



African Union

Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources

**SUPPORT PROGRAMME
TO INTEGRATED NATIONAL ACTION PLANS
ON AVIAN AND HUMAN INFLUENZA
SPINAP-AHI**

**Regional Coordination Mechanisms for
Avian and Human Influenza and
other Transboundary Diseases**

Workshop Report

Naivasha / Kenya 19—21 October 2009

Contents

Acknowledgements	<u>42</u>
List of acronyms	<u>52</u>
1 Executive summary	<u>62</u>
2 Opening session	<u>72</u>
Director AU-IBAR speech	<u>72</u>
Overview of the SPINAP programme	<u>72</u>
Discussion and comments	<u>82</u>
3 Presentations from Regional Economic Communities	<u>92</u>
SADC presentation	<u>92</u>
ECCAS presentation	<u>92</u>
Discussion and comments on SADC and ECCAS presentations	<u>102</u>
4 Presentations by technical organizations (partners)	<u>122</u>
OIE presentation	<u>122</u>
FAO/ECTAD presentation	<u>132</u>
WHO-AFRO presentation	<u>132</u>
Discussion on OIE, FAO/ECTAD and WHO/AFRO presentations	<u>142</u>
5 AU-IBAR Strategic Plan	<u>162</u>
Specific areas of the IBAR mandate include:	<u>162</u>
The core functions are to:	<u>172</u>
IBAR Strategic Thrusts	<u>172</u>
Discussions on AU-IBAR Strategy	<u>172</u>
6 Group discussions	<u>182</u>
Day 2 morning session	<u>182</u>
Group 1 report	<u>182</u>
Group 2 report	<u>202</u>
Group 3 report	<u>222</u>
Day 2 afternoon session	<u>262</u>
Group 1 report on task force	<u>262</u>
Group 2 report on information needs	<u>272</u>
Group 3 report on Inter-REC coordination	<u>282</u>
Day 3 discussions	<u>282</u>
Group 1 report on what technical organizations can contribute	<u>282</u>
Group 2 report on how technical organizations can contribute	<u>292</u>
7 Workshop recommendations	<u>302</u>
Preamble	<u>302</u>
8 The road map	<u>322</u>
▪ STEP 0: Develop and Finalize TORs for a Task Force	<u>322</u>
▪ STEP 1: Review and summarize information from INAP/PVS	<u>322</u>
▪ STEP 2: Verification of information from Step 1	<u>322</u>
▪ STAGE 3: Consolidation	<u>322</u>
▪ TIME LINES	<u>322</u>

- CHALLENGES
- SUGGESTIONS

332
332

9 Annexes

342

Acknowledgements

This workshop would not have been possible without the blessings of the director AU-IBAR. The financial support of both AU-IBAR and the EC through the SPINAP program for organization and participants is highly appreciated.

Many thanks to our technical partners, the FAO, OIE and WHO for dedicating time and human resources to take part in this important workshop.

To the RECs that found time to participate, we say thank you as we embark on the unique but necessary journey of operationalizing key linkages for better coordination, especially of technical inputs between and within RECs.

To all the participants, many thanks for active and constructive participation. We feel inter-connected in the journey forward and will continue to look to your individual and collective contribution.

Many thanks to the SPINAP AHI Program Coordination unit Staff for excellent conceptual and physical inputs into the concept.

Various other people contributed to the organization, logistics and in other ways that made the workshop a success. To them all, many thanks and congratulations.

List of acronyms

AI	Avian Influenza
AHI	Avian and Human Influenza
ARIS	Animal Resource Information System
AUC	African Union Commission
AU-IBAR	Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources
CAADP	Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme
CEBEVIRHA	Commission Economique Du Betail, De La Viande Et Des Ressources Halieutiques
EAC	East African Community
ECCAS	Economic Commission of Central African States
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
ECTAD	Emergency Centre for Trans-boundary Animal Diseases
EID	Emerging Infectious Diseases
FANR	Food, Agriculture & Natural Resources
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GF-TADs	The Global Framework for the Progressive Control of Trans-boundary Animal Diseases
GLEWS	Global Early Warning and Response System for Major Animal Diseases including Zoonoses
HPAI	Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza
IGAD	Inter-Governmental Authority on Development
LTC	Livestock Technical Committee
ND	Newcastle Disease
NEPAD	New Partnership for African development
NGO	Non-Governmental Organizations
OIE	World Organisation for Animal Health
OFFLU	OIE/FAO Network of Expertise on Animal Influenza
OWOH	One World One Health
RA	Rapid Assessment
RAHCs	Regional Animal Health Centres
REC	Regional Economic Community
SADC	Southern Africa Development Community
SPINAP	Support Program to the Integrated National Action Plans
TADs	Trans-boundary Animal Diseases
WAHIS	World Animal Health Information System
WAHID	World Animal Health Information Database
WHO	World Health Organization of the United Nations

I Executive summary

The African Union-Interafrican Bureau for Animal resources (AU-IBAR) organized a meeting on regional coordination mechanisms for Avian Influenza (AI) and other Trans-boundary diseases (TADs) at the Holiday Inn Hotel, Nairobi from 19th to 21st October 2009. The main objectives of the meeting was to review the current coordination arrangements at regional level, discuss their strengthening, build consensus and agree on a road map to support the strengthening of coordination of AHI/TADs within and between RECs with key partners, namely World Organization for Animal Health (OIE), Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), World Health Organization (WHO) and Regional Economic Communities (RECs). A total of 17 participants drawn from the partner organizations, Regional Economic Communities (RECs) and IBAR attended the meeting. To achieve the objective, the representatives made presentations on the current activities and coordination strategies of their respective organizations and between partner organizations, which were followed by in-depth plenary discussions and group-work sessions.

Discussions following the presentation identified the need for a clear road map to be developed by AU-IBAR, in close collaboration with partner international organizations to identify priorities for coordination activities at regional level, including coordination mechanisms at RECs level.

The meeting recommended that a rapid appraisal of current situation of coordination mechanisms between and within the RECs be undertaken through a dialogue between AU-IBAR and RECs, including validation or collection of additional information through targeted field missions to enable the development of a framework to guide the coordination agenda at the regional level. The meeting further urged partners to explore ways of reviewing and strengthening the collaboration between the RECs and Regional Animal Health Centres (RAHCs); and to schedule a regular forum between the partners for information exchange, assessment of progress in implementation of coordination activities and joint action planning. Greater involvement of human health and wildlife sectors in regional coordination mechanisms on the prevention and control of TADs and zoonoses at a regional level rather than focusing on a single disease entity was emphasized. The meeting further recommended strengthening of advocacy at REC policy level for human resource capacity development, mobilization to support coordination and raise investment in livestock and human health systems to support poverty alleviation. Supporting the strengthening of regional level coordination is to be carried out hand in hand with capacity building to ensure sustainability. Technical agencies represented at the forum agreed in principle to provide relevant inputs in a timely and consistent manner to ensure success of the action within the context of their respective areas of responsibility while AU-IBAR committed itself to effective coordination and facilitation including financial support of the work program using resources available within the Support Program to the Integrated National Action Plans (SPINAP) program.

2 Opening session

Session Chair: Dr. Cagnolati, Vittorio – Alive Secretariat, AU-IBAR

After self introduction, the Chair invited the Director AU-IBAR to make his opening speech.

Director AU-IBAR speech

Dr. Ahmed El Sawahly the Director AU-IBAR, welcomed the participants to the meeting. He noted that this was a unique meeting being the first time that representatives of Regional Economic Communities (RECs) and lead international technical agencies on animal health (FAO and OIE) and human health (WHO) were meeting to discuss ways of strengthening regional coordination mechanisms for the control of Avian Influenza (AI) and other trans-boundary animal diseases (TADs).

The Director affirmed that AU-IBAR recognized the importance of a regional approach in the fight against AI and other TADs, noting that this was a key lesson learned during the implementation of SPINAP. He stated that much support on the fight against HPAI had been directed at country level interventions and much still remained to be done to strengthen cross-border and regional coordination mechanisms. He noted that such mechanisms were necessary for effective control of diseases due to their trans-boundary nature. He reiterated the value of effective regional coordination in creating synergy of partnerships and better delivery of animal and public health services to AUC Member States. He further noted that it was AU-IBAR's core mandate as a technical organ of the African Union Commission (AUC) to coordinate animal resource matters on the continent through the RECs.

Overview of the SPINAP programme

The SPINAP Continental coordinator, Dr. Samuel Muriuki gave background information on the origins of the SPINAP programme. He identified the lessons learnt on the weakness points during the implementation of SPINAP. Among these included the targeting of INAP/IAP, which were purely intra-country and had no inter-country linkages. He further identified inter-country capacity disparities; resource gaps and channelling mechanisms in the countries and weak inter-sectoral and inter-agency coordination mechanisms as other areas where an effective regional coordination mechanism would provide the necessary impact. Dr. Muriuki noted that the INAPs, which form the back bone of SPINAP support to countries, were designed to address intra-country issues and had few or no inter-country linkages. Had there been an inter-country mechanism, then, countries with better capacities could support the weaker ones if good coordination mechanism existed. While INAPS provided entry points and means for action, clear plans with a stronger inter-agency coordination could have provided a clear direction for a regional coordination mechanism. He cited the growing trend where RECs have been proposed to host various networks as an indication that they are gaining recognition as institutions that can provide both coordination and sustainability of initiatives on a regional basis.

Dr Muriuki indicated that the main objective of the meeting was to review the current situation of coordination mechanism at regional level with its main partners, namely OIE, FAO, WHO and RECs in order to generate ideas for an objective and progressive approach to coordination and capacity development for effective management of AHI and other zoonoses (emerging/re-emerging) in Africa. In summary, he emphasized that there was need for better coordination of AI (and other TADs) activities and strengthening of capacities within and between the

RECs. This was the main thrust of the meeting. Better coordination of the management of AI and TADs is also necessary at the continental level. There was therefore a need for assessment of existing frameworks in the regional and at inter-regional levels and identification of the best way forward to achieve better coordination. Five RECs: ECOWAS, ECCAS, EAC&IGAD and SADC were invited for initial discussions and also as the potential entry points for the follow-on activities. Other RECs would be considered taking cognisance of the AUC recognition and recommendations on RECs.

Discussion and comments

During the discussion, issues were raised on clarification as to the approach the international partners were expected to take while playing their coordination roles at inter-REC and intra-RECs levels. It was pointed out that while the presentation by Dr. Muriuki heavily relied on the INAP process to identify gaps, there was no clear tool for such an assessment at the regional level. It was indicated that while there were weaknesses in the inter-country and Inter-REC coordination, some mechanisms existed within the framework of international partners that could be exploited to achieve the goal. One such a mechanism identified during the meeting was the Global Framework for the Progressive Control of Transboundary Animal Diseases (GF-TADS).

However, a significant proportion of the participants argued that the existing mechanisms, especially GF-TADS was too high up and of a global calibre and lacked suitable arrangements for intra and inter REC coordination of technical aspects as desired within the African Union protocol and relationships with RECs. However, there was consensus that further work on the issue should take cognisance of the global coordination mechanisms with the view of creating functional linkages to avoid duplication and/or conflict of roles.

Participants further noted that cooperation between animal and human health sectors at the regional level (RECs) was quite weak. Possible reasons cited included lack of resources, poor political will, capacity, conservative attitude among the sector personnel, lack of supportive policies and clarity on areas of collaboration. There was therefore a need to enhance awareness to governments to address this within the countries. It was however, agreed that there was no need to dwell much on the past but focus at the new environment that was being supported internationally especially through the one-world-one-health (OWOH) concept. Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI) outbreaks catalysed the creation of Regional Animal Health Centres (RAHCs) which were now platforms that should be utilized for coordination mechanisms at the Regional Economic Communities (RECs) while better concrete plans were being developed. It was noted that the main players at the RAHCs were OIE, FAO and AU-IBAR, the same organizations that have activities at the regional level. The question now was how to better link the RAHCs and the RECs for better coordination. The participants noted that there was a need to establish linkages between RAHCs and RECs since the current linkages were weak and did not clearly encompass human health issues. Improving these linkages required institutional arrangements to promote the coordination.

It was noted that there were legal and institutional issues around the RAHCs that may necessitate discussions among the management ranks of the three partners involved to agree how best to associate the RAHCs and the RECs as a step towards better coordination.

3 Presentations from Regional Economic Communities

Session Chair: Dr. Nicholas Eseko - WHO.

Only two RECs (SADC and ECCAS) attended the meeting and made presentations.

SADC presentation

Dr. Beedeenan Hulman made the presentation on behalf of SADC. He described the SADC member state composition and elaborated on the organization structure of the SADC. He indicated that SADC had four directorates, namely: Trade, Industry, Finance & Investments (TIFI); the Food, Agriculture & Natural Resources (FANR) Directorate; Social and Human Development & Special Programs (SHD&SP); and Infrastructure and Services (I&S). A full presentation is found in report ANNEX.

He explained that the livestock development unit of SADC, which is responsible for the regional coordination of HPAI and TADs, is under FANR directorate. He further explained that the unit works through the Livestock Technical Committee (LTC) which has four technical sub-committees, namely; Epidemiology and Informatics, Veterinary Public Health and Food Safety, Veterinary Laboratory and Diagnostics, Animal Production, and Veld Marketing and Genetic Resources. He showed that the LTC has clear terms of reference among which are: coordinate regional livestock development; identify constraints impeding regional livestock development; develop policies and strategies to address the constraints; identify programmes and projects to implement the policies; monitor regional livestock development; assist in eliminating non-tariff barriers in livestock trade; foster linkages with regional and international institutions and organizations and foster public private partnerships.

Dr. Hulman enumerated the priorities for integration in the SADC region, notably: control of TADs and disease vectors; quality assurance of veterinary drugs and animal feed ingredients; sanitary standard and regulation for animals and their products; information exchange and early warning systems; capacity development to implement policies; and research geared to problem solving.

He finally proposed the SADC SPINAP regional mechanism stating that it should use HPAI prevention and control as an entry point to address other TADs. He enumerated regional activities that could be supported through SPINAP funding, notably: HPAI Joint Technical Committee Meeting; Incident Command System; Consultancy on Lab Quality Standards; One-World-One-Health (OWOH) regional workshop and regional workshop on biosecurity at farm level.

ECCAS presentation

Dr. Liman Mohama made a presentation on behalf of ECCAS. A full presentation is found ANNEX 3. In summary Dr. Liman described the composition of the ECCAS member states and thereafter focused on implementation by ECCAS-CEBEVIRHA of HPAI prevention and control support activities in the sub-region. He indicates that Cameroun experienced an outbreak of HPAI in March 2006 and the Heads of States of ECCAS allocated a special budget of 300 Million FCFA to enable CEBEVIRHA to support control of the disease in the affected country and prevention of its spread to the other Member States. The community provided funding to support implementation of the prevention and control activities of HPAI in five countries namely: Cameroun, Congo Brazzaville Gabon

Equatorial Guinea and Tchad. Financial and technical support to Central African Republic is pending and will be provided upon completion of the country's action plan.

Among the activities carried out by CEBEVIRHA were assessment of country needs and follow-up on monitoring of the evolution of the outbreak in Cameroun; organization of workshops on communication and on biosecurity; the formation of regional information sharing forum for poultry professionals and implementation of one regional desk-top simulation exercise. Dr. Liman pointed out of the urgent need that was required to strengthen the national veterinary services in the region in order to have a functional early warning and response system to prevent and control HPAI and other TADs.

Discussion and comments on SADC and ECCAS presentations

During discussions the meeting appreciated the effort being made by the RECs to coordinate AI/TADs among their member states. It was however clear that the 2 RECs were at very different levels of development. While SADC had clear structures and strategies in place, CEMAC had only a project or 2 to implement and didn't seem to have any clearly defined coordination mechanism.

The issue of weak inter-sectoral collaboration at regional level was again raised. In both RECs, it was not obvious that the animal and human health sectors were working closely together in a structured and coordinated manner. Participants were informed that the OWOH strategic framework was in the agenda of SADC's next LTC meeting and this would provide a platform to explore ways of strengthening the collaboration.

A clarification on how policy issues in SADC were generated indicated that these were either developed at the SADC political levels but were endorsed by the LTC through its sub-committees which are derived from member states or member states could also submit their issues directly to the LTC for discussion at the SADC level. The process was two-way traffic.

The participants were informed through questions and answers that there were no arrangements in ECCAS similar to those in SADC in terms of coordination. The current effort for coordination effort in ECCAS was an offshoot in response to outbreaks of AI in the region. The SADC was felt to be almost there but still needed to be appraised to see what may be required to make the existing mechanisms more effective and also learn lessons to develop a global structure for intra-REC coordination across the continent.

The participants noted that there were harmonization issues regarding legislation in different countries within the same RECs. This was identified as an area that AU-IBAR could play a significant role to enable RECs to be able to dialogue on international issues such as Codex and speak with one voice and influence issues for the good of Africa.

Through discussions, participants also felt that there was need for communication systems such as ARIS, ADIS, LIMS, WAHIS and others being used on the continent to be able to "speak" to each other in order to create harmony.

The existence of mechanisms for inter-REC coordination was not clear from both presentations and the ensuing discussions.

4 Presentations by technical organizations (partners)

Session Chair: Nicholas Eseko – WHO

Three presentations were made under this session. These included presentation from the OIE, FAO and WHO-Afro.

OIE presentation

This presentation was made by Dr. Alain Dehove on behalf of the OIE. A full presentation is found ANNEX 4. Dr Dehove identified the global trends in the shift in animal protein consumption, issues on globalization and climate change and how these affected the disease patterns. He elaborated on the impacts of animal diseases on losses on animal production (and on animal products) worldwide; animal health as a key component of food security; food safety and public health, and the zoonotic potential of animal pathogens. He indicated that there was strong link between animal health, food security and public health and therefore, the global intensification of animal production to meet the meat and eggs demands should be carefully monitored as new diseases were likely to emerge.

Dr. Dehove further elaborated on the global public good concept. In the case of control and eradication of infectious diseases, he indicated that the benefits were international and inter-generational in scope as countries depend on each other. Animal health systems were neither commercial nor strictly agricultural goods. They are fully eligible to national and global public resources and therefore failure of one country may endanger the entire planet. He indicated that the good governance requirements for all countries entails the need for appropriate legislation and its efficient implementation through appropriate human and financial resources allowing national animal health systems providing for: specific legislative texts dedicated to animal health control; appropriate surveillance, early detection, transparency, notification; rapid response to animal disease outbreaks; biosecurity measures; compensation; vaccination when appropriate and education and research.

After discussing on the key elements for efficient Veterinary Services he presented table summaries of OIE reference laboratories and the concept of twinning among laboratories. He indicated that the laboratory twinning concept allowed for provision of regional support with better geographical coverage for diseases and topics that are a priority in a given region and improved access for more countries to high quality diagnostics and expertise. Better scientific expertise allowed members to debate OIE scientific justification for standards on an equal footing with other Members (better representation) and to contribute to building a veterinary scientific community worldwide. The OIE has twinning Projects on Avian Influenza and Newcastle Disease (ND).

After presenting the above, Dr. Dehove dwelt on the objectives of the OIE, defined the delegates, the criteria for listing diseases; the notification procedures and types of reports. He described the OIE's WTO mandate, OIE-PVS tool and presented tabular data on the global program state of play of PVS (100 country requests recorded); programme state of play of PVS Gap Analysis and the programme state of play of legislation as of 2nd October 2009. He completed the presentation by discussing the needs for veterinary education, the one-world-one health (OWOH) concept and issues for global attention.

FAO/ECTAD presentation

Dr. William Amanfu made the presentation on behalf of FAO/ECTAD. A full presentation is found ANNEX 5. Dr. Amanfu stated that FAO's mission is to help build a food-secure world for present and future generations. He elaborated the structure of FAO stating that it has 7 departments, namely; agriculture and consumer protection department where the Animal Production and Health Division lies; economic and social development department; fisheries and aquaculture department; knowledge and communication department; natural resources management and environment department; technical cooperation department and the department of human, financial and physical resources.

In response to the rapid evolution of the HPAI crisis in SE Asia the Director General of FAO set up the Emergency Centre for Trans-boundary Animal Disease (ECTAD) in December 2004. ECTAD's objectives and structure aimed at establishing a corporate centre with a unified chain of command to plan and deliver FAO's support to member countries. The FAO ECTAD takes a multidisciplinary approach in the management of HPAI and other TADs. This is achieved through multidisciplinary teams based at the ECTAD centres. These teams coordinate activities in various thematic areas including: veterinary epidemiology and laboratory diagnosis/animal Health; socio-economics; biosecurity and safe animal production /farming Systems; communication and wildlife.

The FAO ECTAD teams work within the RAHC, a joint initiative developed between FAO, OIE and AU-IBAR. There are four RAHC offices in Africa, Nairobi, Bamako, Gaborone and Tunis. Coordination is achieved through periodic meetings, exchange of technical information, organization of workshops and exchange of expertise.

Dr. Amanfu elaborated on the initiatives and mechanisms that FAO has developed jointly with other international agencies to foster an integrated approach in fighting AHI and other TADs, notably: the FAO/OIE Global Framework of the Progressive control of Trans-boundary Animal Diseases (GF-TADs); the FAO/OIE/WHO Global Early Warning and Response System for Major Animal Diseases including Zoonoses (GLEWS); the OIE/ FAO Network of Expertise on Animal Influenza); the rapid assessment missions towards Integrated National Action Program on Avian Influenza (INAP) implemented by FAO, OIE, WHO, and AU-IBAR under the Alive Platform; and "Contributing to One World One Health" (OWOH): "A Strategic Framework for Reducing Risks of Infectious Diseases at the Animal-Human-Ecosystems Interface".

Dr. Amanfu concluded by saying that there was need for inter-sectoral collaboration and political commitment to be implemented at country level; public-private partnership and partnerships with Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) can help to provide long-term sustainability of HPAI and other Emerging Infectious Diseases (EID) control; there was need to develop and implement OWOH and that RAHCs could provide the requisite platform for institutional collaboration and progress in the management of trans-boundary animal diseases on our continent.

WHO-AFRO presentation

Dr. Nicholas Eseko made the presentation on behalf of WHO/Afro. A full presentation is found ANNEX 6. He started by defining the difference between the influenza infection by making distinction between seasonal influenza and the current H1N1 outbreak. He indicated that of all the influenza viruses that circulate in birds, the H5N1 virus is of greatest concern at present. There have been more than 300 million poultry deaths due to H5N1 either due to disease or culling. This has had a major impact on the economies of affected countries.

At present, H5N1 avian influenza remains largely a disease of birds. The species barrier is significant as the virus does not easily cross from birds to infect humans and it does not spread easily from person to person. Despite the infection of tens of millions of poultry over large geographical areas since mid-2003, only a few hundred human cases have been laboratory confirmed. Dr. Eseko indicated that H5N1 is the most visible, albeit not unique, threat to evolve into a virus capable of causing a human pandemic. He presented data on mortalities caused by H5N1 and H1N1 by region in the Afro area.

Regarding the WHO coordination plan, Dr. Eseko indicated that plans were developed at global, regional, sub-regional and country levels. The regional pandemic plan was developed in January 2006 for H5N1 with full participation of the Member States and key partners. The regional pandemic plan was revised to accommodate for H1N1 response. He indicated that the expected results of the plans were:

1. Opportunities for human to human spread of infection reduced
2. Early warning systems strengthened
3. Capacity to cope with the pandemic built
4. Spread of infection from the source delayed
5. Regional preparedness and response coordination capacity enhanced
6. National health systems strengthened
7. Operational research on human pandemic influenza supported
8. Communication and Health Promotion reinforced

Dr. Eseko described the activities undertaken as per the plans and the coordination mechanisms during outbreaks.

Discussion on OIE, FAO/ECTAD and WHO/AFRO presentations

Plenary discussion of the presentations made raised some pertinent issues.

1. Issues were raised as to whether WHO involved animal health scientists when drawing their plans. It was indicated that sufficient consultation took place while drawing the plans and that even FAO was involved.
2. With regard to identifying coordination gaps at country level, it was indicated that INAPS were effectively used to address the issues.
3. The SADC model was hailed as an example of coordination between institutions and sectors at the REC level that can be further analysed and developed to inform support to other RECs.
4. The presence and role of the Regional Animal Health centres was also discussed. The question of enhancing the involvement of WHO at the RAHC activity level to help with human health issues was raised. The RAHCs were also felt to lack proper links and institutional arrangements to effectively coordinate with the RECs, partly because of the way they were established and the fact that relational issues among the key

actors as still evolving. It was recognized that RAHCs and RECs relationships differ in the various sub-regions, and it was understood that RECs desired and sought the technical support of RAHCs in all the subregions, indicating a need for better coordination.

5. RAHCs and RECs were seen as requisite platforms for institutional collaboration and coordination in the management of trans-boundary animal diseases on our continent.
6. The importance of public-private partnership and partnerships with Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) to provide long-term sustainability of AHI and other EID control was underscored. This is a challenge to be considered in the development of any coordination mechanism.
7. The availability of the GF-TAD framework as an existing coordination mechanism at global and at regional levels that associates FAO, OIE, WHO and RECs was highlighted and suggested for potential linkage with coordination mechanisms established at the sub-regional (REC) levels

5 AU-IBAR Strategic Plan

Dr. Simplicé Nouala presented the AU-IBAR strategy. A full presentation is found ANNEX 7. Dr. Nouala indicated that AU-IBAR is the AUC technical office with the mandate to coordinate animal resources. He emphasized that IBAR is mandated by the African Union to exercise its mandate through the RECs.

To effectively execute its mandate, AU-IBAR has developed a new 5 year strategy. Among the key issues the strategy responds to is the leadership role of IBAR in the livestock component of the Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) and the need to play a greater role in the animal resources sector in the continent. Experience and insights gained from rinderpest eradication, execution of other programs and sub-regional and continental levels and recognition of major challenges such as shortage of veterinary professionals; insufficient national budgets; increasing food insecurity; complexity of international trade; climate change; emerging and re-emerging diseases and demand driven innovative and collaborative efforts have further shaped the development of the strategy.

Vision: An Africa in which animal resources contribute significantly to the reduction of poverty and hunger.

Mission: To provide leadership in the development of animal resources for Africa through supporting and empowering AU Member States and Regional Economic Communities.

Mandate: To support and coordinate the utilization of animals (livestock, fisheries and wildlife) as a resource for human wellbeing in the Member States and to contribute to economic development, particularly in rural areas.

Specific areas of the IBAR mandate include:

1. Improve public and animal health through the control and possible eradication of trans- boundary animal diseases and zoonoses
2. Improve the management of animal resources (livestock, wildlife and aquatic animals) and the natural resource bases on which they depend
3. Explore investment options and enhance competitiveness of African animal products
4. Contribute to the development of relevant standards and regulations and enhance compliance by Member States
5. Strengthen institutional capacity and support policy development and harmonization
6. Disseminate information and knowledge to Member States, RECs and other relevant institutions on animal resources
7. Provide essential support to Member States with special needs or in emergency situations

The core functions are to:

1. Facilitate development and harmonisation of policies, guidelines and other decision-support tools.
2. Coordination of animal resources development matters in Africa
3. Facilitate articulation of common African positions on aspects of animal resources in global processes
4. Provide technical leadership and advisory services to RECs and Member States
5. Play advocacy role on issues relevant for Africa, including the mobilization of public and private sector investment in animal resources development, trade and marketing
6. Collate, analyse and disseminate data and information on animal resources.
7. Provide strategic support to countries in emergency situations, and facilitate countries with special needs to maintain core animal resources functions.

IBAR Strategic Thrusts

- 1) Reducing the impact of trans-boundary animal diseases and zoonoses on livelihoods and public health in Africa
- 2) Enhancing Africa's capacity to conserve and sustainably use its animal resources and their resource base
- 3) Improving investment opportunities in, and competitiveness of animal resources in Africa
- 4) Promoting development of standards and regulations and facilitation of compliance
- 5) Improving knowledge management in animal resources to facilitate informed and timely decision-making
- 6) Facilitating development of policies and institutional capacities for improved utilization of animal resources in Africa

Discussions on AU-IBAR Strategy

- The strategy was hailed as well thought in terms of coordination of activities at the REC level.
- It was noted that AU-IBAR was best placed for advocacy purposes with Member States and RECs on the coordination of animal resources issues on the continent, including AI and zoonoses
- It was proposed that it would perhaps be useful in the long-term for AU-IBAR to focus on supporting capacity building for in RECs sustainability as this would create a permanent solution to coordination challenges experienced in the animal resources sector. This would also assist IBAR to realize its mandate with ease.

6 Group discussions

In order to explore various issues in depth, groups were formed and engaged on specific discussion topics to generate ideas and consensus. Group discussion issues were generated in plenary through a participatory process. Discussion questions revolved around the coordination them and related inputs needed to make it work successfully.

Day 2 morning session

Session Chair: Dr. DEHOVE, Alain - OIE

Six broad issues were identified for discussion in the morning. These included:

1. Capacity at the RECs, RAHCs and at AU-IBAR
2. Institutional arrangements
3. Relationship between RAHCs and RECs
4. What coordination was required
5. Inter-sectoral collaboration
6. Financial and human resource

Three groups were formed, with Group 1 discussing the first two items on the list, Group 2 item three and four while Group 3 items five and six.

Group 1 report

1. Capacity at the REC and RAHC levels

The group reported that there was need to carry out stock-taking of human & financial resources in order to identify gaps in capacity. The issues to be addressed include, what is being done and who is doing it. Should there be an identified need to enhance capacity, then it should clearly indicate when this needs to be done. In identification of gaps, there will be need to specify TORs on the process of analysis, who does the analysis and who pays for it. The analysis should have a section on how the information derived can be used; what can be achieved and what cannot be achieved. The nature of information to be analysed should lead to identification of priorities that are demand driven. There should be a way of involving RECs in these analyses. The following observations were made:

- SADC has weak technical capacity but it goes round it by incorporating expertise from countries.
- A kind of manual to be proposed to RECs, some issues and source of information.
- Need to enhance laboratory / epidemiology networks, INAP, PVS, information systems, and education.

- Quantification of staff needed should be based on activities to be carried, before stock-taking. RECs should be involved in this exercise in order to capture their priorities
- The principles of approach: There is need to know the policy issues related to formation of the RECS and what protocols and memorandum of understanding exist.

The group reported that the extra capacity is needed at AU-IBAR will depend on what the RECs requirements. They noted that the relationship of AUC-IBAR-REC-Member States is defined and that the role of AU-IBAR is to harmonise coordination between RECs before considering inter-REC coordination. AU-IBAR should back-stop and give support but not be much involvement. Areas it can play a significant role include creating awareness of what RECs are doing; arranging meetings and play an observer role during meetings. As RECs are at different level, AU-IBAR's role will also vary.

2. Institutional arrangements

There was need for a rapid appraisal of diagnosis of current set up-legislative, resources, and priorities, followed by a more in-depth analysis of institutional set-up of individual RECs. This activity can be carried out with the assistance of AUC. This will entail reviewing existing strategic and policy documents of RECs to understand priorities (like SADC health protocol). It was proposed that a team be selected by the Director AU-IBAR on the basis of proposals from Partners to collect and collate the information from existing protocols and working arrangements, do fact finding visits to the RECs, look at the commonalities and ways to breach gaps; the Director to call representatives from the RECs to learn how they work- institutional experts to be part of the meeting and lastly commission a consultant to carry out the study.

3. Inter-REC relationships

It was noted that the overlapping of RECs was an advantage as it gave good opportunity, cross exchange information and flexibility. This is as far as membership is concerned but not necessarily in terms of overlapping mandates. It was noted that interaction with non-recognised regional organizations could be carried out directly through member states. It was however, noted that for the long-term, it would be important to incorporate these non-recognized organizations in the coordination mechanism.

The group noted that interaction of RECS with international organization varied because some international organizations had memoranda of understanding with the RECs. There was however, a need to map out the existing agreements to identify which organizations had made which agreements. The purpose of this exercise would be to identify what was in place and to build on it.

The group developed the roadmap below in order to address capacity building and institutional arrangement issues:

Rapid assessment

- Start to develop the TORs to address objectives, information required to be gathered and the level of information on set-up of RECS. TORs to be shared first with the technical partners and them with the RECs

- There is need for an institutional expert to work with us the TORs and to implement the analysis- the AUC may already have the information, and there was need to consult with the AUC to know what information they can provide, as the first scoping of the work
- For TORs setting it would be advisable to consult with FAO, WHO and OIE
- Preparatory mission from IBAR to REC to be completed by December 2009.

Second step long-term

- To gather all the details will take the first 9 months or so of 2010
- Need to go to one of the RECs for a pre-test, of the template

Thematic scope

- Immediate action: use of outcomes of INAPs, country OIE-PVS, opening up to OWOH (about synergies and better collaboration), livestock, food security. CAADP, NEPAD as referred to in the initial drafting of the IN-APs
- Long-term: Addresses all mandate of AU-IBAR

Group 2 report

I. Relationship between RAHCs and RECs

The group noted that the mandates of the two varied. The RAHCs bring technical expertise close to the regions while RECs were set up by political authorities to look at socio economic advancement of their people including livestock and agricultural development as well as Public health issues.

In both RECs and RAHCs, Public Health issues are not as clearly defined as issues on agriculture and livestock development. There is no formal relationship between RECS and RAHCs and only RECs have clear institutional political and technical arrangements with AU-IBAR.

The group recommended that:

- There need to formalize institutional relationships between the RECs and RAHCs and to strengthen technical support to both
- RAHC linkage to RECs could be discussed at higher leadership level
- Identify the institutional arrangements of RAHCs with AU-IBAR
- AU-IBAR should strategically work through RECs

2. Coordination – What to coordinate

The group noted that the Coordination mechanism should develop clear framework to guide the coordination agenda. This could be achieved through an identified focal point with specific TORs. A regular forum for information exchange and to assess progress in strategic implementations was necessary for Sustainability. The role of AU-IBAR in working with RECs and RAHCs should be identified but will involve convening regular forums between RECs and RAHCs in consultation with the principal partners and the creation of a sustainable coordination platform in line with its mandate. Focal points should be identified in AU-IBAR, OIE, and FAO to interact at institutional level.

The group identified the following as areas that needed coordination:

- Identification of gaps using INAPs and country PVS outcomes, and other available documents at national and REC levels
- Reviewing and mapping of laboratory/Epidemiology network and linkage with Public Health laboratory networks
- Animal resource data and information management
- Harmonization of legislation and policies within RECs
- Harmonization of curricula and training schemes for professional veterinary

Group 3 report

Group 3 discussed inter-sectoral collaboration and Financial and human resources. The group identified the current situation spelling out the strengths and gaps/constraints and proposed the way forward.

I. Intersectoral coordination and resources

	Current situation		Way forward
	Strengths	Gaps/Constraints	
Inter-sectoral collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Existing mechanism at international level e.g GF-TAD ○ Better inter-sectoral collaboration at country level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Poor collaboration at regional level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Put in place inter-sectoral collaboration mechanism at regional level
Integration of Public health in RAHCs		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ WHO not taking part in RAHCs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Involve WHO
Integration of Public health in RECs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Health desks exist in some RECs ○ WHO collaborative centres exist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Collaboration between Animal desk and human desk is poor in some RECs ○ Livestock institutions not collaborating with WHO centres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Involve WHO
Tools on Public health (PVS like)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ IHR-Core assessment tool which incorporates the animal health component (Kenya and South Africa) ○ IDSR strategy (Integrated Disease and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No bridges with INAPS and PVS tools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Encourage and support the implementation of tools in other countries ○ Encourage and support medical and animal health assessment tools

	Surveillance Response) has animal health com- ponents		
--	---	--	--

2. Financial and human resources

	Current situation		Way forward
	Strengths	Gaps/Constraints	
Availability of HR & FR in RECs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some RECS have a good financial base ○ Support from donors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Low human resources for core-functions such as coordination ○ Most staff is project staff ○ Most RECs have only one livestock officer ○ Partner support only projects and temporary functions ○ Some RECs not supported at all by international partners e.g. ECCAS ○ Not enough skills to address TADs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Advocacy at political level to recruit staff and dedicate more resources. ○ The tree partners (FAO, OIE and AU-IBAR) should advocate for RECs to raise livestock profile and put priority on coordination functions ○ Advocacy to Partners to support core and permanent functions through budget support (e.g SADC model)
Availability of HR & FR in RAHCs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Resources available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Resources are often project based 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sustain RAHCs resources through advocacy
Utilization of HR & FR in RAHCs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Existence of thematic working groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lack of pooling of resources at RAHC level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Enhance synergy to better efficiency
Sharing HR in RAHCs and RECs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In some RECs e.g. SADC there is sharing of human resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Other RAHCs and RECs don't share resources ○ The coverage of some RAHCs e.g. Bamako is very wide 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ See Group I
Fund-raising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some RECs have a strong donor support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some RECs don't have strong donor support 	

Day 2 afternoon session

This group discussions sought build consensus on the approach to establish the regional coordination mechanism and the form it should take drawing lessons from INAP process.

Session Chair: Dr. DEHOVE, Alain - OIE

After lengthy discussions, the discussion was slightly modified. Three broad issues were identified for discussion in the afternoon. These were:

The approach – formation and TORs of a Task Force

Information needs for improved coordination within the RECs

Inter-REC coordination

Group 1 discussed the Task Force; Group 2 information need for coordination and Group 3 inter-REC coordination,

Group 1 report on task force

The group reported that the Task Force (TF) to initiate the process should be composed of IBAR staff. The following were identified:

1. Vittorio Cagnolati
2. Samuel Muriuki
3. Henry Wamwayi
4. Dodji Tagodoe
5. Thomas Nyariki
6. Simplicie Nouala
7. Bruce Mukanda
8. Alex Saelaert

It was proposed that the TF should finalize the TORs and circulate the document to partners (FAO, OIE, WHO and RECs) for inputs. It should develop the timelines for development of TORs for the study and TORs for the experts. It was proposed that one month would be adequate to develop the zero draft and circulate to partners by end of November. Two weeks were allowed for the partners give feedback (15th Dec) after which the methodology of the study should be agreed upon by second week of January (11th -15th January). The study would be carried out in three phases:

Phase I: Desk review (INAPS,PVS)/diagnostic completion of INAPs

Phase II: Same IBAR team as for Phase I but will have field validation and gaps appraisal at RECs

Phase III: A different team to identify main issues to be addressed at regional level and provide cost estimates of key priorities

- The persons to carry out the study should be selected to compose a highly experienced /qualified team of experts from the organizations to undertake the study. Partners should help in the recruitment of the highest calibre experts. Required expertise will be drawn from the following institutions:
- Team leader to coordinate the activity (AU-IBAR)
- Human health expert-epidemiologist (WHO)
- Veterinary services, PVS, laboratory networks, education expert (OIE)
- Communication expert (FAO)
- Bio-security, Livestock and trade (FAO)
- Veterinary epidemiologist/disease control (AU-IBAR)
- Wildlife expert (AU-IBAR)

Regulatory and policy frameworks expert will be required in Phase II while a Financial Analyst and Institutional specialist in Phase III. The Peer Review Task Force will be composed of AU-IBAR, WHO, OIE, FAO and RECs.

Group 2 report on information needs

- The Group 2 reported that in the absence of most the RECs their discussion was rather speculative. They indicated that ideas coming from the group have to be validated with the RECs. On this basis, the group listed the information needs with caution as follows:
- Mandate and legal authorities of the RECs with regard to animal health and human health sectors
- Mechanisms to prepare and adopt common legislation and regulations at RECs levels
- How the mandate of RECs are developed and executed in countries
- Existence of resources to help the capacity building within the RECs
- Presence or absence of instruments required to facilitate gathering, sharing and analysis of information on animal resources
- Information on internal capacity and ability to link with external human resources base
- Mechanisms to coordinate response should any outbreak of zoonosis, TADs occur

- Transparency in reporting animal and human disease (IHR 2005 and OIE) during outbreaks
- Availability and sources of financial support
- Strategy for zoonoses and TADs prevention and control
- Formal and informal mechanisms for interaction with different stakeholders
- Coordination of cross-border disease prevention and control mechanisms (animal and human)
- Involvement of RECs in the facilitation of the lab and epidemiology networks

Group 3 report on Inter-REC coordination

Group 3 reported that:

- AU-IBAR as AUC technical office had unique mandate to coordinate animal resources through the RECs.
- While institutional arrangements exist on paper, it is important to translate this in practical mechanisms to operationalize it.
- There is need for a focal point person in each REC with direct links to a person in-charge at AU-IBAR as a contact person for this kind of activity/coordination. Need for TOR for the coordination unit in IBAR.
- Regular meetings convened by IBAR
- Resources Mobilization for capacity building and support
- Link with partners at RECs level in addition to continental level for effective coordination on common missions

Day 3 discussions

Session Chair: Dr. William Amanfu - FAO/ECTAD

Two groups were formed on day three to discuss the following topics

1. What can technical organizations contribute to the realization of intra- and inter-regional coordination? (Group 1)
2. How can technical organizations contribute to the realization of intra- and inter-regional coordination? (Group 2)

Group 1 report on what technical organizations can contribute

Intra-REC coordination

1. Help in designing
2. Defining road map
3. Provide capacity building through technical support
4. Networking
5. Help to facilitate fund raising
6. Lead discussion on all success stories
7. Provide different type of tools, on policy to define methodology
8. Design of policy and harmonization
9. Information exchange among RECS

Inter-RECs Coordination

1. Inter-Agency coordination
2. Regulatory and policy issues
3. Coordination of outbreak response
4. Support in setting and harmonization of standards
5. Make available international standards
6. Setting of legislation through the standards

Group 2 report on how technical organizations can contribute

KEY ISSUES TO ADDRESS	HOW TO COORDINATE
1. Networking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination through projects • Use of different for a and platforms to call for technical support from agencies; example: Alive, GF-TAD • Collectively encourage donors to strengthen capacity by providing technical support on ad hoc basis to RECs • Mobilize all partners in RECs to address specific technical issues related to OWOH concept
2. Harmonization of policy & legislation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate the updating of policy at national level • Harmonization at the RECs level on specific areas
3. Research & training institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harmonization of research institution curricula and use of international research center
4. Biosecurity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage use of the setting biosecurity measures at RECs

7 Workshop recommendations

Preamble

The AU-IBAR organized a meeting on Regional Coordination Mechanisms for Avian Influenza, and other Trans-boundary diseases at Holiday Inn, Naivasha from 19th to 21st October 2009. The main objective of the meeting was to review the current situation of coordination mechanism at regional level with its main partners, namely OIE, FAO, WHO, and RECs. To achieve the objective representatives made presentations on the current activities and coordination strategies (including GF-TADs and Alive Platform) of their respective organizations and between partner organizations, which were followed by in-depth plenary discussions and group-work sessions.

- Considering the tremendous concerted effort by the International Partners and Donors in the control of HPAI and TADs in Africa;
- Taking cognizance of lesson learned during the implementation of SPINAP, other HPAI programmes and other TADs projects in AU-IBAR;
- Noting the importance of inter-agency and inter-sectoral collaboration in order to create synergy in prevention and control of HPAI and TADs;
- Considering that regional and cross-border coordination mechanisms on the prevention and control of animal and human influenza and other TADS need enhancement for effective delivery of animal and human health services;
- Aware of and drawing lessons from the existing coordination mechanisms at global, regional and sub-regional levels;
- Considering the availability of country INAPS and PVS reports;
- Taking into consideration the evolving One-world-one-health (OWOH) concept in the approach to prevention and control of emerging and re-emerging diseases;
- Noting the commitment of lead international organizations in animal and human health matters at the global level to work in a coordinated manner, and the need to further improve the coordination at regional, sub-regional and national levels;
- Recognizing the core mandate of AU-IBAR as a technical organ of the African Union Commission to coordinate animal resource matters on the continent through the RECs;
- Aware of the increasing recognition of RECs as the AUC organs of integration and coordination of sub-regional actions among Member States and as the institutions for ensuring sustainability of actions;

The meeting recommends that:

- i. Terms of reference, a roadmap and a work programme be developed by IBAR, in close collaboration with partner international organizations, to characterize various phases so as to capture the current and future activities and priorities at regional level, including coordination mechanisms at RECs level;
- ii. Possible actions and priorities be identified at regional level through the review (stock taking) of existing reports of assessments at Member States level, in close collaboration with partner international organizations, namely the analysis of outcomes of country INAPs and PVS reports for the different RECs;
- iii. A rapid appraisal of current situation between and within the RECs be undertaken through a dialogue between IBAR and RECs, including validation or collection of additional information through targeted field missions;
- iv. A regional coordination mechanism at the RECs be developed based on clear framework to guide the coordination agenda;
- v. Partners explore ways of reviewing and strengthening the collaboration between the RECs and RAHCs;
- vi. A scheduled regular forum between the partners be instituted for information exchange, assessment of progress in implementation of coordination activities and joint action planning. Such forum should be included in the calendars of Partners for better and effective coordination;
- vii. Partners promote greater involvement of human health and wildlife sectors in regional coordination mechanisms on the prevention and control of TADs and zoonosis at a regional level rather than focusing on a single disease entity;
- viii. Partners to strengthen advocacy at REC policy level for human resource capacity development and mobilization to support coordination and raise investment in livestock and human health systems to support poverty alleviation;
- ix. Support to the strengthening of regional level coordination should be carried out hand in hand with capacity building to ensure sustainability;
- x. Technical agencies represented at this forum will provide relevant inputs in a timely and consistent manner to ensure success of the action within the context of their respective areas of responsibility;
- xi. AU-IBAR commits itself to effective coordination and facilitation including financial support of this work program using resources available within the SPINAP program.

8 The road map

The workshop participants identified a roadmap to the development of a regional coordination mechanism. The process was divided into four steps starting from Step 0 to Step 3. Below is a summary of the major activities that will be carried out at each step:

- **STEP 0: Develop and Finalize TORs for a Task Force**

IBAR in close collaboration with partners to develop and finalize TORs for a Task Force (TF).

- **STEP 1: Review and summarize information from INAP/PVS**

A stock taking exercise of coordination arrangements at the REC level and between RECs is required to inform the design of a coordination mechanism. Information required will initially be obtained through a desk study of available reports at national and REC levels. The INAPs and PVS reports are some materials to be reviews. Others will include REC documentation of its operations, mandate etc. The information obtained could be utilized as is, or augmented through other processes as may become evident during the desk review.

- **STEP 2: Verification of information from Step 1**

Information obtained above may be further verified through dialogue and visits to countries and RECs, dialogue with political leadership in the RECs on improvement of coordination etc.

- **STEP 3: Consolidation**

Issues identified through steps 1&2 will be put together in a strategic document clearly spelling out the findings and making recommendations on the creation of effective coordination mechanisms within and between RECs. Available capacities and gaps will also be highlighted and interventions to bridge them proposed. At this stage, the key priorities will also be costed to enable the various actors have a clear understanding of resources needed for the task, and to formulated resource mobilisation plans. Once completed, the findings will be subjected to discussion by the key stakeholders for adoption and action planning.

- **TIME LINES**

The entire process is expected to take 6-9 months beginning November 2009

▪ CHALLENGES

It was noted that AU-IBAR does not have enough human resources to undertake the process and there was need for external support from experts to help drive the process. One source of experts are the partner organizations who are expected to provide experts as per agreement reached at the workshop. AU-IBAR should on its part, prepare to manage and facilitate the team of experts throughout the process.

▪ SUGGESTIONS

It was suggested that the document developed should have a very concise preamble to explain the process. The Preamble will have to refer to INAP and PVS reports as some of the existing tools at the national level from which information can be derived. Paucity of similar tools at the REC level may necessitate a more participatory approach, including adaptation of RA tools for application to the regional level. In the initial stage, the RECs should work directly with AU-IBAR to initiate the process after which the Technical agencies will be invited to make their contribution to the process.

9 Annexes – list of participants

CEBEVIRHA

Mr. Liman Mohama

Expert zootechnicien, Chef Service de la production Animale
CEBEVIRHA, Avenue MOBUTU, Quartier MOUSAL

B.P. 665 NDJAMENA

Tel. (Office) (235)6518386

Fax: (235) 6518386

Mobile: +235-5414236/+235-3129911/+237-75747037

E-mail: mohamaliman@yahoo.fr

FAO

Dr. William Amanfu

Regional Manager

FAO ECTAD Unit RAHC

P. O. Box 30470, 00100

Nairobi, Kenya

Tel : +254(0)733999154

Email : william.amanfu@fao.org

OIE

Dr. Marie Edan

OIE Regional Activities Department

12, rue de Prony

F.75017 Paris

France

Tel: +33(0)1441888

Fax: +33(0)14267 0987

Email: m.edan@oie.int

Dr. Alain Dehove

Coordinator of OIE World Animal Health and Welfare Fund

OIE, 12 Rue De Prony,

F.75017 Paris

France

Tel : +331 44 15 18 88

E-mail: a.dehove@oie.int

SADC

Mr. Beedeeanan Hulman

Senior Programme Officer

SADC Secretariat, P.Bag 0095

Gaborone

BOTSWANA

Tel. No. +267 395 1863 Ext. 6090

Fax No. +267 3924099 / 3972848

Mobile No. +267 72202944

E-mail: bhulman@sadc.int

WHO

Dr. Nicholas Eseko

Inter country epidemiologist

Inter country support team – ESA
Epidemic and pandemic alert and response
World Health Organisation
Enterprise/Glenera Road
P.O. Box BE 773, Belvedere
HARARE, ZIMBABWE
Tel: +263 23255942
Email esekon@zw.afro.who.int

AU-IBAR

Prof. Ahmed El-Sawalhy

Director of AU-IBAR
P.O. Box 30786 – 00100

Nairobi

KENYA

Tel. (Office): +254-20-3674000/212/213

Fax: +254-20-3674341

Mobile: +254-733 74 98 70

E-mail: ahmed.elsawalhy@au-ibar.org

Dr. Nouala Simplicie

Animal Resource Officer

AU-IBAR

P.O. Box 30786 – 00100

Nairobi

KENYA

Tel. (Office): +254-20-3674000/224

Fax: +254-20-3674341

E-mail: nouala.simplicie@au-ibar.org

Dr. Samuel Muriuki

SPINAP Continental Co-ordinator

AU-IBAR

P.O. Box 30786 – 00100

Nairobi

KENYA

Tel. (Office): +254-20-3674000/307

Fax: +254-20-3674341

Mobile no. +254-722 85 81 95

E-mail: samuel.muriuki@au-ibar.org

Dr. Vittorio Cagnolati

Technical Advisor

AU/IBAR, P.O. Box 30786 – 00100

Nairobi

KENYA

Tel. (Office): +254-20-3674204

Fax: +254-20-3674341

Mobile no. +254-733-61 17 07

E-mail: vittorio.cagnolati@au-ibar.org

Dr. Bobo Germain

Coordinator – Alive

AU-IBAR

P.O. Box 30786 – 00100

Nairobi

KENYA

Tel. (Office): +254-20-3674000/222

Fax: +254-20-3674341

E-mail : germain.bobo@au-ibar.org

Dr. Dickens Chibeu

Coordinator – SERECU

AU-IBAR

P.O. Box 30786 – 00100

Nairobi

KENYA

Tel. (Office): +254-20-3674000/314

Fax: +254-20-3674341

E-mail : dickens.chibeu@au-ibar.org

Dr. Alban Bellinguez

Technical Advisor

AU-IBAR

P.O. Box 30786 – 00100

Nairobi

KENYA

Tel. (Office): +254-20-3674000/223

Fax: +254-20-3674341

E-mail: alban.bellinguez@au-ibar.org

Dr. Dodji Tagodoe

Human Health Expert

[SPINAP-AHI Program](#)

AU-IBAR

P.O. Box 30786 – 00100

Nairobi

KENYA

Tel. (Office): +254-20-3674000/353

Fax: +254-20-3674341

E-mail: dodji.tagodoe@au-ibar.org

Dr. Dr. Samuel Wakhusama

AU-IBAR

P.O. Box 30786 – 00100

Nairobi

KENYA

Tel. (Office): +254-20-3674000/211

Fax: +254-20-3674341

E-mail: samuel.wakhusama@au-ibar.org

Dr. Raphael Coly

Project Officer

AU-IBAR, P.O. Box 30786 – 00100

Nairobi

KENYA

Tel. (Office): +254-20-3674000/229

Fax: +254-20-3674341

E-mail: raphael.coly@au-ibar.org

Dr. Thomas Nyariki

Wildlife Expert

[SPINAP, AHI Program](#)

AU-IBAR

P.O. Box 30786 – 00100

Nairobi

KENYA

Tel. (Office): +254-20-3674000/352

Fax: +254-20-3674341

E-mail: tom.nyariki@au-ibar.org