



C O N S T R U I S O N S   E N S E M B L E   V O T R E   F U T U R

**Evaluation of  
ALive's first three-year action plan  
(2004-2007)**

**- Final report summary -**

March 10th, 2009



# Contents

<b>1- INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>II</b>
1.1 - PRESENTATION OF THE ALIVE PLATFORM .....	II
1.2 - THE AIMS OF THE EVALUATION OF THE THREE-YEAR ACTION PLAN (TAP1).....	II
1.3 - CONTEXT AND SPECIFIC POSITION OF THE ALIVE PLATFORM.....	III
<b>2- THE LEVERAGE EFFECTS OF THE ALIVE PLATFORM .....</b>	<b>IV</b>
2.1 - REINFORCEMENT OF THE POSITION OF LIVESTOCK FARMING IN THE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES .....	IV
2.2 - FINANCIAL DONORS ARE RETURNING TO LIVESTOCK FARMING AND SUPPORT POLICIES ARE BETTER TARGETED.....	IV
<b>3- EVALUATION OF ALIVE'S ACTIVITIES .....</b>	<b>V</b>
3.1 - THEME 1: VISION, STRATEGY AND COLLABORATION .....	V
3.2 - THEME 2: "KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND CAPACITIES REINFORCEMENT" .....	V
3.3 - THEME 3: ANALYTICAL SUPPORT AND OPERATIONAL ASSISTANCE.....	VI
3.4 - BIRD FLU ACTIVITIES .....	VI
3.5 - GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.....	VII
<b>4- MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE OF THE PLATFORM .....</b>	<b>VIII</b>
4.1 - GOVERNANCE ADAPTED TO THE PLATFORM FOUNDERS .....	VIII
4.2 - THE SECRETARIAT: DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED .....	IX
4.3 - BUDGETARY ASPECTS: EXPENDITURE THAT IS DIFFICULT TO CURB .....	IX
4.4 - IDEAS FOR INCREASING THE PLATFORM'S ADDED VALUE.....	IX
<b>5- POSSIBLE SCENARIOS.....</b>	<b>X</b>
5.1 - SCENARIO 1: ALIVE STOPS; CONTINUATION OF ACHIEVEMENTS? .....	X
5.2 - SCENARIO 2: ALIVE IS REFOCUSED AND TRANSFERRED TO AN AFRICAN INSTITUTION .....	X
5.3 - SCENARIO 3: A PLATFORM WITH A MORE POLITICAL POSITION .....	XI
5.4 - CONCLUSION ON THE SCENARIOS .....	XII
<b>6- GENERAL CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>XIII</b>



## 1 - Introduction

### 1.1 - Presentation of the ALive platform

ALive is a local partnership in Sub-Saharan Africa, created in 2004, further to the observation that livestock farmers in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) represent an important part of the population affected by poverty. They also suffer from the fact that livestock farming is given little consideration in the development strategies of SSA countries.

This platform includes the main actors involved in the development of livestock farming and has several objectives:

- To define development strategies adapted to the SSA livestock farming context;
- To include livestock farming activities in poverty reduction strategies.

An action plan has been defined with activities enabling to exchange and share information and analyses and to set up tools to implement the strategies thus defined.

The operational guidelines (version 2004) present three structures within the ALive organization:

- A General Assembly (GA) including the various participants in ALive, which decides on the orientations. The General Assembly is made up of three caucus: those of the African institutions, the financial donors, and the research and training institutions. It is a policy consultative structure.
- An Executive Committee (EC) which is made up of members appointed by each caucus with, in addition, a member representing the FAO, a member representing the OIE and a member of the institution housing the MDTF (Multi Donor Trust Fund) (the World Bank during the period under review). The Executive Committee decides on the orientations of the platform and approves the action plan: it is a technical decision-making structure, and the platform leadership structure. The EC is led by a chairman appointed by the EC members.
- The Secretariat coordinates the actions and ensures the implementation of the action plan. A Program Manager pilots the program on a day-to-day basis and leads the activities of the Secretariat.

### 1.2 - The objectives of the evaluation of the three-year action plan (TAP1)

The objectives of the evaluation are:

- Evaluation of the products of TAP1;
- Evaluation of the way in which ALive products are used by the various partners;
- Evaluation of the plan's institutional and managerial administration.



### 1.3 - Context and specific position of the ALive platform

The first discussions regarding the idea of the platform began around 2002 and 2003, when the development of livestock farming in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) was experiencing difficulties. The donors were more and more reluctant to invest in this sector in which the support given does not match the stakes related to livestock farming:

- The return on investment is thought to be unpredictable: uncertain climate (drought), economical uncertainties (market depression, long cycle production...) and sanitary hazards;
- The structure of the value-chains is complicated with lot of actors...

However, livestock farming represents more than a quarter of agricultural production in Africa, and is present in more than 67% of poor rural families. Livestock farming plays several roles: nutritional, economical, savings, social... This sector, relying mainly on private investments, has experienced a low average growth (2% per year from 1961 to 2000). Nevertheless, real growth prospects exist with the increasing consumption of animal origin products in urban centres.

This analysis has been the basis for the idea of a platform grouping together the main key actors, around three main technical themes:

- Vision, strategy and collaboration;
- Knowledge management and capacities reinforcement;
- Analytical support and operational assistance.

**As a result, the ALive platform has firstly managed to gather together the various opinions and most of the organizations involved. Certain important organizations are absent or do not participate enough, in particular among the donors. However, faced with the need to make this initiative credible, it could have been difficult to expand the platform and develop the actions.**



## 2 - The leverage effects of the ALive platform

### 2.1 - Reinforcement of the position of livestock farming in the development strategies

The various discussions, debates and publications have enabled to reposition livestock farming within poverty reduction policies:

- The policy notes have enabled to make actors aware of the real position held by livestock farming.
- The ALive contributions have also enabled a better integration of the recommendations for livestock farming within the pillars of the CADDP/NEPAD<sup>1</sup>, even if relations still have to be reinforced.

Finally, ALive's initiative was a leading force in organizing the mobilization against Avian Flu in Africa and it provided a coordinated structure for the use of the funds collected. This is one of the ALive platform's major achievements.

### 2.2 - Financial donors are returning to livestock farming and support policies are better targeted

Notwithstanding the funds brought about for the Avian Flu, ALive's work has enabled to increase the mobilization of financial donors on livestock farming themes. For example, the World Bank, which increased the amount of its investing in the agricultural sector from 400 million to 1.3 billion USD in 2007-2008, is now ensuring that an important part of these new investments in the agricultural sector (estimated at around 15% depending on the country) is used for livestock farming. The European Union is developing projects on livestock farming with the IBAR (e.g. SPINAP, PAN SPSO, SOLICEP<sup>2</sup> ...) on issues directly related to ALive's concerns. These are just two examples given as illustrations. It is now becoming easier to plan projects or project components in the livestock farming sector with new financial donors.

**However, it will only be possible to assess the real impact of the platform in the future, when strategy definition tools specific to livestock farming (e.g.: PRSP guide)<sup>3</sup> will help in proposing pertinent projects to the donors.**

**Finally, in grouping together the main members of the livestock farming sector, ALive offers a unique platform for discussion and dialogue in order to develop the livestock value-chains in Africa.**

---

<sup>1</sup> CAADP: Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme

NEPAD: New Partnership for the Development of Africa

<sup>2</sup> SPINAP: program to support integrated national action plans to fight bird and human flu

PAN-SPSO: Participation of African Nations in Sanitary and Phytosanitary Standard-setting Organisations

SOLICEP: Somali Livestock Certification Project

<sup>3</sup> PRSP: Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers



## 3 - Evaluation of ALive's activities

### 3.1 - Theme 1: vision, strategy and collaboration

This is the core mandate of such a platform, which aims at defining common strategy for a given sector in order to generate leverage effects on the defined policies and the investments made.

It included the following actions:

- **The Project portfolio:** The objective was to list the main projects related to livestock farming in SSA. This task, which was essential in order to know who does what, has led to a first list which must be completed and updated on a regular basis.
- **Policy Notes or strategic orientation notes.** 6 strategic orientation notes on important subjects have been drawn up creating a useful consensus for African decision-makers and also for financial donors. Once again, this work must be continued. On the one hand, certain notes need to be updated and better developed. On the other hand, other subjects (global warming and livestock farming...) should also be the subject of strategic thinking.
- **Elaboration of a general strategy.** A document was drafted on the investment priorities and the integration of this investment strategy within the CAADP pillars.
- **Animal health research.** This module did not achieve the expected results. ALive was to determine priority research areas and work themes, so that they could be included in the terms of reference of the calls for tender of agencies financing research. Faced with the difficulty of creating the consensus on such priorities, ideas on an animal health research strategy would have been useful.

**This first theme must therefore be continued. New strategic orientation notes should be discussed. The platform could have been more responsive regarding major issues such as global warming, food crisis or financial crisis. Finally, the strategy on research related to livestock development remains a major issue that merits strategic thinking.**

### 3.2 - Theme 2: “Knowledge management and capacities reinforcement”

Within this theme, some activities were led by member institutions of the platform and others by the platform itself.

The comparative advantage of the first was to inspire ideas and exchanges within the platform, by enabling it to give value to the experiences developed elsewhere.

- The T2A1 action on the reinforcement of veterinary services: evaluation of Veterinary Services Performances (PVS) has experienced success in Africa. The PVS experience inspired the note on animal health services.
- The T2A2 action, “international trade study”, was carried out by the FAO but the results have not yet been transmitted to the platform.
- The T2A3 action has enabled to set up the Africa GF-TAD (Global Framework for Transboundary Animal Diseases) coordinating with ALive which is integrating the conclusions of this coordination institution.



This shows that ALive must remain a place in which actors can exchange and capitalize on experiences and results achieved by all Pan-African projects on livestock farming and all projects and pilot studies in this domain. This implies that ALive must keep an eye on all projects in progress or planned.

The actions piloted by the platform aimed at developing policy notes through the creation of training tools for the decision trees defined in the notes or the use of the PRSP guide (actions T2A5 and T2A6). The results are mixed due to the delay in designing the PRSP guide.

### 3.3 - Theme 3: Analytical support and operational assistance

This theme focused mainly on the development of the PRSP toolkit in order to support countries in developing a livestock development strategy and including it in the poverty reduction plans. The 3 actions were therefore complementary:

- T3A1: Outcomes of IEPCs (Livestock farming initiative, poverty and growth) in Mauritania and in Burkina Faso.
- T3A2: Elaboration of a toolkit to integrate livestock in the PRSPs;
- T3A3: Tests in two voluntary countries to validate the guide.

A lot of work has been done. It must be completed in order to confirm the results achieved. Emphasize should be put on its operational function. This is why tests are absolutely necessary in the various value-chains of animal production. **This tool should constitute one of the leading products at the platform's disposal providing a development and operationalisation opportunity for the other products already developed.**

### 3.4 - Avian Flu activities

The occurrence of Avian Flu has allowed ALive to play a key role through two kinds of activities:

- Regional ones to define common strategies in terms of risk analysis of Avian Flu on the continent, in particular by involving the various sectors and stakeholders (livestock farming, animal health, human health...);
- The other (INAP) to help countries assess their ability to prevent and manage such a crisis and create contingency plans in the case of epizootic disease.

In spite of the difficulties encountered, the outcome of the “Avian Flu” actions is positive. It increased the platform's visibility. The regional activities fell within the scope of the platform. If the development and implementation of the INAPS could have been more efficient, this was probably the price to pay to gain trust between the various international institutions.

The evaluation of the Avian Flu activities of ALive should lead to a comparative analysis of the unique approach adopted in Africa with those implemented on the other continents, in order to assess the medium-term benefits of it.



### 3.5 - General conclusions

**The platform must remain a place and tool for discussions, exchanges and definition of common strategies.** This includes:

- The “project portfolio” type activities which are the basis of information exchange;
- The definition and promotion of strategic orientation notes (Policy Notes);
- The sharing of key information (reports, progress statements, exchanges on strategies) on projects on a Pan-African level;
- The pooling for the development of common tools when necessary.

**This does not include leading activities in direct support to the countries,** beyond the information and development of the platform products.

**The analysis of the activities underlines the ambitious nature of TAP1** to simultaneously define strategies, create tools and carry out concrete actions. The weaknesses noted are due to the diversity of the activities, and the need for full completion of certain actions in order to evaluate them correctly.



## 4 - Management and governance of the platform

### 4.1 - Governance adapted to the platform founders

#### Governance synthesis

During the 4 years of the plan, the platform has generally been well governed: 11 ECs were organized and three GAs (General Assembly). The African chairmanship of the GA has been held by the Agriculture Commissioner of the African Union since May 2006. The EC, originally chaired by the Managing Director of the OIE, has been chaired by the Director of AU/IBAR since September 2007.

The choice of the platform's informal legal status remains adapted to the flexibility required for these types of tools and avoids creating a new structure. The remarks above show the need to consolidate the method of functioning. However, the platform members are aware of this, as discussions on the "operational guidelines" have begun.

#### Evolutions to be studied

**The General Assembly** has not yet found its place, as it is neither a structure for large debate nor a policy structure. Three evolutions are possible:

- **An open General Assembly**, rather a debating structure than a decision-making one;
- **A more restrained political General Assembly** with more powers regarding ALive's general policy and involving more political decision-makers;
- The third solution would be to combine both the above.

**The caucus** must play a more important role as places of exchange and definition of shared positions for the EC representatives. The segmentation of the bodies is an issue for discussion but there should be a balance between the North and the South, and a representation of the various categories of actors. It would appear preferable to maintain the segmentation per category of player (financial donors, African regional institutions...).

The **Executive Committee** (EC) must be the main policy decision-making structure. This refers to discussions on, and approvals of, the action plan, budget, strategic choices, the validation of the platform's products, significant changes in the action plan or the budget. Its set-up should allow to run with conference calls or video-conferences and with one physical meeting per year.

In order to remain pragmatic, the **Secretariat and the funds manager** (Program Manager) must be hosted by the same institution. However the EC Chairman should not come from the same institution. The Chairman must play his entire role between the members of the EC, political structure, and the Secretariat. The Program Manager is in charge of the coordination and implementation of the action plan, and ensures that the resolutions taken by the EC are correctly applied.

**The organization of ALive in TAP2 is primarily the result of a trade-off, depending on the involvement of each member institution. The new version of the "operational guidelines" will therefore have to set rules enabling to avoid the risk of deviation from the chosen scenario.**



## 4.2 - The Secretariat: difficulties encountered

**The Secretariat has encountered several difficulties.** Part of these difficulties is a result of the constraints imposed on the implementation of the action plan by the EC or the ALive partners. The other difficulties were unexpected issues as often occur in projects.

The work of the Secretariat is not always assessed at its fair value, as it is often judged in light of the products and messages sent to the members which is only the visible part of the huge amount of actual work carried out. This highlights the importance of the quality of communication of the Secretariat.

The Secretariat has also often been considered as the structure performing the action plan whereas the term “coordination unit” would be a better description of the role expected from the Secretariat of ALive: a structure that helps with the activities and organizes exchanges of data and information.

**To conclude, the following recommendations can be made:**

- **A better estimation of the time** allocated to each activity must clearly be made in order to have a better agreement with the EC on the prioritisation of the actions,
- The Secretariat must pay attention to the **quality and frequency of the communication** with the EC members, in particular regarding all matters that materialise its work.

## 4.3 - Budgetary aspects: expenditure that is difficult to curb

The platform has survived through the contribution of two financial donors:

- **The European Commission**
- **The French Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs**

The average cost of the program is **between 700 and 800 KUSD per year**, which places it within a range that is comparable to other similar initiatives. The budget has generally been respected. However, the cost of such a platform must take into account some expenses that are difficult to curb:

- The organization of an EC costs between at least 50 KUSD and 60 KUSD;
- The Secretariat needs at least 150 to 200 working days per person and per year.

## 4.4 - Ideas for increasing the platform's added value

The platform's added value can be increased by working on 3 levers:

- If the platform allows a consensus on livestock support policies, **its efficiency should be assessed through the results of a better coordinated support policy.**
- **The second lever is fund-raising for livestock development in SSA.** The return on this investment lies in the increase of funds devoted to livestock farming.
- **The third leverage effect is the economy of scale made by pooling the design of project elaboration tools.** This is the case of the PRSP toolkit.



## 5 - Possible scenarios

### 5.1 - Scenario 1: ALive stops; continuation of achievements?

The probability of this scenario is not zero. Some current donors will no longer contribute in 2009 and others are questioning the pertinence of their support to ALive in its current configuration. The World Bank is also aiming at a different position within ALive and no longer wishes to carry the weight of the Secretariat.

If this scenario should occur, a disengagement strategy must be implemented in order to continue to build on the platform's achievements.

### 5.2 - Scenario 2: ALive is refocused and transferred to an African Institution

This involves the transfer of the ALive Secretariat to an African institution, as has been decided. Among these, the AU/IBAR is certainly the most appropriate. The ambition of this scenario in terms of action will be more limited with the platform's activities being relatively refocused.

- Theme 1 of the TAP1 seems to be worth continuing with the following priorities: the updating of the project portfolio, the continued drafting or updating of the policy notes, the reinforcement of the relationship between the CAADP / NEPAD and ALive.
- Theme 3 with the PRSP guide also deserves more effort. Its use by countries will imply collective organised support and certainly the updating of the tool.
- The Pan-African activities and projects can also be added to these, falling under the management of one of the member institutions of the platform and for which ALive can be used as a place of promotion and capitalization.

On an institutional level:

- The General Assembly must remain open as a structure of debate and proposal. Within the General Assembly, the caucus must be better structured so that they can vote for EC members. Moreover, work within each body must be encouraged.
- The EC must represent the various kinds of actors. Meetings must be able to be held by conference call or video-conference every 3 months.
- The Chairmanship of the EC is a key role. The choice of EC Chairman must enable the latter to maintain his/her political role and relative independence in relation to the Secretariat in order to fulfil his/her role between the EC and the Secretariat.
- The Secretariat is ensured and managed by the IBAR
- The funds for ALive's activities must therefore be managed by the IBAR.

Even if the process is underway, it is necessary to accelerate it so that the IBAR can ensure the ALive Secretariat after the EC12/13.

Once a year, a meeting could be organized over one week in order to gather together:

- The General Meeting;
- The Executive Committee;
- Other platforms meeting about livestock farming (GF-TADs...);



- One scientific day;
- One day to promote this week on a political level.

The overall budget for such a structure is 500 KUSD per year. In the case of budgetary restrictions, it would be possible to reduce the ambitions regarding the African Meetings on Livestock Farming or the assistance financed by the EC Chairman. **But it is necessary to be aware that this scenario cannot work at less than 300 KUSD.**

**This also corresponds to a new phase of ALive where the work cannot be restricted to thinking and conception, but must also include the promotion of the development of livestock farming on policies defined together.**

### 5.3 - Scenario 3: A platform with a more political position

On the one hand, this scenario maintains an ambitious platform with the following technical assignments:

- The definition of strategies (theme 1)
- The creation of shared tools for all countries (e.g.: theme 3);
- The coordination of the activity managed indirectly by members of the platform (e.g.: theme 2).

On the other hand, the governance will be reinforced to increase the political dimension.

On an institutional level, the political dimension is reinforced:

- The implementation of a “Policy Council”. This authority should include real political decision-makers, major economic actors with an influence on the decisions made in the African Continent with a majority of well-known African figures.
- The General Meeting remains an open structure for proposals and debate.
- The EC also remains the main decision-making structure of the platform.
- The Secretariat or coordination unit remains the coordination and follow-up structure of the implementation of the action plan.

The aim of this new organization is:

- On the one hand, to extend the participation basis of the General Meeting by giving a feeling of membership to a same community of interest;
- On the other hand, to increase the added value of it (and therefore its attraction capacity) by reinforcing its political leverage dimension.

The TAP2 activities will be reinforced in relation to scenario 2: higher production of policy notes, communication on livestock farming, application of the PRSP guide, continuation of the effort on veterinary services’ abilities .... Themes which have not been sufficiently considered during the TAP1 must be added:

- The analysis and definition of reinforcement strategies of the trade of animal products or animal origin products within the African continent and with the other continents.
- The structuring of the sector of transforming animal products to satisfy the African markets.
- The improvement of African animal sectors’ competitiveness by gains in productivity.



In order to last, the development of livestock farming in Sub-Saharan Africa must be led by the market. The ALive platform must therefore deal with these issues as a priority.

The budget of this scenario is close to 900 KUSD per year.

The issue at stake is to transfer the platform towards a more political dimension, while giving it the role of a crossroads between technical action and political action ensuring a close relay with the political decision-makers.

#### **5.4 - Conclusion on the scenarios**

As a conclusion, the last two scenarios are not exclusive from each other: efforts can be spread and options can be mixed from both of them.

- Minimum:
  - Being able to continue the work of monitoring and drawing up the policy notes;
  - Being able to continue to pool information on projects about livestock farming;
  - Monitoring the application of the PRSP guide.
- Beyond:
  - Studying the issues on structuring the livestock farming sectors and on the market access which is a key issue in developing livestock farming in Africa.

Afterwards, iteration should be performed with the financial donors to ensure coherence between an accessible budget and ambitions in terms of activities.



## 6 - General Conclusion

### Results achieved

**The first result is that of having united people** from various institutions in order to gain a clear consensus on the strategies for livestock development in Africa. This had led to several results:

- Recognized Policy Notes;
- A PRSP toolkit to help with defining strategies adapted to livestock farming;
- Projects led by other institutions have found a place for promotion;
- The Avian Flu action has enabled several international institutions to work together (FAO, OIE, WHO, IBAR), to formalize a shared position of Africa in international conferences and help countries to define plans to upgrade prevention and crisis management (INAPs).

**These results could have been more promoted to establish the recognition of ALive.** It is also a shame that some important cooperation agencies did not get more involved in the ALive platform.

### Noticeable effects that are difficult to quantify

The first effects of the work can be identified but not really quantified. The impact will be assessed in the future years if the leverage effect is efficient:

- By the consensus created on strategic orientations for livestock development making dialogue much easier between States and financial donors;
- By the number of projects and the extent of investments made in the sector;
- By the economies of scale that the strategy design tools and projects (PRSP toolkit) may generate.

The implementation of the ALive platform has enabled to improve the position of livestock in investment policies in SSA. The platform has also enabled to develop partnerships (joint work with the FAO, OIE, WHO and IBAR). These first experiences of synergic partnerships must continue and improve on other subjects (food crisis, financial crisis...),

### A platform in a transitional period

- However, ALive is in a transitional period: the financial future is not ensured; TAP2 still needs more readability in its objectives and the organizational structure of the platform needs to be updated. **ALive members must specify the orientations to be given:**
- A scenario of disengagement;
- A scenario of transfer to an African institution (AU/IBAR) refocusing the platform on strategic thinking and on the capitalization of experience;
- An ambitious scenario by reinforcing the political dimension of ALive to reinforce the interface between technical and political actions.

**In all cases, the continuation of the platform requires much more investment in this initiative by African actors and their ability to make the various actors work together.**