

Comments on the Draft Bill, entitled “AN ACT TO DEVELOP THE LIVESTOCK, POULTRY, AND DAIRY INDUSTRY VALUE CHAIN, INCLUDING THE STRENGTHENING OF ITS DISEASE PREVENTION, CONTROL AND REGULATORY FUNCTIONS, AVAILABILITY OF AFFORDABLE AND QUALITY FEEDS, PROMOTION OF DAIRY AND NATIVE ANIMALS AND TO PROVIDE FOR A LIVESTOCK, POULTRY, DAIRY, AND RELATED FEEDS COMPETITIVENESS FUNDS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES” prepared by NEDA

Prepared by Rhoelano M. Briones¹

January 25, 2022

1. **Section 21 No. 3. (Page 32.21 – 24)** mandates PIDS to conduct impact assessment on years 3 and 6 of effectivity of the Act. We have two comments on this. First, the PIDS should receive explicit funding for the mandatory conduct of impact assessment studies on LPDCEF and CCEF programs as provided. Second, PIDS prefers to have an allocation for conduct of a baseline study on year 2, followed by midterm and endline assessments on year 3 and year 6.
2. **Section 6** provides for the creation of a Philippine Livestock and Poultry Authority (PLPA). It would be preferable to have an explicit statement of functions and powers of the PLPA. This is similar to what was done in RA 7884, the National Dairy Development Act of 1995, which established the National Dairy Authority, one of the component entities to be merged into PLPA. Note that p. 28.8 provides for importation to be a mandated activity under the dairy herd build-up programs to be implemented by PLPA (Sect. 18h), but the Act does not state explicitly that importation is a function of PLPA. The statement of function and power will also make clear how to constitute PLPA whether as an agency, attached agency, or attached corporation of DA.
3. **Section 7c** provides for deputization of police and military for the purpose of pest and disease control. I suggest to include “local government” as among the entities that may be deputized, to make more explicit the partnership with LGUs (p. 17.24).

¹ Dr. Rhoelano M. Briones, Senior Research Fellow, Philippine Institute for Development Studies. The views expressed in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the institute.

4. **Section 12 (p. 20.17-18)** repeals PD 194. In doing so, the law should also repeal RA 3018, else it might be “unrepealed” by the repeal of PD 194.
5. **Section 13** should be kept as it is aligned with the mandate of the President to adjust tariffs given by RA 10863, the Customs and Tariffs Modernization Act, subject to the provisions of Section 1608. The Tariff Commission is a good venue to discuss tariff adjustments. Stakeholders are free to express their views during the public hearings to be conducted by the Commission as part of this review. I suggest to include the phrase “in-quota and out-quota” in p. 20.21 to make clear that tariff lines for Minimum Access Volume (MAV) and outside MAV will be subject to mandatory review.
6. **Section 22** requires the National Feeding Programs under RA 11037 to allocate 40% of their Feeding Program budgets for the Milk Feeding Program using locally produced milk. The problem is there may not be enough dairy herds in the initial years of the dairy herd build-up program. I suggest the percentage allocation be phased, namely 20% for year 1 of the law, rising to 30% for year 2 and 40% for year 3.
7. **Section 18** provides for Bureau of Agriculture and Fisheries Standards (BAFS) to share in the extension funds of the LPDCEF. However. I understand that BAFS does not have an extension mandate. I suggest the following wording:

“Ten percent (10%) of the LPDCEF shall be made available to ATI, ~~two and a half percent (2.5%)~~ four percent (4%) of the LPDCEF shall be released to PLPA and BASR and ~~two and a half percent (2.5%)~~ one percent (1%) shall be made available to BAFS for improving food safety and animal support extension.”