

Scotland's Rural College

Assessing and managing intensification in smallholder dairy systems for food and nutrition security in Sub-Saharan Africa

Chagunda, MGG; Mwangwela, A; Mumba, C; dos Anjos, F; Kawonga, BS; Hopkins, Richard; Chiwona-Kartun, L

Published in:
Regional Environmental Change

DOI:
[10.1007/s10113-015-0829-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-015-0829-7)

First published: 01/01/2015

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Chagunda, MGG., Mwangwela, A., Mumba, C., dos Anjos, F., Kawonga, BS., Hopkins, R., & Chiwona-Kartun, L. (2015). Assessing and managing intensification in smallholder dairy systems for food and nutrition security in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Regional Environmental Change*, 16(8), 2257 - 2267. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-015-0829-7>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 **Assessing and Managing Intensification in Smallholder Dairy Systems for Food and**
2 **Nutrition Security in Sub-Saharan Africa**

3
4
5 Mizeck G.G. Chagunda^{1*}, Agnes Mwangwela², Chisoni Mumba³, Filomena dos Anjos⁴, Bettie S.
6 Kawonga², Richard Hopkins⁵, Linley Chiwona-Kartun⁶

7
8
9 ¹Future Farming Systems Group, SRUC, Kings Buildings, West Mains Road, Edinburgh, EH9
10 3JG, Scotland, UK

11
12 ²Lilongwe University of Agriculture and Natural Resources (LUANAR), Bunda Campus, P.O.
13 Box 219, Lilongwe, Malawi

14
15 ³Department of Disease Control, University of Zambia, Box 32379, Lusaka, Zambia

16
17 ⁴Veterinary Faculty, Eduardo Mondlane University, Mozambique

18
19 ⁵Natural Resources Institute, University of Greenwich at Medway, Chatham Maritime, Kent,
20 ME4 4TB, UK

21 ⁶Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Department of Urban & Rural Development, PO
22 Box 7012, SE-750 07 Uppsala, Sweden

23
24
25 *Corresponding author

26 E-mail: mizeck.chagunda@sruc.ac.uk

1 **Abstract**

2 Smallholder farmers play an important part in the dairy value chain in most countries in Sub-
3 Saharan Africa. Over the past two decades, three technological approaches have been used.
4 First, applying agricultural ecological processes (ecological intensification), the other, utilising
5 modern livestock breeding (genetic intensification), and socio-economic intensification. In terms
6 of ecological intensification, some of strategies that have been applied are, continuous housing of
7 cows applying a cut-and-carry feeding system, introduction of purpose-bred forages and
8 pastures, and the introduction of agro-forestry within the dairy systems. Genetic intensification
9 strategies have included; importation of the world-renown dairy breeds such as Holstein Friesian
10 (HF) and Jerseys, crossbreeding of the indigenous breeds with HF with the aim of upgrading
11 towards HF. Training and capacity building activities to create sustainable livelihoods have been
12 initiated to not only impart farming and technological practices of animal husbandry but also to
13 enhance appropriate leadership and corporative-building skills that would create and support an
14 enabling environment for sustainability. These improvements and initiatives in the service
15 delivery have been championed by either the national governments, or development partner
16 institutions and non-governmental organisations through different programmes and projects.
17 Challenges of intensification include matching management to genetic potential of imported and
18 crossbred improved dairy breeds, ensuring low post-harvest losses, proper utilisation, and
19 environmental impact challenges. Using examples from Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania
20 and Zambia, this paper examines the management and assessment approaches used in fostering
21 smallholder dairy development strategies and dairy's contribution to sustainable livelihoods in
22 the face of intensification.

23

24 **Keywords:** Sustainable Intensification, Smallholder, Dairying

1 **Introduction**

2

3 In most African countries, milk is produced on both small and large-scale dairy farms. Small-
4 scale dairy farms are commonly referred to as smallholder dairy farms. Among others, the major
5 differentiating features of these two dairy sub-sectors are the holding size, the genotype of cattle
6 raised and the level of management (Chagunda, et al 2004). Smallholder dairy production is an
7 important agricultural activity, producing a valuable food product and providing a regular
8 income and work for poor households. Although smallholder dairy farms on average have
9 anything from one to five milking cows, their contribution to national dairy production is high
10 and play an important part in the dairy value chain. For example, in Malawi, smallholder
11 dairying supplies about 60% of the milk that is processed at the formal processing plants every
12 year. In Zambia, smallholder dairy farmers own an average of 4 dairy cows, yet more than half
13 of the milk in the country is produced by them and most of them are organized in cooperative
14 societies around milk collection centres from which processors collect the raw milk (Mumba et
15 al 2011). Smallholder dairy farmers use mostly mixed-breed cows and sell the bulk of their
16 output to processors in the formal market or consumers in the informal market (Mumba et al
17 2011). The Malawi Milk Producers' Association (MMPA) indicates that current milk production
18 in one of its dairy regions (Blantyre) is 49,000 litres of liquid milk per day, an increase from
19 10,000 litres per day in 1997. The breeds/genotypes used, and cow management in smallholder
20 dairying varies significantly.

21 Over the past two decades, two technological approaches have been used to improve small scale
22 dairy productivity in sub-Saharan Africa. The application of agricultural ecological processes
23 (ecological intensification), and utilising modern livestock breeding (genetic intensification)

1 have both been used. In terms of ecological intensification, some of strategies that have been
2 applied are, continuous housing of cows applying a cut-and-carry feeding system, the
3 introduction of purpose-bred forages and pastures, and the introduction of agro-forestry within
4 the dairy systems. Genetic intensification strategies have included the importation of world-
5 renown dairy breeds such as Holstein Friesian (HF) and Jerseys, crossbreeding of the indigenous
6 breeds with HF with the aim of upgrading towards HF. Training and capacity building activities
7 to create sustainable livelihoods have been initiated to not only impart farming and technological
8 practices of animal husbandry but also to enhance appropriate leadership and corporative-
9 building skills that would create and support an enabling environment for sustainability. Using
10 examples from Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania and Zambia, this paper examines the
11 management and assessment approaches used in fostering smallholder dairy development
12 strategies and dairy's contribution to sustainable livelihoods in the face of intensification.

13

14 **Intensification**

15

16 Intensification of production can take many forms. However, as was stipulated by the
17 Montpellier Panel (2013), intensification is not a viable solution if it comes at the expense of
18 damaging the environmental and social resources on which it depends. Sustainable
19 intensification strives to utilise the existing resources to produce greater yields, better nutrition
20 and higher net incomes while improving the resources use efficiency and lowering emissions of
21 harmful greenhouse gases. Possible components of sustainable intensification can be categorized
22 into three major constellations, following the scheme introduced in The Montpellier Panel (2013)
23 report: ecological intensification, genetic intensification, and socio-economic intensification

1

2 Ecological intensification

3

4 In terms of ecological intensification, several initiatives have been carried out in the livestock
5 sector in Sub-Saharan Africa. These initiatives include the introduction of more intensive cattle
6 management systems than the extensive communal grazing commonly found, integration of crop
7 and tree species, and the introduction of non-conversional livestock feeds. Availability of animal
8 feed is one of the greatest constraints to the expansion of the livestock industry in developing
9 countries. Apart from the high and fluctuating costs and some of the ingredients used in mixed
10 feeds, notably cereal grains are in high demand for human consumption (Oguntimein, 1988).

11

12 The majority of smallholder farmers have adopted cut-and-carry feeding system. Cut-and-carry
13 feeding system are a form of zero grazing, an approach in which livestock are permanently
14 housed and provided with fodder and water. The benefits of using zero grazing management on
15 dairy farms include increased monitoring of the health of the animals, reduced energy and time
16 costs to livestock, and reduced risk of tick-borne diseases. The other common initiative is that of
17 agroforestry, the integration of crops with trees. Agroforestry provides some very important
18 sustainable advantage for the farmer through nutrient recycling and adding additional value to
19 the system by providing extra forage that would otherwise be underutilised. In addition,
20 livestock also provide an incentive for farmers to plant legumes. In addition to fixing nitrogen
21 into the soil and hence serving to improve soil fertility and reduce soil erosion, legumes provide
22 protein to livestock (FAO, 2007). The introduction of feed that have traditionally not been fed to
23 livestock on a regular basis has been another initiative that has been utilised in ecological

1 intensification. One crop that has been utilised in the recent years is cassava. Cassava products
2 and by-products are a good alternative source of carbohydrate and protein for conventional feed
3 ingredients and have a major role to play as a grain substitute in animal diets in developing
4 countries (Correa and Henry, 1991). Cassava can be used for animals fed in two ways. Of most
5 importance is dried cassava root (chips or pellets) used as partial raw material for commercial
6 animal feed rations. Secondly, and of much lesser importance, is on-farm utilization of cassava
7 leaves for animal feeding. Although cassava is a good source of carbohydrates, rations based on
8 cassava require additional vitamins and proteins. In Kenya, Sanda and Methu (1998) evaluated
9 the effect of substitution of maize by cassava in dairy Friesian, Ayrshire and cross-bred cows,
10 and reported that cassava products are good energy feed ingredient for dairy cows and it can
11 totally replace maize meal in the concentrate diets for cows producing 12 kg of milk per day. In
12 addition, there is no significant difference in vivo digestibility of either the dry matter or organic
13 matter of the cassava, and the feed cost per ton were reduced. In Mozambique, farmers have
14 widely adopted the use of cassava roots and leaves as livestock feed. It is estimated that 4% of
15 total cassava output is used as a livestock feed resource (dos Anjos, 2007).

16

17 Genetic intensification

18

19 Animal breeding strategies support livestock development by focusing on genetic improvement
20 in a continuous manner (Madalena, 2012). In dairy production in Sub-Saharan Africa the major
21 genetic driving force that has been employed are genotype migration and crossbreeding (Hodges,
22 1984)). Only in a few cases has selection within local breeds been used (Seo and Mendelsohn,
23 2008). Migration has been applied through the importation of germplasm and stock from the

1 traditional global dairy regions of Europe, and North America, and to a lesser extent from within
2 Africa for breed substitution and crossbreeding. The majority of these initiatives have been
3 carried out by either national governments or practical entrepreneurs. For example, in 1979 the
4 Malawi Government and the Canadian Government through the Canadian International
5 Development agency (CIDA) approved a dairy development project: the Malawi Canada Dairy
6 Development project. Consequently, over a period of 5 years, a foundation stock of 400
7 Canadian Holstein Friesian heifers was imported to the 5500 hectare Ndata farm in the southern
8 region of Malawi and the 2250-hectare Katete farm in the central region. In 1988 the project was
9 combined with Malawi Milk Marketing to form Malawi Dairy Industries Corporation (MDI), a
10 statutory organisation involved in producing, processing and marketing milk and milk products
11 (Chagunda et al., 2004). When animals are imported their production environment is not restricted to
12 large scale intensive farms. As an example, animal donation programs mostly run by non-profit
13 development agencies, have become an increasingly popular way for people living in developed
14 countries to transfer resources to families living in developing countries (Rawlins et al., 2014).
15 Smallholder farmers seem to have a special liking for imported dairy breeds. In a study with
16 smallholder dairy farmers in the Kenya highlands, Bebe et al. (2003) reported that the dominance
17 of *Bos taurus* dairy breeds (78% of the farms) over *Bos indicus* breeds (22% of the farms)
18 indicating high priority to exotic dairy breeds.

19
20 Crossbreeding has been another genetic improvement strategy that has been employed widely in
21 Sub-Saharan Africa. In Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia, most of the crossbreeding is aimed at
22 upgrading the indigenous Zebu cattle towards the productivity levels of the traditional dairy
23 breeds such as the Holstein Friesian. Crossbreeding has traditionally explored the difference in
24 milk yield and tropical stress adaptability between the *Bos Indicus* and *Bos Taurus* breeds

1 (Cunningham and Syrstad, 1987). Crossbreeding has produced has produced new genotypes with
2 high milk production as well as good adaptation to tropical environments. The key to
3 improvement through crossbreeding is heterosis or ‘hybrid vigour’, a phenomenon that makes
4 the half-bred cattle more vigorous in performance and better survivability than the expected
5 average of the two parent populations. Previous studies have shown that heterosis for production
6 traits such as milk yield, butter fat, and milk protein range from 2% to 10% (Hurst, 2002).

7

8 Socio-economic intensification

9

10 Socio-economic intensification centres on enabling the environment of the production system
11 efficient, resilient and contributing to the stock of natural environmental capital. Training and
12 capacity building activities to create sustainable livelihoods have been initiated to not only
13 impart farming and technological practices of animal husbandry but also to enhance appropriate
14 leadership and corporative-building skills that would create and support an enabling environment
15 for sustainability. Examples of the result of these initiatives are the emergence of rural artisanal
16 groups such as village farmer technicians, para-veterinary practitioners, lead farmers and farmer
17 extension workers.

18

19 Improvements and policy shift initiatives in the service delivery have been championed by either
20 the national governments or development partner institutions and non-governmental
21 organisations through different programmes and projects. . Market access has been identified as
22 one of the foremost factors influencing the performance of small scale producers in developing
23 countries, particularly in least developing countries. Smallholder access to markets stimulates

1 higher values for agricultural and food products is recognised as a vital opportunity to enhance
2 and diversify the livelihood of lower income farm household and reduce poverty (World Bank
3 2007). An example is in Malawi and Zambia where national governments have shown interest in
4 using smallholder dairying to accelerate economic growth and poverty reduction, especially
5 among the rural poor. In Malawi, the government has made smallholder dairying its flagship in
6 the livestock sector (Malawi Government, 2006). For the period between 2008 and 2013, the
7 Malawi Government implemented strategies such as the importation of improved exotic dairy
8 breeds, enhancing artificial insemination (AI) services, and the promotion of local stud-breeding
9 by farmers. In addition, some NGOs have introduced smallholder dairying into their food
10 security programs. Further, the Malawian Government has recently launched the Presidential
11 Initiative on Poverty and Hunger Reduction with the one cow a family programme to promoted
12 smallholder dairying to majority rural areas. In Zambia, the capabilities of smallholder dairy
13 farmers are strengthened through the provision of resource persons, materials and financial
14 support mainly by NGOs in collaboration with the national government (Mumba et al 2011).

15

16 **Why does smallholder dairying matter?**

17

18 Growing agricultural productivity attacks poverty from three different ways. It increases the
19 productivity and incomes of the majority of Africa's poor, who work primarily in agriculture. It
20 reduces food prices, which govern real incomes and poverty in urban areas. It generates
21 important spill-overs to the rest of the economy (Haggblade et al., 2010). Quashigah (2002)
22 defined food security as 'good quality, nutritious food, hygienically packaged and attractively
23 presented, and available in sufficient quantities all year round and located at the right places at

1 affordable prices'. The World Food Summit of 1996 established four dimensions of food
2 security: availability, access, stability and utilisation (FAO, IFAD and WFP 2014). It is the
3 elements of food quality and nutrition that link food security to nutritional security and human
4 health. The utilisation dimension of food security is the one that deals with nutritional security.
5 Livestock provides 27.9% of protein world wide and 47.8% in developed countries. Smallholder
6 farmers are mainly in the rural community, and thus are best placed to fulfil the role especially in
7 countries where there is an essential weakness in the logistics chains to transport foods. Milk
8 can improve the nutritional outcomes of household members as an important source of energy,
9 protein and essential amino acids and vitamins A and D which are deficient in carbohydrate
10 based diets (Nicholson et al, 1999). Milk is also a good source of other nutrients such as
11 magnesium, zinc, phosphorus and calcium which are essential for body growth (Njarui et al,
12 2009). Studies conducted in Kenya, Malawi and Tanzania have shown that monthly
13 consumption of milk and milk products is up to 58% more in households with dairy cattle than
14 those without dairy animals. (Lwelamira et al, 2010; Nicholson et al, 1999).

15
16 Animal food products such as meat and milk are concentrated sources of high-quality protein,
17 vitamins, minerals and other micro nutrients, vital to human health (McLaren, 1984). For
18 example, when children consume even modest amounts, these products help to alleviate poor
19 growth, poor cognitive development and impaired physical health (Neumann, et al 2003; Hoppe
20 et al 2004). According to the MDHS, about 5% of infants under the age of two years receive
21 other milk other than breast milk and 14% of non breastfeeding infants consume milk other than
22 infant formulas (NSO, 2010). According to Kalumikiza (2012), in a study conducted in the
23 central region of Malawi, children below the age of five years among the dairy farming

1 households consumed more milk than any other age groups. Consumption of milk by children
2 was mainly due to the respondent's belief that children needed more milk for good growth and
3 health. In most cases children tend to be given some milk during or immediately after milking.
4 The 2012 Integrated Household Survey for Malawi revealed that 11% of people in the rural areas
5 and 9% of people in urban areas of Malawi reported that when resources are scarce or inadequate
6 to provide sufficient food for all household members, children are usually protected from the
7 disruption of eating patterns and reduced food intake that may reflect food insecurity (NSO,
8 2012), more than 80% of the under five children consumed milk daily as compared to adults. In
9 a study on the impact of adopting dairy technology in the coastal region of Kenya, children
10 coming from households with improved dairy cattle were taller than children coming from
11 households with unimproved breeds (Nicholson et al, 1999). Similarly Children between the ages
12 of two and five years from households with dairy cattle and goats in rural Rwanda were found to
13 be significantly taller than children from households that did not rear dairy animals. The
14 ownership of dairy animals in this case has been shown to be a contributing factor towards the
15 difference in child growth as compared to household wealth, access to land or the mother's
16 education (FAO, 2012). However, this is not always the case. Walingo (2012) demonstrated
17 performed a study that assessed food intake patterns and nutritional status in households of
18 beneficiaries of a livestock distribution project and those that were not supported by the livestock
19 project in western Kenya. They found that levels of underweight (1.25%) and stunted (1.25%)
20 preschool children of women participating in the dairy program was no different from those
21 preschool children from women not participating in the dairy program whose children were
22 underweight (2.9%) and stunted (1%). Similarly the proportion of women who were severely
23 malnourished (BMI less than 16) was not significantly different between beneficiary women

1 (0.7%) and 1.3% non beneficiary women while 6% of the beneficiary women were obese as
2 compared to 4.5% of non beneficiary women. This kind of data may imply that increase in milk
3 production; income and income expenditure may not result to improved diets due to less income
4 being used for food purchases, despite dairy having the potential to improve nutrient adequacy
5 and BMI (Walingo, 2012). Although livestock keeping is no universal panacea, if animals are
6 managed properly within an adequate agricultural system, it can be an important lever for
7 reducing poverty and boosting human health (ILRI, 2003). Other studies have indicated that
8 some specific constituents of milk and meat have beneficial human health effects. For example,
9 conjugated linoleic acids (CLA), vitamin E, beta carotene and omega-3 fatty acids. CLA, for
10 instance, is best known for its anti-carcinogenic properties ((Tricon et al, 2004; Zulet et al, 2005;
11 Dannenberger, et al., 2007). Although the smallholder farms play an important role in milk
12 production, the effects of the different breed raised, feeding regimes, nutrition and cow
13 management on nutritional quality of milk and its links to human health has not been quantified.
14 One way in which this is happening is through the gradual increase in the rural market economy.
15 Enterprises such as dairy production, which provide a regular source of income, are providing
16 the platform for increased purchase of diversity of foods. For example, Kalumikiza (2012)
17 reported that dairy farmers use the income from milk to purchase other food items such as rice,
18 meat, maize, fish, vegetables, cooking oil, beans, sugar and salt. This behaviour would
19 contribute toward better dietary diversity for the households.

20

21 **Challenges**

22

1 With reference to food and nutritional security, there are mainly four categories of challenges
2 which arise due to the intensification process to smallholder dairying. These are, production
3 challenges, product handling challenges, product utilization challenges, and environmental
4 impact challenges. These challenges need to be managed accordingly in order to make
5 smallholder dairy farming contribute to rural livelihoods in a sustainable way.

6

7 Animal production challenges

8

9 Genetic improvement of farmed livestock has had a major impact on productivity, resource use
10 efficiency, and food security, in many temperate countries over the last 70 years. Being
11 permanent, cumulative and usually highly cost effective, it is also of huge potential value in
12 countries, like those in Sub-Saharan Africa, most in need of improved food security. However,
13 this technology has not been widely used to date, largely because of small herd and flock sizes
14 and a lack of animal performance recording infrastructure. Most genetic improvement efforts
15 have often relied on importation of inappropriate exotic breeds, which often has the added
16 disadvantage of marginalising indigenous genetic resources. In a study between sibs of
17 Canadian sires performing in both Malawi and Canada the confounding effect of the production
18 environment on the genotype that was used was significantly apparent (Chagunda, 2004),
19 indicating that the production environment limited the full expression of genetic potential of the
20 cows. The estimated genetic correlation for milk yield between Malawian and Canadian
21 conditions was 0.44. This is substantially less than 0.8, which according to Robertson (1959) is
22 the threshold genetic correlation below which genotype by environment interaction is considered
23 of biological and agricultural importance. This entails a reduced accuracy for prediction of

1 ranking of Canadian breeding bulls in Malawi based on their Canadian breeding values. This
2 kind of mismatch between genetics and the production environment hampers progress and leads
3 to perpetual low productivity which in turn slows down the lift of the poor out of the poverty
4 trap. In addition, there is lack of detailed studies that would inform the appropriateness of
5 different breeds, genotypes and breeding strategies to different production systems. Revesai et
6 al., 2002 demonstrated that when only production traits such as milk yield, Holstein Friesian (HF)
7 cows were the best performers followed by $\frac{3}{4}$ HF x Malawi Zebu crosses while Malawi Zebu was the
8 lowest performer (mean = 12.1kg s.e. = 0.14 vs 11.9 kg s.e.= 0.20 and 5.4 s.e = 0.18). When a
9 productivity index which included calving interval, age at first calving, number of services per
10 conception, calf survival, and milk yield, was used, $\frac{1}{2}$ HF x Malawi Zebu were the best. These
11 results showed that in terms of both biological and economic efficiency, it was $\frac{1}{2}$ HF x Malawi
12 Zebu and $\frac{3}{4}$ HF x Malawi Zebu that were optimum genotypes for use on smallholder dairy farms
13 in Malawi, rather than pure Holstein Friesians. The general lack of breeding planning and
14 organisation is associated with indiscriminate breeding and hence lack of genetic progress. There
15 is a critical need to match genotypes to particular managerial and environmental situations for
16 optimal productivity. In this process there is need to ask critical question s pertaining to what to
17 import. Examples of such questions are,

- 18 a) Which breed should be imported and why?
- 19 b) Should it be purebreds or crossbreeds?
- 20 c) Should it both male and female stock that need to be imported?
- 21 d) Should it be semen or embryos?
- 22 e) At what age should animals be imported?
- 23 f) How should individual animals be selected?

1 These and others are the kind of questions that can help develop strategies that can be used to
2 explore the productivity potential and tropical stress adaptability of different breeds to be used in
3 Sub Saharan Africa (Cunningham and Syrstad, 1987).

4

5 Product handling challenges

6

7 Milk is a perishable product with a shelf life of a day, when no preservation treatment is
8 available. Milk losses which, mostly occur due to poor handling and keeping quality at both
9 farm and milk selling points contribute significantly to farm-family economic losses. Reducing
10 any post harvest losses in the milk production chain in the smallholder sector would empower
11 farmers economically through sales of milk. This would directly contribute to food and
12 nutritional security, and poverty reduction. Promoting smallholder dairy production and reducing
13 post-harvest losses would provide a robust coping strategy where agro-ecological conditions and
14 access to markets provide a favourable environment for dairy production. The smallholder dairy
15 sector could significantly contribute to accelerating rural economic growth through multiplier
16 effect. Recent reviews and studies have shown that critical and substantial amounts of milk are
17 lost and also rejected for sale due to poor quality and hence deny the farmer the much needed
18 income. For example, in Malawi (Chindime 2006) an average of 17% of milk produced in the
19 smallholder sector goes sour and is rejected from the market.

20

21 Smallholder herd management practices in nutrition, milking procedure, sanitation and housing
22 play major roles in predisposing the individual animals to diseases such as mastitis which in turn
23 affect milk quality (Falvey and Chanthalaka, 1999). Although mastitis is usually perceived as a

1 disease for high producing herds, it is one of the most common diseases in cows in smallholder
2 dairy systems. This results in great economic losses due to high milk rejection rates at milk
3 market (e.g. Kawonga et al., 2012). Kawonga (2012) reported that smallholder farmers lose up
4 to 12 % of the potential monthly earnings from post harvest losses.

5

6 Utilisation challenges

7

8 The other challenge that leads to low impact of milk in terms of food and nutrition security is the
9 perceptions towards milk from different species and breeds. Cow milk is the most widely
10 available and preferred to milk from other species such as sheep and goat. Despite goat and
11 sheep milk having more nutritional benefits in terms of high protein, energy and fat values than
12 cow milk, goat and sheep milk is not popular. Goat and sheep milk, however is deficient in
13 vitamins D and C and folic acid. With the supplementation of these deficient nutrients
14 (Vitamins D and C), sheep and goat milk would be ideal for infants and pregnant women (Banda,
15 2007). Goat milk protein molecules are better absorbed than other proteins (Banda, 2007).
16 However the low consumption of goat and sheep milk is mainly attributed to the strong flavour
17 and taste of goat and sheep milk and beliefs that consumption of goat and sheep milk reflects low
18 social status. According to a study conducted in Malawi, people in the lakeshore area of Malawi
19 never want to consume sheep milk due to the religious and personal beliefs. Out of the 172
20 respondents from Lilongwe involved in the study, 94% reported that it was not traditionally
21 acceptable to consume goat milk. However from the blind organoleptic test conducted with
22 willing subjects in the study, goat milk was voted to have the best flavour and taste, followed by
23 sheep milk, and lastly cow milk (Banda, 2007).

1
2 Gender is a very important issue in household utilisation of milk and milk products In many
3 countries of Sub- Saharan Africa, men are responsible for the larger livestock such as cattle and
4 women are responsible for the smaller livestock such as sheep and goats and for activities such
5 as feeding and milking of all livestock. A study conducted in Arumeru in Tanzania showed that
6 as their traditional practice men and boys were not involved in milking while on the other hand
7 women contributed to a larger amount of labour such as cleaning, milking and feeding of animals
8 than other household members in dairy farming (Kimaro et al, 2013). However, when it came to
9 decision making on how earnings from livestock were used, women seem to be left out. An
10 example is in Malawi where only 37% of married women aged between 15 and 49 years reported
11 that they decided for themselves on how to use their earnings. About a quarter (21%) of the
12 women make joint decisions with their husbands on how their earnings are to be used and 40%
13 of the women reported that decisions on how their earnings are used are made by their husbands
14 (NSO, 2010).

15
16 Information obtained in a study conducted in Tanzania reported that men involved in dairy
17 production have specific duties such as sales, purchase of animals and consulting veterinary
18 services. Although women may provide most of the labour on dairy cattle farms and other
19 livestock they rear, they may not realize the benefits from dairy production in relation to their
20 contribution and this may limit their motivation to increase production (Kimaro et al, 2013). The
21 Maasai women of Kenya, however are responsible for allocating how much milk should be used
22 for home consumption, exchange and marketing (Tangka et al, 2000). Similarly, in Ethiopia the
23 control of milk products belonged to women (Abebe and Galmessa, 2011). According to FAO

1 (2005) improvements in household food security and nutrition in Africa are linked to the increase
2 in access to and control of income and decision making of household expenditure at household
3 level by women. This is largely due to women spending a larger proportion of their finances on
4 purchasing food for the household.

5
6 In light of this, most NGOs are formulating programmes that address gender related constraints
7 and barriers that affect food and nutrition security. One of the organizations is Land O' Lakes,
8 through its Zambian Dairy Development Program (2004- 2009), it has been able to improve
9 household food security and livelihood of 829 female headed households and women
10 participants. This programme ensured that there was 30% active representation of females in
11 farmer associations, in a country where women were usually forbidden to enter cattle byres with
12 the belief that chemicals used in cattle dips could lead to the prevention of pregnancies. From
13 this programme, it was also noted that women given ownership of cattle, were more effectively
14 able to use income obtained from the sale of dairy products to provide food for the household
15 and other basic farming needs (Land O' Lakes, 2014).

16

17 Environmental impact challenge

18

19 The impacts of climate change on agriculture and food security are widely studied, but the sector
20 is also an important contributor to global emissions. Livestock contributes about half of the
21 agricultural greenhouse-gas emissions and the major gases such as methane from livestock is
22 produced by the fermentation of feed within animals' digestive systems, a process referred to as
23 enteric fermentation (Gnacadia and Mersmann, 2008). The amount of methane emitted is driven

1 primarily by the number of animals, the type of digestive system, and the type and amount of
2 feed consumed (Gnacadia and Mersmann, 2008; IPCC, 2007). A total CH₄ emission inventory
3 from enteric fermentation and manure management for domestic livestock in Malawi, developed
4 using Tier 1 emission factors of IPCC (2007), showed an increase from 81,957 t in 2010 to
5 86,774 t in 2012. These CH₄ emission figures are equal to 2,048,920 and 2,169,353 t/year of
6 CO₂ equivalents, respectively, when assuming that the global warming potential of CH₄ is 25
7 times that of CO₂ (IPCC, 2007). Examining the contribution from individual species showed
8 that the indigenous Zebu cattle were the biggest producers, followed by goats. However,
9 smallholder dairy production was only responsible for 5% of the methane emissions.

10

11 **Managing intensification towards more sustainable smallholder dairy systems**

12

13 Several opportunities are available that would help smallholder farmers achieve more sustainable
14 production than is currently the case. One example of such an opportunity is the availability of
15 technology. Precision agriculture (PA) can be defined as a management strategy that uses
16 information technologies to bring data from multiple sources for decision making in agricultural
17 production (Bouma et al, 1999). For some time, the applications of precision farming techniques
18 have been associated with intensive livestock farming (Frost, 2001). However, PA is possible in
19 both intensive and low-input dairy systems, because the animal is in the centre of PA in livestock
20 systems. PA allows farm animals to be managed on individual level in terms of controlling the
21 inputs to the individual animal and measurement of individual outputs (Wathes et al. 2008).
22 Deployment of high-tech sensor systems opens a wide range of options to use smart but low-cost
23 technology as a bio-sensor for animals' energy state and health. Consequently, in the low-input

1 farms, the potential for using high-tech but low-cost sensors to improve animals' management is
2 very high.

3

4 Another technology that has the potential to help manage intensification achieve sustainable
5 smallholder dairy production is the use of sexed semen. The use of sexed semen in the dairy
6 herd would reduce the number of unwanted male calves and replace them with beef cross calves
7 which would increase beef production at a time when a shortage of beef is predicted. Given
8 programmes like Pass-on the Heifer which exist in most Sub-Saharan African countries in
9 different formats, the use of sexed semen would help increase the number of heifers that could
10 then be passed on. However, there is a need to consider any potential problems pertaining to
11 low fertility that is associated with the use of sexed semen (Frijters et al., 2009). For any
12 reproductive technology and breeding policies to be effective in smallholder dairy systems, the
13 multi-functional roles that cattle play in these systems should always be taken into account (Bebe
14 et al, 2003). Recognition of this broad basis for breeding decisions is central to managing
15 genetic intensification in smallholder dairy production.

16

17 The increased attention of issues around the impact of dairying on the environment has raised the
18 profile of issues around carbon management and climate-change mitigation options in dairying.
19 Total global green house gas mitigation for livestock management is estimated to be 10 to 12%
20 (Beach *et al.*, 2008). Although data from Sub-Saharan Africa on mitigation of GHG emissions in
21 the livestock sector are sparse, studies conducted elsewhere have shown different options. For
22 example, improving animal productivity would reduce enteric methane emission by 20 to 30%;
23 increasing concentrate levels at high level of feed intake reduces enteric methane emissions by
24 25%; while the use of high quality forages and pastures can reduce enteric methane by 25%
25 (Boadi et al., 2004). In general, animal productivity through improvements in animal nutrition,
26 fertility, genetics and management reduces CH₄ output per unit of desirable product e.g. milk.

1 These improvements could be made through the animals converting energy from feed into
2 production in a more efficient way. Increasing feed efficiency and improving the digestibility of
3 feed intake are potential ways to reduce GHG emissions and maximize production and gross
4 efficiency. In dairy cattle, 50% of the amount of feed energy is associated with body
5 maintenance (Mathison *et al.*, 1998). The rest is used for production. Although the amount of
6 enteric CH₄ per animal increases as productivity increases, this increase is relatively small and
7 hence CH₄ per unit of product decreases (Johnson *et al.*, 1996). This provides the opportunity for
8 farmers to explore ways in which to improve the efficiency of their productions.

9

10 **Assessing intensification**

11 This review aimed at examining the management and assessment approaches used in fostering
12 smallholder dairy development strategies and dairy's contribution to sustainable livelihoods in
13 the face of intensification. Using the three intensification strategies of ecological, genetic and
14 socioeconomic improvements, optimising feeding, mitigation of disease and improving general
15 husbandry, the review demonstrated that the inter-linked policies should be promoted in order to
16 achieve the desired goal of sustainable livelihoods. The traditional approach of assessing the
17 impact of intensification to sustainable livelihoods is predominantly through use of univariate
18 approaches that deal with either productivity or economic contribution. However, given the
19 interrelated nature of the different outputs and the trade-offs that arise thereof, other approaches
20 may be more appropriate. Multivariate statistical methods are designed to evaluate more than
21 one variable at a time. Many of these methods are derived from models in which all the
22 variables are assumed to follow a multivariate normal distribution. Examples of such approaches
23 are, principal components analysis (PCA), risk index methods, and Bayesian clustering methods.
24 The inputs into the model would be data reflecting degree of adaptation, productivity of the
25 cattle, the production system, indigenous knowledge, socioeconomic importance of the traits

1 involved, and the economic contribution of the traits. In such a method the model would be
2 designed to calculate a risk value (a value between 0 and 1) to indicate the contribution of
3 intensification. Bayesian networks have been used in biological sciences to build models of
4 domains with inherent uncertainty. Bayesian networks appear naturally in several domains in
5 biology. In pedigree analysis, for example, the joint distribution of genotypes in a pedigree is a
6 product of conditional probabilities of the genotype of each individual given the genotypes of its
7 two biological parents. Bayesian Networks are a combination of probability theory and graph
8 theory. They provide a natural tool for dealing with two problems that occur throughout applied
9 science. Fundamental to the idea of a graphical model is the notion of modularity - a complex
10 system is built by combining simpler parts. Probability theory provides the glue whereby the
11 parts are combined, ensuring that the system as a whole is consistent, and providing ways to
12 interface models to data.

13

14 **Conclusion**

15

16 Smallholder dairy farming is becoming increasingly important. This is because of its potential to
17 substantially contribute to sustainable household livelihoods through economic wellbeing,
18 household food security and nutritional stability. However, just like other aspects of rural
19 development, smallholder dairy development is multi-faceted and hence its long term
20 sustainability trajectory is affected by the pull and push of social, economic, cultural,
21 environmental, and technological factors. Using examples from Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique,
22 Tanzania and Zambia, this paper has highlighted the need to use management and assessment
23 approaches that utilise the synergies and accounts for trade-offs among the different facets of

1 intensification in order to help smallholder dairy farming sustainably contribute to food and
2 nutritional security in Sub-Saharan Africa. For intensification to be effective and sustainable it is
3 important that appropriate strategies are correctly chosen based on the production systems in
4 Sub-Saharan Africa.

5

6 **Acknowledgements**

7 The authors thank the Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs Food Security Initiative special
8 support to the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (UD15). SRUC receives financial
9 support from the Scottish Government. Thanks to the anonymous reviewers for the comments.
10 We appreciate.

11

12 **References**

13 Abebe W, Galmessa U (2011) Gender role in peri urban dairy production system of Ambo town,
14 Ethiopia. *J Agric Extand Rural Develop* 3: 224-228

15 Banda JW (2007) Comparison of consumer attitude towards and acceptance of goat, sheep and
16 cow milk in Malawi. *Intern J Consum Studies* 16: 129-138

17 Beach RH, De Angelo BJ, Rose S, Li C, Salas W, Del Grosso SJ (2008). Mitigation potential
18 and costs for global agricultural greenhouse gas emissions. *Agric Econ* 38 (2): 109-115

19 Bebe, BO, Udo, HMJ, Rowlands GJ, Thorpe W (2003) Smallholder dairy systems in the Kenya
20 highlands: breed references and breeding practices. *Livestock Production Science* 82: 117–
21 127

1 Boadi D, Benchaar C, Chiquette J, and Massé D (2004) Mitigation strategies to reduce enteric
2 methane emissions from dairy cows: Update review. *Canadian Journal of Animal Science*
3 84: 319-335

4 Bouma J. Stoorvogel J, van Alphen, BJ, Booltink HWG (1999) Pedology, Precision Agriculture,
5 and the Changing Paradigm of Agricultural Research. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 63:1763–1768

6 Chagunda MGG, Bruns EW, King J.M, Wollny CBA (2004) Evaluation of the breeding strategy
7 for milk yield of Holstein Friesian cows on large scale dairy farms in Malawi. *J Agric Sci*
8 142: 595-601

9 Cunningham EP, Syrstad O (1987) Crossbreeding bos indicus and bos taurus for milk production
10 in the tropics. *FAO Animal Production and Health paper 68*. Rome, Italy

11 dos Anjos F (2007) Exploring opportunities for developing the use of cassava-based diets to mitigate
12 feed scarcity in Mozambique. *Veterinary Faculty, Eduardo Mondlane University, Mozambique*

13 Falvey L, Chantanthalaka C (1999) *Smallholder dairying in the Tropics*, International Livestock
14 Research Institute, Nairobi, Kenya

15 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2011) *The State of Food and*
16 *Agriculture: Women in agriculture closing the gender gap for development*. Fish and
17 Aquaculture Department, Rome, Italy

18 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (2012) *Livestock sector development*
19 *for poverty reduction: An economic and policy perspective*, Rome, Italy

20 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, International Fund for Agricultural
21 Development and World Food Programme. (2014) *The State of Food Insecurity in the World*
22 2014. *Strengthening the enabling environment for food security and nutrition*. Rome, FAO.

23

1 Frijters ACJ, Mullaart E, Roelofs RMG, van Hoorne RP, Moreno JF, Moreno O, Merton JS
2 (2009) What affects fertility of sexed bull semen more, low sperm dosage or the sorting
3 process? *Theriogenology* 71: 64–67

4 Frost A (2001) An Overview of Integrated Management Systems for Sustainable Livestock
5 Production. In: Wathes C, Frost A, Gordon F, Wood J (eds) Occasional Publication Number
6 28, British Society of Animal Science, pp. 45-50

7 Gnacadia L, Mersmann C (2008) The Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation Information
8 Kit. In United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), New York, USA.

9 Heifer International (2012). Annual Report 2012. <http://www.heifer.org> Accessed 12 January
10 2012

11 Hodges J (1984) Strategies for dairy cattle improvement in developing countries. In: Smith AJ
12 (ed) *Milk Production in Developing Countries*, University of Edinburgh, UK pp 198 – 217

13 Hoppe C, Udam TL, Lauritzen L, Mølgaard C, Juul A, Michaelsen KM (2004) Animal protein
14 intake, serum insulin-like growth factor I, and growth in healthy 2.5-y-old Danish children.
15 *Amer J Clin Nutr* 80 (2): 447-452

16 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), 2007. Climate change 2007: the physical
17 science basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the
18 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. [http://ipcc-](http://ipcc-wg1.ucar.edu/wg1/docs/WG1AR4_SPM_Approved_05Feb.pdf)
19 [wg1.ucar.edu/wg1/docs/WG1AR4_SPM_Approved_05Feb.pdf](http://ipcc-wg1.ucar.edu/wg1/docs/WG1AR4_SPM_Approved_05Feb.pdf)

20

21 Johnson DE, Ward GW, Ramsey JJ (1996) Livestock methane: Current emissions and mitigation
22 Potential. In: Kornegay ET (ed) *Nutrient management of food animals to enhance and*
23 *protect the environment*. Lewis Publishers, New York, NY pp 219–234

- 1 Kalumikiza Z (2012) The effect of increasing dairy production on household food security and
2 nutritional status of under-five children in central region milk shed area in Malawi. MSc
3 Thesis. University of Malawi
- 4 Kawonga B, Chagunda MGG, GondweTN, Gondwe SR, Banda JW (2012) Characterisation of
5 smallholder dairy production systems using animal welfare and milk quality. Trop Anim
6 Health and Prod 44:1429–1435
- 7 Kimaro EG, Lymo- Macha JG, Jeckoniah JN (2013) Gender roles in smallholder dairy farming:
8 Pertinent issues on access and control over dairy farming resources in Arumeru district,
9 Tanzania. Livest Res Rural Develop 25 (5) <http://www.irrd.org/irrd25/5/kima25082.htm>
- 10 Land O’ Lakes inc, (2013). Malawi.
11 [http://www.idd.landolakes.com/stellent/groups/public/documents /web_content/ecmp2-](http://www.idd.landolakes.com/stellent/groups/public/documents/web_content/ecmp2-1070018.pdf)
12 [1070018.pdf](http://www.idd.landolakes.com/stellent/groups/public/documents/web_content/ecmp2-1070018.pdf). Accessed 15January 2014
- 13 Lwelamira J, Binamungu HK, Njau FB (2010) Contribution of small scale dairy farming under
14 zero-grazing in improving household welfare in Kayanga ward, Karagwe District, Tanzania.
15 Livest Res Rural Develop. 22 (2). <http://www.irrd.org/irrd2212//we/22031.htm>
- 16 Mathison GW, Okine EK, McAllister TA, Dong Y, Galbraith J, Dmytruk OIN (1998) Reducing
17 methane emissions from ruminant animals. J. Appl. Anim. Res. 14: 1–28
- 18 McLaren DS (1984) Health and nutritional implications of artificial milk feeding of young
19 children in developing countries. In: Smith A.J. (ed) Milk Production in Developing
20 Countries, University of Edinburgh, UK pp 2 – 14
- 21 Mumba C, Samui KL, Pandey GS, Hang’ombe BM, Simuunza M, Tembo G, Muliokela SW
22 (2011) Economic analysis of the viability of smallholder dairy farming in Zambia. Livest
23 Res Rural Develop 23(6). <http://www.lrrd.org/lrrd24/4/mumb24066.htm>

1 National Statistical Office (NSO) (2012). Integrated Household Survey (HIS) 2010- 2011.
2 Volume 3; Household Socio- economic Characteristics. Zomba, Malawi, pp194

3 National Statistical Office and ICF Macro (NSO and ICF Macro) (2010) Malawi Demographic
4 and Health Survey 2010, Calverton, Maryland, pp 61- 254

5 Neumann CG, Bwibo NB, Murphy SP, Sigman M, Whaley S, Allen LH, Guthrie D., Weissz
6 RE, Demment MW (2003) Animal source foods improve dietary quality, micronutrient
7 status, growth and cognitive function in Kenyan school children: background, study design
8 and baseline findings. *The J Nutrit* 133(11): 3941S-3949S

9 Nicholson CF, Thornton PK, Mohammed L, Muinga RW, Mwamachi DM, Elbasha EH, Staal
10 SJ, Thorpe W (1999) Smallholder Dairy Technology in Coastal Kenya: An adoption and
11 impact study. Nairobi Kenya, International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI), Nairobi,
12 Kenya

13 Njarui DMG, Gatheru M, Wambua JM, Nguluu, SN, Mwangi DM, Keya GA (2009)
14 Consumption frequency and levels of milk and milk products in semi- rid region of Eastern
15 Kenya. *Livest Res Rural Develop.*24 (7) <http://www.lrrd.org/lrrd>

16 Oguntimein GB (1988) Processing cassava for animal feeds. In: Hahn SK, Reynolds L, Egbunike
17 GN (eds) *Cassava as Livestock Feed in Africa: Proceedings of the IITA/ILCA/University*
18 *of Ibadan Workshop on the Potential Utilization of Cassava as Livestock Feed in Africa :*
19 *14-18 November 1988, Ibadan, Nigeria.*

20 Rawlins R, Pimkina S, Barrett CB, Pedersen S, Wydick B (2014) Got milk? The impact of
21 Heifer International’s livestock donation programs in Rwanda on nutritional outcomes *Food*
22 *Policy* 44: 202–213

1 Revesai T, Chagunda MGG, Banda JW, Kamwanja LA (2002) Effects of upgrading on some
2 production and reproductive traits in smallholder dairy cattle in Malawi. Proceeding of the
3 Second National Scientific Conference, Department of Agricultural Research and Technical
4 Services, Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation, Lilongwe, Malawi. 28 - 30 October, 2002.

5 Robertson A (1959) The sampling variance of the genetic correlation coefficient. *Biometrics* 15:
6 469–485

7 Tangka BF, Jabbar MA, Shapiro BI (2000) Gender roles and child nutrition in livestock
8 production systems in developing countries: A critical review. *Socio- economics and Policy*
9 *Research Working paper 27*. International Livestock Research Institute, Nairobi Kenya.

10 The Montpellier Panel (2013) *Sustainable Intensification: A New Paradigm for African*
11 *Agriculture*, London, UK.

12 Walingo MK (2012) Socio- economic, food and nutrient intake and nutritional status associated
13 with successful Livestock Development Programmes in Western Kenya. *Afric J Agric Res*
14 7: 153- 163

15 Wathes C, Kristensen H, Aerts J-M, Berckmans D (2008) Is precision livestock farming an
16 engineer's daydream or nightmare, an animal's friend or foe, and a farmer's panacea or
17 pitfall. *Comput Electr Agric* 64: 2-10

18