

(M/E. 4)

TERMS OF REFERENCE

MID TERM REVIEW OF THE PANAFRICAN PROGRAM FOR THE CONTROL OF EPIZOOTIC DISEASES (PACE)

Accounting numbers

No. 7 ACP – RPR – 744/745

No 8 ACP – TPS – 032/033

No 8 ACP – ROC - 009

1 Introduction

The PACE programme is a major development programme financed by the EDF in the field of animal health in Africa, reaching 32 African countries. The Programme started on November 1st, 1999, and countries started the implementation of their PACE national projects from the summer of 2000. After two years of implementation, a mid term review is commissioned, as foreseen in the Financing agreement.

The review will be undertaken in the second quarter of 2002 by a team of independent consultants. The duration of the study will be 8 weeks.

It is expected that the study reviews the programme at its different levels of implementation, and draws the necessary conclusions to enhance its impact.

2. **Objectives of the review**

The objectives of the Mid Term Review are to:

- Analyse the coherence and the relevance of the objectives of the PACE programme
- Analyse the strategy adopted during the project implementation.
- Analyse the results and the impact of the project so far;
- Formulate recommendations for the remaining period of the programme.

3. **Background**

The PACE program is an on-going 5 years programme financed with EDF regional funds. The financing agreement was signed in August 1999 for an amount of 72,000,000 EURO. A number of European Member States have made additional financial contribution to the EDF resources of PACE (UK, France, Italy). They are providing technical assistance, additional funds for specific countries, or a 'project within a project' (CAPE).

The PACE programme aims at building upon the headway made in the campaign against rinderpest in order to establish lower-cost national and continental epidemiological surveillance networks for the main animal diseases, provide the countries with the capacities needed to organise economically and technically justified control programmes and develop effective and sustainable distribution of veterinary products and services.

A more detailed description of the programme are presented in annex A. The programme

includes national operations planned and implemented in each country and also sub-regional and regional support and coordination components.

The PACE programme covers 32 sub-Saharan Africa countries. The national projects are 'consolidated' in a regional Work programme signed by the RAO and endorsed by the lead delegation every 6 months in batches. In November 2001, almost all PACE country projects have their first or second annual work programmes approved, and have consequently started implementation (Annex B). Exceptions relate to countries where EU development cooperation is suspended, and to Northern Sudan where implementation is linked to the recruitment of technical assistants for the PACE national programmes, which is not yet conducted. The Coordination Unit has prepared a manual of procedures for the management of the National projects early 2000.

PACE is coordinated by the Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources (IBAR) of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU/IBAR), where Common services are also set. The organisational chart of the programme include a Programme Coordination Unit (PCU) in Nairobi and two Regional Coordination Units, in Bamako for West and Central Africa and Nairobi for Eastern Africa. Regional co-ordinations aim at minimising duplication of effort and at harmonising the different national activities within the PACE programme. In December 2000, this structure was fully staffed. Several changes in Technical assistance have occurred, including the main Technical assistant to the Programme.

A backstopping mission to the management of the PACE Coordination unit has been undertaken in December 2001. The backstopping mission made recommendations to improve the efficiency between the Coordination Unit and the regional co-ordination units, the Common Technical Services, the Regional Authorising Officer and the Lead EC Delegation.

4. Issues to be studied

The evaluation will review the whole PACE programme. It will therefore analyse a sample of country projects, the support given to, and coordination of these country projects, the activities pertaining to OAU/IBAR, and the activities implemented by other parties.

The mission will use the European Commission's Project Cycle Management (PCM) Integrated Approach and Logical Framework method to analyse the progress in implementation of the programme. In order to fulfil the objectives of the review, the following issues will be given a particular attention by the team:

4.1 Project preparation and design.

- Review the project design phase (in particular the process which led to the PACE program), and assess the management and impact of the transition phase PARC-PACE.
- The evaluation will include a judgement on whether the major project components were correctly chosen priorities, and whether any other needs were omitted. It will evaluate whether the inputs proposed were appropriate to meet the various objectives. In particular the management and financial structures for planning, implementing and monitoring the various projects.
- Review the overall PACE programme design; a particular attention will be given to the central role played by the OAU/IBAR.
- Review the rationale underlying the design of PACE as a regional program. This may entail an assessment of the social, institutional and economic environment of the programme.

- Review the financial design of the financing agreement;
- The complementarities and coherence between the EDF funded activities and the other donors funding directly related to PACE will be assessed; the way that CAPE (DFID) logic nests and operates within PACE will be given a particular attention.
- Review the potential for PACE to play a facilitating role in the financing of additional activities in the field of animal health in Sub Saharan Africa.

4.2 Relevance of the project

- Review internal coherence of the log frame (relationship between goals, purpose and results stipulated in the log frame). A particular attention will be paid to the coherence between the log frame of the financing agreement, and the working log frame designed during the PACE coordination unit and common services workshop held in Machakos in November 2000.
- Review whether the specific objectives are realistic and relevant to the overall objectives, government policy and problems to be solved?
- Assess the relevance of the objectives pursued (at a regional and national levels) in the context of the trend of livestock development in Africa. A particular attention will be paid to the changes related to trade of livestock products in the world.
- Review the Institutional linkages of PACE (OIE, FAO, IAEA, World reference Laboratories, etc...), and assess how they affect the relevance of the programme

4.3 Efficiency and effectiveness

The efficiency and effectiveness of the project will be reviewed in the light of the specific objectives of PACE. The reviewers will:

- Review the level of program implementation at all levels, and identify factors that might have affected it..
- Evaluate the level of integration of activities of PACE in addressing its four thrusts and recommend improvement if necessary
- Review the relationships between the activities and the results of PACE achieved so far, taking into consideration the resources mobilized.
- Assess the already achieved PACE results and outputs.

Keeping in mind that the expected impacts of PACE lay primarily at the National level, which receives the largest share of financial resources, the reviewers will

- Review the balance of attention devoted to the regional components and to the national projects by the Co ordination units and the PACE Common Services. Assess the support provided to the PACE countries.
- Assess (on a sample basis) the Global plans for the PACE country projects, and review their consistence with the PACE FA on the one hand, and with the Common Services strategies on the other hand.
- Assess (on a sample basis) the results achieved at country level
- Review the PCU preparation and management of the consolidated WP. Have these consolidated WP contributed to a greater consistency of the programme, and efficiency of implementation?

- Review the initial financial allocation to the pace country projects, the management of these amounts by the PCU, and the proposed mechanism for reallocation of financial envelopes/drawing rights.
- Review the financial management of the national PACE projects, and in particular whether the mechanism adopted ensures the smoothest financing of operations together with an adequate financial monitoring and control

The following issues pertinent to the PACE Co ordination and Common Services will be addressed, as they affect both their activities and the national PACE projects:

- The strategies established by the various PACE services, and assess their contribution to fulfilling the programme objectives on the one hand, and how they have been translated into project activities/work plans on the other hand.
- Review the planned and/or established Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms (both for regional activities and country projects), as well as the timeliness and adequacy of project reporting. The reviewers will discuss the indicators used to assess the degree of achievement.
- Review the contribution and role of the Advisory Committee and Policy Committee to PACE.

The team will also re-evaluate the appropriateness of the existing organisation, management systems and reporting channels of PACE in the light of experience gained in the first two years, with proposal of improvement if necessary. The evaluation team to this effect will rely as much as possible on the recommendations and the findings of the backstopping mission to the management of the PACE co-ordination Unit. The following issues will in particular be assessed:

- Institutional capacity of OAU/IBAR to coordinate the PACE programme (including assessment if coordination role conflicts with regional authorising functions). The possibility that the PACE Co-ordinations for West and central Africa and for Eastern Africa be made more independent will be reviewed.
- The support provided by technical assistance
- Mechanism to assess project staff performance,
- Mechanisms to coordinate various donors inputs; is the PACE project management given the necessary tools and skills to run a multi donor funded project?
- Other existing or potential management constraints and bottlenecks to effective and efficient implementation of the programme and recommendation for their correction.

5. Expected Impact and sustainability

- Assess whether the specific objectives are likely to be achieved, and if not identify the reasons impeding the achievements and measures to address them.
- Review the problems to be resolved which are being addressed, and eventually review problems that have emerged out of the first two years of implementation. They will indicate activities to be fostered in that respect..
- Assess the expected impact of the project at the Institutional level on the one hand, and for farmers on the other hand
- Review the measures aimed at ensuring the sustainability of the results of PACE at the national level. Among the accompanying measures listed in the financing agreement, the issue of the progressive contribution to the running costs of the epidemiological surveillance networks will be give a particular attention. This will include a review of the

risks and flexibility for PACE.

- Review the sustainability of the results directly affecting OAU/IBAR. A particular attention will be paid to the future of OAU/IBAR within the OAU structure, and the related staffing capacities.
- Assess the support given to external structures (PANVAC, OIE regional Office for Africa) and their future strategies.

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

The conclusions shall cover all the important aspects requiring action that the team has identified. The conclusions may take into consideration aspects concerning other projects closely linked to PACE. The conclusions should lead to the recommendations.

Considering the findings of the review, and in particular the answers to the points raised above, recommendations for the future of PACE will be presented. Recommendations shall be made for improving the current activities. The recommendations may also entail a review of the logical framework, any modification to the project timeframe, and financial allocations (including for technical assistance and among countries). The implications for a possible review of the financing agreement will be discussed and a draft proposed if the case be.

5. Plan of work

To conduct this assignment, the consultants will undertake the following visits:

- OAU/IBAR office in Nairobi, where the team will be based.
- PACE coordination Unit in Bamako
- The Delegation of the EC in Kenya
- A sample of PACE countries (representative of the different 'batches' of national projects financed), where the national administration and the Delegation of the EU will be interviewed.

In addition, the reviewers will liaise with the OIE in Paris and the FAO in Rome. A provision is made for visits deemed necessary in Europe, and for report preparation in country of residence.

The PACE Coordination is planning a regional coordination meeting at the end of June (in Cameroon) where all national PACE coordinators might be met if the review team so wishes.

DFID may also concomitantly undertake a mid term review of CAPE. Both teams should meet and work in a complementary form. If DFID is not in capacity to organise a mid term review, some DFID staff will meet the reviewers in Kenya at some key stages of the mid term review.

Initial list of documents to be consulted:

- Preparatory documents to the Financing proposal
- Financing Agreement
- PACE Common Services draft Global Plan
- PACE Manual of procedures
- Advisory Committee meetings reports
- PACE Country Global plans and Work programmes/cost estimates
- PACE consolidated Work Programmes

Before the end of the second week, the reviewers will hold a one-day workshop in Nairobi where an inception report will be presented and discussed. It will include a plan for the undertaking of the review, detailing the use of the line 'regional travel' of the budget breakdown.

In the last days of the study, a workshop will be held to present the conclusions of the mid term review. It may be organised by the consultants in Kenya, Bamako, or at OAU headquarters, depending on the proposal from the consultant. The cost of this workshop will be borne by the PACE programme coordination. The aide memoire should be communicated to the workshop participants (RAO office, the EC Delegations, OAU/IBAR) several days in advance.

7. Expertise required

The evaluation team should comprise at least four members each of whom should have a university degree, and preferably a higher degree in a relevant discipline. It is proposed that the members have the following profiles:

- An agricultural economist, with a particular experience in the field of animal production/health economics.
- A specialist of the organisation of livestock services, preferably with an experience related to animal health services.
- A veterinarian experienced with epizootic diseases and knowledgeable with epidemio-surveillance.
- A Communication and information management expert with an experience in rural communication and/or development support communication.

Proven experience of every team member in development cooperation is needed, and in particular in the evaluation of complex projects. Each team member should have at least 10 years of experience relevant to African countries. The team should be fluent in French and English and present a wide knowledge of the Western, Central and Eastern Africa.

The consultant in his offer shall designate the team leader. The consultant may also propose additional team members to increase the disciplinary fields covered. A proven experience in the management of regional projects by one of the team members at least will be required. Knowledge of EDF procedures by some team members is required.

7. Reporting

inception report

The inception report will be regarded as a working document and its format must reflect this requirement. It should be a maximum of 10 pages. The report will be based on a dossier comprising financing proposals, financing Agreement, various Work programmes and reports as well as preliminary discussions with the Regional Authorising Officer, the EC Lead Delegation in Nairobi, Staff of the IBAR Office, the PCU, the Office of the Regional Co-ordinations and other key project personnel met.

aide memoire

An aide memoire will be presented to a workshop at the end of the field work. It will include a concise self contained summary with major conclusions and corresponding recommendations clearly listed.

Main report

The final report should follow as closely as possible the format of evaluation reports (Annex C). The report of the MTR will include: (a) a concise, self-contained executive summary of four pages with recommendations, (b) a main report of a maximum of 75 pages, (c) annexes, (d) a list of content, (e) a list of all the used acronyms, (e) maps.

Twenty (20) copies (2 to the RAO, 11 to the PACE Coordinator, and 7 to the CEC) of the draft final report will be presented. The main text of the draft report should be in English with the executive summary in French and English (4 pages each).

Forty-five (45) copies (2 to the RAO, 15 to the PACE Coordinator, and 30 to the CEC) of the final report will be submitted. The main text of final report will be presented in English and French (20 and 25 copies respectively). Appendices may be presented in any of the two languages.

8 Time Schedule

The fieldwork of the experts will be carried out before the end of July 2002.

The draft final report must be submitted within 4 weeks after completion of the fieldwork. The final report will be presented within 4 weeks of receipt of written comments from the client and other interested parties. Such comments must be submitted to the consultants 40 days after the presentation of a draft final report, by either the RAO, the Commission or the PACE project. If no comments are received the contractor resubmits the draft final report as a final report.

"PanAfrican Program for the control of Epizootics (PACE)"
Description of the programme: DTA of the Financing Agreement

1. BACKGROUND

2.1. Political and organisational background

Increasing the production of foodstuffs of animal origin and promoting regional trade are priorities for the Member States of the OAU, as reaffirmed at the August 1997 Conference of Agriculture Ministers in Mbabane. The ministers accordingly gave a remit to the IBAR to harmonise livestock farming policies, co-ordinate and step up surveillance of, and the campaign against, the main epizootic diseases¹ (list A of the International Office of Epizootics - IOE), including those affecting game, and establish a sustainable partnership between private and public sectors.

These aspects are in keeping with a broader framework:

- Protecting animal health has become a key element in WTO agreements on international trade in products of animal origin. These agreements assign a regulatory role to the IOE and provide for an undertaking by the developed countries to help developing countries fulfil these conditions.

- The campaign against rinderpest, one of the main diseases of cattle and wild ungulates in Africa, is in keeping with a world eradication campaign coordinated by the FAO, the "Global Rinderpest Eradication Programme (GREP)", for which the IBAR is the operational arm in Africa.

The IBAR, a technical body of the OAU, is allocated some 10% of the OAU's general budget for this purpose. It already coordinates the PARC programme and in this connection successfully uses the OAU's political clout to promote, via ongoing dialogue, major sectoral policy reforms for the African states: privatisation of veterinary medicine, cost recovery, health mandates, etc.

2.2. Features of the sector

Annual population growth in sub-Saharan Africa is 2.7% whereas the increase in animal production is only 2.2%. Per capita consumption of animal products, already very low, is permanently declining (-28% in 30 years for meat), although Africa regularly imports livestock products. The economic problem is therefore compounded by an alarming human dimension.

Extensive traditional production systems, with limited growth potential, are still widespread in sub-Saharan Africa. In the last 20 years, however, there has been a marked change in production methods: ruminant herds have shifted to wetter regions and animal production systems have become more

¹ IOE definition of List A diseases: "Transmissible diseases which have the potential for very serious and rapid spread, irrespective of national borders, which are of serious socio-economic or public health consequence and which are of major importance in the international trade of animals and animal products". These diseases are: foot and mouth disease, vesicular stomatitis, swine vesicular disease, rinderpest, peste des petits ruminants, contagious bovine pleuropneumonia, lumpy skin disease, Rift Valley fever, bluetongue, sheep pox and goat pox, African horse sickness, African swine fever, classical swine fever, highly pathogenic avian influenza, Newcastle disease.

intensified and more closely incorporated with other rural and peri-urban activities. There is considerable potential for increasing African production by means of these "new" systems.

However, animal health constraints, in particular epizootic diseases that cause high mortality, jeopardise livestock numbers and discourage private investment in the sector. Traditional stock farmers respond to this insecurity by building up large herds, which are often under-exploited and impinge heavily on local natural resources.

Creating a system to protect animal health will remove these constraints and will redound on the development of all production systems and stock farmers' incomes. Health security therefore seems to be a prior condition for any programme or project aimed at intensifying production.

One of the most dangerous epizootic diseases is rinderpest, which now only exists in four or five East African countries. Its eradication, which on the basis of past experience is the only sustainable option, is technically possible and complies with the rules laid down by the IOE and that the PACE programme intends to follow.

The PACE programme will therefore build on the very positive achievements of the PARC programme, which has been co-financed by the Commission for several years. These achievements, confirmed by an independent evaluation in 1996-97, offer a firm basis for eradicating rinderpest from Africa and controlling other major diseases.

2.3. Beneficiaries and parties involved

The first group of beneficiaries will be stock farmers and herdsmen, whose wives are usually responsible for milk and small livestock production but who also traditionally own animals in their own right. The second target group is animal health professionals, many of whom are already involved in a general process of privatisation. Finally consumers and the national economies will also benefit from the programme as a result of the expected increase in production and enhanced trade and food security.

2.4. Problems to be addressed

The problem to be addressed is the precariousness of animal health in Africa. This is a limiting factor on animal productivity, stock breeders' incomes, the expansion of private investment in the sector and the development of interregional or international trade in livestock products. The main constraints that cause health insecurity are connected with the poor performance of the public services responsible for the surveillance of diseases, and the difficulty of assessing the impact of major epizootics, including the persistent threat of rinderpest.

To eradicate rinderpest from the African continent, the countries concerned must follow the procedure laid down by the IOE: a halt to vaccinations, active research into the disease and the establishment of an epidemiological surveillance network. Compared with the costs involved in this procedure, the cost of establishing the epidemiological situation of the other major diseases and their surveillance is minimal. Nevertheless, they will be dealt with under specific programmes that will be evaluated according to the expected economic impact. These will mainly be long-term operations that are consequently only feasible with the support of the producers themselves via a full cost recovery system. Experience has shown that the private sector is the most effective in this area even if the process of privatising veterinary medicine is still incomplete. In any case, the underlying principles have been widely accepted.

2.5. Other interventions

The programme will draw on the achievements of the PARC programme (since 1986) and also the EC-financed wildlife veterinary project (1998-2000), the vaccine certification project organised by the FAO with EC/Japan financing and the project to train community animal (1996-1999) financed by the USAID and DFID.

It will also build on other schemes to reorganise national administrative departments, like the agricultural sector investment programmes (ASIP) which have started in several countries, for example Kenya.

Another EC programme currently in the pipeline pursues similar objectives in the SADC area and could be incorporated in the whole system. The EC is also going to conduct studies in East Africa for a programme to support production and trade in livestock products which will fully complement the health protection system that PACE will set up.

3. INTERVENTION

The following details the PACE program logical framework:

The overall objective of the programme is to relieve the poverty of those involved in the livestock-farming sector (producers, service providers and consumers) in Africa by the improving animal productivity, trade and food security.

The specific objectives of the programme are:

- to strengthen national and regional capacities to assess the technical and economic aspects of animal diseases, and to generate appropriate programmes for their control;
- to protect animal health in Africa against the principal epizootic diseases (list A of the IOE).

The Expected results are:

- In each participating country animal epidemiology services (information, diagnosis and follow-up) and services for the control of major diseases will be reinforced.
- Privatisation will be better organised and epidemiology capacities will be strengthened to the direct benefit of livestock farmers.
- Rinderpest will be eradicated from Africa and there will be greater control over other epizootic diseases, in particular contagious bovine pleuropneumonia (CBPP).
- A sustainable system will be set up at pan-African level to coordinate national animal health systems and the fight against epizootic diseases.

3.1. Activities

The programme activities are divided into national components (74% of the programme's budget) and regional components - or common regional services - (26% of the programme's budget).

3.1.1. The national components

National component activities will vary according to the individual situations in each country but they will always come under four headings:

- Enhanced national capacity for analysis and action in the fields of epidemiology, socio-

- economics of animal health, communications and project management;
- Improved accessibility and distribution of veterinary services and medicines, based on developing a harmonised approach to the privatisation process and coherent links between public services and private operators;
- Fight against rinderpest, based on halting vaccinations as soon as possible and on giving aid to countries to fulfil the IOE procedure for being declared "countries free from the disease", including active research into the disease, strengthening the surveillance network and setting up rapid response systems;
- Improved control of other epizootic diseases, particularly CBPP, by drawing up epidemiological and socio-economic data enabling the states concerned to assess the advisability of future campaigns based on full cost recovery. Vaccine funds could possibly be made available for the most badly affected areas.

These programme components are all directed at building up the institutional capacity of national animal health systems. They aim to encourage national capacities for planning, implementation/follow-up and viability of actions. A multiplier effect will be produced through regional and sub-regional meetings and is also one of the main responsibilities of the Coordination Units.

3.1.2 The regional components

These are common services that will support the implementation of activities at national level. They will be based in the IBAR's offices in Kenya and in the Regional Co-ordination Units and will include:

- An epidemiology unit that will be the heart of the programme. **It will include a service with special responsibility for epidemiological monitoring of wildlife.** Three sub-units dealing with the rinderpest situation will be set:
 - one in Nairobi for the area where rinderpest is still endemic;
 - one in Bamako for the countries of West and Central Africa that have ceased anti-rinderpest vaccinations and begun the IOE procedure;
 - one in N'djamena responsible for monitoring the western sanitary cordon which protects West Africa against possible re-infection from East Africa.
- A communications unit based in Nairobi with a sub-office in Bamako, which will build up national expertise in this field. At the request of the other technical units it will produce advisory back-up material at central level, it will promote the programme and help to supplement the veterinary schools curriculum.
- A socio-economics unit will be responsible for developing appropriate instruments for socio-economic evaluation of diseases and devising projects for their control. These will then be transferred to the sub-regional and national levels.
- A unit to back up the organisation of the veterinary services (privatisation and use of husbandry auxiliaries). It will be responsible for the legal aspects of the privatisation process, harmonisation of approaches and negotiations with financial intermediaries, and also promoting the participation of husbandry auxiliaries ("paravets" and community-based animal health workers) in vaccination campaigns in remote or unsafe areas, under the supervision of veterinary doctors. Auxiliaries will also take part in improving the distribution of veterinary products and services in the more arid regions, and more generally in the process of privatising veterinary medicine. This aspect will be carried out in conjunction with other donors such as the DFID.
- A financial unit responsible for establishing real time analytical accounts for the financial control of the programme, accurately estimating the costs of activities to control diseases, and carrying out internal audits at regular intervals.

- Other common services including:
 - i) a data processing and analysis unit, ii) a follow-up/evaluation structure, iii) a policy and strategy committee for the programme, iv) support for veterinary schools to alter their curriculum.
- **The programme will also support the PANVAC (OAU centre for the quality certification of vaccines)** and will commission scientific research institutions according to the needs identified, in particular for work on CBPP.

3.2 ASSUMPTIONS

These are listed in the logical framework but primarily depend on the willingness of the OAU and its member states to invest in the development of livestock farming and to support the strategic choices of the PACE programme, as reaffirmed at the Mbabane meeting in August 1997. A propitious world market scenario and climatic and political stability are basic assumptions.

In each country, even if resources are limited, one of the core functions of the Ministries currently undergoing restructuring is to run health surveillance systems, and these will consequently be financed by the national budget. Where necessary, economic and financial mechanisms could be devised in order to generate the necessary resources, depending on the specific features of each country concerned. How activities develop in the countries in crisis will depend on the political and security situation.

4. IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 Physical and non-physical means

The programme will provide the operational means: technical assistance, vehicles and office, laboratory and field etc equipment. Training and information campaigns are planned at all levels from the grassroots communities to officials in the services: diagnosis, epidemiology, surveillance of wildlife, geographical information systems, socio-economics of animal health, techniques of communicating with stock breeders etc. Active research campaigns into diseases and the establishment of epidemiological surveillance networks will receive organisational and logistical support and also emergency intervention plans and the means to implement them. African personnel will be trained at both national component and IBAR level to ensure the maintenance of the Centre of Excellence, in particular for the exchange of information on animal health and the preparation of economically and technically justified disease control programmes.

4.2 Organisation and implementation procedures

Implementation of the programme hinges on the linkage between regional co-ordination and national initiatives ("drawing right" project or "demand-driven" project). They will be financed on the basis of annual work programmes, from indicative budget allocations for each country.

The OAU/IBAR Director is the programme's Regional Authorising Officer. *The regional component of the programme will be managed* by the IBAR with the Nairobi Delegation (leader of the programme). Organisation of the programme will be in the hands of two Regional Co-ordination Units based in Nairobi for East Africa and in Bamako for West and Central Africa. The organisation chart for the common services is attached in figure 1.

The IBAR will draw up bilateral protocols with the participating countries (National Authorising Officers) for the implementation of national components.

This organisation will be backed up by two other structures:

- A Policy Committee that will meet every two years at the instigation of the Director of IBAR. Its job will be to devise animal health policies and strategies in Africa and it will be made up of representatives of the relevant institutions and donors active in this sector. Its recommendations will serve as a basis for the work of the Advisory Committee.
- An Advisory Committee that will meet every six months under the presidency of the OIE. It will be made up of 7 members and will act as a technical advisory structure for the OAU/IBAR and the EC. This committee must ensure that activities at all levels are in line with the programme's objectives and approaches and also with the policy guidelines adopted. Every six months it will examine the headway made by the programme and will use outside consultancies as it sees fit to provide ongoing follow-up/evaluation of the programme.

4.3. Timetable

The PACE programme will start officially with the arrival of the principal TA, which must be before 31 October 1999. The implementation deadline is 31 October 2004.

4.4. Cost estimate and financing plan

The total EC contribution is EUR72 million. The indicative budget tables by component and cost headings is given below.

Table 1: Indicative breakdown by project component

(EUR thousand)

Items		EUR	%
1. National components:		48000	67%
	Campaign against rinderpest	14900	
	Strengthening veterinary services and epidemiological capacity	24500	
	Support for privatisation	8600	
2. Regional components:		17000	24%
	Epidemiology	5400	
	Communications	1800	
	Socio-economics	540	
	Support for privatisation	540	
	Community animal health workers	450	
	Financial monitoring	950	
	Other: Data processing	360	
	PANVAC	900	
	Research	1300	
	Advisory Committee	270	
	Other monitoring	180	
	Veterinary schools	270	
	Monitoring and evaluation (including environmental monitoring)	800	
	Co-ordination	3240	
Contingencies		7000	9%
TOTAL		72000	100%

4.5. Special conditions and accompanying measures

Various important conditions need to be met by the participating countries: undertaking to embark on and follow the OIE pathway for the eradication of rinderpest, continuation of the process of privatising veterinary medicine and full cost recovery, assumption of recurrent costs for the epidemiological surveillance networks.

All these principles are already recognised and approved by the participating states. The IBAR

will use political dialogue to support the necessary reforms, as during the PARC programme.

As regards the IBAR itself, before the end of the programme the OAU will have to find the means of maintaining the essential personnel for the epidemiology and socio-economics part of animal health (4 officials) to ensure the sustainability of this Centre of Excellence.

5. FACTORS ENSURING SUSTAINABILITY

5.1. Policy support measures

No major political change is necessary as rural development and livestock farming feature among the priorities of most of the participating countries. Maintaining these options as well as those already recognised (privatisation, etc.) is the main support required.

5.2. Appropriate technology

The programme will not introduce any technologies that have not been extensively tested on the ground. It also includes a major training input at all levels to ensure that these methods are fully assimilated by the participants and are harmonised.

5.3. Environmental protection

Protecting animal health will enable the livestock farming sector to continue gradually moving towards an intensification of production, which impinges less on natural spaces. This move is the only means of absorbing demographic growth while respecting fragile African environments according to the 1998 FAO/World Bank initiative "Livestock and the Environment - L&E".

This joint L&E initiative, which is also supported by the EU and several of its Member States, is continuing. The Director of the IBAR will form part of the Steering Committee that is in charge of monitoring. Thus the environmental dimension will be fully taken on board in the implementation of the PACE programme.

However, to evaluate the impact of the programme itself, there will be ongoing environmental monitoring in four test areas. The necessary expertise will be provided by the Scientific Environment Monitoring Group (SEMG), possibly in conjunction with specialist international bodies. The project also specifically provides for the use of auxiliaries from the pastoral communities in order to step up environmental education in arid areas via a participatory approach. The programme will also have an individual epidemiology component covering wildlife, which will help to increase knowledge of the main pathologies and thus foster protection.

5.4. Socio-cultural aspects/women in development

The intervention simply backs up the socio-cultural practices followed by the beneficiaries. One of their first requests is often for help to improve health care for animals. Generally, any boost to the productivity of stock farms will result in an increase in incomes and improved living conditions, especially for women, who are often responsible for and the direct beneficiaries of livestock products.

5.5. Management capacities

Under the PARC project, the IBAR demonstrated its ability to follow programmes on a continental scale and play to the full its role as sectoral policy leader. For the implementation of the PACE, a financial control unit will be added to its structure.

Similarly, the PARC project confirmed the existence of technical and management capacities at national level and these will be fostered by the PACE programme, in particular as regards support for the process of privatising veterinary medicine.

6. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

6.1. Monitoring indicators

Objectively verifiable monitoring indicators are included in the logical frameworks for each of the programme's objectives and expected results. Monitoring and regular internal evaluations of the programme will be the key asks of the Regional and Sub-regional Coordination Units. The approach adopted will be based on participatory monitoring and evaluation in each country. The overall effectiveness of PACE will be measured in terms of the development of epizootic diseases, documented by the OIE, the number and results of samples and also the improved effectiveness of husbandry services.

6.2. Reviews/evaluations

Every six months the Advisory Committee, will review planned activities and technical and financial results. It will also be able to organise specific independent evaluations where necessary.

There will be an annual external financial audit. It will be supplemented by technical audits carried out either by the European Commission or by consultants recruited for this purpose. If the final discharge of the audit is positive, activities will continue as planned. If it is not, there will be consultations between the partners and the Commission before any resumption of activities.

Independent evaluations will be carried out at the end of the second year of the programme and six months before it ends.

As the project is based on a system of "drawing rights" on indicative allocations, if one of the programme partners makes insufficient, slow or inappropriate use of national or regional funds, the OAU/IBAR, in conjunction with the EC, may modify or cancel some of the cost heading or geographical allocations.

Similarly, during implementation of the project, the Commission departments responsible for technical monitoring of the programme may, if necessary, send adjusted technical guideline documents to the IBAR.

Annex B: Implementation stage of PACE country projects

)

)

AnnexC: Format and Presentation of Evaluation Reports

The findings of an evaluation are best presented in accordance with the following Report Format or Outline.

Two introductory comments are pertinent:

- first, while it is important that evaluations are based on existing or re-drawn LogFrames, which should always be annexed to evaluation reports, they should not be allowed rigidly to determine the report structure; rather, the structure of an evaluation report should be determined primarily by its intended main purpose and target audience;
- second, it is most important, when drafting the report, to acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be already taking place, and so avoid misleading readers and causing unnecessary irritation or offence.

In general, the main sections of an evaluation report are as follows:

I - Executive Summary: a tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing Executive Summary is an essential component. It should be short, no more than five pages. It should focus mainly on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main analytical points, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons learned and specific recommendations. Cross-references should be made to the corresponding page or paragraph numbers in the main text that follows.

II - Main Text: the main text should start with an introduction describing, first, the project or programme to be evaluated and, second, the evaluation objectives. The body or core of the report should follow the five evaluation criteria discussed in Part II, describing the facts and interpreting or analysing them in accordance with the key questions pertinent to each criterion.

III - Conclusions and Recommendations: these should be the subject of a separate final chapter. Wherever possible, for each key conclusion there should be a corresponding recommendation. The key points of the conclusions will vary in nature but will often cover aspects of the key evaluation criteria, for example:

- i.* **Relevance** - whether the design of the project was originally, and still is, sound as regards targeting the real needs and problems of the right beneficiaries;
- ii.* **Efficiency** - whether the same results could have been achieved at lower costs; or whether there might have been different, more appropriate ways of achieving the same results;
- iii.* **Effectiveness** - whether the planned benefits were in fact received, whether the beneficiaries' behavioural

patterns changed, whether neglect of cross-cutting issues affected the achievement of the project purpose;

- iv. Impact* - the wider outcomes for a larger group of persons or for society as a whole; the successes and failures in achieving the overall objectives, and the main reasons why;
- v. Sustainability* - whether the flow of benefits to the beneficiaries, and to society generally, is likely to continue or not, and why.

The ultimate value of an evaluation depends on the quality and credibility of the recommendations offered. Recommendations should therefore be as realistic, operational and pragmatic as possible; that is, they should take careful account of the circumstances currently prevailing in the context of the project, and of the resources available to implement them both locally and in the Commission. They could concern policy, organisational and operational aspects for both the national implementing partners and for the Commission; the pre-conditions that might be attached to decisions on the financing of similar projects; and general issues arising from the evaluation in relation to, for example, policies, technologies, instruments, institutional development, and regional, country or sectoral strategies.

Recommendations should be *carefully targeted* to the appropriate audiences at all levels, especially within the Commission structure (the project/programme task manager and the evaluation manager will often be able to advise here).

IV - Annexes: the report should generally include the following annexes:

1. The Terms of Reference of the evaluation
2. The names of the evaluators and their companies (CVs should be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person)
3. Methodology applied for the study (phases, methods of data collection, sampling &c)
4. Logical Framework matrices (original and improved/updated)
5. Map of project area, if relevant
6. List of persons/organisations consulted
7. Literature and documentation consulted
8. Other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses)
9. 1-page DAC summary, following the format incorporated in the contract and annexed to this document.

ANNEX I: KEY CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION IN EVALUATION OF EC AID PROJECTS/PROGRAMMES

I. GENDER

Gender aspects should be taken into consideration when carrying out an evaluation of any project in which they could be of significance. All development actions touch male and female beneficiaries, and very often these two groups as well as other sub-groups of beneficiaries will have different needs, responsibilities and potential for benefit from the project. For any project to be as efficient and effective as possible it is important that such differences are taken into consideration *at all phases of the project cycle*.

The “Gender” Approach

The “gender” approach is not concerned with women per se, but with the social construction of gender and the assignment of specific roles, responsibilities and expectations to women and to men. A fundamental conceptual difference between the Women in Development (WID) and Gender approaches is the assumption implied in the WID approach that men are able to obtain access to all project related services and resources, and special measures and efforts are necessary to protect and advance the interests of women. Field experience has, however, shown consistently that this assumption is correct only in the case of better-off men; poor men are disadvantaged vis-à-vis better-off men and often face many of the problems and constraints similar to those experienced by poor women. Sensitivity to Gender would detect this. The gender approach does not focus solely on productive or reproductive aspects of women’s and men’s lives; rather, it analyses the nature of the contribution of every member of society both inside and outside the household and emphasises the right of everyone to participate in the development process and to benefit from the results of the process.

Some Key Questions to Consider when Carrying out Evaluations

Below are listed some questions to be addressed when carrying out evaluations in order to better understand whether EC aid projects had a significant gender dimension and, if so, whether it was taken into consideration - as it should according to the Commission’s current gender guidelines - in each phase of the project cycle.

Project Preparation and Design

- Are the beneficiaries clearly identified (sub-groups, age, socio-economic status, etc. “poor” or “women” is not a homogenous group, so are more details needed)?
- Have these groups been consulted?
- Have their needs, resources and constraints to access the project services been identified?
- Have solutions been sought ?
- Where relevant, how well does the project take account of gender roles in reproduction and raising children, work, and community management ?
- How well does it address gender-related needs that are (i) practical: access to food, water, shelter; social services; paid work? (ii) strategic: reducing inequalities in work, domestic & childcare tasks, politics, rights to land & property, credit, education; preventing male abuse of power and violence ?

Relevance

- Does the project respond to real needs formulated by the intended beneficiary group ?

Efficiency and Effectiveness

- Have appropriate delivery modes for services to reach all beneficiary sub-groups been identified and implemented?

- Has the traditional division of tasks been taken into consideration?
- Have changes (by the project) to workload been considered?
- Who has access/control of project inputs?
- Is training provided to the right groups, given the project's objectives?
- Do women/other vulnerable groups participate in the different phases of project implementation (the number of women employed by the project is not necessarily an indication of female beneficiary participation)?
- Are monitoring and information-gathering gender-differentiated ?

Sustainability

- Are gender aspects in the project mainstreamed or are there specific services for women?
- How can the access of women/other vulnerable groups to services and resources, be ensured?
- Who has access/control of the benefits?
- Has there been capacity building efforts to make local institutions aware of gender issues, capable to carry out gender analysis and implement projects in a gender sensitive manner?
- Did social-cultural and gender aspects endanger the sustainability of the project during implementation or, especially, after termination of donor assistance. Did opportunities for men and women to benefit equally from the project will continue after its implementation (e.g. through women's and men's participation in decision making; the issue of 'ownership' of the project activities by the various beneficiary groups and implementing agencies should also be discussed)?
- How could better results have been achieved? How could beneficiary participation as between women and men been improved?

II. ENVIRONMENT

Environmental aspects should also be taken into consideration when carrying out an evaluation of any project in which they could be of significance. Many projects impact on the physical environment, some directly, others in more subtle ways. For any project to be described as truly sustainable it is important that issues of environmental impact are taken into consideration *at all stages of the project cycle*. The following are some key questions from which the most appropriate should be selected:

- was an environmental impact assessment made?
- was environmental damage done by, or as a consequence of, the project?
- to what extent did the project respect traditional ways of resource management and production?
- to what extent were environmental risks fully taken into account in the project?
- to what extent can it be expected that such risks will continue to be managed?
- overall, will the environmental effects of the project's activities and results jeopardise the sustainability of the project itself or reach levels unacceptable for long-term environmental protection and management?

III. Final Note: Poverty Alleviation and other over-arching issues

In many EC programmes, **poverty alleviation** is the over-arching priority, the key question being how far a planned project will benefit those in the poorest, most disadvantaged and most

vulnerable groups. This requires careful analysis of the various categories of potential beneficiary during project preparation, and a key element in successful attention to this issue is an appropriate balance of participation both in the identification of objectives and associated indicators (OVIs), and in their systematic monitoring during implementation, with responsibilities appropriately divided between donor and recipient.

Other key cross-cutting issues include questions of **good governance** and **human rights**.

These issues are all too extensive and complex to be covered in an Annex of this nature.

Evaluation Task Managers and consultants should refer for more guidance to one or other of the numerous sources available in hard copy and on the Internet.

ANNEX II: The Standard DAC Format for Evaluation Report Summaries²

Evaluation Title / Titre de l'évaluation (+ Evaluation Reference)

Abstract / Abrégé (central, 4 lines/lignes maximum)

Subject of the evaluation / Action évaluée

5 lines/lignes max on the project, organisation, or issue/theme being evaluated / au sujet du projet (&c) évalué

Evaluation description / Description de l'évaluation

Purpose / But (3 lines/lignes max)

Methodology / Méthodologie (3 lines/lignes max)

Main findings / Conclusions principales

Clearly distinguishing possible successes/obstacles and the like where possible / identifiant si possible les réussites/échecs et obstacles (25 lines/lignes max)

Recommendations / Recommandations

25 lines/lignes max

Feedback / Rétroaction

To be completed by SCR/F/5 / à compléter par l'unité SCR/F/5 (5 lines/lignes max)

Donor / Donateur: Commission Européenne	Region / Région: ³	DAC sector / Secteur CAD: ⁴
Evaluation type / Type d'évaluation: ⁵	Date of report / Date du rapport: .../.../... ⁶	Subject of evaluation / Objet de l'évaluation: ⁷
Language / Langue :	N° vol./pages: ⁸	Authors / Auteurs :

Programme and budget line concerned / Ligne budgétaire: ⁹		
Type of evaluation / Type d'évaluation :	() ex ante	() intermediate / en cours () ex post
Timing / Dates <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Start / Commencement :	Completion / Achèvement :
Contact person / Personne responsable: ¹⁰	Authors / Auteurs:	
Cost / Coût: ¹¹	Steering group / Groupe de pilotage:	

² Text font should be Times New Roman 10 or equivalent / utilisez la fonte Times New Roman 10 ou l'équivalente.

³ If more than 3 countries but not continent-wide, choose a geographical region / Si plus de 3 pays, mais pas un continent, indiquer la région géographique.

⁴ Choose from standard list / A choisir dans la liste standarde.

⁵ Choose between : relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact / Choisir entre : pertinence, efficacité, efficacité, impact.

⁶ Date as on cover page of report / Date indiquée sur page de couverture du rapport.

⁷ Choose one of: programme/project/sector/country or region/synthesis/thematic/NGO / Choisir entre : programme/projet/secteur/pays ou région/synthèse/thème/ONG.

⁸ Indicate number of pages per volume (e.g. 72 pp; 80 pp; 102 pp in case of 3 volumes) / Indiquer n° de pages par tome (ex 72pp; 80 pp; 102 pp dans le cas de 3 tomes)

⁹ Budget line / Ligne budgétaire (EDF, Tacis, Phare, etc.).

¹⁰ Name of the responsible person in SCR/F/5 / Nom de la personne responsable au SCR/F/5.

¹¹ Cost of the evaluation / Coût de l'évaluation