



African Union

Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources

Review of Platform Impact

Analysis of responses to questionnaire

ALive 18th EC . November 7th- 8th 2011, Douala - Cameroon





African Union

Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources

Background

www.au-ibar.org



Rationale of the assessment



- **Alive is 6 years**
- **TAPI evaluation in 2008**
- **Transfer of Secretariat to IBAR in 2009**
- **Revised Operational Guidelines in 2010**
- **EC should:** *“Review the impact of Alive Platform through ex-post assessment of selected activities”*
- **Need to enhance Participation of EC members and stimulate debates (see resolutions of 17th EC) during and between the meetings**
- **NEED to take stock of what has worked so far, what could be improved and suggest adjustments if necessary**



Methodology of the assessment



- **Questionnaires drafted by Secretariat and approved by EC Chair**
- **Questionnaires sent to 16 EC members on Oct 5th**
- **Analysis done by secretariat and presented to EC for action**



Questionnaire structure



- 1. Role and importance of the Platform**
- 2. Governance Organs**
- 3. Secretariat**
- 4. Ownership**
- 5. TAP (focus, CFP, type of products...)**



African Union

Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources

Results

9 responses received to date (56 %)

www.au-ibar.org



Part I: role and importance of the platform



I.1 GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF ROLE & IMPACT:

- **In general the role is adequate but the impact is still questionable/low (6/9)**
- 1/8 mentioned low implication of RECs
- 1/8 mentioned unbalance in favor of AH issues
- 1/8 mentioned low emphasis and impact on research



Part I: role and importance of the platform



1.2.1 Function I “improve decision making”:

- Assessment
 - Average to Good
 - Needs improvements
- Recommendations
 - **Improve communication and advocacy (by EC members and Secretariat)**
 - **More emphasis on decision making tools (LSIPT type)**
 - Set up M&E mechanism to assess impact on decision making



Part I: role and importance of the platform



1.2.2 Function 2 “support evidence base advocacy for increased investment”:

- Assessment
 - Poor to Average
- Recommendations
 - **Increase presence and pro-activity in advocacy fora**
 - **Increased efforts to collect data/evidences (analytical tools, research, monitoring of investments...)**



Part I: role and importance of the platform



1.2.3 Function 3 “Improving livestock pro-poor policies”:

- Assessment
 - **Average** to Low
- Recommendations
 - More efforts on collecting information on pro poor policies (impact)
 - Increase participation of decision makers in ALive activities



Part I: role and importance of the platform



1.2.4 Function 4 “Improving access to global knowledge”:

- Assessment
 - Only 25% find it adequate and satisfactory
 - **75% question its relevance**
- Recommendations
 - **Rethink or Abandon (no comparative advantage, other functions contribute to it...)**





Part I: role and importance of the platform



I.3 Which function should be abandoned?



- **Function 4 should be abandoned 5/9**
- Function 4 should be kept 4/9

I.4 Which new function should be added?

- No new function



Part II: Governance organs



2.1 Assessment of functionality of governance organs

- Adequate but representation of key actors could be improved
- Lack of follow up between 2 ECs
- Disconnect between EC members and countries



Part II: Governance organs



2.2 proposed improvements in governance

- Communication and exchange of views among members and within caucuses should be maintained between 2 ECs: Caucuses could work on preselected topics between 2 meetings
- Broaden membership within caucuses:
 - Specialized regional livestock consortium : ASARECA, CORAF/WECARD, etc,
 - Donors,
 - Countries in African caucuses



Part II: Governance organs



2.3 Role of caucuses

Caucuses are not active enough or do not fulfill their mandates 6/9

- Lack of intra-caucus communication
- Membership within some caucuses not adequate (eg: research and academia)





Part II: Governance organs



2.4 Suggestions to improve contribution of caucuses

- **EC delegates parts of its responsibilities to caucuses for implementation and follow up**
- Caucus should be led by one of its member institution



Part II: Governance organs



2.5 frequency of meetings

- Adequate 5/9
- Should be reduced 3/9
- **Specific thematic activities (meetings) should happen between ECs (eg: emerging issues – proactivity)**



Part III: Secretariat



3.1 general assessment of role of secretariat

- Satisfactory 6/9
- Should be strengthened
- Should focus more on promotion of platform, publication of documents (policy briefs) and networking



Part III: Secretariat



3.2 Ideal composition of secretariat

- No opinion 1/3
- The coordinator should be assisted by consultants or experts for follow up of specific activities



Part III: Secretariat



3.3 Sustainability of funding mechanism

- The current situation affects independence and sustainability (6/9)
- Need to look for more donors
- Increase contribution from AUC or MS (1/3)



Part IV: Ownership



4.1.1 Has the transfer of ALive contributed to advance livestock agenda in CAADP?

- Yes (3/9)
- No or little effect (6/9)
- **Relations between CAADP and Alive are still mainly on paper and should be reinforced**

4.1.2 Has the transfer of ALive contributed to enhance African ownership of the platform?

- Yes (2/9), No (3/9)
- **African ownership is satisfactory at continental level but not at regional and national level**



Part IV: Ownership



4.1.3 Has the transfer of ALive contributed to foster investment?

- Difficult or impossible to evaluate, in the absence of **specific monitoring tool (7/9)**
- It has at least contributed to improve understanding of sector contribution



Part V: TAP



5.1 Was the strategic refocusing relevant and useful?

- Yes (7/9)
- **But should go further, and that Alive should focused its portfolio on few core activities(3/9)**

5.2 Assessment of new TAP mechanism

- Adequate (6/9)
- TAP still not focused enough (1/9)
- Insufficient involvement of members in its elaboration (1/9)
- **Rolling system and CFP questionable**



Part V: TAP



5.3 Has the TAP allow the platform to deliver efficiently?

- Yes (2/9)
- **The TAP is unrealistic or lacks focus (3/9)**



5.4 How to improve the TAP?

- Focus on few core activities (1/3)
- More responsibility to caucuses and members (2/9)
- Decentralize implementation to RECs (1/9)
- More emphasis on communication (1/9)



Part V: TAP



5.5 Which activities should be maintained, left out, added?

- Focus on core activities (2/9)
- More emphasis on policy briefs (2/9)
- Work on diagnostic tools (PVS type) (1/9)
- Clean up TAP and remove activities not implemented and not relevant

5.6 Benefit from platform outputs for stakeholders

- The platform should find the way (communication tools) to reach the national and regional level, who currently do not benefit adequately from outputs (6/9)



Main outcomes from assessment and possible way forward



- Impact of the Platform difficult to assess: "questionable"
- Strengthen visibility of the platform - Need to enhance communication on the platform and advocacy
- More emphasis should be on the development of decision making tools
- Abandon function 4 "improving access to global knowledge"
- Improve "inter EC" activity of the platform (networking and communication, specific meetings, etc...)
- Transfer responsibilities from EC to caucuses



Main outcomes from assessment and possible way forward



- Broaden the membership in the Caucuses
- Need to strengthen relationship with CAADP
- Need to develop a M&E framework to monitor impact of the platform
- Review and refocus the TAP on core activities
- Improve communication of outputs towards decision makers at national and regional level
- More involvement of RECs and countries in Alive activities



THANK YOU

MERCI