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Objectives

Improve AW in Europe

*Empower VS to take actions in AW*

- Raise awareness
- Improve implementation
- Encourage participation in the OIE standard setting process

Governance

- OIE Regional Commission for Europe
- Steering Group: 15 Members, incl. member countries (ES/IE/RS/RU/TR - FR) and observers: CH, DE, several NGOs
- Secretariat (OIE sub-regional Representation in Brussels)

**Action Plans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 priority topics:</td>
<td>5 priority topics:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transport (long distance)</td>
<td>- Transport (long distance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Slaughter</td>
<td>- Slaughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stray dog population management</td>
<td>- Stray dog population management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Working equids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- AW in disaster management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Type of activities**

Trainings:
- Workshops
- Seminars
- Train-the-Trainers
- Whole Journey Scenarios

Developing awareness campaigns: stray dogs, working equids

**Budget**

~ 150,000 € / year on average

**Communication**

- Annual newsletter
- Website - [https://awp.oie.int](https://awp.oie.int)
Background of the external evaluation


- 2017, 2018: repeated calls for an evaluation, including at
  - steering group SG10 in Berlin, May 2018
  - OIE regional commission for Europe in Tbilisi, September 2018

- Autumn 2018: strong request from the European Commission in order to consider its next contribution to the Platform (2019/2020)

Timeline of the external evaluation

- October 2018: Drafting of the ToR of the evaluation and selection of the external consultant
- 10 January 2019: Kick-off meeting
- 16 April 2019: Submission of the draft report
- 29-30 April 2019: Presentation at RCG8 (Madrid)
- 15-16 May 2019: Presentation and discussion at SG12 (Lyon)
The Terms of Reference of the external evaluation

- **Scope of the evaluation** = 1st Action Plan
  2nd Action Plan in its current stage of implementation

- **Objectives of the evaluation**

  **Overarching objective** = to provide a reasoned and analytical assessment of the Platform as a basis to guide its future development, for the use of:
  - OIE authorities: General Assembly; Council; Bureau of the regional Commission
  - OIE management: Director General; DDGs; Heads of Department; RR/SRR
  - Current and future donors
  - Platform members and stakeholders

  **Specific objectives:**
  - Assessing the effectiveness and the efficiency of the 1st and 2nd Action Plans
  - Providing recommendations for the preparation of the 3rd Action Plan, identifying areas of further improvements in terms of:
    - Effectiveness
    - Efficiency
    - Management
    - Scope and monitoring of activities
Evaluation questions = “To what extent:

- ...was the OIE AW Platform effective in implementing the Action Plans?

- ...have the activities of the OIE AW Platform been performed efficiently with regards to the funds, human resources and time delivery?

- ...is it possible to measure today whether the activities of the OIE AW Platform have been effective in delivering on its general and specific objectives?

- ...are the current activities, scope and monitoring framework relevant to the needs of the region?”
Methodology

- **Desk Review** of the strategic documents of the Platform:
  - Concept Note
  - Action Plans
  - Newsletters, etc.

- **Interview** of 22 key informants:
  - OIE staff,
  - Bureau of the Regional Commission for Europe,
  - Platform donors,
  - participants to the Steering Group,
  - some beneficiary countries.

- **Qualitative survey** across the 53 countries of the region.
## Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Category</th>
<th>Respondent Details</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OIE Senior Management and Headquarters Staff</strong></td>
<td>Director General&lt;br&gt;Director of Finance&lt;br&gt;Chargé de mission for Animal Welfare&lt;br&gt;Project Officer (World Fund Unit)&lt;br&gt;Current Platform Secretariat (x2)&lt;br&gt;Former Platform Secretariat</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Members of the Bureau of the Regional Commission</strong></td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Members and Observers of the Platform SG</strong></td>
<td>Spain, Turkey, OIE, IZSAM Teramo, ICFAW</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beneficiary Countries</strong></td>
<td>Georgia, Republic of North Macedonia, Greece</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Platform Donors</strong></td>
<td>European Commission, Ireland, France, Switzerland</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative Survey

Objective

- Gather feedback and opinions from those stakeholders who could not be interviewed

Topics included in the survey

- Respondent profile and relation with the Platform
- Awareness of the Platform
- Relevance of the activities of the Platform
- Quality of the activities conducted by the Platform
- Impact of the Platform activities, including on compliance with OIE standards and awareness raising
- Lessons learnt
Respondents - 31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>AnimalhealthEurope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Copa-Cogeca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>European Federation of Animal Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>FVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>International Fund for Animal Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>World Animal Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liechtenstein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Macedonia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Platform’s Best Practices

What do you consider to be best practice of the Platform based on the activities you participated in so far? What would you suggest for future Platform activities?

**BEST TOPICS**
- Stray dog population management
- Long distance transport
- Slaughter
- Animal welfare in disaster situation
- Working equids

**BEST APPROACHES**
- Access to information on varied topics around AW, increased awareness
- Practical cases, training and methodology
- Exchange of experience
- Capacity building (ToT approach)
Evaluation Findings
Relevance

To what extent are the current activities, scope and monitoring framework relevant to the needs of the region?

- The Platform is an important tool in promoting animal welfare in the wider European region.
- The governance structure of the Platform ensures a participatory approach to defining the objectives and activities

BUT

- The Platform’s objectives are formulated at the macro-level and the activities included in the APs are not specific enough to address needs at individual country levels
- The Platform does not have a strong monitoring and evaluation system
Effectiveness

To what extent was the OIE Animal Welfare Platform effective in implementing the Action Plans?

- The Platform is on track in implementing the planned activities
- Effectiveness ranks high in terms of number of tasks listed and executed under each activity in the Action Plan

BUT

- The extent to which the activities have reached their intended outputs is less straightforward.
- Assessing ‘intangible’ outputs such as levels of awareness, or capacity, or shifts in attitudes and behaviour, is a difficult task to undertake within the current results framework.
Efficiency

To what extent have the activities of the OIE Animal Welfare Platform been performed efficiently with regards to the funds, human resources and time delivery?

- There were no significant delays in implementing the activities
- The Platform is considered by the respondent donors and countries as ‘good value for money’

BUT

- Spendings are far below the estimated funding needs – a more professional approach is needed
- Human resources: the Platform Secretariat is understaffed or does not rely enough on the OIE Headquarters resources (communications, logistics, and specialists)
Short – term / Early Impact

To what extent is it possible to measure today whether the activities of the OIE Animal Welfare Platform have been effective in delivering on its general and specific objectives?

- Not really possible.

- Assessing impact [i.e. implementation of OIE standards, improvement of knowledge and awareness] requires:
  - time: implementation of the Platform is still too short
  - Indicators: current indicators are not designed to measure impact
  - A known baseline situation: not systematically available

- Capacity / financial constraints within the beneficiary countries
Evaluation Recommendations
Recommendations (1/2)

1. Platform should seek ways to reinforce its stakeholder engagement to keep up momentum
   → Rotation of the Steering Group membership?

2. Platform should explore ways of providing a more nuanced approach to technical assistance.

3. Platform should reduce its breadth of activities while increasing its target audience.
   i. Reduce the overall number of activities and focus on improving quality and efficiency while keeping in mind the capacity of the beneficiary countries
   ii. The target audience of Training of Trainers could include veterinary departments at universities / faculties in view of increasing 1/ the quality of knowledge transfer and 2/ the sustainability of the capacity built.
Recommendations (2/2)

4. The Platform should constantly collect feedback and evaluate itself
5. The Platform should develop its capacity to evaluate achievements and impact
6. The Platform should track and explore outcomes in a systematic way
   ➔ **setting up a monitoring and evaluation system.**

7. The Secretariat should boost the frequency of communication and information sharing on Platform activities, progress and more importantly on follow-up
   ➔ *The Platform website should be updated very regularly*

8. The OIE Secretariat in Brussels could benefit from additional staff
And now, what?

**Evaluation report**
- Final version
- online publication