.people demanding
- African Continental Free Trade Area (AU) – with 1.2 billion people now/2.5bill, by 2050, people demanding

Current Status/Drivers of the Livestock sub-sector

- Between 2019 and 2022 big supermarkets down sized or closed, e.g UCHUMI, NAKUMAT and SHOPRITE
- Young population which demands for mostly first foods “Chips and Chicken” “Nyama Choma na Ndiizi”, “Yorghut and Ice Cream” and consumes less of vegetarian dishes. Very viable for McDonalds, Café Java and KFC.

National development plans:

Aim at Boosting agriculture to another level to meet needs of the growing population and strategically align with regional economic growth trends such as, Malabo Declaration (2014)-Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) with key focus on inclusive growth. That is,

- Plan for Modernization of Agriculture aimed at modernizing and commercializing agriculture
- National Development Plans^{2/3} aimed at raising income status, inclusive growth
- National Agriculture Advisory Services and Operation wealth creation, raising household income status

Key relevant policies/Acts:

- Animal Breeding Act 2001,
- Dairy Industry Act, 2000;
- Animal Diseases Act 2000, CAP 38 and its Statutory Instruments),
- National Drug Policy and Authority Act (1993),
- Veterinary Surgeons' Act Cap 277
- Hides and Skins (Export Duty) Act 1962,
- Animals' Prevention of Cruelty Act (1957), Cap 39 among others.
- Cattle Grazing Act (1945),
- Cattle Traders Act (1943),

New related Policies

Policies in draft form:

- Bio-Economy Policy (2021)

Policies recently launched:

- National Organic Agriculture Policy (2020)

Policies under review:

- National Livestock Policy (2019);
- National Environment Management Policy (1995)

The Livestock sub-sector (UBOS, 2008)

- About 4.5 million households (70.8%) rear at least one kind of livestock or poultry in Uganda.
- Central region, 56.3% of the households own livestock/mostly arable or Mixed commercial farming/intensive
- Other regions where over 72% of all households in those regions own livestock. Farms with Free range, Paddocks or both



Introduction: Livestock types

- Cattle
- Goats
- Pigs
- Sheep
- Rabbits
- Horses
- Donkeys
- Camels
- Dogs
- Cats
- Chicken
- Ducks
- Turkeys
- Geese
- Guinea Fowls
- Bees
- Crickets
- Soldier flies
- Fish

Cattle

- The national cattle herd was estimated to be 11.4 million cattle (UBOS 2008)
- 2.5 million (22.3%) was in the Western Region,
- 2.4 million (21.8%) was in the Eastern Region,
- 2.4 million (21.7%) was in the Central Region,
- Karamoja sub-region had 2.3 million (19.8%) cattle
- the rest of Northern Uganda had 1.6 million (14.4%) cattle.
- Kotido district registered the lowest cattle herd of 694,250 (6.1%) cattle.
- Cattle-owning households (92.7%) owned indigenous cattle

Goats

- About 39.2% of the households in Uganda owned goats as of 2008.
- About 2.5million households in Uganda own goats
- Eastern region had the highest number of households owning goats (0.74million).
- Almost all the goat-owning households (99.5%) owned indigenous goats.
- A typical household in Uganda owns on average five (5) goats.



Pigs

- The national pig population in Uganda was estimated to be 3.2 million as of 2008.
- Central Region had the highest number of pigs estimated to be 1.3 million (41.1%),
- Karamoja sub-region had the least number of pigs estimated to be 0.06 million (18.3%).



Chicken

- The national chicken flock for Uganda was estimated to be 37.4 million as of 2008.
- Regionally, the Eastern Region had the highest number of chicken estimated to be 10.7 million (28.6%),
- Western Region had the least number of chicken estimated to be 7.2 million (19.3%).
- Districts of Wakiso (2.8 million), Bugiri (0.9 million), Lira (1.1 million) and Masindi (1.0 million) had the highest number of chicken in Central, Eastern, Northern and Western regions respectively.



Chicken ctnd

- The national chicken flock of exotic layers for Uganda was estimated to be 2.5 million as of 2008, representing 6.6% of the total chicken flock in Uganda.
- Regionally, the Central Region had the highest number of exotic broilers estimated to be 1.9 million (77.3%),
- Karamoja sub-region had the least number of exotic broilers estimated to be 0.003 million (0.11%).
- The dominant chicken breed in Uganda is the indigenous chicken (87.7%) followed by the exotic layers (6.6%).

Rabbits

- Only 1.1% of the households in Uganda owned rabbits as of 2008.
- The estimated number of rabbits was 0.37 million.
- Most of the rabbits in Uganda (81.6%) are indigenous.
- The estimated number of indigenous rabbits in Uganda was 0.30 million.



Concerns about animal welfare and abuse

- The Central region has the highest concentration of livestock yet in limited space hence intensive and in confinement with high incidence of animal welfare and rights abuse.
- These concerns culminated into policies to guide in ensuring holistic animal well-being

The big question is: How do these policies address concerns of animal welfare and rights?

Specifically:

- If we have livestock key related policies towards improving animal welfare and rights, why do we continue observing animal welfare and rights abuse?
- What are the solutions towards animal welfare and abuse provided in these policy proposals?
- What could be missing/silent in these policy proposals?

Methods

- We adopted Carol Bacchi's (2012) approach which deals with "What's the Problem Represented to be (WPR)?" approach: "what is the problem (of... an issue) represented to be in a specific policy or policy proposal?"
- In this case: What is the problem of animal welfare and rights represented to be in the livestock key related policies?
- Solutions to a policy proposal are referred to as problem representations according to the WPR approach (Bacchi, 2012).
- Thus problem representations in this analysis are based on the notion that "what one proposes to do about something reveals what one thinks is problematic and needs to change" Bacchi (2012, pg. 21).

Methods ctd.

- Bacchi's approach applies a step-by-step procedure to policy analysis
- Thus, content analysis of the policy documents was guided by questions:
 - ❖ What is the problem of animal welfare and rights represented to be in the selected policy proposals?
 - ❖ What assumptions underpin these problem representations?
 - ❖ What is left silent in these problem representations?

Methods ctd.

- Basing on policy objectives and solutions/recommendations towards animal welfare and rights, we determined the existing gaps and silences in respect of animal welfare and rights.
- The analyzed policy solutions/recommendations and silences towards animal welfare and rights formed the basis for our presented recommendations

Results

- The Animals Prevention of Cruelty Act (1957) Cap.39, had issues of animal welfare and rights covered to a great extent.
- **However,**
 - **the Act does not mention poultry welfare. In addition, convicted persons face very light punishments (only 1000Ugx fine or not more than 3 months imprisonment)**
 - **the Act is not specific on which minister..., and the unspecified period of licensing by the minister (may permit corruption and bribery)**
- All other considered policies on livestock did not have streamlined guidance on welfare and rights of animals.
- Policies had recommendations/articles that when implemented would possibly lead to abuse of animal welfare and rights
- There is a possibility of most livestock systems which are considered to be modern today being against animal welfare and rights in the livestock sub-sector.

Conclusion

- It is a serious omission for many subsequent policies not borrowing from this 1957 law that came very clear about animals' welfare and rights.
- This is more so in the case of the National Livestock Policy which is seeking to improve the livestock sub-sector.
- Without offering outmost care to livestock, one would not expect the sub-sector to perform better and improve towards sustainability.

Recommendations

- 80 recommendations produced to mitigate identified potential causes of abuse of animal welfare and rights
- These recommendations have varying importance to enabling animal welfare and rights in the sub-sector
- This implies the need to prioritize given recommendations for best streamlining of animal welfare and rights in the livestock sub-sector
- Generated recommendations be basis for developing an appropriate strategy for animal welfare and rights towards industrial/factory/intensive livestock management

Outcomes

- The Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries drafted strategy (based on community needs/views) was merged with our developed strategy (based on silences identified in policy documents).
- The idea of an harmonized regional or continental standard for Animal welfare and rights has emerged vs continuous lobbying and advocacy campaigns. This would facilitate inspection of farms wishing to access national and international support e.g from World Bank, African Development Bank, etc

Acknowledgement

- We extend gratitude to Brighter Green, NY, USA who supported this activity.
- We thank the Livestock Directorate, MAAIF, Uganda for their cooperation, allowing us to share with them our findings and accessing relevant policy documents.
- Brighter Green thank you for supporting us to present these ideas and findings in this conference.
- We thank organizers of this conference for offering us space to present our views

THANK YOU