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Executive summary

Introduction

The Animal Health and Welfare Board for England (‘the Board’ hereafter) was established to advise ministers on strategic animal health and welfare issues, drawing on information and support from industry. This report presents the outcomes from a process evaluation, conducted during 2013-2014, to understand why the Board has produced the results it has since it was established in 2011.

The aims of the evaluation were:

1. To assess the extent that the Board has been effective in building trust with the industry, improving Defra policy making through enhanced stakeholder engagement, and encouraging animal keepers to take greater responsibility for animal health and welfare issues.

2. To consider the contribution the Board has made to opening out policy with respect to animal health and welfare issues and the broader Open Policy Making agenda.

The study is qualitative, largely based on a series of in-depth, confidential interviews. Research participants included representatives of relevant industry bodies (referred to as ‘external stakeholders’), Board members themselves and Defra officials who work closely with the Board (or ‘internal stakeholders’), as well as a range of other individuals with an interest in Open Policy Making more generally.

The research team and steering group devised a series of criteria for recruiting participants in order to cover as wide range of perspectives as possible within the boundaries of the research, nevertheless relevant individuals may not have been included in the process. This implies a degree of bias in the findings, according to the views of those who participated at the time of the research. The views expressed by those consulted cannot be considered representative of all individuals who interact with, or work on, the Board.

Research Findings

The research findings, primarily drawing directly on what research participants reported, are set out below. The findings are structured around the ‘anticipated benefits’ of the Board which were developed by the evaluation steering group, drawing on the Board terms of reference. As the success criteria for the Board was not well defined from the outset, the success of the Board is likely to be understood differently, in typically tacit and informal ways, by different people.
Communication & engagement

Interviewees agreed that the Board has devoted a considerable proportion of its time to engaging with representatives from industry. In areas where effort has been focused on active engagement with industry-specific issues, research participants reported that the Board’s engagement has been effective. Face-to-face engagement was reported as having been particularly effective.

The Board was reported by interviewees as having focused its efforts on a small number of areas, so that stakeholders with interests in other areas reported less effective communications and engagement.

Some interviewees highlighted the amount of time it can take for effective relationships to develop and questioned whether the Board had had enough time to do so on the scale required.

Building stakeholder trust and support

Overall, those interviewed tended to agree that the presence of external members on the Board represented a positive step to building links between industry and government and, as such, supported its establishment.

External interviewees identified a number of factors at the interim evaluation stage which acted to limit the level of trust in the Board - such as a lack of clarity surrounding the Board’s relationship with Defra. In follow up discussions, many of these limiting factors had receded for those external stakeholders who had been part of an effective engagement process led by the Board. However, trust was still more limited among individuals who had not engaged as closely with the Board.

Internal interviewees also reported varying levels of trust in the Board, with trust being greater among individuals that had worked closely alongside Board members over the preceding months. Many interviewees suggested that, although unavoidable, changes in personnel – on the Board itself, across Defra and on the Board’s Secretariat - had inhibited the Board’s efforts to develop key relationships that help to foster trust between different parties.

There was also a sentiment among those interviewed that senior backing for the Board within Defra, initially high and visibly so, has seemed to diminish, influencing internal stakeholders’ own confidence in the level of influence held by the Board.

Tackling difficult issues

The Board was considered by research participants to have played a significant and important role in tackling TB; to have begun to make progress on a number of other
issues; and was regarded as having contributed to a series of useful and robust discussions about animal health and welfare budgets at senior level within policy teams.

It was generally considered by internal interviewees that the Board has not yet developed a strategy for tackling the fundamental issues of cost and responsibility sharing, although many acknowledged that the Board has been involved in some specific activities (e.g. Risk Based Trading) that contribute toward increased responsibility.

Several inter-related factors were suggested by interviewees as reasons that might explain the Board’s progress in tackling difficult issues: The Board’s large remit across all strategic animal health and welfare matters; The limited resources available to the Board; The time taken to become familiar with how Defra decision-making processes work and the timeframes associated with these; The current prioritisation of bovine TB as the most important animal disease issue in England.

**Partnership in policy development and delivery**

Although the Board was perceived by research participants as seeking advice and support as well as engaging with industry representative organisations on specific issues, they felt that this has not yet developed into full partnership working (although see comments in analysis section).

The Sector Councils\(^1\) were identified by interviewees as an area where the Board had started to develop collaborative relationships, which would eventually enable co-design and delivery of policy.

More generally, many external interviewees felt that partnership working should in principle flow from improved communications and higher levels of trust and that, as a result, it was still too early to pass judgment on whether the Board has potential to fully deliver benefit in this area.

Greater change had been observed by internal interviewees in relation to working relationships between non-executive Board members and Defra officials. Defra officials observed that there were occasional examples of personality clashes between Board members and stakeholders, however, which was felt to have influenced the Boards effectiveness in building relationships.

\(^{\text{1}}\) Stakeholders within key sectors working together with one another to contribute to decision-making processes associated with animal health and welfare policy
Openness in decision-making

There was a widespread perception among external interviewees that the Board could have been more open about the processes it had followed to contribute to policy decisions and, also, whether it had its own ‘position’ on animal health and welfare issues.

Some of the criticism from research participants surrounding the Board’s perceived lack of transparency tended to be linked to the channels used by the Board to explain their activities and achievements. The Board’s meeting minutes were particularly heavily criticised for providing insufficient details about decisions taken by the Board.

Among interviewees from within Defra there was a more developed recognition of the challenges associated with greater openness in policy making. Research participants identified a tension between the need for more transparency in order to build trust and collaborative relationships, against the need to protect the integrity of policy processes and advice presented to ministers.

Analysis

In order to guide the interpretation of the findings, the anticipated benefits of the Board, the Cabinet Office’s components of OPM and the Rogers’ Innovation framework were combined to develop an overarching analytical framework. The framework comprised of the five themes which are discussed below.

Communication & engagement

There are instances where engagement has either been limited or less effective, nevertheless the potential of the Board to deliver effective engagement with the agricultural industry has been clearly demonstrated. A more strategic approach to communication and engagement, in terms of both content and channels, could help to broaden the Board’s success.

Adaptability

There is sometimes a mismatch between what the Board is expected to do, based on its terms of reference, and its resources and capacity. Greater flexibility to reflect on lessons learnt and to adapt accordingly would allow the Board to make the most of its resources.

Both individually and collectively, the Board has had to learn how the policy process works, how to submit advice to Ministers, indeed how to ‘be’ an entirely new, governance mechanism. This has understandably influenced on what the Board has been able to achieve over the last two years. Developing this kind of capacity is not a rapid process;
and it is difficult to say with any certainty precisely how much time the Board should be
given to reach ‘maturity’.2

Collaboration & partnership
There was not always a shared understanding of what ‘genuine partnership working’ would
mean to stakeholders in practice, potentially reflecting a need to be clearer about what the
Board is aiming to achieve and how success will be defined.

With the Board itself being relatively new, there are not existing structures and
mechanisms through which people can ‘do’ collaboration and partnership. While these
processes are being developed there is an unavoidable reliance upon inter-personal (and
often informal) channels. Personality inevitably influences such channels and as the
Board’s work includes such a major focus on the development of relationships then the
issue of personalities is particularly important.

Improved documentation and better communication to ensure clarity about the objectives
and the role of the Board may also have facilitated the development of relationships
between the Board and both internal and external stakeholders.

Openness
The findings suggest that some stakeholders felt distanced from the Board and Defra
because they had not been given sufficient opportunity to be involved in framing issues,
and that the scope for them to influence was limited.

The differences between the rules, norms, networks, procedures and practices (ways of
working) that prevail in the decision-making of the Civil Service compared to decision-
making in ‘industry’, in some cases, restricted the development of openness. Some tacit
understanding of the challenges implied by this prospective culture clash was reported to
have been in place when the Board was first established, but the Board could have
benefited from processes to develop individuals’ capacity and to formalise ‘new ways of
working’.

Effecting change
Many factors such as the mismatch between the Board’s scope and its resources and
blurred lines of responsibility between the Board and other entities3 have impacted on the
Board’s ability to effect change. However, the interpretation of the findings also suggests
that the current framing of the Board’s objectives (and thus the intended benefits which are

---

2 The Radcliffe Review suggested that a full evaluation of the Board should be conducted between three and
five years after its formation.
the focus of this report) are not always sufficiently well-defined to enable a clear assessment of whether the Board has been effective or not. Better defined and measurable objectives would allow for more effective monitoring of progress and mean that progress can be more effectively demonstrated to stakeholders.

Lessons

Drawing on our analysis, and bearing in mind the three primary audiences for this report (all those involved in or engaged with the Board, senior decision-makers in Defra and policy makers across government interested in Open Policy Making), Brook Lyndhurst derived nine lessons from the experiences of stakeholders involved with the Board during its first two years:

1. Clarity on accountability

Novel policy development mechanisms, such as the Board, are likely to interrupt existing lines of accountability in some way; and it is important to overcome the potential negative consequences of this by being as clear as possible (and updating as frequently) how and where responsibility lies.

2. Personalities and processes

During the early phases of an innovation, the systems and procedures which, in a more mature setting, provide rules and guidance for interaction, are not yet in place. As a result, the personalities and inter-personal relationships of those involved has a more significant role. It is important to devote appropriate management attention to these sensitive issues, and to judge carefully the pace at which systems and procedures are put in place.

3. New structures take time

New approaches to making policy may imply new skills for existing policy makers; or may introduce individuals with a (relative) lack of skills. New entities may take considerable time before developing sufficient capacity to fulfil their potential. There is no template for how much time might be required: but care should be taken not to reach a conclusion of ‘failure’ prematurely nor to ascribe excessive responsibility too soon.

4. Learning mechanisms

Mechanisms to enable open and effective reflection on experiences and to adapt in the light of those experiences should be built in to novel policy development mechanisms from the outset.

5. Resilience
Explicitly considering how a new mechanism can be made resilient to the inevitable ‘events’ that will surround its operation (e.g. wider organisational changes) may help to reduce the risk that innovations may fail for the wrong reasons rather than the right ones.

6. **Active promotion and support**

The literature on innovation and change management suggests that one of the most important factors in maximising the chances of success for an innovation is the active promotion of and support for it by senior individuals. Any and all innovations in policy making will need not just a head-line grabbing endorsement at the outset, but well-maintained signs of leadership support.

7. **Fit between responsibilities and resources**

Care should be taken to ensure there is a realistic fit between the responsibilities placed upon a new process or entity, on the one hand, and the resources and authority allocated to meet those responsibilities on the other. It will be important, too, to link this with the learning mechanisms mentioned above and to ensure sufficient flexibility in the deployment of resources.

8. **Transparency and risk management**

Few organisations, professions or individuals are comfortable admitting to error in public, for example; yet greater transparency increases the possibility of such exposure. Avowedly and transparently acknowledging this, and managing the change process accordingly, may help to reduce any anxiety or suspicion among individuals, teams or organisations affected; and may help to build trust and increase the wider prospects for success.

9. **Change management processes**

Finally, it should not be supposed that an innovation in policy making will flourish in and of itself simply because it is a good idea. There are a large number of factors that influence success (and risk of failure) of innovations. An active change management process is the most effective way of dealing with this, and should be an integrated element of any innovation in policy making.
1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose

This report presents the results of an independent evaluation of the Animal Health and Welfare Board for England (hereafter the AHWBE or simply ‘the Board’).

The evaluation was commissioned to:

1. Assess the extent that the Board has been effective in building trust with the industry, improving Defra policy making through enhanced stakeholder engagement, and encouraging animal keepers to take greater responsibility for animal health and welfare issues.

2. Consider the contribution the Board has made to opening out policy with respect to animal health and welfare issues and the broader Open Policy Making agenda.

Based on research which took the form primarily of extensive in-depth interviews, the report derives lessons intended to be of value to three main audiences:

- All those involved in or engaged with the AHWBE;
- Senior decision-makers in Defra;
- Policy makers across government interested in Open Policy Making (OPM hereafter).

1.2 This report

The report is structured as follows:

- **Section 2** sets out the three principal challenges faced by the evaluation: the Board itself; the context within which the Board operates; and the methodology for the research and analysis. To explain how the evaluation has addressed these challenges, section 2 presents:
  
  - A brief account of the history of the Board and, in particular, an explanation of the benefits the Board was expected to deliver;
  
  - A review of key contextual factors, focusing in particular upon the OPM agenda, which is used as a lens to consider key lessons from the Board;
  
  - A summary of the methods and theoretical approached used to conduct the evaluation.
The section concludes by setting out an integrated framework, which draws on the logic model for the Board, the Cabinet Office’s components of OPM and Rogers’ innovation framework to draw together the research evidence, to frame the analysis and to derive and communicate key lessons.

- **Section 3** presents the main findings from the research in terms of the expected benefits set out in the logic model. For each area of expected benefit, the report presents, firstly, a brief summary; then evidence concerned with areas where the Board has been more or less successful. Each sub-section concludes with observations from interviewees concerning factors and processes they considered to have been important in affecting the Board’s performance.

- **Section 4** adopts the perspective of open policy. It introduces open policy (drawing primarily on a review of relevant literature, augmented by a handful of expert interviews) before concentrating on the work and approach of the Open Government team within Cabinet Office: their ‘Components of Open Policy Making’ then feed into the framework within which the findings from the evaluation are interpreted (Section 5).

- **Section 5**, finally, presents analysis of the evidence and some of the implications from that analysis using the framework introduced in section 2 (and drawing on the OPM literature). The focus is on deriving and articulating key lessons for the three audiences identified above.

- The document concludes with a number of annexes.
2 Evaluating the Board

2.1 The Challenges

Conducting and reporting on this evaluation of the Animal Health and Welfare Board for England entailed addressing three distinct challenges:

Challenge 1 – the Board itself

- The Board is an innovative, perhaps unique approach to policy formulation in the UK. No ready template or model exists that would make it straightforward to say: “The Board is like this”. Specific and tailored effort is therefore required to understand the Board’s origins, functions and performance. This poses challenges for all those involved or engaging with the Board, as well as for the process of deriving lessons from the Board’s experiences to date.

Challenge 2 – the context

- A number of macro-scale factors have characterised the time period over which the Board was conceived, set up and began its work. These include the transition from the previous Labour administration to the current Coalition Government; a period of reduced public expenditure, affecting the availability and configuration of a wide variety of resources; and headline-grabbing animal health issues, most notably bovine TB. Considerable sensitivities are associated with these factors, posing challenges that need to be taken into account when attempting to understand the Board, as well as when conducting and reporting on its evaluation.

Challenge 3 – the evaluation

- Given the innovative nature of the Board and the surrounding sensitivities, the process of conducting the evaluation; of analysing and interpreting findings; and of reporting on those findings was also in itself challenging. Particular attention needs to be paid to the choice of method; to consideration of the audiences for the results; and to an appropriate analytical framework.

The challenges exist in their own right, but also interact with one another. For example: the OPM agenda (at least as it is currently articulated), now an integrated part of Civil Service Reform, was not an established part of the context for either the Board or the evaluation at the time they were initiated. During the course of the past couple of years,
however, OPM has come to provide an important lens through which to consider the Board, and both the research and the analysis needed to adapt to accommodate this. The overarching challenge has therefore been to find a way to bring together in a coherent fashion three distinct perspectives:

- The Board – in terms of the benefits it was expected to deliver;
- The Context – in terms of the OPM agenda;
- The Evaluation – in terms of assessing an ‘innovation in governance’.

To navigate and explain these challenges, and to set out the approach adopted to enable robust lessons to be derived, Section 2 of the report continues as follows:

- **Section 2.2** concerns itself with the first challenge and presents a brief history of the Board. It sets out the responsibilities with which the Board is charged and summarises its objectives how Brook Lyndhurst have sought to define the benefits which the Board might be expected to deliver.

- **Section 2.3** is concerned with the contextual factors comprising the second challenge, particularly OPM.

- **Section 2.4** addresses the third challenge, the evaluation itself and the methods and theoretical approaches applied.

- **Section 2.5**, finally, triangulates the three perspectives to provide a common framework that is used later in the report to structure the analysis and the lessons derived from that analysis.

### 2.2 The Board

As clearly explained on the Board’s webpage:

“The Animal Health and Welfare Board for England (AHWBE) brings together independent people with the relevant knowledge and skills, and senior government officials. The AHWBE makes direct recommendations to Defra Ministers on strategic policy affecting the health and welfare of kept animals in England including farm animals, horses and pets (excluding the welfare of zoo and circus animals)”

---

4 A brief history of the Board is provided at Annex I
5 http://www.defra.gov.uk/ahwbe/ (accessed 17/02/14)
The webpage also explains that the Board:

“…was created in 2011 based on the findings from the Independent Responsibility and Cost Sharing Advisory Group chaired by Rosemary Radcliffe, which published the findings of their work on how animal keepers can play a greater role on tackling animal disease.”

The Board’s ‘Terms of Reference’ identify its overall purpose as follows:

“The Animal Health and Welfare Board for England ("the Board" or “the AHWBE”) is responsible for strategic animal health and welfare policy and oversight of its delivery in relation to England, taking account of public health considerations”

Those ‘Terms of Reference’ specify some of the following responsibilities for the Board:

- Setting the strategic policy and budget priorities within the available budget envelope;
- Development of key policies and how they should be funded (including where appropriate charging regimes for funding these policies);
- Assessment of the risk of threats from animal disease and how to manage these;
- Determining what the surveillance and research priorities should be;
- The implementation of policy, commissioning its delivery and ensuring value for money by the relevant Defra agencies and other delivery organisations;
- The effectiveness and proportionality of the regulatory framework;
- Approving the operational plans of the Animal Health and Veterinary Laboratories Agency in relation to animal health and welfare in England and monitoring the delivery of those plans;
- Approving the operational plans of other delivery bodies in respect of animal health and welfare in England (e.g. CEFAS and FSA);
- The contingency plans for dealing with new disease outbreaks and for reviewing these plans on an annual basis (or as circumstances require). These should provide for speedy and effective day-to-day management of the outbreak by officials.

---

7 http://www.defra.gov.uk/ahwbe/about/terms-of-reference/
Within the context provided by these responsibilities, the Board operates according to a set of ‘Guiding Principles’, protocols and a ‘Code of Practice’ (A brief note on the Board’s ways of working is provided at Annex II.)

More precisely to guide its work, the Board produces a ‘Forward Plan’ on an annual basis. Objectives for 2012/13 were:

- Trust developed within a working partnership on animal health and welfare;
- Good health and welfare of kept animals, generating related benefits for industry and wider society, including safe food and improved competitiveness and sustainability;
- Leadership on innovation, alternative approaches and best practice to achieve maximum value for money;
- Redefinition of the roles and responsibilities for implementing and funding action to improve animal health and welfare in the face of increasing pressure on government resources.

The objectives for 2013/14 are:

- An affordable and comprehensive TB Eradication Strategy;
- A review of compensation arrangements in the event of a disease outbreak;
- A fit for purpose response to the MacDonald Review livestock movement recommendations;
- An agreed negotiating position for the EU Animal Health Law which gives us the best chance of securing a package which best serves England’s business and animal health interests.

The Board’s Terms of Reference clearly state:

“The performance of the Board as a whole will be evaluated 2 years after its establishment and will be measured against the benefits it is expected to achieve”

The ‘expected benefits’ of the Board were also set out in detail in the Independent Responsibility and Cost Sharing Advisory Group’s Final Report. For the purposes of

---

9 http://www.defra.gov.uk/ahwbe/work/ways-of-working/
12 http://www.defra.gov.uk/ahwbe/work/
13 http://www.defra.gov.uk/ahwbe/about/terms-of-reference/
evaluating the Board, any one of these components – the responsibilities, the guiding principles, the annual objectives and stated benefits – could, in theory, provide a suitable framework for evaluating what impact the Board has made. However, the number of stated roles and objectives, and their qualitative nature meant that it was difficult to clearly define what success would look like for the Board. It is also important to emphasise that the success of the Board is likely to be understood differently, in typically tacit and informal ways, by different people. For the purposes of this evaluation, Brook Lyndhurst and the Evaluation Steering Group agreed to summarise the expected benefits in terms of the headings set out below:

- Greater openness in decision-making about animal health and welfare policy;
- Improved stakeholder trust and support;
- More effective communications and engagement with industry stakeholders;
- Partnership working in policy development and delivery;
- Stimulation of innovation and best practice to ensure maximum value for money;
- More proportionate and effective regulation;
- Animal keepers taking greater responsibility for health and welfare matters;
- Ability to tackle difficult issues by working in collaboration with industry.

These factors comprise the headings used to frame the evaluation and a ‘logic model’ was developed to (set out in section 2.4, below) to consider how these intended benefits could theoretically be met.

2.3 The Context

Two groups of contextual factors were identified during the research as being relevant to a rounded consideration of the Board.\(^{15}\)

The first group of factors relate to the disease profile of kept animals in England, and the working cultures and policies associated with the farming industry:

- **Disease landscape** – Bovine tuberculosis (TB) has long been a serious problem in England and therefore it dominates government spend on animal health and welfare. Consequently TB has also been a core focus for the Board since it was

---

\(^{15}\) Factors were identified either through interviews with stakeholders or through review of relevant contextual documentation.
established and it continues to be one of its key priorities. While the Board’s remit includes a wide spectrum of strategic animal health and welfare issues, activities surrounding the development of a TB eradication strategy necessarily demanded considerable input from the Board.

- **Structure of the industry** – The farming industry in England is made up of several hundred thousand farm holdings, whose interests are represented by many farming and welfare organisations. The level of fragmentation in the industry poses a challenge for the Board (and government in general) when seeking to build the relationships and trust with industry that are essential for effective collaborative working.

- **Relationships** – The Radcliffe Review states: “Sharing a greater degree of responsibility and costs between animal keepers and Government in England has a long history and has proved to be a complex and difficult area of policy to resolve. Various approaches to policy-making and numerous consultation exercises have not, so far, resulted in an agreed way forward.” This lack of consensus reflects, in part, the complex pattern and history of relationships among the many institutions, organisations and interest groups involved in animal health and welfare in England. Inherent to this pattern has been a mix of perspectives, priorities and ways of working, and these form a key dimension of the landscape within which the Board operates.

- **Changes to policy and regulation** – The establishment of the Board has coincided with a broader shift in farming and rural development policy, in particular in terms of reform to CAP and government commitments to better regulation.

The second group of factors concerns the broader political landscape:

- **Change of Government** – The idea for the Board was originally developed under the previous Labour Government, and was been refined and implemented under the current Coalition Government.

- **Fiscal environment** – The Board has been brought into being during a programme of on-going government spending cuts and efficiencies to reduce the UK’s budget deficit. Defra’s budget has been cut by £500m since 2010 and the department must find an additional £300m in savings by 2016. The cuts will continue to influence the internal resources available to support the Board and the development and delivery of animal health and welfare policy more widely within the department.

---

16 The Board has a sub-group dedicated to this issue: [http://www.defra.gov.uk/ahwbe/work/sub-groups/](http://www.defra.gov.uk/ahwbe/work/sub-groups/)


• **Changes in personnel** - There have been numerous changes in Defra personnel since the Board was established – amongst executive board members, Ministers, the AHWBE secretariat and policy teams. While these changes are part of the normal course of business for all government departments, they mean that non-executive Board members have been required to build new relationships with a range of key individuals since they were appointed.

• **Devolution** – Animal health and welfare budgets have been devolved since 2011, although the English, Scottish and Welsh governments continue to work together to address UK-wide matters. The Board’s remit is restricted to animal health and welfare matters in England, but it engages with representatives from the Welsh and Scottish Governments on cross-border issues.

• **Civil Service Reform** – The government is in the midst of large-scale reform\(^\text{19}\) to create an open and flexible Civil Service, which is effective at creating and delivering policy within increasingly constrained resources.

On the other hand, and perhaps more importantly, a significant component of Civil Service Reform is the OPM agenda, which has thrown a fresh light on the Board. Re-casting it as an example of OPM would provide lessons from which could be of value both to Defra and government more widely.

A full discussion of OPM, including consideration of lessons from other examples, is presented in section 4 of this report. At this stage, however, the crucial consideration is that the Open Government team\(^\text{20}\) in Cabinet Office has identified the core components of OPM as follows:\(^\text{21}\)

These seven headings\(^\text{22}\) represent a potential mechanism for framing lessons derived from the evaluation of the Board and for thinking about what makes for successful OPM in different contexts. Applying the OPM components is also intended to maximise the wider transferability of the evaluation findings.\(^\text{23}\)

---


\(^\text{20}\) [http://my.civilservice.gov.uk/policy/](http://my.civilservice.gov.uk/policy/)


\(^\text{22}\) An explanation of the ‘Least/Most’ collaborative columns is presented in section 4.

\(^\text{23}\) ‘The Magenta Book: Guidance for Evaluation’ (HM Treasury 2011) makes it clear [Table 4A] that it is vital to bear in mind the audience for the results when designing, conducting and reporting on an evaluation.
2.4a The Evaluation

The evaluation began in autumn 2012. The approach to, and methodology for, the evaluation, was based upon:

- A specification of requirements issued by Defra;
- A research proposal submitted by Brook Lyndhurst in response to that specification;
- An ongoing discussion and management process by means of an Evaluation Steering Group.\(^{25}\)

A key role for the Evaluation Steering Group was to take account of evolving circumstances, in particular the emergence of the OPM agenda. The evaluation process, which was adapted as the objectives of the evaluation evolved, comprised:\(^{26}\)

---

\(^{24}\) Components of open policy in ‘Civil Service Reform Plan’ (HM Government, 2012)

\(^{25}\) The Evaluation Steering Group comprised: Gemma Harper (Defra), Caryl Williams (Defra, who took over from Rachel Muckle), Scott Spencer (Defra) and Kathryn Packer (Defra, who took over from Rory O’Donnell and Vic Platten); as well as David Fell and Charlotte Lee-Woolf of Brook Lyndhurst

\(^{26}\) See Annexes III to VI present details of the methodology and the research instruments used.
• An interim review in autumn 2012, based primarily on in-depth, confidential, one-to-one interviews with around 70 individuals involved with the Board,\textsuperscript{27} which culminated in an Interim Report;\textsuperscript{28}

• A monitoring exercise during 2013, involving document and web research and selected interviews/discussions;

• A final review, conducted in autumn 2013, comprising a mix of desk research, individual interviews and workshops, culminating in this report.

It was a clear requirement of the exercise that, in order to meet appropriate standards of robustness, it be conducted according Magenta Book guidance,\textsuperscript{29} with particular attention given to three guiding principles:

• **Transparency** – that, as far as practicable, the evaluation and the reporting of findings should be conducted in a transparent fashion, to make evident the robustness of findings;

• **Impartiality** – that the evaluation would be conducted by an authoritative independent agency and an evidence-led approach used to ensure that the findings and analysis are as objective as possible;

• **Confidentiality** – that, since the overwhelming majority of the evidence for the evaluation comes from in-depth one to one interviews; and since the full value of those interviews could only be achieved if interviewees felt able fully to express their views, the evaluation and the report would strictly adhere to a high level of confidentiality.

Magenta book guidance also stresses the importance of a stable 'logic model' to guide evaluation; and the model for this evaluation was developed at the beginning of the process:

\textsuperscript{27} A list of participants is presented at Annex VII. The Steering Group worked closely with Brook Lyndhurst to identify and agree interviewees/research participants for the first wave of interviews; and all interviewees were given the opportunity to contribute to the second wave of research, and most (including all Board members) were able to do so. In qualitative research of this kind it is not possible to select a 'representative' sample; but the number of interviews was large and permitted cross referencing and triangulation of statements made by interviewees.

\textsuperscript{28} A summary of findings was published in the Board’s AGM Report; and a more detailed summary of the report is available at www.defra.gov.uk/ahwbe/files/Interim_Exec_Summary_.pdf (accessed 11/02/14)

\textsuperscript{29} The Magenta Book: ‘Guidance for Evaluation’ (HM Treasury 2011)
The research process was focused primarily on the fourth column, the ‘expected benefits’ explained in section 2.2. Desk research, supplemented by interviews, was the primary mechanism for gathering evidence in respect of Resources, Activities and Outputs; while the confidential interviews, which comprised the large majority of the research effort, provided the evidence in terms of benefits.

The Evaluation Steering Group agreed (at an early stage) that ‘Outcomes’ were beyond the scope of the evaluation, in large part because, as the Radcliffe Review acknowledged, these outcomes would in all probability take more than two years to become manifest.

The Steering Group also agreed three further important decisions concerning the evaluation:

- **Confidentiality:** The large majority of the evidence from the evaluation was gathered by means of in-depth, confidential interviews. As a result, much of the
material cannot easily be presented in traditional form (i.e. in the form of quotations). Given the relatively small number of interviewees, many of whom are known to one another, even anonymised quotes cannot easily be presented. Therefore the research team adopted a process for describing the findings according to the type of stakeholders they referred to, and extent that opinions and insights were reported by participants (see below).

- **Process evaluation**: the intention that the results of the evaluation take the form of ‘lessons’ for the future, and the difficulty of demonstrating tangible impacts on factors such as trust and responsibility, led the Group to emphasise ‘process’ rather than ‘impact’. Thus, although evidence of impact is presented where relevant, the majority focus of this report, and especially in terms of lessons, is upon the processes associated with the Board’s performance over its first two years.

- **Innovation**: given the fact that the Board was an ‘innovation in governance’, it was also agreed that considering the Board from the perspective of innovation more generally could provide a useful supplementary perspective.

Research participants included representatives of relevant industry bodies, the devolved administrations and government delivery agencies (such as the Food Standards Agency). Participants also included members of the Board and the Secretariat, as well as senior Defra officials who work closely with the Board and Defra ministers (in post since the Board was established), and a small number of other individuals with an interest in OPM.

The research team and steering group devised a series of criteria for recruiting participants in order to cover as wide range of perspectives as possible within the boundaries of the research. This included representatives of different farming sectors and animal species, some of whom had been heavily involved with the Board since it was established and others who had rarely been engaged.30

An invitation to submit comments to the research team via the Board’s webpages was also established, in an effort to allow those who were not invited to participate in an interview to contribute to the evaluation. Despite this, the views of relevant individuals and/or organisation may not have been included. This implies a degree of bias in the findings, according to the views of those who participated at the time at which the research was undertaken. The views expressed by those consulted cannot therefore be considered representative of all individuals who interact with, or work on, the Board.

Due to the confidential nature of the interview process, none of the research participants are specifically referenced in the report in relation to the findings. The report predominantly

---

30 46 individuals were interviewed during the baseline research and 44 were engaged in the follow up research (either in the form of a one-on-one interview or a small workshop). 23 research participants were engaged during both rounds of research, while others were only engaged once (predominantly due to staff replacements or changing responsibilities). For further information on the research process see Annex III.
uses phrasing such as “almost all interviewees indicated” or “only a few voices suggested that” when presenting the results, although these are indicative as qualitative insights provided by participants were not quantified.

Terms such as ‘research participants, ‘stakeholders’ and ‘interviewees’ are used throughout the text to indicate the origin of the evidence. Where the term ‘stakeholders’ is used to refer to a wider group, this is clearly indicated. Where specific groups expressed a common and particular view, more specific language is used, such as ‘the Board’ or ‘senior interviewees’.

Additionally, wherever possible, the report distinguishes ‘internal’ from ‘external’ research participants. ‘Internal’ participants refer to members of the Board, Defra officials and ministers, while ‘external’ participants refers to representatives of industry organisations and groups. The report also distinguishes senior from less senior stakeholders; and also highlights where there have been changes in opinions about the Board between the two waves of interviews (autumn 2012 and autumn 2013).

The views of OPM experts consulted are presented in chapter 4.

2.4b An innovation in governance

The Board’s status as an ‘innovation’ was clearly acknowledged by the Radcliffe Review:

“The Partnership Board idea is a new proposition. We have not been able to find a similar model anywhere else in Government.”

Executive Summary, Radcliffe Review

Three broad domains were identified by the evaluation team as being relevant to innovation and as having the potential to provide a supplementary framework that could provide a useful perspective:

- ‘Change management’ in terms of implementing an innovation within an organisation;
- Innovation in terms of public policy;
- Product or process innovation at a general level.

A limited review of literature was conducted,\(^\text{31}\) as a supplement to the main body of the research, and this review revealed:

---

\(^{31}\) Given the supplementary nature of this component of the research, only a cursory overview of the literature is provided here. The interested reader is invited to follow up the individual references provided annex.
• **Change management** – There is a very wide range of approaches and models associated with the introduction of new management mechanisms within an organisation. There is little consensus as to which approaches are ‘best’; but many approaches are variations on the widely-cited ‘8-step process’ devised by John Kotter and published in Harvard Business Review.

• **Public policy** – A particularly useful overview of rapidly-developing practice in the domain of innovation in public policy is provided by the LIPSE (Learning from Innovation in Public Sector Environments) programme. The first working paper from the programme provides an introduction to principal drivers, conceptual frameworks and operational models, and presents a synthesis framework the elements of which overlap considerably with the Kotter model.

• **Product and process innovation** – By some margin the most widely cited author in the field of innovation studies is Everett Rogers, whose ‘Diffusion of Innovations’ was first published in 1962 and is now in its fifth edition (2003). Although apparently focused on ‘diffusion’ (i.e. the process by which an innovation is adopted by others) the framework developed by Rogers’ functions as a device for analysing innovations more generally: “Rogers’ model has become a standard reference in planning and guiding organizational change processes”.

Since it is both the most general and the most widely cited, it was decided to use the Rogers approach for the purposes of providing a framework for thinking about the Board.

Rogers identifies ten criteria which effectively determine the likelihood of success of an innovation. It is not yet known what mix of factors, with what degree of intensity, might be a sufficient explanation of the success or otherwise of an innovation; it is the case, rather, that an innovation confronted by unfavourable circumstances in all ten factors would be extremely unlikely to be successful; while an innovation blessed with extremely positive conditions under all ten headings would be very likely to succeed:

1. **Relative advantage**: the more potential value or benefit is anticipated from the innovation the more likely it is to be successful;

2. **Trialability**: ability to try the innovation improves its prospects;

---

3. **Observability**: the extent to which the benefits of the innovation are visible improves the prospects for success;

4. **Communication channels**: the paths chosen by opinion leaders to communicate an innovation affect its prospects;

5. **Like-minded groups**: innovations gain acceptance more quickly among like-minded ['homophilous'] groups;

6. **Pace of innovation/reinvention**: some innovations tend to evolve and are altered following their introduction whilst others remain stable;

7. **Norms, roles and social networks**: innovations are shaped by the rules, hierarchies and informal mechanisms of communication operating in the social networks in which they operate;

8. **Opinion leaders**: opinion leaders affect the success or otherwise of innovations;

9. **Compatibility**: the ability of an innovation to coexist with existing technologies and social patterns improves the prospects for success; and

10. **Infrastructure**: the success of many innovations depends on the presence of some form of infrastructure or of other technologies that cluster with the innovation.

This set of criteria provides the third and final analytical perspective on the Board. The remaining challenge is to pull all three perspectives – the expected benefits; the OPM framework; and the innovation criteria – together.

### 2.6 An overall framework

In response to the three challenges identified at the beginning of this section, three distinct perspectives have been presented:

- **Logic model** – a set of eight ‘intended benefits’ to frame the research process;

- **Cabinet Office framework** – a set of seven factors to structure and communicate the lessons learned from the evaluation;

- **Rogers criteria** – a set of ten headings to provide an objective method for analysing an innovation.

Whilst each approach has a value in its own right, leaving the three approaches to function entirely separately makes it difficult to make sense of all the material. Adapting the
Magenta Book guidance on triangulation and looking across the three approaches, however, it proved possible to group variables into five overarching themes or an ‘analytical framework’ to structure the interpretation of findings from the evaluation:

- **Communication & engagement:** Factors concerned with mechanisms for, and the extent of, communication and engagement – that is, factors concerned with dialogue, discussion, exchange of information and so on;

- **Adaptability:** Factors concerned with the ability to adapt to changing circumstances;

- **Collaboration & partnership:** Factors concerned with different organisations and/or individuals actually working together (rather than having a dialogue, as in ‘Communication and engagement’);

- **Openness:** Factors concerned with the degree of transparency characterising communications, collaboration etc.;

- **Effecting change:** Factors concerned with the availability and deployment of resources to bring about change.

The degree of ‘fit’ between the variables from each of the three perspectives and the overarching theme is not always perfect; and the boundaries between variables are not always precise. The five resultant headings do, nevertheless, provide an accessible and comprehensive mechanism for pulling the findings together; for analysing and interpreting the findings; and for transmitting lessons.

The table below shows which variables from each of the three perspectives have been allocated to each overarching theme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 – Development of an Analytical Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overarching Framework: Themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37 'The Magenta Book: Guidance for Evaluation’ (HM Treasury 2011) especially s8.6
38 This applies within the sets of criteria, too: the expected benefits of ‘trust’, ‘engagement’ and ‘openness’, for example, are all mutually co-dependent.
In the final section of the report, the themes are used to frame the analysis and present lessons for the future.

## 3 Benefits of the Board

### 3.1 Approach

This section presents the main findings from the interviews and workshops. It draws upon the findings from both the interim and the final wave of research. The material is presented for five of the Board’s eight ‘expected benefits’:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adaptability</th>
<th>Stimulating innovation and best practice</th>
<th>Real world testing</th>
<th>Trialability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iteration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pace of innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compatibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration and partnership</td>
<td>Genuine partnerships</td>
<td>Shared power</td>
<td>Norms, roles and networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cross boundary teams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>Openness in decision making</td>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>Observability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effecting change</td>
<td>Tackling difficult issues</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Relative advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportionate and effective regulation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Brook Lyndhurst*
• More effective communications and engagement with industry stakeholders;
• Improved stakeholder trust and support;
• Ability to tackle difficult issues by working in collaboration with industry;
• Partnership working in policy development and delivery; and
• Greater openness in decision-making about animal health and welfare policy.

References are also made to the Board’s impact on innovation in animal health and welfare policy and on animal keepers taking greater responsibilities for health and welfare matters where interviewees provided evidence against these areas.

This section does not present any evidence on the Board’s impact on value for money in animal health and welfare policy as this is beyond the scope of the evaluation. No findings are reported on the Board’s influence on the effectiveness or proportionality of regulation either, as there were too few examples of the Board having been involved in the development and delivery of new regulations.

For those areas where evidence was gathered, each sub-section follows a similar structure:

• A brief summary;
• Evidence concerned with areas where the Board has been more or less successful;
• Observations made by interviewees that offer some explanation of the processes that led to any benefits or dis-benefits brought by the Board.

Wherever possible, examples of particular initiatives or activity are presented so as to illustrate the points raised during the research.

3.2 Benefits

More effective engagement with industry

Summary

• The Board was reported by interviewees to have devoted a considerable proportion of its time to engaging with representatives from industry. This engagement has run alongside on-going communications between industry and Defra policy teams.

• Interviewees indicated that the Board’s engagement activities have involved:
Raising awareness about the Board’s existence and remit;
Seeking opinion from industry about specific health and welfare issues on behalf of Defra;
Listening to concerns raised by industry; and
Updating interested parties on progress made by the Board.

In areas where effort has been focused on active engagement with industry-specific issues, feedback from interviewees suggested that the Board’s engagement has been effective. The accessible language used by Board members was praised; and both internal and external stakeholders reported that the Board has been able to acknowledge, publicly, the uncertainties and complexities surrounding some issues.

The Board was judged by interviewees, however, to have focused its efforts on a small number of areas, with the result that stakeholders with interests in other areas reported lower levels of communication and engagement.

Some interviewees, and several participants in the workshops, highlighted the amount of time it can take for effective relationships to develop and wondered whether the Board had had enough time to build and maintain such relationships on the scale required.

External stakeholders also reported some inconsistencies in the Board’s engagement activities between different sectors/issues and over time; a view which was maintained between the interim and final phases of the research. Many stakeholders are keen to deepen and/or extend their engagement with the Board.

Stakeholders also reported that some communication channels used by the Board had been more successful than others: face-to-face communication was reported as having been particularly effective.

The difficulty of striking a balance between confidentiality of advice to Ministers and involvement of stakeholders in the development of that advice was also recognised. This presents a dilemma for Board minutes, in particular.

The Board was reported to have worked successfully with the Sector Councils, and though relationships with each Council were said to vary, these relationships were reported as having grown stronger over time.

At interim stage, the evaluation team recommended the development of a strategic engagement strategy so as to tackle these important issues and improve the effectiveness of the Board’s engagement activities. Although some work has gone
on to develop such a strategy. During the second round of field work in (autumn 2013) external stakeholders were not aware of the strategy and did not feel that communication had improved.

Areas of greater success

The Chair was widely reported as having had effective engagement with individuals and/or organisations across industry, particularly in raising awareness about the existence of the Board.

It was also evident from feedback that Board members had spent a significant amount of time engaging with industry on several health and welfare matters, which was deemed to be highly effective by both internal and external stakeholders. That is, communication has led to a sense among external stakeholders that they are engaged in a meaningful and worthwhile dialogue; and, among internal stakeholders, that the information upon which they are making decisions is well-informed and robust.

For example, the Board’s role in facilitating a dialogue between industry and government on bovine TB was almost universally regarded by research participants as a success. The ‘TB conversations’ in which the Board was involved were used as an opportunity for industry to contribute ideas and participate in discussions underpinning policy decisions about how to eradicate the disease and compensate those affected. All those consulted during the evaluation felt that the Board’s involvement in this process led to more productive engagement with industry, which led ultimately to the development of a more robust TB strategy.

This example could also be said to represent an example of innovation in animal health and welfare policy development – by involving animal keepers in the decision-making process early on and adopting a solutions-orientated approach to dialogue between industry and government.

The Red Tape Challenge, too, was highlighted by interviewees as an area where the Board was able to play an effective role. The Board was reported to have set out the government’s rationale for action in a credible way and provide a robust response to objections from industry, as one internal stakeholder said “this kind of thing could not have been done by Defra”.

A third, more specific example, relates to the Board’s involvement in the development of a voluntary welfare code for the hot branding of feral ponies. In this case, several stakeholders interviewed felt that the Board added value by facilitating an effective dialogue with stakeholders about the issue, which led to the establishment of a new voluntary code that had buy in from relevant external and internal parties.

In the majority of these cases, the Board had made use of face-to-face engagement activities (e.g. workshops, one-on-one meetings) which were widely regarded by
stakeholders to have been successful. That said, internal stakeholders (including Board members) acknowledged that these activities were necessarily limited because they had been very time consuming.

It was also reported that the Board has held regular meetings with Sector Councils and worked successfully with the Sector Councils as a mechanism for reaching agreement on specific issues. The strength of the Board’s relationship with each Council was said to vary, but that these relationships had tended to grow stronger over time. The development of disease compensation arrangements in conjunction with the Sector Councils is one such example that some stakeholders (the Board and some Sector Councils) cited as a successful example of joint working and, as such, a policy innovation.

In discussing these examples, some internal interviewees felt that Board members had brought an important and valuable dimension to policy decision-making as a result of their communication links with industry. In part, this is because many of them are known and respected within the agricultural industry. This means they have been able to capitalise on their knowledge and their relationships with key stakeholders to engage in a credible and robust manner with industry representatives – for example, by using accessible language to describe policy drivers and barriers.

In addition, the Board’s engagement activities have been found to be particularly successful when they have found ways to acknowledge, publicly, the uncertainties and complexities surrounding the issues with which they are grappling. Though this realism is acknowledged by Civil Servants, internal stakeholders tended to feel that the Board was best placed to communicate the complexities and uncertainties surrounding particularly difficult issues.

**Areas of lesser success**

Beyond the specific engagement activities outlined above, the Board and Chairman were generally considered by research participants to have conducted ‘communication’ rather than ‘engagement’ with industry in relation to the Board’s role and progress (except in relation to a small number of specific issues): that is, processes have so far tended to be one-way and/or sporadic rather than two-way and sustained.

For example, a common issue raised by external stakeholders was that written outputs by the Board – notably the minutes of Board meetings – were not sufficiently detailed and transparent. Though several stakeholders agreed that the level of detail provided had improved since the interim phase of the evaluation, they were generally still deemed to be too high-level. Moreover many external stakeholders expressed interest in becoming more actively involved in the Board’s decision-making processes, for example by observing Board meetings or being invited to comment on meeting agendas in advance.

External stakeholders also tended to feel that some parties had had a greater opportunity to engage with the Board on issues of concern to them than others. Perceived differences
in the extent of attention given by the Board to specific issues varied by sector, and according to the strength of individual relationships between the Board and industry organisations.

Some stakeholders also felt that communications by the board were unpredictable or sporadic. Some explained that they had felt frustrated by an absence or delay in efforts by the Board to engage them on specific issues. Others felt that the Board had, at one time, been in regular contact with their organisation but that they had "drifted apart" over time and consequently they were not aware of the Board’s recent activities.

Consequently, many external interviewees (and some internal interviewees) felt that these ad hoc communications did not reflect a transparent prioritisation process, or were subject to the personal (non-financial) interests of Board members. Stakeholders highlighted some other areas where there had been considerable communication but they were unable to specify what impact that communication had had.

There was widespread confusion among external stakeholders about the relationship between the Board’s remit for communicating with industry, on the one hand, and - on the other - efforts by Defra policy teams to directly involve stakeholders in policy decisions. This view was apparent in both waves of evaluation research.

Finally, there were also a few specific examples where the Board’s engagement activities were not thought to have been successful. For example, the development of voluntary Animal Welfare Codes across each sector in the industry was not reported as having been especially effective (with the exception of hot branding in ponies). Most interviewees with experience of this process suggested that it had not gone well, though there were different (and conflicting) accounts of how and why this happened. Issues mentioned (both positively and negatively) included the expertise of Board members; the reliability (or otherwise) of engagement with the Board; and understanding the Board’s decision-making processes.

**Observations**

Numerous explanations were offered by stakeholders in relation to the perceived effectiveness of the Board’s engagement and communications activities.

Some interviewees (including internal and external stakeholders as well as Board members) noted the limited resources – notably the time contribution from Board members and amount of support available from the Secretariat – as an important factor limiting their communication efforts. Some interviewees, and several participants in the workshops, highlighted the amount of time it can take for effective relationships to develop and

---

39 Note: These are observations by research participants as to factors that they believe help to explain the performance of the Board, rather than observations by the evaluation team.
wondered whether the Board had had enough time to build and maintain such relationships on the scale required.

Personalities, both on the Board and across industry, were also commonly seen to influence the character of the Board’s engagement and communications activities. Research participants observed that communication activities had been notably more successful where the individual Board member involved had strong communication skills.

The difficulty of striking a balance between confidentiality of advice to Ministers and involvement of stakeholders in the development of that advice was also recognised. For example, some predominantly internal and senior interviewees acknowledged the dilemma facing Board minutes: on the one hand, there is a reasonable desire among external stakeholders for the minutes to be much fuller and more transparent; but, on the other hand, there is a reasonable requirement that advice to Ministers (and the process building up to that advice) should be characterised by a degree of confidentiality.

Many stakeholders (both internal and external) felt that the Board had not been strategic enough in identifying who should be engaged, on what issues and when. This finding had led the research team to recommend, at the interim evaluation stage, that the Board develop an engagement strategy to maximise the effectiveness of future activities in this area. This included the need to identify methods for sustaining dialogue with stakeholders over time, rather than simply collating views or transmitting decisions made by the Board. During the follow up research, several external stakeholders expressed disappointment that they had not seen evidence of an engagement strategy being implemented by the Board.

A majority of interviewees acknowledged, at the time of the interim evaluation, that the Board would need time to bed in: a few reported in the follow up research that the Board has made little progress, but most had either seen signs of progress or were still content to allow the Board more time. Meanwhile, internal and external stakeholders alike are continuing to engage with one another directly on animal health and welfare issues, alongside or in addition to the activities of the Board.

Building stakeholder trust and support

Summary

- The research for the interim report - when the Board had been up and running for less than a year - revealed varying levels of trust between industry stakeholders and Defra. In the second wave of research, there were mixed views among interviewees about the extent to which the Board has succeeded in improving that trust and support.
• Overall, stakeholders tended to agree that the presence of external Board members represented a positive step to building links between industry and government at the interim stage and, as such, supported its establishment.

• Many stakeholders suggested that changes in personnel – on the Board itself, across Defra and on the Board’s secretariat - had inhibited the Board’s efforts to develop key relationships that help to foster trust between different parties.

• At the interim evaluation, external stakeholders identified other factors which had tended to limit the level of trust in the Board. These included:
  o A lack of clarity surrounding the Board’s relationship within Defra (particularly how the Board is part of Defra’s internal decision-making processes);
  o Cynicism surrounding the longevity of the Board; and
  o Criticism relating to the selection of non-executive Board members with the appropriate mix of skills and experience to facilitate co-development and delivery of policy between industry and government.

• In follow up discussions with external stakeholders, many of these limiting factors had receded. Support for the existence of the Board had been maintained amongst many external stakeholders, while trust in the Board (both of individual members and the collective) had generally increased for those stakeholders who had been part of an effective engagement process led by the Board.

• Lower levels of trust in the Board’s potential to support the views and interests of industry were evident in interviews with external stakeholders from parts of industry where the Board had invested less time and energy. In a minority of cases where there was a lack of confidence in the Board, evidence from both internal and external stakeholders suggested that stakeholders were engaging directly with policy teams, rather than voicing their views through the Board.

• Internal stakeholders also indicated varying levels of trust in the Board. Many of those who had worked closely alongside Board members over the preceding months reported high levels of trust in Board members (although there were some exceptions).

**Areas of greater success**

In general, external stakeholders supported the principles behind the Board and they welcomed its establishment. Trust in the Board’s ability to improve animal health and welfare policy processes was reported to have grown amongst external stakeholders in instances where the Board had succeeded in achieving consensus between Defra policy
officials and industry representatives on specific issues – including the development of the TB Strategy for England.

Stakeholder trust and support in individual Board members was cited as a reason for more effective policy development in specific instances, by a range of external stakeholders. For example, many regarded this to be a key factor in the development of a voluntary code for hot branding in feral ponies and in the success of the TB conversations.

Trust in the Board among internal stakeholders was found to vary. Defra officials who voiced their support for the Board tended to be distributed across different policy teams, many of whom had had the opportunity to work closely with the Board.

Areas of lesser success

Some external interviewees felt, since they had not engaged sufficiently with the Board between the interim and final stages of research, that their trust in the Board had not increased. More generally these stakeholders also reported that they would like to see more evidence (i.e. via meeting minutes, public meetings held by the Board, or the AHWBE webpages on the Defra website) on what the Board is doing or has done to influence policy processes.

The research team engaged with a number of internal stakeholders who expressed low levels of support for the Board. The reported reasons for this were numerous but tended to be associated with policy areas where the Board’s role was ambiguous; or where non-executive Board members’ were not deemed to have the appropriate knowledge and skills; or where the Board’s engagement was felt to be too tactical or operational rather than strategic. For example, some internal stakeholders suggested that the Board’s role in the domestic translation of the EU Framework Directive for Farmed Animals had been insufficiently strategic.

More generally, a number of internal stakeholders reported that they felt the Board lacked strategic direction, and that this left some Board members on some occasions having to engage with policy teams on more operational issues with which they had little experience. For some interviewees this served to limit the development of trust in and support for the Board.

Observations

It was noted by many stakeholders that the development of trust is an iterative process which takes time, and that it involves many components. In particular, it was widely suggested that trust is dependent upon individual relationships, particularly during the early or development phases while new processes and procedures are still being developed.
Variance in inter-personal relationships was referred to above in relation to the effectiveness of the Board’s engagement activities. One factor reported by interviewees that has influenced the ability of the Board (both as a whole and in terms of its individual members) to develop strong professional relationships is the turnover in staff which has been experienced internally (including within the Board and secretariat) as well as more widely across Defra and industry during the evaluation. Many stakeholders suggested that this had inhibited the Board’s efforts to develop key relationships that help to foster trust between different parties.

Many interviewees, both internally and externally, suggested that the status of the Board, and therefore the confidence that could reasonably be put in it, was critically dependent on there being clear backing for and championing of the Board at the very highest level. Many felt that such support for the board could be made more apparent. This view was particularly apparent among internal stakeholders, although some external stakeholders who were particularly close to the Board also identified this as an issue.

Tackling difficult issues

Summary

- The Board was reported as having played a significant and important role in tackling TB; as having begun to make progress on a number of other issues; and as having contributed to a series of useful and robust discussions about animal health and welfare budgets at senior level.

- The research team did hear from interviewees some criticism of the Board’s processes for tackling difficult issues, however, including:

  o The Board’s adoption of a reactive rather than proactive approach to selecting issues upon which to focus;

  o A focus on operational rather than strategic issues; and

  o Difficulties associated with conflicting opinions between the Board and accounting officers.

- It was generally regarded by internal stakeholders that the Board has not yet developed a strategy for tackling the fundamental issues of cost and responsibility sharing, although the Board has been involved in some specific activities that contribute toward increased responsibility (e.g. the review of compensation, risk based trading etc.)

- Several inter-related factors were suggested by interviewees as reasons that might explain the Board’s progress in tackling difficult issues, including the:
Board’s large remit across all strategic animal health and welfare matters;

- Limited resources available to the Board (in terms of the number of days per month available from non-exec Board members and the resources provided by the Secretariat);

- Time taken to become familiar with how Defra decision-making processes work and the timeframes associated with these; and

- Inevitable prioritisation of bovine TB as the single most important animal disease issue in England at present.

Areas of greater success

The Board’s involvement in the TB issue was widely reported by research participants as having been the best illustration of its ability to tackle a difficult issue, and of illustrating the contribution it can make when it does so. Both internal and external stakeholders reported that the Board had succeeded in delivering “difficult messages” in relation to TB and working through these to identify feasible solutions.

Senior interviewees reported that “robust discussion” about some of the difficult issues associated with animal health and welfare spending had occurred as a result of the Board; and that this was very welcome.

Progress has been made on a variety of other difficult issues, interviews reported, although these tended to be quite specific in nature. For example, Board members reported that they had facilitated discussions between Defra and RDPE that had resulted in the allocation of RDPE funds towards specific animal welfare issues. In another instance, the commercial experience of non-executive Board members was said to have been beneficial in the re-tendering of TB testing contracts, working in conjunction with Defra, and the devolved administrations.

As part of the Red Tape Challenge, stakeholders explained that the Board negotiated the removal of legislation in the horse sector. The Board member leading this work was recognised by interviewees as having provided a “robust response” when criticised by industry stakeholders. In setting out Defra’s rationale for action and encouraging a solutions-orientated dialogue with industry, several internal stakeholders felt that the Board had tackled this issue more effectively than Defra could have done.

Areas of lesser success

Most internal interviewees – and especially Senior Defra Officials – report that the Board could have conducted itself in a more strategic fashion. These individuals felt that the Board had often become either bogged down in detail or overly concerned with operational issues.
The most conspicuous ‘difficult issue’ and one which the Board is widely believed not to have made sufficient progress on, by both internal and external stakeholders, is the generic issue of cost and responsibility sharing. While many examples of specific activities relating to cost and responsibility sharing were provided by those engaged in the research – such as TB testing or disease compensation arrangements (described above) – some recognised that the Board had not yet articulated their vision of shared cost and responsibility and an overarching strategy for achieving it.

Some interviewees felt that the Board had been too reactive and insufficiently pro-active on the ‘difficult issues’, with many internal interviewees suggesting that the Board had not “joined up the dots” across animal health and welfare issues generally, in addition to the central issue of shared cost and responsibility.

**Observations**

There were mixed views among research participants as to why the Board had made relatively limited progress in this area. Several inter-related factors were suggested as reasons that might explain the Board’s performance - including the Board’s large remit across all strategic animal health and welfare matters; the limited resources available to the Board (in terms of the number of days per month available from non-exec Board members and the resources provided by the Secretariat); the time taken to become familiar with how Defra decision-making processes work and the timeframes associated with these; and the inevitable prioritisation of bovine TB as the single most important animal disease issue in England at present.

Some other interviewees suggested that more active resistance to the presence of the Board internally was an issue. Board members reported that they tended to feel that Defra processes had hampered open dialogue between Board members and industry on occasion, which had reduced the quality of their engagement or the speed of their progress (for example, in relation to the introduction of Voluntary Welfare Codes). By contrast, some internal stakeholders felt that examples such as this illustrated the Board’s lack of experience in appreciating the constraints placed on policy teams; and some also felt it reflected the Board’s tendency to focus on operational/tactical rather than strategic issues.

A few internal stakeholders went so far as to suggest that the Board had not been as effective as it might have been in this area because existing lines of governance for overseeing policy development and delivery (in the form of policy teams and the Board) are not yet fully aligned. In some cases, concern about the Board was reported to have led to some policy teams keeping ‘difficult issues’ away from the Board.

**Genuine partnership in policy development and delivery**

**Summary**
• Although stakeholders reported that the Board has been seeking advice and support and engaging with industry on specific issues, as part of policy development and delivery processes, no interviewees felt that this engagement has yet turned into a genuine partnership. Equally, there was no clear sense among interviewees about what ‘genuine partnership’ would actually look like.

• At the interim stage of the research, the majority of external stakeholders recognised that there had been numerous opportunities to voice their opinions about specific issues focussed on by the Board (particularly in relation to TB). Many were unclear, however, about whether and how those opinions were being used to inform policy decisions. In addition, many felt the depth of engagement was not always adequate to give rise to true partnership between industry and government.

• The interviews revealed that this view has not changed substantially in the months that followed, although there was some recognition amongst external stakeholders that the Board’s working relationships with some farming sectors had improved.

• The Sector Councils were also identified by interviewees as an area where the Board had started to develop collaborative relationships, based on trust and support that would eventually enable co-development and delivery of policy.

• Internal stakeholders reported that they had observed greater change, in relation to working relationships between non-executive Board members and Defra officials. The Board’s presence was reported as having “shaken things up” in the way government works with industry. This was welcomed by some officials, while it was a source of resistance for others. These findings tend to support the idea that, even if there is little evidence of other new examples, the Board itself represents a ‘genuine partnership’.

• More generally, many external interviewees felt that partnership working should in principle flow from improved communications and higher levels of trust (see above) and that, as a result, it was still too early to pass judgment on whether the Board has potential to fully deliver benefit in this area.

Areas of greater success

At the interim stage of the evaluation, instances where external stakeholders had been asked by the Board to provide advice or information on specific issues were widely appreciated by interviewees. There was a general keenness among stakeholders for greater joint working between industry and the Board going forward and an appetite to understand how such activities would influence decision-making. The ‘TB conversations’ were most commonly cited in support of this view at the interim stage.

The Sector Councils were also identified by research participants as an area where the Board had started to develop collaborative relationships, based on trust and support that
would eventually enable co-development and delivery of policy. It was acknowledged that some of these relationships were stronger than others at the outset. Relationships with others, such as the Companion Animals Sector Council, were reported to have improved during the evaluation period by both internal and external stakeholders.

Latterly, other examples such as disease compensation payments, hot branding of ponies, or TB in Camalids, were cited during the interviews as signs of greater collaboration.

More success was reported by research participants in relation to the working arrangements between non-executive Board members and Defra policy teams. For example, collaboration by the Board with Defra officials and the RDPE team was mentioned as having been instrumental to the successful apportioning RDPE funds for improving animal welfare. In another example, the Board’s initiation of a debate with Defra officials about endemic diseases such as bovine viral diarrhoea reportedly led to options for intervention being re-examined, where the impetus for doing so might not otherwise have existed.

**Areas of lesser success**

Most external interviewees were unable to identify instances of partnership working. Although instances of effective communication and/or engagement were reported, few felt that these had developed into ‘genuine’ partnerships, in which they have been able to identify and negotiate shared priorities alongside government where the Board has played a co-ordination/facilitation role.

As described above, it was reported that the Board had experienced some resistance from Defra’s policy processes, and that this had in some instances prevented them from facilitating a dialogue between industry and government about the policy options being explored. One such example is the Veterinary Delivery Partnership Project. In this case, the process was said to have been slowed considerably by policy processes and the engagement with industry was limited because the Board was unable to discuss the preferred option with industry before it had ministerial sign off.

**Observations**

Some interviewees suggested that the maturity or otherwise of the Sector Councils has been a key factor influencing the effectiveness of dialogue between industry and Defra (via the Board) and, furthermore, that they could ultimately lead to the development of collaborative partnership working.

On the other hand, many external interviewees felt that partnership working should in principle flow from improved communications and higher levels of trust (see above) and that, as a result, it was still too early to pass judgment on whether the Board has potential to fully deliver benefit in this area.
Openness in decision-making

Summary

- Almost all interviewees continued to support the idea of the Board in principle, as they did at the time of the interim evaluation, and they welcome the idea of openness.

- In the early stages of the evaluation, there was a widespread perception among external stakeholders that the Board could have been more open about the processes it had followed to contribute to policy decisions and, also, whether it had its own ‘position’ on animal health and welfare issues. This view had been maintained by most external stakeholders who were engaged during the follow up research.

- Some of the criticism surrounding the Board’s perceived lack of transparency tended to be linked by interviewees to the channels used by the Board to explain their activities and achievements. The Board’s meeting minutes were particularly heavily criticised by research participants for providing insufficient details about decisions taken by the Board or the role that stakeholder views had played in decision-making processes. This was seen to be particularly important for stakeholders who relied upon meeting minutes as the sole source of information about the Board’s progress.

- Internally, there was a greater recognition among interviewees of the challenges associated with greater openness in policy throughout the evaluation period. A tension was identified between the need for more transparency in order to build trust and collaborative relationships, against the need to protect the integrity of policy processes and advice presented to ministers.

Areas of greater success

Some interviewees, particular those on or close to the Board, reported that discussions in the run up to and/or during the development of policy are more open than they might otherwise be as a result of the perspective and approach brought by Board members.

The TB conversations conducted by the Board were widely regarded by internal interviewees as a good illustration of openness because they provided stakeholders with an opportunity to publically debate different policy options alongside Board members, in order to identify a preferred solution – in the context of constraints placed upon government and industry. This view was also widely held by external stakeholders, who felt the process had been more honest and open than would otherwise have been the case.
Examples mentioned by interviewees where the Board was deemed to have been most successful in opening out policy processes tended to involve in-depth, face-to-face engagement between non-executive Board members and industry representatives over a prolonged period prior to finalisation and sign off of a policy decision.

**Areas of lesser success**

The Board was perceived by stakeholders to have been less successful in achieving a greater sense of openness between industry and government in general – by being unable to fully communicate its own opinions on animal health and welfare matters, the nature of its activities inside Defra and its own contribution to the outcome of animal health and welfare policy decisions.

In part, this lack of success tended to be attributed by interviewees to the minutes of Board meetings, which nearly all external stakeholders felt should contain more detail (though some acknowledged a slight improvement over time). Some also criticised the Board’s 2013 Annual Report and webpages on the Defra website on similar grounds. For example, some external stakeholders felt that the Board’s webpages were not updated with the Board’s activities or achievements on a sufficiently regular basis.

Many external stakeholders also complained about a broader lack of clarity about how/where the Board is situated within Defra and the extent that decisions taken on animal health and welfare matters could be attributed to it. This position – that they would like to see more transparency - was maintained by all external stakeholders who were involved in both stages of the evaluation. For example, “they have a website and report on some discussions they have, but I was hoping to see more explanation of what is behind those decisions”.

Debate and discussion with respect to Voluntary Welfare Codes was mentioned by some interviewees as an example where a lack of clarity over the role of the Board had led to confusion (as Defra initiated a consultation exercise alongside the efforts of the Board).

External stakeholders also tended to report that they were unclear as to how the Board prioritised its work. Despite a recommendation in the interim report that this be addressed; and despite the latest clarification on the Board’s current priorities, the mechanism by which this prioritisation takes place remains opaque.

**Observations**

Almost all interviewees continued to support the idea of the Board in principle, and welcomed the idea of openness, but felt that there is still some way to go before the Board could be considered transparent and inclusive.
No interviewees suggested that they thought that the kind of openness intended for the Board was in some sense impossible, though the challenges associated with it were more readily recognised by internal colleagues.
4 The open policy perspective

4.1 Introduction and background

Although the concept of ‘open policy’ was not a well-established part of the political lexicon at the time the Board was established, it became clear to the Steering Group for this evaluation that lessons from the research could be of particular value to those with an interest in open policy. The Board is an ‘innovation in governance’ that, most strikingly, brings individuals from industry directly into policy processes in an effort, in part at least, to increase and improve the openness and transparency of policy formulation and delivery.

With this in mind, the research team was invited, approximately half way through the evaluation, to investigate the ‘state of play’ in the open policy agenda and consider the Board’s processes within this context. This was achieved by means of a desk-top review of selected documentation and a limited number of consultations with experts in the field, to introduce aspects of the open policy agenda into the second wave of interviews and workshops with AHWBE stakeholders. The insights generated through this process were analysed to derive lessons that could be of value from an OPM perspective.

These lessons, furthermore, have an important ‘two way’ aspect: on the one hand, insofar as it represents an ‘experiment in open government’, the Board may provide lessons of value both to Defra and policy makers in other departments; and, on the other, there may be lessons from the broader world of OPM of potential value to Defra.

This section of the report presents the results of this work, as follows:

- It begins with a discussion of what is meant by ‘open policy’; the rationale for pursuing ‘open policy’; and some of the barriers that have been identified in relation to this objective;

40 Documents reviewed are listed in the annex.
41 Conducted on the same confidential basis as the main body of interviews; see annex for list of those consulted.
42 A limited exercise was also conducted to identify examples of OPM that might be of particular relevance to the Board, lessons from which could be of use to help Defra and the Board. Although some examples were uncovered (see section 4.2) this element of the research encountered three barriers: firstly, it was not straightforward to establish the extent to which any given initiative was ‘relevant’ to the Board; secondly, many of the examples uncovered pre-dated the emergence of the OPM agenda, making it difficult to translate the experience(s) of the projects into the structure of the Cabinet Office components; and, thirdly, the Cabinet Office Open Government team have themselves held back from producing ‘lessons’, preferring instead to rely on deliberative learning among members of their growing network to share best practice and so on. The material reviewed, assembled and presented in this section has, nevertheless, provided useful insight, and this has been incorporated into the analysis and lessons presented in section 5.
• It presents details of the approach adopted by the Cabinet Office’s Open Government Team to OPM, and summary information for a number of examples;

• It presents responses from interviewees and the workshops to the OPM agenda, as a means of demonstrating the relevance of the OPM agenda to the Board for those involved with it.

Analysis of these findings, and an assessment of the lessons derived from them by the research team, is presented in section 5.

4.2 Open policy

The Civil Service Reform Plan sets out the rationale for change and a series of specific actions which are needed to ensure the Civil Service is fit-for-purpose in the 21st century (HM Government 2012). The plan calls for greater openness in policy making towards new thinking and evidence and insight from external experts, to ensure policy is robust and designed with implementation in mind. The document recognises a number of mechanisms that can be (and have previously been) used to involve external parties in policy development, such as:

• ‘Crowd-sourcing’ policy ideas to reflect citizens views and experiences;

• Using ‘policy labs’ to test new policies before they are implemented;

• Involving delivery experts early on in policy processes.

While the term ‘open policy’ is relatively recent in policy circles, the idea of achieving greater transparency and collaboration in policy development and delivery is nothing new, as the focus on end-users/citizens as part of the 2005 Capacity Review Programme shows (National Audit Office, 2013).

Despite present-day interest in the concept of ‘open policy’, there is presently no single, clear, unambiguous definition of the term. Indeed some authors recognise the difficulty of defining open policy because it represents a process of change in cultures and behaviours rather than a specific product (e.g. Rutter, et al. 2011). Instead, open policy tends to be described in in terms of clusters of attributes or principles such as: open-mindedness, widespread participation and transparency (Sciencewise, 2013).

Lying behind these various descriptions, sometimes implicitly, sometimes explicitly, is an inference that policy has in the past, or to some extent still remains, ‘closed’. There is in turn an implication that ‘open’ processes will lead to better policy. ‘Better policy’ is certainly one of the most frequently cited rationales for bringing in more views and
developing policy in a more collaborative and potentially innovative way (e.g. Hallsworth, M. & Rutter, J. 2011).

The literature points to various other drivers for increasing external participation in policy processes, including increased citizen expectations surrounding transparency of governments, coupled with technological advancements that enable citizens to organise themselves more readily and communicate publically with government (Sciencewise, 2013).

Risk is also a driver for open policy because it is often recognised as a mechanism for managing complexity and uncertainty – for example, in the context of animal health, disease outbreaks such as BSE or Foot and Mouth Disease have repeatedly highlighted the importance of openness and trust between the farming industry and government as a means of reducing risk of future outbreaks (Demos, 2006).

Open policy is not universally viewed in positive terms, however. Criticisms aired by those with an interest in OPM who were consulted included:

- It is an *ex post* justification for cost cutting in the Civil Service;
- It reflects a critique of the Civil Service from a perspective that consider the Civil Service to be excessively bureaucratic and slow;
- It is based on a model of internet-based political participation which is itself untested;
- Lacking a clear definition, open policy can mean all things to all people, and therefore means nothing;
- It implies that policy making has in the past been inadequate, but presents no evidence for this assertion.

Critical views are not the only potential barriers faced by open policy. The literature points to a range of challenges associated with a move towards greater openness in policy, including:

- Rigid internal structures and risk averse working cultures in the Civil Service that make it difficult to ‘unlock’ traditional policy processes and associated behaviours (e.g. Bullock, et al. 2001);
- Lack of time, skills (and training budgets) that are needed to navigate uncertainty, competing interests and lack of consensus among external parties (e.g. Demos, 2006);
- Engagement and participation from the ‘usual suspects’, leading to the dominance of vested interests and the prevention of important views or arguments being aired (e.g. Sciencewise, 2013);
• Innovation in policy being limited because external stakeholders’ views are too entrenched (e.g. Hallsworth, M. & Rutter, J. 2011);

• A challenging media environment that reduces the opportunity to test policy options in a ‘safe space’ (e.g. HM Government, 2012);

• The need to build trust in new processes by demonstrating the benefits of open policy (in terms of value for money and improved policy outcomes) which take time to develop and which may be difficult to capture (e.g. Public Administration Select Committee, 2013);

• More general barriers to change in the Civil Service, such as lack of sustained political leadership or lack of clarity in tracking the benefits of open policy (National Audit Office, 2013).

Notwithstanding these barriers and/or criticisms, it is clear that there is considerable momentum associated with the open policy agenda, and many examples are suggested in the literature (although some of these may have predated the open policy agenda). The following illustrate the breadth of scenarios/models that have been highlighted as examples of open policy in practice:

• **Food Standards Agency Consumer Advisory Panel** – Experts on the Panel provide consumer insights that feed into the FSA’s work alongside consumer views derived from direct engagement activities. The Agency also holds ‘stakeholder forums’ as a means of industry, consumer organisations and pressure groups raising matters of broad concern to the Agency in an informal manner.

• **Animal Health Australia** – An independent membership organisation that seeks to improve animal health policy in Australia by working in partnership with the livestock sector, government and other stakeholders.

• **Disability Rights UK** – The organisation aims to strengthen the voice of disabled people in policy creation and delivery by influencing local and national policy associated with disability.

• **Mindlab** - A cross-government innovation unit based in Denmark, that was created to involve citizens and businesses in the creation and testing of new policy; and,

• **The Red Tape Challenge** – RTC has been set up to fulfil a commitment by the Coalition Government to reduce the amount of regulation. By ‘crowdsourcing’

---

43 [www.food.gov.uk/about-us/how-we-work/workingwithothers](http://www.food.gov.uk/about-us/how-we-work/workingwithothers)
45 [www.disabilityrightsuk.org](http://www.disabilityrightsuk.org)
46 [www.mind-lab.dk](http://www.mind-lab.dk)
suggestions online, the initiative encourages citizens to participate in decision-making.\(^47\)

Given the scope of ‘open policy’ and, indeed, its relative novelty, it is also the case that (a) these examples may not necessarily be considered by those responsible for them as examples of open policy, and (b) many other initiatives or projects may include aspects of open policy but are not explicitly labelled as such.

These considerations have in part informed the formation, approach and work programme of the Cabinet Office’s Open Government Team. Established in 2012, the Team has been set up to promote and encourage the adoption of OPM approaches throughout Whitehall (and beyond). Rather than issue a definition [which would, perforce, be centrally determined] and use an enforcement approach, the Team has adopted a more organic methodology for promoting the benefits of openness (making extensive use of IT; relying on departmental champions; encouraging a sharing and deliberative learning culture; developing a Lab; and so on) and has set out a series of ‘components’ that characterise openness.\(^48\)

(The Team has also been developing a ‘live’ list of examples of OPM.\(^49\) This has been evolving during the course of this evaluation study and intelligence from the examples has fed into the discussion and analysis presented below).

This ‘components’ approach – initially introduced in section 2, above - provides a clear and accessible basis for considering the AHWBE from the perspective of openness, and was thus integrated into the analytical framework applied in Chapter 5.

### 4.3 Cabinet Office’s components of open policy

The Cabinet Office ‘Components of Open Policy Making’ are set out in the diagram below. For each of the seven components, the diagram indicates, on the left, the least collaborative approach and, on the right, the most collaborative approach.

The diagram is not intended to imply that it is always the case that it would be ‘better’ to approach policy making by being on the right hand side of the diagram. The Cabinet Office acknowledges that differing departments and differing policy areas face differing complexities, have different stakeholder groups, different histories of engagement and so on: hence the rejection of the one-size-fits-all approach by means of a definition.

The diagram is, rather, a means of reflecting upon existing policy development processes and asking appropriate questions: would it be better (for example) if, for this policy, in

---

\(^47\) [http://www.redtapechallenge.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/home/index/](http://www.redtapechallenge.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/home/index/)

\(^48\) Information obtained during expert consultations (see annex for further details).

\(^49\) [http://my.civilservice.gov.uk/policy/case-studies/](http://my.civilservice.gov.uk/policy/case-studies/)
these circumstances, there were more cross-boundary team working than at present; and so on.

**Figure 3 – Cabinet Office Components of Open Policy Making**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least collaborative approach</th>
<th>Most collaborative approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared power</td>
<td><strong>True co-design in which government relies on ideas, argument and persuasion to help form policy together</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross boundary teams</td>
<td><strong>Team draws across organisations and even sectors, on basis of skill rather than organisational status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint accountability</td>
<td><strong>Clear, mutually police-able roles and expectations for constructive engagement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td><strong>Shared, transparent evidence based from all sources in accessible format for all to interpret</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct access to ministers</td>
<td><strong>Unmediated direct routes to ministers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real world testing</td>
<td><strong>Policies tested/prototype by users/frontline for practical/visibility</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iteration</td>
<td><strong>Anybody can initiate policy review/adaptation/evolution</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4 Relevance to the Board

In discussions in workshops and interviews with the AHWBE members and stakeholders, it was found:

- Few stakeholders (both internal and external) were familiar with the open policy agenda;
- Initial reactions towards the concept were typically bemused or sceptical; in general research participants treated the OPM agenda as peripheral to their focus on the AHWBE;
- Of the seven Cabinet Office components, ‘direct access to Minsters’, ‘shared power’ and ‘transparency’ prompted the most immediate and positive reactions (in terms of relevance to the Board’s activities).

---

50 Components of open policy in ‘Civil Service Reform Plan’ (HM Government, 2012)
Few interviewees (whether internal or external) indicated that they thought the OPM agenda, and the seven components approach in particular, offered any immediate help in terms of explaining the Board’s progress to-date. These reactions are, perhaps, understandable: those interviewed were concerned or involved with the Board rather than OPM per se (indeed some research participants did not react well to the suggestion that the Board was an ‘experiment’ in OPM). Nevertheless, the information gathered provided useful material for the purposes of distilling the two-way lessons sought by the Steering Group; and these lessons are set out in section 5.
5 Analysis of the findings and lessons for the future

This final section presents Brook Lyndhurst’s analysis and interpretation of the evidence gathered during the research process; and suggests lessons emerging from the research and analysis that may be of value to the three primary audiences for this report:

- All those involved in or engaged with the AHWBE;
- Senior decision-makers in Defra;
- Policy makers across government and stakeholders interested in OPM.

This final section uses the five overarching themes established in section 2 as a framework for structuring the analysis of the findings:

1. Communication & engagement: Factors concerned with mechanisms for, and the extent of, communication and engagement – that is, factors concerned with dialogue, discussion, exchange of information and so on;

2. Adaptability: Factors concerned with the ability to adapt to changing circumstances;

3. Collaboration & partnership: Factors concerned with different organisations and/or individuals actually working together (rather than having a dialogue, as in ‘Communication and engagement’);

4. Openness: Factors concerned with the degree of transparency characterising communications, collaboration etc.;

5. Effecting change: Factors concerned with the availability and deployment of resources to bring about change.

Section 5.1 presents our analysis of the Board using these five themes, while section 5.2 sets out the key lessons we have derived from our analysis.

5.1 Overarching analysis

Our analytical approach was iterative and continuous. Brainstorming sessions took place at key stages, acting as opportunities for more considered reflection and consolidation. Discussions with the Evaluation Steering Group were used to test and explore emerging
themes; and responses from the Board to a presentation of the interim research findings provided another useful mechanism during the analytical process.

As well as providing their perspective on what the Board has done over its first two years, interviewees also offered views on why things had or had not happened. These views were presented in section 3 under ‘Observations’. These insights from research participants have informed our analysis, and in many cases we have reached the same or similar conclusions to interviewees. There is, as a result, an occasional element of repetition in this section of the report. However, the analysis here seeks to draw out the more substantial and cross-cutting themes from the evaluation and includes the evaluators’ interpretation.51

Communication and engagement

Key insights from the research are:

- The Board has devoted a considerable proportion of its time to engaging with industry representatives. In areas where this effort has been focussed on on-going dialogue with stakeholders about a specific issue it has been successful. Due to the resource-intensive nature of these activities, however, they have necessarily been limited to certain issues/sectors.

- Face-to-face engagement activities have been far more effective than written outputs produced by the Board in communicating its activities and seeking stakeholder feedback.

- Communication and engagement has tended to be driven by immediate priorities such as TB and the efforts (and contacts) of individual Board members.

- The Board’s key function is to make recommendations to Ministers; and, in order to do so, the Board (notably the Chair) has had many opportunities to participate in policy development discussions directly with Ministers. A small number of internal and external interviewees are disquieted by this direct access, suggesting that it gives privileged access to a group that might actually reduce openness, though this was not the majority view.

- External stakeholders tend to believe that the presence of the Board represents a positive step in building trust between industry and government, though levels of trust in Defra (and the Board themselves) was found to vary.

Our analytical reflections, in light of these key points, are:

51 With this last point in mind, statements throughout this section, unless otherwise specified, are not separately sourced to e.g. ‘interviewees’.
• Although there are instances where engagement has either been limited or less effective, the potential of the Board to deliver effective engagement with the agricultural industry has been clearly demonstrated.

• It was an explicit endeavour of the Board to bring together individuals from industry and the Civil Service; and part of the rationale for this endeavour was an acknowledgement that they would bring very different perspectives. They also, however, bring very different working cultures, and many of the challenges mentioned by either Board members or Defra interviewees were related to differences in working cultures. A more explicit acknowledgement of this challenge may be helpful.

• A more strategic approach to communication and engagement, in terms of both content and channels, could help to broaden the Board’s success.

• There was a widespread sentiment among those interviewed that high-level backing for the Board was not always apparent and, where this was the case, some stakeholders interpreted this to mean that the Board was less important or influential than it might otherwise have been.

Adaptability

Key insights in terms of the Board’s ability to adapt to emerging circumstances are:

• Although many stakeholders reported that the size of the Board’s workload has limited its ability to have a positive impact neither the Board’s remit nor its Terms of Reference have been formally revised to reflect this during its lifetime; yet there has clearly been considerable informal ‘learning by doing’ among Board members and those with whom it has directly engaged.

A persistent refrain from stakeholders has been a lack of clarity about the precise role of the Board and how it fits with other mechanisms either for engaging with Defra on animal health and welfare issues or for formulating policy and/or taking responsibility for policy.

• Whilst the original Terms of Reference set out goals for the Board and the annual Forward Plan presents a list of areas for action, it is difficult for the majority of stakeholders to ascertain the basis for the appearance or disappearance of a ‘priority’, alongside the difficulty most stakeholders faced identifying the Board’s remit and responsibilities (which also led to difficulty evaluating the progress of the Board against it’s objectives).

Our analysis has drawn out a series of issues and factors relevant to the Board’s adaptability:
• There is sometimes a mismatch between what the Board is expected to do, based on its terms of reference, and its resources and capacity. Greater flexibility to reflect on lessons learnt and to adapt accordingly would have allowed the Board to adapt to make the most of its resources.

• The role of the Board in building relationships with external stakeholders and industry puts particular onus on the individual Board members, since relationships require considerable personal and frequently face-to-face investment. The amount of time spent by the Board in building individual relationships has restricted the time available for the Board to step back and consider how it could be more strategic and make most effective use of its resources.

• Both individually and collectively, the Board has had to learn how the policy process works, how to submit advice to Ministers, indeed how to ‘be’ an entirely new, governance mechanism. This has understandably influenced on what the Board has been able to achieve over the last two years. Developing this kind of capacity is not a rapid process; and it is difficult to say with any certainty precisely how much time the Board should be given to reach ‘maturity’.\(^52\)

• Formal documentation and communication have not been adapted sufficiently to ensure clarity about the roles and responsibilities and function of the Board to reflect informal experiences.

Collaboration and partnership

Key insights concerning collaboration and partnership are:

• Partnership working was discussed extensively with research participants but there was not always a shared understanding of what ‘genuine partnership working’ would mean in practice.

• Whilst there is a portfolio structure governing the responsibilities of individual external Board members, limited resources mean that more time and attention has been invested in some industry networks than others. This has limited the development of trust in the Board among some groups of industry stakeholders.

• Even where there has been a high degree of communication and/or engagement, there was little evidence of the development of collaborative partnerships through which policies could be co-developed and delivered between industry and government.

\(^{52}\) The Radcliffe Review suggested that a full evaluation of the Board should be conducted between three and five years after its formation.
A greater shift in relationships was observed by internal stakeholders who tended to recognise that the presence of non-executive members on the Board had, in some cases, initiated closer working relationships between industry and government.

There was an acceptance among most internal stakeholders that the Board represented a new way of making policy and that policy teams were expected to engage with the Board as a means of seeking industry advice and support on strategic issues. However, in some cases internal stakeholders had resisted attempts to work more closely with non-executive Board members.

There was occasionally a lack of clarity among internal and external stakeholders as to the Board’s authority and its role in the decision making-process.

Some external stakeholders were concerned that the Board’s presence had diluted their influence or had ‘closed doors’ since it was established, citing examples where they had approached the Board about a specific issue which they believe had not been subsequently progressed.

The perceived knowledge and/or interest in different farming sectors of non-executive Board members was said to influence the extent that the Board has sought to build collaborative relationships with external stakeholders and prioritise its own workload. This issue may have been confounded by the absence of clear objectives and scope to guide the Board’s work and the processes it uses to identify and address key animal health and welfare issues.

In analytical terms:

The lack of clarity about what ‘effective partnership’ would look like in practice potentially reflects a need to be clearer about what the Board is aiming to achieve and how success will be defined.

All of the key points raised under this theme refer to the presence or absence of a shared understanding of responsibilities and of process. With the Board itself being new, there are not (to start with) existing structures and mechanisms through which people can work: and while these processes are being developed there is an unavoidable reliance upon inter-personal (an often informal) channels.

Personality inevitably influences such channels. In addition, since the Board’s work includes such a major focus on the development of relationships – to build trust and engagement – then the issue of personalities is particularly important.

It is obvious that personalities vary, and some individuals are more ‘personable’ than others. In the absence of established and trusted mechanisms, a ‘personality clash’ can have disproportionate effects on working relationships; and vice versa.
• Improved documentation and better communication to ensure clarity about the objectives and the role of the Board may also have facilitated the development of relationships between the Board and both internal and external stakeholders.

Openness

Key insights on openness from the research are:

• Although the Board was explicitly intended to increase transparency; and the Chair and individual Board members have in some cases gone to considerable lengths to explain the Board’s workings; the majority of external interviewees, making judgments that are significantly influenced by published documents, do not view the Board’s work as being especially transparent.

• Almost all external stakeholders engaged in the research felt that the Board’s meeting minutes, which act as the main source of information about the Board for many external stakeholders, could contain more information on the Board’s opinion on specific issues. It was also felt that their influence over decisions that are subsequently taken should be communicated.

• This has induced some frustration among Board members: “we are being more open, but they [industry] don’t know it”. In several examples provided to the research team, Board members felt it was necessary to be more transparent with industry about policy options being considered but they had been prevented from doing so. Internal stakeholders recognised this issue and pointed to an inherent tension between greater openness and the responsibility to protect advice provided to Ministers.

• Many inside Defra noted that the Board was billed as ‘a new way of working’ in terms of transparency and joint-working, but that this transformation had not really been realised because it had been established within existing processes. Dialogue during the process of formulating advice to Ministers, for example, has remained confidential, and this has contributed to a sense among some external parties that the Board is not being as transparent as had been hoped.

• In instances where the Board’s efforts have been visible – in face-to-face engagement with industry, or in robust discussion with policy makers – those efforts have generally been positively received and the Board is generally viewed in a positive light.

Our analysis of these issues is:

The findings suggest that some stakeholders felt distanced from the Board and Defra because they had not been given sufficient opportunity to be involved in framing issues, and that the scope for them to influence was limited.
The differences between the rules, norms, networks, procedures and practices (ways of working) that prevail in the decision-making of the Civil Service compared to decision-making in ‘industry’ were reported by some Board members and internal interviewees as considerable. In some cases this was reported to have caused a cautious, almost suspicious approach by individuals, the very opposite of the hoped-for openness.

Some tacit understanding of the challenges implied by this prospective culture clash was reported to have been in place when the Board was first being established, but there were no processes in place to develop individuals' capacity or to formalise ‘new ways of working’. It is also important to acknowledge the time needed for mutual understanding of different working styles and appropriate processes to develop in order to facilitate collaborative working.

Effecting change

As the success criteria for the Board was not well defined prior to its establishment, the success of the Board is likely to be understood differently, in typically tacit and informal ways, by different people. This, in turn, meant that it was challenging to assess the extent that the Board had achieved changes in the way that policy is developed and delivered between industry and government. Nevertheless, key insights from the research are:

- The Board was generally considered to be a ‘good idea’ in principle; and there have been some instances where the Board’s processes have been judged to be an improvement compared to the past. The Board was widely reported to have played a significant positive role in the development of the TB strategy.

- However many (especially external) stakeholders have seen little evidence of positive impact and are not (yet) convinced that the Board has a general advantage as a policy mechanism.

- The fact that the Board is so different from other engagement mechanisms between industry and government means that all those involved have not only had (to a certain extent) make it up as they go along, but there has been no other entity, or group of individuals, with whom they can share experiences and learn together.

Brook Lyndhurst’s analytical observations are as follows:

- Many factors - such as the mismatch between the Board’s scope and its resources, mechanisms for adapting; and blurred lines of accountability and/or responsibility between the Board and other entities\(^\text{53}\) have impacted on the Board’s ability to

\(^{53}\) A cited example is the Animal Health & Welfare Framework 2014-2015 which makes no reference to the Board
effect change. However, the interpretation of the findings also suggests that the current framing of the Board’s objectives (and thus the intended benefits assessed in this report) are not always sufficiently defined to enable a clear assessment of whether the Board has been effective or not. For example, ‘tackling difficult issues’ leaves scope for individual interpretation both in terms of whether an issue has been suitably ‘tackled’ or addressed and of what makes any particular issue ‘difficult’. Better defined and measurable objectives would both allow for more effective monitoring of progress and would also mean that progress can be more effectively demonstrated to stakeholders.

5.2 Lessons

This evaluation has not attempted formally to assess the ‘impact’ of the Animal Health and Welfare Board for England. Neither has it been concerned to say whether the Board’s efforts have been ‘successful’ or ‘unsuccessful’. As the evidence presented in section 3 makes clear, the Board’s first two years have included both positive and less positive experiences; but no aggregate assessment has been attempted or is implied.

Instead, the focus has been upon the Board’s activities – its processes – and the various issues and factors that have shaped those processes.

In this final section, the overarching framework is once again used to structure the lessons to have emerged from the research into the Board and our analysis of its processes.

These lessons draw upon the whole of the foregoing: insights from interviewees; the investigation of OPM and relevant examples; and the analysis of the Board’s processes and factors that have influenced those processes.

The lessons are intended to be of use to the three main audiences for this report:

- All those involved in or engaged with the AHWBE – the lessons should help to reflect upon and consider any and all future activity by the Board;
- Senior decision-makers in Defra – to assist decision-makers considering not just the Board but reflecting on the role of open-policy making across Defra as a whole;
- Policy makers across government interested in OPM – to provide insights from a specific example, to complement the ongoing work at the Cabinet Office.

We have identified nine key lessons:

Communication & engagement

1. Clarity on accountability
Novel policy development mechanisms are likely to interrupt existing lines of accountability in some way, shape or form; and it is important to overcome the potential negative consequences of this by being as clear as possible (and updating as frequently as possible) how and where responsibility lies. It should not be assumed that, simply because it is written down somewhere, or because it was agreed a year ago, that it is either appreciated or known.

2. **Personalities and processes**

During the initial and early phases of an innovation, the systems and procedures which, in a more mature setting, provide rules and guidance for interaction, are not yet in place. As a result, the pattern of personalities and inter-personal relationships of those involved with the innovation has a more significant role.

With increased dependence on inter-personal interaction, there is a corresponding increase in the significance of ‘personality’ (and the risk of ‘personality clash’) as a factor that needs to be taken into consideration. There are two implications:

- Firstly, the personalities of the lead figures in the innovation need carefully to be considered. In some cases it may make sense for one or more individuals with ‘disruptive’ personalities to have leadership responsibility; in other cases it may make more sense for leadership to work within existing structures. There is no ‘right’ or ‘wrong’; it will depend on circumstances. What matters, however, is that the matter is attended to, and that unintended consequences are avoided.

- Secondly, the pace at which operational systems and procedures are put in place will interact with personalities. Individuals that are accustomed to having a high degree of room for manoeuvre during the early phases of implementation may not be so suited to, or comfortable with, an emerging set of rules. Careful monitoring and management will be required to ensure, on the one hand, that nascent systems are not delayed or damaged by individuals that dislike or resent (even sub-consciously) the evolving rules; and, on the other hand, to ensure that the energies and commitment of those individuals is not depleted or wasted through the early or excessive imposition of new rules.

**Adaptability**

3. **New structures take time**

New approaches to making policy may imply new skills for existing policy makers; or may introduce individuals with a (relative) lack of skills. They may create conditions for ‘culture clash’; and new entities may take considerable time before developing sufficient capacity to fulfil their potential. There is no template for how much time might be required: but care should be taken not to reach a conclusion of ‘failure’ prematurely, nor to ascribe excessive responsibility too soon.
4. Learning mechanisms

New mechanisms for developing policy will be new for all of those involved; but different components of a new mechanism will be more-or-less new for different stakeholders. Since most, if not all, examples of OPM are context-specific, the precise mix of tools and techniques, of scale and responsibilities, of structures and people and so on, will be unique in each instance. Some elements of a new initiative might be familiar to some people; others may not.

A presumption that, simply because the new initiative was well thought through, it will work as intended is, needless to say, a risky presumption. Equally risky is to presume that a template will exist to address any and all eventualities during the inevitable ‘trial and error’ phase of an innovation.

Better, instead, to ensure that mechanisms to enable open and effective reflection on experiences and to adapt in the light of those experiences are built-in from the outset. Consideration should be given to the scope of such mechanisms (team/department/inter-departmental) as well their ability to include people with different mixes of experience; and participation in appropriate learning networks (such as that being developed by Cabinet Office) would seem eminently sensible.

5. Resilience

Potentially ‘good’ innovations may be snuffed out prematurely for a whole host of reasons; explicitly considering how a new mechanism can be made resilient to the inevitable ‘events’ that will surround its operation may help to reduce the risk that innovations may fail for the wrong reasons rather than the right ones.

Collaboration & partnership

6. Active promotion and support

Organisational change often produces anxiety among those who feel that the change may have some negative consequence for them. Individuals may feel that their status, a future promotion or even their job may be under threat. This can lead – as the literature on change management makes clear - to reactions ranging from outright hostility to ‘passive resistance’.

Repeatedly identified in that literature as the single most important factor in maximising the chances of success for an innovation, and in overcoming anxiety and/or resistance, is the active promotion of and support for the innovation by senior individuals.

Any and all innovations in policy making will need not just a head-line grabbing endorsement at the outset, but well-maintained signs of leadership support. The signals sent by disinterest may be unintended or inadvertent; but they are powerful nevertheless.
7. **Fit between responsibilities and resources**

Care should be taken to ensure there is a realistic fit between the responsibilities placed upon a new process or entity, on the one hand, and the resources and authority allocated to meet those responsibilities on the other. It will be important, too, to link with the learning mechanisms mentioned above and to ensure sufficient flexibility in the deployment of resources so as to adapt to circumstances.

**Openness**

8. **Transparency and risk management**

Openness and transparency are widely regarded as ‘good things’, but they carry risks that are often under acknowledged. Few organisations, professions or individuals are comfortable admitting to error in public, for example; yet greater transparency increases the possibility of such exposure.

Avowedly and transparently acknowledging this, and managing the change process accordingly, may help to reduce any anxiety or suspicion among individuals, teams or organisations affected by increased transparency. This may in turn increase the wider prospects either for success or for learning valuable lessons for the future. The Board’s TB conversations are a powerful illustration of this: many stakeholders (both internally and externally) commented on how refreshing and effective it was to have such open discussions about a difficult issue, and reported, too, how the willingness to talk openly – to take the risk of ‘exposure’ - may be one of the quickest ways of developing mutual trust.

**Effecting change**

9. **Change management processes**

Finally, it should not be supposed that an innovation in policy making will flourish in and of itself simply because it is a good idea. The number of factors that influence success – and which, conversely, represent a risk of failure – is large; and the scope of circumstances that might affect those factors is larger still. An active change management process is the most effective way of dealing with this reality, and should be an integrated element of the introduction of any innovation in the formulation or delivery of policy.
Annexes
Annex I – Brief history of the Board

A ‘Responsibility and Cost Sharing Advisory Group’ was established in 2010 to advise the Secretary of State on how best to implement this agenda. The group, chaired by Rosemary Radcliffe, comprised four senior officials within Defra and eleven industry representatives. It published a report in December 2010, the main recommendation of which was to create an ‘England Partnership Board’.54

The report specified that the strategic aim of the Board would be to reduce the risk and cost of animal disease and improve the welfare of kept animals, but also to rebuild and maintain trust between animal keepers and Defra, and enhance policy development and delivery processes.55

These recommendations directly led to the establishment of the Animal Health and Welfare Board for England on 26th April 2011. The set-up process began with the appointment of Michael Seals as the chair of the Board in August, followed by the recruitment of the first four non-executive board members shortly afterwards. The Board’s first meeting took place in November 2011, before two other non-executive board members were appointed in January 2012.

The appointment of all non-executive Board members followed a selection process that was managed by Defra officials, in accordance with the principles of the Office of the Commissioner for Public Appointments (OCPA) Code of Practice.

In addition to the non-executive members, the Board also comprises four executives. They include the UK’s Chief Veterinary Officer, the deputy Chief Veterinary Officer, the Chief Executive of the Animal Health and Veterinary Laboratories Agency (AHVLA), and the Defra director responsible for animal health and welfare policy. During the course of the evaluation, two executive board members moved on to take up new positions and they were subsequently replaced by their successors.

The recruitment of a chair and non-executive board members from industry to work alongside senior Defra officials was seen as a key mechanism for realising a vision of shared responsibility between industry and government.

Annex II - The Workings of the Board

The Animal Health and Welfare Board’s responsibilities cover the health and welfare of all kept animals (including companion animals and aquaculture), public health implications from animals and zoonosis across the following areas:

- setting the strategic policy and budget priorities within the available budget envelope;
- development of key policies and how they should be funded (including where appropriate charging regimes for funding these policies);
- assessment of the risk of threats from animal disease and how to manage these;
- determining what the surveillance and research priorities should be;
- the implementation of policy, commissioning its delivery and ensuring value for money by the relevant Defra agencies and other delivery organisations;
- the effectiveness and proportionality of the regulatory framework;
- approving the operational plans of the Animal Health and Veterinary Laboratories Agency in relation to animal health and welfare in England and monitoring the delivery of those plans;
- approving the operational plans of other delivery bodies in respect of animal health and welfare in England (e.g. CEFAS and FSA);
- the contingency plans for dealing with new disease outbreaks and for reviewing these plans on an annual basis (or as circumstances require). These should provide for speedy and effective day-to-day management of the outbreak by officials.

The Board’s activities are underpinned by a clear purpose, which is that it should support sustainable food production, enhance and maintain the competitiveness of the livestock industry, protect public health from animal-related threats and promote good health and welfare of all kept animals.

Furthermore, there are a number of principles beneath this broad purpose that shape the Board’s work. These include the need to ensure a fair division of costs and responsibilities between animal keepers and government, and the need for the Board’s actions to be transparent, evidence-based and to provide maximum value for money.56

The Board’s Terms of Reference make clear that the Board’s focus is on strategic, longer term and cross-cutting issues. Though it works on a range of different animal health and welfare issues, it currently has four priorities:

- Develop an affordable and comprehensive TB eradication strategy;
- Review compensation arrangements in the event of a disease outbreak;
- Produce a response to the Macdonald Review livestock movement recommendations;
- Agree a negotiating position for the EU Animal Health Law, which best serves England’s interests.

The Board conducts its business through a range of channels, including formal monthly Board meetings, engagement with internal and external stakeholders, establishment of sub-groups on specific issues, and by working alongside policy teams. The Board is supported by a secretariat, which currently comprises three Defra officers.

Each non-executive member is responsible for engaging with a portfolio of internal and external stakeholders that include Defra ministers and officials, the devolved administrations, the AHVLA, farming organisations, animal welfare organisations, and the media.

The Board sits within Defra as part of its internal decision-making processes (i.e. it is not set up as a Non-Departmental Public Body). Its authority is derived from a commitment made by Defra’s Minister of State at the time of the Board’s establishment, that the Board should be the principal source of advice on strategic animal health and welfare issues in England. Therefore although the Board has no formal legal status, it is charged with providing advice to ministers who are legally accountable to Parliament for decisions made. Ministers are expected to accept advice from the Board where it is the unanimous view of all members. If that is not the case, Ministers are expected to make public their reasons for taking a different view. Over the last two years the Board has advised Defra Ministers on a series of issues, including:

- Approach to updating Farm Animal Welfare Codes;
- New model for delivery of disease surveillance;
- National Equine Database;

---

- Changes to cattle movement controls;
- Call for views on Bovine TB;
- TB Eradication Strategy.
Annex III - Research methodology

a. Aims

The Board’s terms of reference state a commitment to evaluate progress made by the Board, two years after it was established. The evaluation was commissioned by Defra in September 2012, with two key aims:

3. To assess the extent that the Board has been effective in building trust with the industry, improving Defra policy making through enhanced stakeholder engagement, and encouraging animal keepers to take greater responsibility for animal health and welfare issues.

4. To consider the contribution the Board has made to opening out policy with respect to animal health and welfare issues and the Open Policy Making agenda.

b. Approach

Defra commissioned Brook Lyndhurst to conduct the evaluation of the Board. The approach developed by Brook Lyndhurst to assess the Board’s progress was qualitative in nature and involved three main elements of evidence gathering:

- Interviews with stakeholders to inform an initial assessment of the Board’s set up and early progress;
- On-going monitoring of the Board’s activities during its second year of operation;
- A further programme of in-depth interviews to conduct a detailed assessment of the Board’s progress against its expected benefits.

In the months that followed the baseline interviews, the research team and the Defra steering group observed a growing emphasis on the open policy and accountability agenda in government, as part of Civil Service Reform. Both recognised the potential contribution the evaluation could make to the agenda, by increasing the emphasis of the research on the Board’s contribution to open policy.

For this reason, the third phase of the research was reconfigured to focus more resources on this broader objective, while continuing to assess the Board’s progress against its expected impacts. The programme of follow up interviews was replaced with the following activities:

- A brief desk-based review of the open policy agenda and discussions with selected experts;
• Follow up research with stakeholders in two workshops (one for external stakeholders and one for internal stakeholders), together with a series of short follow up conversations;

• A small number of one-on-one interviews with the Defra minister and senior officials.

An overview of the final approach is summarised in figure 2, followed by a description of each phase of the research.

**Figure 4 – Final evaluation approach**

**Source: Brook Lyndhurst**

**Phase 1 – Baseline research**

The purpose of the first phase was to gather factual information about the Board’s set up and early period of operation and to assess its early impacts.

The process began with an inception process which included a meeting with the Defra steering group to discuss the research objectives and approach, an appraisal of proposed stakeholders to be invited to interview as part of the research, and a review of background materials relevant to the establishment of the Board.

Following the inception period, a programme of semi-structured one-to-one interviews were undertaken with stakeholders. A discussion guide was developed to steer the interviews through a series of key themes, according to the knowledge and experiences of each type of interviewee; internal stakeholders, external stakeholders and Board members. Each version of the topic guide – one for each type of interviewee – are presented in annex IV.

Once the Defra steering group had signed off the topic guides, the research team set up and conducted discussions with individuals who had been involved with the Board during its set up and early development.
Research participants included representatives of relevant industry bodies, the devolved administrations and government delivery agencies (such as the Food Standards Agency) – or ‘external’ stakeholders. Participants also included members of the Board and the Secretariat, as well as senior Defra officials who work closely with the Board and Defra ministers (in post since the Board was established) – referred to as ‘internal’ stakeholders.

The research team and steering group devised a series of criteria for recruiting participants in order to cover as wide range of perspectives as possible within the boundaries of the research. This included representatives of different farming sectors and animal species, some of whom had been heavily involved with the Board since it was established and others who had rarely been engaged.60

While every effort was made to engage with a wide range of stakeholders who had been involved in the early development of the Board, it was recognised that some relevant individuals may not have been included in the process. Those who were not formally approached for interview were therefore invited to submit comments to the Secretariat, via the Board’s webpages.

Despite this, the views of relevant individuals and/or organisation may not have been included. This implies a degree of bias in the findings, according to the views of those who participated at the time at which the research was undertaken. The views expressed by those consulted cannot therefore be considered representative of all individuals who interact with, or work on, the Board.

46 individuals were consulted during initial research (a list of all those who participated in the research is provided in annex VII).

Notes of key discussion points were taken during the interviews and the conversations were recorded so they could be transcribed for detailed analysis.61

The qualitative data from the interviews was coded and entered into an analytical framework for preliminary analysis by the research team. The key findings and initial insights were then presented to the Board, so that the recommendations from the research could inform the Board’s development over the year ahead. Further transcript analysis was carried out following this meeting, to refine results and address issues raised by the Board. The final conclusions and recommendations from the baseline research were presented in an interim report, which was submitted to the steering group in December 2012.

60 46 individuals were interviewed during the baseline research and 44 were engaged in the follow up research (either in the form of a one-on-one interview or a small workshop). 23 research participants were engaged during both rounds of research, while others were only engaged once (predominantly due to staff replacements or changing responsibilities). For further information on the research process see Annex III.

61 Transcripts and recordings are stored securely and will be deleted after the evaluation is completed, in accordance with Brook Lyndhurst’s data protection policy.
Phase 2 – Monitoring

In the months between the first and second wave of formal research, the Board’s activities were periodically monitored by the research team. This entailed monitoring media coverage of the Board’s activities, reviewing meeting minutes and other documents published by the Board, and attending the Board’s Annual General Meeting in April 2013.

Phase 3 – Follow up research

The purpose of the third phase of research was to conduct a full assessment of the Board’s progress since it was established and to consider the contribution the model has made to open policy. It comprised three main activities: (1) a rapid review of the open policy agenda (2) follow up engagement with stakeholders consulted during the first wave of the research, and (3) full analysis and reporting of the evaluation findings.

The research team began by conducting a short desk-based review of existing evidence about the theory and practice of open policy. This involved a non-systematic review of key documents identified via an online research and in consultation with the steering group, together with selected discussions with experts working in the field of open policy and accountability. A list of the literature reviewed during this exercise is presented in annex V and individuals consulted as part of the process are included in the list of research participants in annex VII.

This initial review of current evidence and practice of open policy revealed a lack of clarity surrounding the definition of ‘open policy’, with various attempts to characterise the key elements open policy in government in the literature. The research team discussed the findings with the steering group and decided to use the Cabinet Office’s seven ‘Components of Open Policy Making’ as a means of assessing the extent that the Board has initiated greater openness in animal health and welfare policy.62

The next stage of the evaluation involved the design and delivery of two workshops with stakeholders who participated during the first phase of the evaluation. Stakeholders were invited to attend one of two workshops: one for internal interviewees (including Board members, Defra officials and the AHWBE secretariat) and one for external interviewees (including representatives from industry and welfare organisations, devolved administrations and government agencies).

Each workshop began with an overview of the interim findings from the evaluation, before participants were asked to work in small groups to discuss the Board’s progress over the previous 12 months against its expected benefits:

- Effective engagement with industry;

---

• Build trust and support;
• Sector supported communications;
• Tackling difficult issues;
• Openness in decision-making;
• Genuine partnerships in policy development and delivery;
• Animal keepers taking greater responsibility;
• Stimulating innovation and best practice to ensure value for money;
• Proportionate and effective regulation.

Participants were asked to consider the Board’s impact on these areas and whether (if at all) the Board’s presence differed from the previous way of developing and delivering policy on strategic animal health and welfare issues. Participants were encouraged to describe any successes or challenges they had observed in relation to the Board’s activities and put forward suggestions for how the Board might progress in the future. In all cases, participants were encouraged to provide specific examples that supported their opinions.

In the second half of the workshops, participants were invited to consider whether the Board had contributed to greater openness in animal health and welfare policy. The session began with a short presentation on open policy, including an overview of the Cabinet Office’s Components of Open Policy Making. Following a general discussion, participants were asked to consider whether each component was relevant to the Board and, if so, the extent that the Board had had effected change on each area.

Workshop participants were sent a feedback form after the workshop, to invite them to provide additional comments that they may not have felt comfortable raising during the workshop (annex VI).

A total of 24 stakeholders attended the workshops. The majority of individual present were interviewed during the first phase of the evaluation. Other participants attended in place of a colleague who was unavailable on the day, or who had left their post since the baseline research. In addition to the workshops, the research team conducted a number of follow up interviews with stakeholders who were unable to attend, and with numerous workshop participants who wished to provide more detailed feedback on the Board’s progress to the research team.

Finally, a series of in-depth one-on-one interviews were held with the Defra Minister and senior Defra officials, as it was not appropriate to invite them to attend the internal stakeholder workshop (see annex VII for full list of participants).
Once the programme of follow up engagement was complete, the research team analysed the findings alongside the results from the baseline research, to assess the Board’s overall progress from when it was established in 2011.

The conclusions and implications from the research were presented to the steering group in a final report (this document). The report was produced in accordance with Defra’s reporting guidelines and incorporates the steering group’s feedback in two rounds of revisions.

c. Review of the approach

As independent evaluators commissioned by Defra to assess the impact of a new system of governance for developing and delivering animal health and welfare policy, Brook Lyndhurst’s approach was based upon three principles:

- **Confidentiality** – All of the evidence provided by research participants was treated in the strictest of confidence. The findings presented in the interim and final reports were fully anonymous. In some cases, qualitative insights were redacted to prevent identification of the source;

- **Transparency** – The process and findings of the evaluation are presented by the research team as fully as possible within the bounds of confidentiality;

- **Impartiality** – A wide range of individuals’ were invited to contribute to the evaluation. Every effort was made by the research team to represent participants’ views in a balanced light.

While it was felt that the research approach was suitable for addressing the research aims, a number of weaknesses were identified:

(a) Interviewee bias - Every effort was made to include a wide range of stakeholder views in the research. Practical and budgetary constraints meant that it was not possible to consult everybody who had come into contact with the Board since it was established, however. Furthermore it is not known how representative the views of those who participated in the research were in relation to the whole population of stakeholders surrounding the Board. In addition, due to the presence of this bias, it cannot always be assumed that the Board’s activities did not have an impact in the absence of evidence presented by stakeholders engaged in the research.

(b) Securing participation of experts on open policy - The research team had hoped to conduct telephone discussions with 6-8 experts across academia and government, working on open policy. Despite efforts to engage this community, only four individuals were available to participate. The low level of participation necessarily limited the
robustness of the review on open policy. It also prevented the research team convening a meeting to discuss the preliminary review of open policy with a wider group of experts in this field.
Annex IV - Discussion guides (phase 1)

Three discussion guides were developed to accommodate the experiences different groups of interviewees (boxes 1-3 below):

- ‘Board interview guide’ for use in interviews with the chair and Board members;
- ‘External interview guide’ for use in interviews with representatives from organisations representing different species and farming sectors, as well as other government departments and agencies;
- ‘Defra official interview guide’ for use in interviews with official who are not members of the Board.

The following points were made at the beginning of each:

- The purpose of project to evaluate the set up and effectiveness of the Board and to shape its development over the coming months. The purpose is not to evaluate individual Board members therefore, but the processes of the Board as a whole;
- The research process will include initial interviews with stakeholders, feedback of provisional findings to the Board in November, on-going monitoring of the Board’s activities, follow up research with same group of stakeholders one year on, before the full results of the evaluation will be presented in a final report;
- Each interview will last a maximum of one hour and will explore individuals’ experiences of the Board and impressions of early impacts;
- All interviews are strictly confidential – any opinions expressed in feedback to the Board or in the evaluation report will be non-attributable;
- An open and honest discussion is encouraged;
- Permission is sought to record all interviews, in order to transcribe them. All recordings and transcriptions will be stored securely.

**Box 1 – Board member discussion guide**

**Background and interests (5 mins)**

Can you start off by telling me a bit about what you do outside of your role on the Board?

*(Explore knowledge/experience, broader connectedness with government/industry, involvement with different sectors/industry organisations)*
Understanding of historical context and key processes (10 mins)
Can you explain to me the reasons why the Board was established?
(Explore understanding of the context, rationale for development, spontaneous mention of its intended purpose)

What is the role of the Board, as you see it?
How does this differ from the ‘old’ way of developing and implementing policy?
What are your expectations of this new approach?

Can you describe the processes in place to identify suitable issues that should be addressed by the Board?
Do you think that this is the right way to go about this? Why?
What other approaches might be helpful for focussing the Board’s activities?
What processes are in place to involve external stakeholders and advisory groups in the Board’s activities?
How does this compare with previous methods for engaging stakeholders? Why? (I.e. is this better worse or just too early to know?)
What outcomes do you foresee from this approach?
How realistic do you think it is to replace traditional ways of working with this new approach?

Responsibilities and relationships (10 mins)
When was it that you became a member of the Board? What was the process that you went through when being selected?
Did becoming a member of the Board introduce you to others with whom you had not previously worked with?
If so, to what extent have you had the opportunity to build relationships with the other members?

Can you tell me a bit more about your role as a Board member?

And what are the responsibilities of Board members?
To what extent do you feel you personally have been able to fulfil these over the last year or so? Why?
And to what extent do you feel others on the Board have been able to do so? Why do you say that?

Prompt:
Contributing actively and constructively
Building good relationships with one another
Ensuring effective working with the Board
Leading a communication portfolio
Representing the Board externally
Building effective working relationships with Defra officials

How are you managing the balance between these obligations and your other work, roles and responsibilities? (implicit reference to conflict of interest and commitment/time invested in the role)

Broad impacts and outcomes to-date (20 mins)
Thinking more broadly about the Board’s role, what do you think its impacts have been so far?
Why? What examples do you have to support this?
Prompt:
Tackling complex or difficult issues?
Quality and appropriateness of policy development & delivery?
Assessing risk and contingency planning?
Demonstrating value for money in policy making?
Encouraging animal keepers to maintain and improve health and welfare?

To what extent do you feel the Board’s engagement with stakeholders has succeeded in:
In seeking advice and support from stakeholders? Why?
Improving openness in decision-making? Why?
In communicating the implications of policy decisions to industry? Why?
In fostering collaborative relationships between government and industry? Why?
Encouraging industry to take responsibility for health and welfare issues?

Are there any other outcomes which you have observed?

Suggestions for improving the Board’s effectiveness going forward (5 mins)
What are the Board’s greatest challenges over the coming months and years ahead? Why?
What are the most pressing issues to address? Why do you say that?
Who is best placed to tackle these issues? (e.g. the chair, individual members, other stakeholders)
Do you have any suggestions for how the Board could progress across some of the areas we have just discussed?

Thank you and close (5 mins)
Reaffirm confidentiality. Inform interviewee that the initial findings of the research will be presented at the next Board meeting on 6th November.
Box 2 – External discussion guide

Background and interests (5 mins)
Can you start off by telling me a bit about what you do? Your role?
(Explore knowledge/expertise, seniority, connectedness with industry & government, sectors/organisations/interests represented)

Awareness of the Board and historical context (15 mins)
Can you tell me what you know about the Board?
(Explore awareness and understanding of the Board including: its structure; who is involved; its intended purpose; coverage of issues/sectors; specific activities undertaken)

Do you know why the Board was established?
If so, can you tell me what its role is, as you see it?
(If not, explain that the Board was set up in 2011 as a way of creating a direct link between those making policy and those affected by the delivery of that policy. Explain that the Board is part of the internal structure of Defra and comprises non-executive members and senior government officials. Highlight that the Board’s role is to provide Ministers with advice on strategic animal health and welfare matters in England, drawing support and advice from a range of stakeholders and advisory groups).

How do you think this approach differs from the previous way of involving stakeholders in the development and delivery of policy?

What are your expectations of this new approach?
(Listen for references to perceived openness, support, and fairness, joint-working and cost-cutting in the past and looking forward.)

Are you aware of the kinds of things the Board has been working on?
(If no, give some examples such as farm animal welfare codes, bovine TB strategy, determining research priorities, disease surveillance and risk, consulting with advisory groups and stakeholders and communicating decisions made).

Do you know what processes are in place to communicate with external stakeholders about the Board’s activities?
What do you understand the purpose of these processes to be?
(if not known, explain that external Board members will communicate regularly with the relevant sectors to be able to articulate the views and concerns of those groups and interests, as well as communicating the implications of Board decisions with those sectors).

How do you think this compares with previous methods for engaging stakeholders in government
decision-making? Why?

Interactions with the Board and perceived effectiveness (5 mins)
What interactions have you had with the Board to-date (if any)?
(Explore nature and extent of interactions, noting down any broad communications they have had and who they were delivered by (in particular direct communication from Board members).

Can you tell me a bit more about (one of) these experiences?
What was the nature of the issues discussed? (i.e. seeking advice or support, informing about a Board decision or explaining action required by others)
Who was it that you engaged with? Did it come from the right spokesperson, in your opinion?
Were the communications helpful?
Did anything result from the interaction? If not, what you have liked to have seen?

Broad impacts and outcomes to-date (20 mins)
Thinking more broadly again about the Board’s role, what do you think its impacts have been so far? Why?
What examples do you have to support this?
Prompt:
Tackling complex or difficult issues?
Developing policies which are relevant and fit for purpose?
Assessing risk and contingency planning?
Encouraging responsibility amongst animal keepers for health and welfare?

To what extent do you feel the Board's engagement with stakeholders has succeeded in:
In seeking advice and support from stakeholders? Why?
Improving openness in decision-making? Why?
In communicating the implications of policy decisions to industry? Why?
In building a sense of responsibility for welfare within industry?
In fostering collaborative relationships between government and industry? Why?

Are there any other outcomes which you have observed?

Suggestions for improving the Board’s effectiveness going forward (5 mins)
As the Board continues to develop over the coming months and years, do you have any suggestions for how it could progress across the areas we have just discussed?

Thank you and close (5 mins)
Box 3 – Defra official discussion guide

**Background and interests (5mins)**
Can you (each of you) start off by telling me a bit about what you do? Your role(s)?
(Explore knowledge/expertise, seniority, connectedness with the Board, sector/AHW issues represented)

**Understanding of historical context and key processes (15 mins)**
Can you tell me what you know about the Board?
(Explore unprompted awareness and understanding of structure, function, coverage of issues/sectors, specific activities etc.)

Can you explain the reasons why the Board was established?
What is the role of the Board as you see it?
How does this differ from the ‘old’ way of developing and implementing policy?
What are your expectations of this new approach?

Can you describe the processes in place to identify suitable issues that should be addressed by the Board?
Do you think that this is the right way to go about this? Why?
What other approaches might be helpful for focussing the Board’s activities?

What processes are in place to involve external stakeholders and advisory groups in the Board’s activities?
How does this compare with previous methods for engaging stakeholders? Why? *(I.e. is this better/worse or just too early to know?)*
What outcomes do you foresee from this approach?
How realistic do you think it is to replace traditional ways of working with this new approach?

**Internal roles and responsibilities (20 mins)**
Can you tell me more about how your individual role(s) and responsibilities relate to those of the Board?
What processes are in place to enable you to work with/through the Board?
How effective do you feel these have been to-date? Why?
Is there anything you would change about how the Board operates or internal systems operate, to...
enable you to fulfil your role? Why? Can you give examples?

Broad impacts to-date (20 mins)
Thinking more broadly again about the Board’s role, what do you think its impacts have been so far? Why? What examples can you give to support this?

Prompt:
Involving stakeholders in decision-making/communicating how decisions are made?
Tackling complex or difficult issues?
Quality and appropriateness of policy development & delivery?
Assessing risk and contingency planning?
Demonstrating value for money in policy making?
Encouraging animal keepers to maintain and improve health and welfare?

Are there any other outcomes which you have observed?

Suggestions for improving the Board’s effectiveness going forward (5 mins)
What are the Board’s greatest challenges over the coming months and years ahead? Why?
What are the most pressing issues to address? Why do you say that?
Who is best placed to tackle these issues? (e.g. the chair, individual members, other stakeholders)
Do you have any suggestions for how the Board could progress across the areas we have discussed?

Thank you and close (5 mins)
Reaffirm confidentiality. Inform interviewee that the initial findings of the research will be presented at the Board away day on 6th November and that the interim findings from the evaluation will be summarised in a report to Defra by the end of December.
Annex V - Open policy references (phase 3)


Civil Service (2013) Civil Service Reform Plan - One year on.


Office of First Minister and Deputy First Minister (2003) A practical guide to policy making in Northern Ireland.


## Annex VI - Feedback form (phase 3)

### Part 1 - Assessing the Board’s impact

**Q1:** What do you think the impact of the Board has been across the following areas?

- Effective engagement with industry
- Build trust and support
- Tackling difficult issues
- Openness in decision-making
- Genuine partnerships in policy development & delivery
- Animal keepers taking greater responsibility
- Stimulating innovation and best practice to ensure value for money
- Proportionate and effective regulation
- Sector supported communications

**Q2:** How, if at all, does this differ from the old way of doing things? What examples do you have to support this?

**Q3:** What, if any, have the challenges been with any changes you have observed?
Q4: Do you have any suggestions for how the Board might progress on these areas in the future?

Part 2 – Reviewing the Board’s contribution to Open Policy Making

Q1: How collaborative, or open, has AHWBE been against the following measures? (Please respond by marking each measure on the scale below and provide a brief explanation of your response (also see annex 1 for explanation of measures)):

- Shared power
- Cross Boundary teams
- Joint accountability
- Transparency
- Direct access to ministers
- Real world testing
- Iteration
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2. Has this resulted in better policy? (What examples do you have?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. What three recommendations do you have for the Board to develop in the future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any further comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex VII - List of research participants

Almost 70 individuals participated in the evaluation. Table 1 provides a list of all those who contributed, either in the initial research, the follow up research or both. Please note, the names and job titles of research participants included in this list were correct at the time of the research.63

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ailsa Wight</td>
<td>Department of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alick Simmons</td>
<td>Executive board member of AHWBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Opie</td>
<td>British Retail Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryl Williams</td>
<td>Defra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine McLaughlin</td>
<td>National Farmers Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Dodds</td>
<td>Livestock Auctioneers Association Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Hadkiss</td>
<td>Executive board member of AHWBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Mallon</td>
<td>National Beef Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dagmar Droogsma</td>
<td>Defra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Bowles</td>
<td>RSPCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Calpin</td>
<td>Acting executive member of AHWBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Clarke</td>
<td>Assured Food Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Heath MP</td>
<td>Minister of state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Christianne Glossop</td>
<td>Chief Veterinary Officer for Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Barker</td>
<td>Country Land and Business Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemma Harper</td>
<td>Defra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Jeffries</td>
<td>Defra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqui Molyneux</td>
<td>Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Yeates</td>
<td>RSPCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Rogers</td>
<td>British Equestrian Federation/The Horse Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier Dominguez</td>
<td>Food Standards Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

63 This list does not include the details of research participants who did not wish to be cited.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jill Rutter</td>
<td>Institute for Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Paice MP</td>
<td>House of Commons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Scudamore</td>
<td>Pig Health and Welfare Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Rushton</td>
<td>Non-executive board member of AHWBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Pierce</td>
<td>Acting executive member of AHWBE</td>
</tr>
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<td>Kathryn Packer</td>
<td>Defra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katrina Williams</td>
<td>Defra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>British and Irish Association of Zoos and Aquariums</td>
</tr>
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<td>Executive board member of AHWBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Food Standards Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Soulsby</td>
<td>Companion Animal Welfare Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Tufnell</td>
<td>Non-executive board member of AHWBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Williams</td>
<td>British Egg Industry Confederation</td>
</tr>
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<td>Michael Seals</td>
<td>Chairman of AHWBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda Stevenson</td>
<td>British and Irish Association of Zoos and Aquariums</td>
</tr>
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<td>Executive board member of AHWBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>The Horse Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Baber</td>
<td>Sheep Health &amp; Welfare Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Bradnack</td>
<td>British Poultry Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Jones</td>
<td>British Veterinary Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Scott</td>
<td>Companion Animal Sector Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Stevenson</td>
<td>Compassion in World Farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Unwin</td>
<td>Defra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>National Farmer Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>National Beef Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Stocker</td>
<td>National Sheep Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Gerry Stoker</td>
<td>University of Southampton</td>
</tr>
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<td>Defra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Pascual</td>
<td>Cabinet office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Davis</td>
<td>Non-executive member AHWBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Drummond</td>
<td>Defra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Hargreaves</td>
<td>British Veterinary Association</td>
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<td>Defra</td>
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<td>Defra</td>
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<td>Defra</td>
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<td>Chief Veterinary Officer for Scotland</td>
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<td>Simon Bates</td>
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<tr>
<td>Stella Michael-Sargeant</td>
<td>Department of Communities and Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Young</td>
<td>National Animal Health and Welfare Panel</td>
</tr>
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<td>Stewart Houston</td>
<td>Non-executive board member of AHWBE</td>
</tr>
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<td>Stuart Roberts</td>
<td>Non-executive board member of AHWBE</td>
</tr>
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<td>Sue Ellis</td>
<td>Defra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Brigstocke</td>
<td>Cattle Health and Welfare Council</td>
</tr>
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<td>Tim Morris</td>
<td>Non-executive board member of AHWBE</td>
</tr>
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<td>Tom Taylor</td>
<td>Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board</td>
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<td>Defra</td>
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<td>National Pig Association</td>
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