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2 Glossary

ACP  African Caribbean Pacific countries
AHI  Avian and Human Influenza
AI  Avian Influenza
ALIVE  African Partnership for Livestock Development
ARIS  Animal Resources Information System
AUC  African Union Commission
AU/IBAR  African Union Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources
BCC  Behaviour Change Communication
BSL3  Biosafety Level 3
CAR  Central African Republic
CIRAD  French Agricultural Research Centre for international development
CMU  Communications and Knowledge Management Unit
DRC  Democratic Republic of Congo
DVS  Director of Veterinary Services
EC  European Community
EAC  East African Community
ECOWAS  Economic Community of West African States
EDF  European Development Fund
EPRP  Emergency Preparedness and Response Plan
EU  European Union
FAO  Food and Agriculture Organization
GF-TAD  Global Framework on control of Trans-boundary Animal Diseases
GTZ  Germany Organization for Technical Cooperation
HPAI  Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza
HSNI  HPAI outbreaks of subtype Haemaglutinin type 5 and Neuraminidase subtype 1
IAEA  International Atomic Energy Agency
IEC  Information, Education, Communication
ILRI  International Livestock Research Institute
INAP  Integrated National Action Plan
JTC  Joint Technical Committee
MoU  Memorandum of Understanding
M&E  Monitoring and Evaluation
NC  National Coordinator
ND  Newcastle Disease
NGO  Non Governmental Organization
NTF  National Task Force
OIE  World Organization for Animal Health
PANVAC  Pan African Vaccine Centre
PCU  Project Coordination Unit
PSC  Program Steering Committee
PSU  Projects Support Unit
RAHC  Regional Animal Health Center
REC  Regional Economic Community
SADC  Southern African Development Community
SARI  Severe Acute Respiratory Infections
SC  Steering Committee
SPINAP-AHI  Support Program to Integrated National Action Plans for Avian and Human Influenza
STOP AI  Stamping Out Pandemic and Avian Influenza
TAD  Trans-boundary Animal Disease
TOR  Terms of Reference
UNICEF  United Nations Children’s Fund
UN OCHA  United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
UNSIC  United Nations System Influenza Coordination
USAID  United States Agency for International Development
WAHIS  World Animal Health Information System
WB  World Bank
WHO  World Health Organisation
3 Summary and context of the action

Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI) is caused by the H5N1 virus which has existed since 1901. It has been responsible for outbreaks in poultry in various parts of the world at different times in the 19th, 20th and 21st centuries. The current wave of HPAI outbreaks started occurred in China 1996 where the virus seems to have hibernated until 2002 when it resurfaced. Since then, H5N1 has spread from China into other South-East Asian countries through Europe and Africa. Avian Influenza was first introduced into Africa in February 2006. Its spread has been attributed to migratory birds and unregulated trade in birds and their products. Among mammals, pigs are believed to play a significant role in the maintenance and spread of HPAI. Although the HPAI has been recorded to infect and cause mortality in humans, its maintenance and transmission from human to human has not been demonstrated. Nonetheless, its zoonotic nature is a major cause of concern due to the grave public health and socio-economic implications of widespread outbreaks and the threat of an AI pandemic.

To date, eleven African countries (Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Côte d’Ivoire, Ghana, Niger, Nigeria and Togo, Egypt, Djibouti and Sudan) have been infected since the introduction of the virus to Africa. Although the anticipated rapid spread of infection has not been witnessed, the risk of the disease becoming endemic in poultry seems to be taking shape in some African and Asian countries. Africa, however, remains highly vulnerable to rapid spread and establishment of HPAI. Over 80% of poultry raised in Africa is kept in backyards where they interact freely with wild birds and humans. Africa’s public health and veterinary systems are also weak and lack the resilience and capacities required to respond to widespread disease emergencies. This, coupled with weak economies characterized by under-funding of service delivery systems and poor infrastructure, make the impacts of widespread HPAI outbreaks unimaginable. This scenario also creates the perfect setting for establishment of endemicity and the potential genesis of pandemic avian influenza. Thus, the African continent could become a reservoir for the virus from where re-emergence of the disease could pose recurrent risk of infection by the H5N1 virus. So far there have been 52 human cases on the continent with 23 fatalities.

Since the start of the current wave of outbreaks, the international community has made enormous efforts to prevent the spread of disease to non-infected areas and assure rapid containment in infected areas. Africa has benefited from the ongoing global efforts to combat HPAI. With the leadership of the Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources of the African Union and collaboration with other technical organisations and key global HPAI actors, African countries have developed emergency preparedness and response plans and mobilized resources to support HPAI prevention and control efforts. One of the major pan-African efforts to combat HPAI is the Support Program for Integrated National Action Plans on avian (and human) Influenza (SPINAP-AHI).

Objectives of SPINAP-AHI

SPINAP-AHI’s purpose is the strengthening of national capacities of the target countries to prevent and control AHI. It contributes to the reduction of socio-economic impact of AHI and the potential loss of human lives by assisting the countries put in place emergency preparedness and response mechanisms.

The program’s immediate purpose is to strengthen the national capacities of participating countries to prevent and control avian and human influenza.
SPINAP support is demand-led and is based on individual country own identified needs and priorities. AU/IBAR on its part ensures coordination and quality assurance support throughout the implementation process.

The program is financed through a contribution agreement between the European Commission and AU/IBAR, with a total amount of €22,594,513, comprising €21,500,000 (or approx. 95%) from the EC and the balance from AU/IBAR. A total of €18.1 million is earmarked for direct transfer to the countries to support the implementation of the emergency components of their national contingency plans/Integrated National Action plans prioritised in the funding applications. The balance of €4,494,513.00 is set aside for coordination, program management and administrative support.

Expected Results

Program supports seeks to deliver results in 3 key areas namely,

- Capacity for prevention and control of AHI strengthened at national level
- Information and communication for the creation of awareness enhanced
- Coordination of IAPs implementation supported

Collaboration

Since SPINAP addresses animal as well as human health issues, it works in close collaboration with the WHO, FAO, OIE and the ALive platform. In particular, the programme staff worked closely with counterparts in the animal health unit on the rapid assessment of INAPs in collaboration with other ALIVE platform partners.

Other partners: World Bank, CEMAC, COMESA, ECCAS, SADC, ECOWAS, IGAD, EAC
4 Purpose of the report

This report records SPINAP-AHI’s progress during its first 22 months of implementation between May 2007 and February 2009.

It forms part of AU/IBAR’s contractual obligation to the European Commission on information and financial narrative reports. The implementing team has pegged reporting intervals to those of the program steering committee.

The report outlines the activities, achievements and difficulties encountered in the covered time period. It also provides a summary of the financial situation as of February 2009 and a work plan for the next programme year.

The meaning of progress

Progress is deemed to have been made when the implemented activities lead to the achievements that constitute a step in the direction of predefined programme results.

The reported progress is therefore measured against the background of the three key result areas as laid out in SPINAP-AHI programme document, namely:

- Capacity for prevention and control of AHI strengthened at national level
- Information and communication for creation of awareness enhanced
- Coordination of INAP implementation supported
5 Progress in the key result areas

Key result 1 – Capacity for prevention and control of AHI strengthened at national level

Activity 1: Informing eligible countries on support opportunities and programme conditionalities

To ensure effective participation, early start-up and smooth implementation, AU/IBAR organized a campaign that informed all stakeholders and in particular the relevant authorities of the eligible countries about the support available from the programme, about its conditionalities and the links with other existing AHI support facilities.

Various communication channels were used to not only inform about the program but also to sensitize about its key issues. The following media was used:

- Brochures and flyers conceptualised, printed and distributed
- Letters sent to national ministries responsible for livestock
- Documents and information materials published in both French and English
- Information for public consumption made available in printed form and on the website www.au/ibar.org

The following stakeholders in the eligible countries were the targets of the information campaign:

- Ministers responsible for livestock
- Ministers of health
- Directors of veterinary services
- Directors of medical services
- All 25 diplomatic missions in Nairobi as well as six non-eligible countries

The programme was also represented in the following fora:

- Third consultative meeting of DVS in Africa 19 May 2007, OIE Paris/France
- AU/IBAR, ILRI and GTZ training course on AHI surveillance and diagnosis for veterinary and medical laboratory staff from African countries, 25 June—6 July 2007, Pretoria/South Africa
- Fourth PANVAC consultative meeting 11—13 July 2007, Pretoria/South Africa
- Support mission of AU/IBAR HPAI outbreak response 22—26 July 2007, Khartoum/Sudan
- FAO workshop on risk management of TADs in the evolving socio-economic order of the SADC region, DVSs in SADC region, 13—14 August 2007, Arusha/Tanzania
- FAO/IAEA-CIRAD African regional training course on molecular techniques for the diagnosis of HPAI, (25 participants from different countries), 26 August—6 September 2007, Cairo/Egypt

**Achievement**

All 47 ACP countries eligible for support through SPINAP received information on the program including application guidelines in paper and electronic form as well as a proposal template to facilitate the development of comprehensible and comparable funding requests. All 47 countries have since submitted applications in the set formats.

**Activity 2: Funding requests from countries**

**Call for applications**

Countries were invited to make applications for funds from the SPINAP programme through a call for applications. The process of calling for applications was streamlined with the publishing of standardized templates and guidelines. The aim was:

- To provide the prospective applicants with unambiguous and easily comprehensible information on what kind of support could be sought from the program as well as
- To provide a harmonized approach with a template that asked for a minimum set of inputs and acceptable standards in order for proposals to become successful

The templates and guidelines were approved by the first PSC in September 2007 held at the African Union Headquarters in Addis Ababa/Ethiopia. The national authorities used the material to compose funding applications on the background of their countries’ existing INAPs/EPR plans. Initially the deadline for submission was November 2007. It was later extended to the end of February 2008 since very few countries had accomplished a submission within the first deadline.

**Achievement**

The persistence of SPINAP staff’s in their follow-up resulted in 47 submitted applications by end of October 2008.

**Activity 3: Assessment of funding applications**

**Developing funding applications (proposal) assessment criteria**

A team charged with the development of an assessment tool for the applications was formed under the lead of IBAR’s chief animal health officer. The team comprised SPINAP’s program coordination unit and IBAR’s technical advisors from the areas of communications and finance, and international HPAI consultants recruited to support the Rapid Assessment process of the ALive platform.

---

The terms funding applications and funding proposals are used interchangeably and refer to the document sent by a country to AU/IBAR in response to the SPINAP-AHI call for applications.
The assessment team aimed for a standardised assessment process guided by a set of inter-subjectively valid criteria. All aspects of the various thematic areas were deliberated upon extensively and in a collegial manner. The result was a set of assessment criteria structured into the four themes of documentation, technical, financial and communications. 2 Indicative questions were developed and then their complexity reduced by choice of a checklist format. This would allow for easier handling given the vast amounts of materials subjected to SPINAP’s PCU. All received proposals were to be assessed against this checklist.

**Assessment process**

First, the assessors checked whether the proposals met all documentary requirements as laid out in the technical application guidelines. Then the technical content and strategies were viewed to ensure that

- The proposed actions were in line with the global strategies for HPAI prevention and control developed by specialized technical entities
- The proposed strategies had the capacity to sufficiently address the national issues described in the situation analysis
- The proposed activities had the capacity to achieve the desired outcomes of preventing and controlling HPAI in both poultry and humans

The financial assessment sought to determine

- Whether the proposals were within the range of the fund allocations for the respective country
- Whether the proposed budgets corresponded with the proposed activities as described in the submitted logical framework
- Whether the budget lines were justifiable under the terms of the program

The communications assessment section sought to examine whether the national proposals gave sufficient input;

- To facilitate effective communications to sensitize the respective national population on HPAI, its significance and risks, appropriate preventive/control behaviour (IEC)
- To be able to gauge the integration and consistency with the actions of other players in the area of AI communications in the respective country
- To translate from the provision of information into effective change of behaviour (BCC)
- To assess whether the communications section of the logical framework was comprehensive
- To meet the reporting requirements for rapid containment in case of an outbreak.

**Achievement**

---

2 Throughout this report ‘technical’ generally refers to veterinary and human health aspects in a wider sense.
The checklist provided a comprehensive and practical tool to the assessors. All received proposals have since been subjected to an assessment using the checklist gauging the suitability in targeting SPINAP’s objectives and compliance with global strategies for HPAI prevention and control. The developed criteria were capable of indicating whether information contained in all sections was consistent in itself and minimized the possibility of duplicating efforts. All proposals and respective assessments have been catalogued for accurate tracking.

Activity 4: Proposal assessment outcomes

The assessment process included a thorough examination of all proposals by a team of technical and management specialists. The technical sections were handled by five African HPAI experts who had been utilized by AU/IBAR as part of the rapid assessments taskforce of the ALive platform. From 11 to 15 February 2008 the three regional SPINAP coordinators, an additional international technical advisor and the PCU reviewed the funding applications received to that date.

After the technical review, the proposals were passed on to the management specialists (Francophone and Anglophone) for assessment of the finance and budget sections. The communications aspect was assessed by AU/IBAR’s communications advisor.

Thereafter the proposals were examined by the regional coordinators who wrote an analytical narrative report for each country of their respective region. The program coordinator reviewed the reports and made specific comments, then passed the documents to the head of the animal health unit at AU/IBAR for final endorsement of the assessments.

A completed checklist with comments, observations, suggested actions and recommendations was produced for each proposal. It was sent to the respective national coordinators and subsequently discussed with them in detail during the regional inception workshops. In fact, the second day of the inception workshops was devoted entirely to the discussion of proposals and observations captured on the checklists.

At the inception workshop, each national programme coordinator or alternative country representative present was given the opportunity to present their application, which was then subjected to a plenary discussion forming the first of part of the intended peer review mechanism. In the second stage, SPINAP’s detailed feedback provided in form of the completed checklists and narrative reports was reviewed one-by-one in small discussion groups under the chairmanship of the respective expert. Four to seven national coordinators discussed issues in each thematic area of the checklist, focussing on the necessary next steps for applications to be successful. The national coordinators were asked to indicate which specific actions they intended to take on the way forward. The moderator was at hand to respond to questions and a rapporteur appointed to capture the discussions, reactions and action points in every group and report back to the plenary.

The process of proposal assessment has been continued by the SPINAP technical team until all applications received from countries are concluded.

Achievement
The proposal assessment and reassessment process formed the bulk of work during the first half of the program implementation period. It entailed continuous dialogue and exchange of documents between national teams and the SPINAP team. This process laid the foundation to the formulation and signing of the funding contracts, at different points in time for each country.

**Major findings of assessments**

While assessing the proposals and during the discussions at the inception workshops, the team witnessed vast differences in the level of capacity of the national veterinary services to handle the development of the SPINAP applications. There were a number that indicated a well-organized approach, while there were also quite a few who displayed that their country virtually lacked a functional veterinary service. The team found that in between the two extremes most countries seemed to have functional veterinary services but struggled with resource constraints, manifested by little real investment into their IAPs.

Below are some general observations gathered at the assessment process structured into the thematic areas. They constitute an informative basis to tailor SPINAP’s strategic support to the specific needs of each country in the next stages of the funding process and implementation.

**Sub-activity: Assessing submitted documentation**

Key documents requested according to the application template:

- A forwarding letter signed by responsible person within the national system
- Curriculum vitae of the national coordinator
- Copy/summary of the INAP
- Declaration by the applicant

The documentation served AU/IBAR

- To crosscheck the information from the template against the information contained in the funding application for consistency
- To gain inside into the intended complimentarity with the INAP
- To obtain official commitment from the applicants in terms of establishing a mechanism to implement the programme as well as providing accountability for SPINAP support

**Achievement**

The detailed preparation paid off.

A majority of 85% of the applicants provided the required documentation already with their initial submission. The others were reminded of their obligation, sometimes repeatedly, along with requests to make necessary adjustments to their applications.
Sub-activity: Assessing technical aspects

The assessors sought to establish whether the applications were

- Based on a sound technical analysis and understanding of the problem of HPAI risk and context
- Conforming with global strategies developed by the leading technical organizations coordinating the global fight against HPAI
- Sufficiently taking the national context as well as the broader global context of HPAI prevention and control into account

Achievement

During the initial assessment, the applications demonstrated varying levels of capacity in the technical context:

- About 25% of the applicants presented the situation in their country well and proposed adequate mitigation strategies. These proposals needed only minor modifications and clarifications in specific sections to be approved for the next steps, entering the negotiation of the contract and eventual funding
- 40-50% of the proposals required substantial revisions. They lacked a clear analysis of the situation (production system, HPAI risk) and consistency with the global HPAI strategies. A number proposed to address routine activities and lacked a clear emergency preparedness strategy. The concerns were communicated to the respective representatives and discussed in one-on-one discussions between AU/IBAR experts and the national coordinators during the inception workshops.
- 15-30% of proposals were hampered by serious weaknesses. Many originated from countries with deteriorated governments structures due to conflict and were prepared without paying due attention to the technical guidelines and templates provided for this purpose. Some countries developed proposals without considering the Integrated National Action Plans. With these applicants the SPINAP team maintained close contact, explained what was required and gave more time and support for revisions.
- For the countries lacking IAPs/INAP, support was sought through various organizations including NGOs, FAO and ALive to help with the process.
- The SPINAP team also gave direct support to countries with weak proposals to further develop and finalize them. In this regard, technical missions were sent to Angola, Equatorial Guinea, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Rwanda and Comoros. Ten other countries – Comoros, Djibouti and Burundi in Eastern Africa and Sao Tome, Cape Verde, CAR, Chad, Cote d’Ivoire, Gambia, Gabon in Western Africa – were assisted to finalize their proposals through clinics organized by the SPINAP team back to back with the regional technical coordination workshops. This approach produced instant results as proposals from a majority of these countries were finalized.

It is expected that the countries of this category will require more substantial support during the implementation process. In addition to these, Somalia which has had political problems with grave consequences on its technical and institutional capacities was also accorded special support. A three day special clinic was organized with the participation of key stakeholders in Nairobi during the month of February 2009 to explore the
best funding mechanism to use for SPINAP support, discussions on the development of a national contingency plan and finalization of funding applications. The three politico-geographic regions were invited to the meeting. This effort paid off as it was agreed to channel Somali funds to the three regional entities through the SAHSP program coordinated by Terra Nuova to address specific interventions for every region.

Note

A significant number of African countries have not yet undergone rapid assessments to update their INAPs. As the process adds value to the INAPs, the SPINAP team seized every opportunity – such as the workshops and correspondence – to point out the need to apply for support (rapid assessment) through the ALive platform.

Sub-activity: Assessing financial aspects

For applications that were found technically sound, the budget sections were scrutinized.

Well in advance, IBAR developed a country fund allocation formula and obtained endorsement by the first steering committee. Subsequently, the national authorities were informed the actual amount available to their respective countries.

Thus, IBAR's assessment of the budget sections of the applications focussed on

- Illuminating how the available funds had been distributed to the different activities
- Clarifying how feasible the budgeted activities could be in achieving the intended results
- Accepting or rejecting the budget lines in terms of type of material, indicated height of expense and the way the funds were proposed to be used

Achievement

The assessor, IBAR's financial advisor, found that the budget sections of many applications needed

- Adjustments to ensure proper targeting of the desired results
- Unacceptable budget positions to be removed
- More detailed budget lines for purposes of inclusion to the financing contract

All necessary modifications were achieved through a two-way exchange between the IBAR-SPINAP team with the national counterparts to build consensus on the final budgets. Once the budgets were accepted they were included in the contracts.

Sub-activity: Assessing communications aspects

Although the call for proposals, guidelines and templates did not make it mandatory for applicants to provide information on communications activity, the technical team decided that communication was an integral part of any
emergency preparedness and management strategy and therefore needed adequate reflection in the country’s application for SPINAP support.

The assessment of the proposals’ communications aspects was designed to gain insight on

- How the applicants proposed to create awareness on HPAI under different infection scenarios, i.e. before, during, after outbreaks (IEC)
- Feasibility of the proposed means to carry out the communication interventions in the first place as well as their probable effectiveness
- Effectiveness of proposed approach in stimulating behaviour change for real impact (BCC)

**Achievements**

IBAR’s communications advisor identified gaps in the communications approaches of many countries:

- Most countries did include basic communications interventions in their proposals
- Some had elaborate communication strategies while the majority approached the subject simplistically with a list of communications tactics such as posters, radio and leaflets
- It was apparent that few had received input from communications professionals

At the inception workshops IBAR’s communications expert advised all participating applicants on indispensable improvement and encouraged the participants to involve communications professionals in their planning and design of communications-related activity to ensure a strategic and targeted approach. He provided practical considerations on how to develop or strengthen their communications strategies which later found entry into the refining of their proposals.

Communication, however still remains a challenging area where the SPINAP team needs to provide additional technical support – in terms of sketching out communications strategies, facilitating as well as monitoring the implementation of communications-related activities. This necessity was already expressed at the inception workshops. SPINAP implementation takes place at national level. That is true for communications-related activity as well. The SPINAP team, has therefore drafted a technical support strategy for communications, to enable countries make the best use of their communication budgets and to ensure achievement of result 2.

**Overall achievements**

**Country funding status**

As of 28th February 2009, after a rigorous assessment process and sustained dialogue between national and AU-IBAR based SPINAP teams, all the target countries had submitted funding applications. These have been assessed and decisions made on their funding.
## Country contract progression matrix as at end of February 2009

**Action taken**

1 = Has signed contract and has received first tranche  
2 = Has signed but some problems on bank account details  
3 = Dossier sent to country for signature, not yet back to IBAR  
4 = Dossier prepared for signature  
5 = In good progress  
6 = Preparation in process with third party for safe implementation  
7 = Amount sent, 8 = Implementation report received, 9 = Country given technical assistance to finalize report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>W&amp;C Africa</th>
<th>Allocation ($)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>320,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Guinea Bissau</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Allocation ($)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Burkina faso</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>S/Leeone</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>G/Conakry</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>330,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>C/d'Ivorie</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>575,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sao Tome</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Cape verde</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>11,800,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,170,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Allocation ($)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SPINAP-AHI – Progress Report at 22 months

### Support Programme to Integrated National Action Plans for Avian and Human Influenza

© March 2009, IBAR Communications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Cash</th>
<th>Loan</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>E/Guinea</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98775</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,100,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>788,775</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Allocation ($)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C/Brazaville</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Congo DRC</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Somalia (Somaliland,</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Puntland and TFG areas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Support Programme to Integrated National Action Plans for Avian and Human Influenza

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Amount (USD)</th>
<th>Goal Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S/Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,450,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation ($)</th>
<th>Signed contract and has received first tranche</th>
<th>Signed but some problems on bank account details</th>
<th>Dossier sent to country for signature, not yet back to IBAR</th>
<th>Dossier prepared for signature</th>
<th>In good progress</th>
<th>Preparation in process with third party for safe implementation</th>
<th>Amount sent</th>
<th>Implementation report received</th>
<th>Country given technical assistance to finalize report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Total W/C A</td>
<td>11,800,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,015,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Total EA</td>
<td>8,450,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,522,532</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Total S A</td>
<td>4,100,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>788,775</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Grand Totals</td>
<td>24,350,000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,326,307</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 26 have signed the contract and have received their first tranche of funds
- 9 have signed but we have some problems with their account number what is delaying their first transfers
- 3 dossiers are in country for signature
- 1 dossier is prepared and ready to be sent in country for signature (Eritrea)
- 2 are in good progress for finalization (Namibia and Sao Tome Principe)
- With one, Somalia, we are in negotiation with an NGO, third party for smooth implementation
- Note that 14 countries benefited from technical assistance for finalization.
- A total amount of $6,481,307 has been disbursed to 26 countries where activities are in progress
- Way forward: Need for close supervision and monitoring of implementation
Activity 5: Development and signing of MoUs and contracts

To enter into the implementation phase with the applicants, a legally binding the relationship between AU-IBAR and the countries is needed. The SPINAP team developed a comprehensive contract template in line with the SPINAP financing agreement between the European Commission and AU/IBAR and obtained legal advice from the AU office of legal services. A memorandum of understanding was also developed to guide the implementation processes at a more general political level.

Challenges and achievement

The 2nd steering committee approved both the contract and MOU templates on the basis of their technical soundness in April 2008.

By end of February 2009, 43 contracts and contract offers had been forwarded to the steering committee for endorsement. Of these 40 were enacted as they had received counter-signature by the appropriate national authorities. The remainder of 3 have been sent to countries for signature. Of the balance of 4 countries, 1 (Eritrea) was ready to be forwarding to the PSC for endorsement and country for signature. Sao Tome and Namibia had some minor adjustments to be made on their budget and log frame respectively, while Somalia’s application was in the process of being adjusted to harmonize it with the negotiated mode of implementation (through an NGO consortium).

Transfer of funds to countries is only done after successful signing of contracts and MOUs and hinge on the opening of designated bank accounts for local and foreign currency. Often a signed document was needed to initiate the opening of bank account. This plus the time lags between processing and signing of documents, as well as the opening of bank takes substantial lengths of time.

A second reason for delay on the side of the recipients was that the SPINAP contract drafts had to be scrutinised by a legal advisor prior official signature. Delays ranged from two to four months in the cases of Kenya, Tanzania, Botswana, Cameroun and Mali among others.

Enacted contracts were analysed and information extracted to project the cash flows and map out activity based time schedules for monitoring charts. For the PCU these instruments help to visualise the disbursements to the countries over certain time periods, for national counterparts they form a handy tool to monitor compliance with implementation procedures and timelines.

By the end of February 2009, funds totalling about USD 6.5m had been transferred to 26 countries.

Disbursements to the small number of countries remaining is expected to be concluded by end of April 2009. Disbursement of subsequent tranches of funds is also foreseen in the immediate future, starting as early as April for those receiving funds in November and December 2009.
Summary of funds disbursement to countries and status of accounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Amount Transferred</th>
<th>With Financial Details</th>
<th>Missing Details</th>
<th>Contract Sent But not Returned</th>
<th>Prepared for Signature</th>
<th>Out for Approval</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Proposal Not At Hand</th>
<th>Amount of the first tranche</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>No Financial Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>No account holder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>275,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>230,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cameroun</td>
<td>No Financial Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>No Financial Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Congo Brazzaville</td>
<td>135,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cote D'Ivoire</td>
<td>No Financial Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>110,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>No Financial Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>75,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>120,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Guine Bissau</td>
<td>160,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Guine Conakry</td>
<td>330,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>140,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>170,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td>No corresponding bank and currency details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>No Financial Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>No Financial Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>700,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>575,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Sao Tome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>320,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>75,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>900,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>272,532.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>190,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>375,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>98,775.00</td>
<td>630,000</td>
<td>1,415,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,481,307</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,340,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity 6: Technical and administrative support to countries

AU/IBAR is responsible to provide technical and administrative support to target countries throughout the programme implementation process. To fulfil this responsibility, standardized templates and guidelines have been developed and forwarded to guide the national coordinators and their teams on project issues. Secondly, the program implementation team installed mechanisms to ensure correct management of the grants and compliance with administrative and financial rules. Besides support and training on finance, administrative and procurement procedures, rules and regulations manuals have been prepared. To date, national coordinators from 45 countries, all regional coordinators and their finance teams have been trained on the various aspects of the contracts, applicable EDF rules and regulations as well as AU finance and administrative procedures. A total of 7 training sessions have been held across all program regions. All participating countries except Mauritius and Somalia took part in the exercise.

Achievement

All participating SPINAP national coordinators and their accountants have the right information and knowledge to effectively manage the program. They also have reporting formats, manuals and procedures to effectively manage implementation of the national SPINAP components.

AU/IBAR and the SPINAP team established mechanisms to provide additional technical assistance throughout the implementation process through support missions covering monitoring, financial and program audits and periodic ad hoc reviews determined on a case by case basis.

Accounting forms and manuals to guide implementation of the programme are being fine-tuned taking into account the lessons learned from the training sessions. Forms and manuals are available to all implementing teams.

Activity 7: SPINAP’s team monitors and evaluates implementation

AU/IBAR is responsible for the monitoring of progress and making adjustments in the implementation of SPINAP-funded interventions at the national levels. During the contract signing stage, national work plans and budgets were analysed, monitoring charts created and appended as annexes to the contracts to guide the national implementing teams. With these strategies and interventions in place, the basis is laid for SPINAP’s implementation to be adequately monitored and important lessons learned to be recorded throughout the process. However, complying with the procedures under tight timelines in the implementation phase is expected to challenge the national teams.

A comprehensive approach to program monitoring and evaluation was built into the terms of reference of the implementing staff and a full time M&E position established at the PCU. Ad-hoc program and financial audits as well as routine M&E are being established as part of the technical support arrangements by the PCU and IBAR. To make the M&E process widely participatory, a system has been developed and all team members trained on its use. Plans have been mooted to train national teams also. Within IBAR, several teams can be constituted at any give time to undertake M&E activities across the wide geographic coverage of the program.
Achievement

SPINAP’s PCU developed a monitoring and evaluation system including training of program coordinators on its use across the entire program. Its approach is harmonised with the results-based AU M&E system. In the recent past, the PCU sent initial M&E missions to test the system in 10 countries. The main thrust was to check how well the system is adapted to the national interventions, appraise the implementation process and initiate corrective actions in countries where found necessary.

Activity 8: Implementation support through regional coordinators and RAHCs

SPINAP implementation is managed through a coordination mechanism bringing together personnel at national, regional and continental levels. A full complement of program technical and support staff has been established and is in charge of program implementation and control. All staff has been recruited through internationally competitive tendering processes including the advertising of posts on international listserves, websites and other media commonly used by the African Union.

Achievement

For effective facilitation of the implementation at the national level, every target country nominated a national SPINAP coordinator from among its national task force members to oversee the day to day implementation on request from AU/IBAR. The national coordinators are assisted by specialists responsible for accounting and financial reporting, and technical aspects of program implementation mainly veterinary, wildlife, communication and public health specialists. National coordination positions are secondment arrangements by national governments with no additional costs to SPINAP.

- At the regional level, AU/IBAR appointed three SPINAP regional coordinators to take care of three clusters of countries, comprising 12 in southern, 14 in eastern and 21 for western and central Africa. They are based at the Regional Animal Health Centres in Nairobi, Bamako and Gaborone respectively. AU/IBAR established a functional coordination mechanism with FAO and OIE in all three regions and provided financial resources for staffing and office operations at the RAHCs. Besides the regional SPINAP coordinators, AU/IBAR has appointed RAHC coordinators, accountants and support staff to provide support to the SPINAP coordinators and also collaborate closely with OIE, FAO and other regional stakeholders in the coordination of its broader livestock mandates at the regional level.

- At the continental level (AU/IBAR’s head office) program management and implementation is overseen by the overall (continental) SPINAP coordinator who heads the PCU and works under the preview of the head of animal health unit and AU-IBAR director. Besides SPINAP-related activity, the overall coordinator networks with other organizations and programs involved in HPAI prevention and control. The PCU also hosts technical specialists on wildlife, public health and Monitoring and Evaluation. These together with a financial advisor form the core SPINAP team at the AU/IBAR head office.
Overall achievements

Overall, the SPINAP program has sought to address gaps in the IAP/National contingency plans that have been prioritised by the countries themselves. Additionally, the program team has strived to ensure country funding applications conform to global HPAI prevention and control strategies. In general the team has guide the development and approved funding applications that address key areas of intervention recommended for early detection and rapid response to HPAI incursions. The table below shows the distribution of country grants by area of intervention.

Key areas of investment of Country SPINAP grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Intervention</th>
<th>Eastern Africa</th>
<th>Southern Africa</th>
<th>Western and Central Africa</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness Creation</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and Supplies</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance and Field Implementation</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this analysis, it is evident that countries are investing their grants in areas relevant to the strengthening of their abilities to prevent and respond to HPAI outbreaks.
Key result 2 – Information and communication for creation of awareness enhanced

Activity 1: Maintaining a web presence

The SPINAP team has developed numerous materials relating to the program and to some degree to HPAI in general. AU-IBAR’s communications team edited and laid out the documents and other material for public consumption and web usage on a dedicated web page.

AU/IBAR communications created and maintained a section for all of IBAR’s AI projects under which content relating to SPINAP can be found from the very beginning of the project.

Achievement

SPINAP features prominently and extensively on the AU/IBAR website www.au-ibar.org

All of SPINAP’s stakeholders have been kept informed about the objectives, activities, and progress made of the programme. The website publishes HPAI information generated by the program and links to other organisations and sources of information.

Pertinent information retained on the websites SPINAP-AHI section:

- Summary of the programme
- Stakeholders and beneficiaries
- Concept note of SPINAP-AHI
- Upcoming events
- Agenda and minutes of SC
- Flyer and brochures (English and French)
- Job opportunities
- Guidelines and fund request template
- Manuals for countries (after endorsement by PSC)
- Program reports
- Other relevant information
- Links to other websites

Activity 2: Contribute to creation of public awareness among stakeholders

The program made efforts to create public awareness on wider matters of HPAI. The AU/IBAR website avails programme-related information from SPINAP but also the wider AHI portfolio. However, according to the overall programme set-up, public awareness is targeted to be raised more at the field implementation level (national level) where the primary stakeholders and target groups are located. Thus, most of the awareness raising by SPINAP will be achieved through the coordination of efforts with national program coordinators. The core SPINAP team has on its part assured this is realized by ensuring every country has a budget for communication
and by putting in place a mechanism to provide specialized technical support for countries to effectively implement their communication components of their SPINAP funded interventions.

**Achievement**

An average of 21% of all funds allocated to countries (24% WA, 21% SA and 18% EA) is devoted to awareness creation. Additionally, the participation of IBAR’s communications advisor during the proposal assessment process and inception workshops was an important contribution to the objective of raising of awareness through provision of technical support to the process. This role has been sustained and will be reinforced through consultants during the actual implementation of activities after countries receive funds.

Beyond this action various channels were used with specific focus on the following interventions

- The website, reinforced with brochures, banners and other communication materials sustained throughout the implementation period
- Links with key stakeholders through diverse media, including websites, workshops, seminars and media briefs
- At national level SPINAP-AHI made provisions to support the development of awareness creation materials. Most countries submitted specific budget lines with substantial sums of money to support information and communication interventions
- The communication expert assisted with the adaptation of communication activities in the national funding requests to improve targeting, content and ensure professional input in the implementation of communication activities. With his assistance, SPINAP-AHI will also provide targeted capacity building support during implementation of communication activities at the country level. The scope of communication under SPINAP has been reviewed to include behaviour change for greater impact.
- The SPINAP page on the AU/IBAR website has been updated fortnightly with programmatic information and information gathered from other sources.

**Activity 3: Links with partners for dissemination of information on the programme**

AU/IBAR and SPINAP’s PCU have been in constant contact with various HPAI actors on the African continent and globally. Information gathering and dissemination has been achieved through participation in joint activities like seminars and workshops, meetings and projects specific activities of AU/IBAR and other actors. Of the common activities, participation in the ALive platform-led rapid assessment process and development of INAPs has been routine.

Another significant activity in this respect has been the establishment of regional animal health centres in collaboration with OIE and FAO. This has created a mechanism for continuous exchange of information and programmatic collaboration on a day-to-day basis. The mechanism has also provided opportunities for joint planning, synergy building and improved coordination between projects implemented by the partner organizations.
To advance this further, the SPINAP team are exploring other mechanisms for developing institutional partnerships with other key actors in HPAI and other zoonoses. Key among these are WHO/Africa with whom discussions have started to sign an MoU for collaboration on the “one world one health” agenda, Centres for Disease Control (CDC) to strengthen the establishment and training of joint rapid response teams, FAO and OIE. Internally, AU-IBAR is also in discussion with the African Union Commission to strengthen technical links with the human health department.

Achievements

- Regular contact with the ALive platform, OIE, FAO, WB and EC has been maintained. AU/IBAR has appointed officials to coordinate with these stakeholders.

- Adoption of the OIE and FAO global HPAI strategies in the design of the support programmes. Conformity with these strategies is a major consideration in determining acceptability of funding applications. AU/IBAR also appointed rapid assessment experts to take part in the INAP process alongside those from the FAO, OIE and WHO. This cooperative process ensures convergence of the partner technical organizations views and strategies in the INAPs developed and adapted by countries. Both the SPINAP coordinator and the IBAR animal health unit are involved in the process.

- In its implementation arrangements, SPINAP-AHI aims at close cooperation with projects funded by other organisations to minimize duplication and expand their impact. In this respect, SPINAP coordinators are in touch with other projects at all levels and organizations implementing projects at regional and national levels are involved in all coordination events. This coordination is realized through regional organizations and RECs as well as actors at country level e.g. through the National AI Task Forces (NTFs). Strategically, SPINAP implementation has been dovetailed with the national HPAI portfolio as contained in the INAP documents.

- Active involvement in fora organized at international, continental, regional/REC and national levels to be fully linked to all HPAI coordination mechanisms. In an effort to promote this approach to resource targeting, SPINAP has been advocating for the use of the NTF as the sole mechanism for the channelling of HPAI funds to countries. This view was shared at regional coordination meetings as well as the 6th International Ministerial Conference in Sharm El Sheikh.

- From experience with SPINAP, AU/IBAR has begun rethinking more effective mechanisms of engaging with other regional technical actors. Specifically, a mechanism to strengthen the linkage between veterinary and public health needs to be worked out expeditiously. The SPINAP team are currently exploring the option of engaging the public health desk at the African Union head office with SPINAP and subsequently working out institutional arrangements to mainstream the public health/animal health linkage. This is expected to culminate in the creation of a formal inter-institutional coordination mechanism between the AU/IBAR, public health desk and WHO, that will strengthen integrated approaches to the management of HPAI and other zoonoses. A memorandum of understanding or similar instrument is expected to be negotiated to conclude this arrangement before the end of 2009.
Key result 3 – Coordination of INAP implementation supported

The main thrust of this result area is to strengthen the coherence of AHI-related activities in participating African ACP countries.

Through the regional animal health centre coordination mechanism and national coordination arrangements, the SPINAP coordinators are actively involved in AI coordination at all levels on the continent. The national SPINAP coordinators are key actors in the national AI task forces established in all countries. Coordination is mainly achieved through participation in and organization of coordination forums, workshops and other activities organized by national governments and AI actors, as well as deliberate efforts to enhance inter-agency collaboration at implementation levels. More specifically, activities geared towards enhancing coherence at different levels are built in and financially supported by the program. To date, the program has organized six regional coordination events and its coordinators took part in many forums at national and regional levels. Resources have also been set aside to support coordination and NTF activities at the country level.

Activity 1: Organise inception meetings in collaboration with partners

Three inception workshops were organized on a regional basis covering western and central, southern and eastern Africa. They provided the first direct interaction between the SPINAP core team and their national counterparts, and sought to enhance regional cohesiveness of HPAI prevention and control activities. The specific objectives of the inception workshops were amongst others to:

- Share the lessons learned from the assessment of country applications received for funding by the PCU
- Share information on the status of HPAI in different countries
- Improve understanding on different actors involved in HPAI activities in the region
- Build networks and discuss ways to enhance cooperation in the fight against HPAI
- Discuss communication strategies, identify gaps in national communication approaches to facilitate their strengthening
- Lay out programme implementation modalities
- Discuss programmatic issues, procedures, guidelines, implementation modalities, relationships with other actors

Workshop structure

Day 1:

- Sharing of general information on HPAI activities in the region by various actors
- Sharing of specific information on SPINAP-AHI program
Day 2:

- Presentation of the national level HPAI situation, activities and plans
- Identification and discussion of specific challenges nationally/regionally

Day 3:

- Discussion of the SPINAP implementation modalities/procedures and communications

Other actors (projects, organizations, RECs) were present to share information on their projects and identify opportunities for collaboration and synergy building.

**Workshop dates**

- February 2008 in Dakar Senegal for 21 countries grouped under the western Africa coordination office, Bamako
- First week of March at AU head office in Addis Ababa for the eastern African countries
- Second week of March in Gaborone for the countries of the southern African region, RAHC Gaborone.

**Achievement**

A total of 39 countries and an average of 7 international organizations active in the 3 regions took part in the workshops. The inception workshops were instrumental in shaping the relationship between the wider SPINAP team and the national counterparts and helped to define the relationship between AU/IBAR and other HPAI actors at national and regional levels.

**Specific achievements**

- Greater understanding and clarification of issues on the application procedures, assessment criteria and expectations by the SPINAP teams on country inputs
- Consensus build around key lessons learned from country applications and how to deal with gaps
- Information shared with other stakeholders for better coordination of interventions at national levels
- Implementation modalities, roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders and the rationale behind various decisions and strategies explained and agreed upon
- Special needs and challenges to program implementation identified and utilized to make decisions on national applications and technical support strategies
Activity 2: Organize Program Steering Committee meetings

The SPINAP-AHI steering committee, comprising key international stakeholders involved in HPAI has the principal mandate of providing oversight and policy guidance to the implementation process. The committee comprises members drawn from FAO, OIE, UNICEF, WHO, World Bank, EC, AU, AU-IBAR, ACP secretariat, ECOWAS, COMESA, SADC and ECCAS and is open to observers from various organizations involved in avian influenza work. To facilitate the work of the committee, the program is obliged by contract to organize programme steering committee (PSC) meetings every six months.

Achievements

- The first PSC meeting was successfully organised on September 21, 2007 at the African Union head office in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Program templates proposed for guiding the cooperation with the ACP countries, streamlining access to the funds and guiding the implementation processes at all levels were approved. Also tabled for approval were the PSC ToRs and the funds allocations to countries.

- The second steering committee was held approximately six months after the first (April 2009), back to back with the 3rd steering committee meeting of the GF TADs for Africa group and 11th ALIVE executive committee meetings at the FAO head office in Rome. It also coincided with the conclusion of the extended program inception phase. Its main agenda items were the presentation of the progress report of the extended inception phase, the assessment criteria applied to country funding applications, the initial thoughts on the SPINAP M&E framework and the first main implementation phase work plan and budget for the period April 2008 to March 2009. The SPINAP team also presented the MoU and funding contract templates for endorsement by the steering committee.

- The 3rd SC meeting was held in Nairobi on the 11th of November 2008 after cancellation of the initial plan to have it in Gaborone back to back with ALIVE and GF-TADS meetings. In spite of the underlying confusion, the SC went ahead and dispensed its agenda as planned. The 3rd SC was the first since start of the main implementation phase of the SPINAP program. As is customary with SC meetings, the PCU team made presentations of progress achieved including some programmatic proposals, the financial report, M&E framework, work plan for the next period and a draft report on countries with special needs (requiring special assistance). In summary, the 3rd SC made the following resolutions;

  o After proper review of the minutes of the 2nd PSC meeting with the view of raising any matters arising and/or making corrections where needed, they were adopted with minor corrections. Adoption was proposed by Mr. Christer Hermansson (EC) and seconded by Mr. Ojo Olusoa from the ACP Secretariat

  o In view of the progress made and challenges experienced in the field, the team made justification for a no-cost-extension of the SPINAP. After discussion, the team was advised to make a formal application as per procedure. The extension would compensate for the time lag to finalize countries documents and contract agreements due to bureaucratic procedures in various countries
The meeting was informed that SPINAP was due to a mid-term evaluation sometime in January/February 2009.

The meeting also discussed availability of an additional 3 Million Euro which the SPINAP team proposed to invest to create a regional coordination mechanism for the program. The meeting advised that the best time to concretise decision on the additional money would be after the Mid-Term evaluation of the program due in 2-3 months, as there may be other issues to take into account.

The proposed few changes in the work plan such as the holding of three inception meetings instead of one, a Pan African technical coordination meeting, reducing the number of regional technical meetings in the earlier plan from 6 to 4; developing a regional coordination mechanism for SPINAP to address a need that had been realized; mid-term evaluation of the program by end of January were endorsed.

The presented analysis of countries with special needs was discussed with some critical questions arising. The idea of identifying special needs and addressing them to facilitate effective program implementation was endorsed. However, the meeting recommended the preparation of a detailed report with actionable recommendations. For instance, some of the countries said to have special needs have a lot of money but may be lacking ideas or human resources, while others lack proper prioritization and may only need to be lobbied to prioritize veterinary capacity building rather than additional funding.

**Activity 3: Organize regional technical meetings**

AU/IBAR received and assessed funding applications for SPINAP support from all the 47 eligible countries. From these assessments and feedback received during a series of regional program inception workshops, significant disparities were identified both in the technical capacities of participating countries, and the conceptualization of interventions for emergency preparedness and response against HPAI. This was evidenced through variations in the interpretation of available strategies on such issues as disease surveillance in poultry and wild birds, communication and laboratory diagnosis among others, as well as the formulation of interventions to address SPINAP objectives. This pointed to a need for discussion of technical issues relating to HPAI emergency preparedness and response to ensure a common understanding and effective application of recommended strategies. The IN-APs and national contingency/emergency preparedness plans were also observed to be purely internal plans lacking cross-border coordination mechanisms essential for the successful management of diseases like HPAI.

To address these concerns AU/IBAR and the SPINAP-AHI team organized three regional technical coordination workshops between July and September 2008 in close collaboration with the regional economic communities, regional animal health centres and other HPAI actors. They sought to bring technical experts from human health and SPINAP national coordinators together to discuss pertinent HPAI issues relevant to the successful implementation of SPINAP. The workshops were scheduled to take place around the time of signing funding agreements.
The aim of the technical workshops was to ensure the applicants have a clear understanding on the best way to utilize the funds and more specifically to improve the regional coordination of INAP implementations by bringing the key actors together to share ideas and knowledge, harmonize understanding and application of HPAI strategies at national and regional levels.

- Generate common understanding and practical application of key HPAI prevention and control strategies on regional and national basis
- To discuss areas of importance in the control and prevention of HPAI as well as the practical difficulties that may influence national preparedness and early detection.
- Equip the national coordinators with theoretical and practical technical knowledge, lessons learned and best practice necessary to ensure smooth implementation of SPINAP project
- Provide opportunities for improved cross-border sharing and coordination in the management of HPAI and other important trans-boundary diseases
- Provide opportunities to analyse available technical knowledge on the prevention and control of AI and identify critical gaps that need to be addressed at national and regional levels.

To achieve these objectives, the workshops were organized so as to bring together key actors at the regional level (RECs, technical agencies, donor representatives) with research institutions and international experts to discuss selected topics and share experiences and best practice in the fight against HPAI. Additionally, professionals from infected countries and technical experts from leading organizations involved in HPAI management were invited to make presentations on selected topics and facilitate discussions on the best bet actions for investing SPINAP grants and other funds to strengthen national HPAI preparedness and emergency responses.

**Specific activities at the technical workshops**

- Veterinary and other HPAI experts in the region presented selected themes and facilitated discussions during the workshop. Both plenary and group discussions on selected topics were used
- Countries which had experienced outbreaks were given slots to share experiences and lessons learned
- Documentaries on topical issues e.g. simulation exercise, diagnosis were occasionally used to initiate discussion and highlight the necessities required for a response.

Workshop themes and topics discussed included:

- Safe poultry production and policies
- HPAI epidemiology and surveillance in poultry, wild life and human populations, early detection
- Laboratory capacity building and diagnosis
- Emergency preparedness and response
- HPAI communication
- HPAI Training and human capacity development

At the time of reporting, preparations have been initiated for a continental technical coordination workshop to discuss HPAI prevention and control preparedness at continental level, share experiences from SPINAP implementation to date, harmonize coordination of HPAI interventions with other actors and discuss emerging issues on HPAI and pandemic influenza preparedness, including gaps and actions to address them.

Lessons learned from technical workshops

- Most countries in Africa have developed emergency preparedness plans against HPAI similar to those of countries in other regions. However, the occurrence and maintenance of infection in some African countries has raised queries on the sufficiency of the existing plans. For some, the response has been weak and uncoordinated. This signifies that African countries should do more against HPAI. From the experiences shared by infected countries on preparedness, the time taken to respond to the index cases make a significant difference on the progression of infection and establishment of the virus. It has also been shown that pre-testing national plans through simulation exercises helps to identify and seal gaps in the plans.

- Information shared at the workshops indicated that poultry has not been taken seriously as livestock both in terms of legislation as well as service delivery arms of most countries. As such countries should learn from their peers who have initiated specific legislation on poultry and review their disease control legislations to give poultry appropriate legal recognition like other livestock species, provide guidelines for service delivery and regulations for the improvement and enforcement of bio-safety regulations in the poultry sector. In this regard, Kenya was reported to be progressing well towards completion of a new poultry policy.

- There is a lack of clear-cut legal and other cross-border coordination mechanisms on trans-boundary diseases, thus making it difficult for countries to share information and institute joint measures on such important issues.

- Although AU/IBAR collects and consolidates animal health reports from all African countries for publication in the African Animal Health Year Book, reporting by countries has been erratic and quite low due to poor advocacy with the countries and lack of a harmonized reporting format. There was consensus that if these two issues were addressed, disease reporting would be significantly improved.

- It was made clear that awareness does not necessarily lead to the desired changes in behaviour. There is therefore real need for communication to target behaviour change as opposed to just awareness creation because real change, adaptation and effectiveness of the communication is only realized when the target groups embrace new behaviour/way of doing things to address the problem.

- There is poor cooperation between communications and livestock technical professionals, which has often led to conflict and dissemination of inaccurate or incomplete information on various technical issues. It was suggested that professionals from both sectors identify effective ways of working together to ensure accu-

3 Concept note for the workshop is annexed for reference
rate messages are communicated in a professional manner to all target groups especially on HPAI due to its socio-economic and public health significance.

- Most countries were said to lack budgets and technical capacities for disease surveillance and emergency response in both livestock and wildlife. This situation was cited as a serious threat to the risk of HPAI and participating nations and development actors were challenged to establish mechanisms to address it.

- Some HPAI infected countries experienced challenges with compensation to the extent that it became a cause for disease spread as opposed to it serving as an incentive for timely reporting. Thus, compensation should be thought of and applied very carefully to ensure it serves the right purpose and does not become an alternate market for “intentionally infected” birds.

- It was observed that the integration approach adopted for HPAI globally has rekindled the “one medicine” philosophy which participants emphasized should be extended to all zoonoses, emerging and remerging.

- AU/IBAR was challenged, together with its partners, RECs and national authorities to learn from past programs and take measures to improve the sustainability of accruing from SPINAP.

Recommendations and action points

Considering that the majority of countries in Africa are free from HPAI outbreaks; bearing in mind that it may be just a matter of time before HPAI outbreaks occur in these; considering that there is serious need for effective emergency preparedness and response plans as opposed to preparedness plans on paper, and further considering the urgent need for efficient management of HPAI and other Trans-boundary diseases at both national and regional levels; and considering that there is the need for effective coordination and collaboration among various actors in the implementation of HPAI programs and projects, the technical coordination meetings recommended:

- Integrated National Action Plans against Avian and Human Influenza be tested through the use of simulation exercises to determine their completeness and readiness in case of an outbreak.

- Regional integrated preparedness plans be put in place at the REC level and be backed by simulation exercises to test and authenticate their readiness.

- AU/IBAR considers expanding the scope of the SPINAP-AHI program to include a regional coordination mechanism on HPAI given that in its current form the program lacks a regional perspective.

- AU/IBAR in accordance with its mandate, takes up the role of coordinating funding and interventions on avian influenza and other TBDs in close cooperation with the RECs and other key actors (organizations and programs) at the regional level, and develops mechanisms with RECs and national authorities for sustainability of projects funded through such initiatives.

- In view of the importance of accurate and rapid diagnosis of HPAI during outbreaks, national and regional laboratory networks should be strengthened, with at least 2 BSL3 veterinary and human health laboratories established or strengthened in every region to H5 antigen detection.
In view of the increasing need for transparency in disease reporting and cross-border information sharing, AU/IBAR should strengthen advocacy for disease reporting and provide harmonized formats to enhance compliance. On their part, regional countries were challenged to give due priority to disease reporting to AU/IBAR as it is the continental animal health watchdog for Africa.

In view of the commonality of the zoonoses challenge between animal and human health sectors, the “one world, one health” integrated approach to their (zoonoses) management should be strongly promoted and applied at all levels within the continents regions.

Considering the inter-connectedness of the states within the RECs and the trans-boundary character of HPAI, policy and legal frameworks and strategies on HPAI should be harmonized.

In view of the important role played by wildlife in the epidemiology of animal diseases and zoonoses, the project should make deliberate effort to enhance the technical capacity for wildlife disease surveillance in all countries, and enhance collaboration between wildlife and veterinary services for better efficiency as disease surveillance, reporting and management.

That information and communications are integral aspects of emergency, development and technology transfer programs, and especially new and emerging threats such as HPAI. The meeting therefore recommends the strengthening of awareness and behaviour change communication interventions as well as the use of participatory approaches to mobilize and sustain practices towards behaviour change in poultry husbandry as a tool to combat HPAI and other diseases.

Noting that the SPINAP team has made a significant effort towards inter-sectoral integration by bringing together public health, animal health and wildlife expertise together. To further enhance and operationalize the principle of inter-sectoral integration, it is recommended that AU/IBAR involves the public health department of the African Union commission in the implementation of SPINAP and other HPAI interventions.

In recognition of the fact that a lot of training is planned and or being undertaken by various HPAI actors as a capacity building tool, and that most of the training targets more or less similar target groups for similar reasons, it is recommended that effort should be made to harmonize the technical content of HPAI training materials for use by all actors. Further, it is recommended that the formation and training of rapid response teams should embrace inter-sectoral integration.

In view of the fact that most African countries are free of HPAI, but run significant risks of introduction from trade and migratory birds, it was recommended that interventions targeting the strengthening of skills for early detection and immediate reporting be emphasised at the central and peripheral levels of the veterinary services, alongside with the strengthening of national laboratory capacities for initial diagnosis.

Considering that a number of HPAI-free countries easily lose momentum of investing in a non-existent problem while many pressing problems exist, the meetings after discussions on the challenge of sustaining interest on HPAI in its absence, recommended the use of new castle (ND) as an entry point for HPAI preparedness. Mass vaccination against ND was recommended as a tool to allow for easy recognition of HPAI in the event of an outbreak as ND could easily mask HPAI.
In recognition of the Integrated Disease Surveillance and response and Internal Health Regulations developed by the WHO, it was recommended that all countries should establish/strengthen their human sentinel surveillance systems of Severe Acute Respiratory Infections (SARI) as a means of improving differential diagnosis of Avian Influenza

**Achievement**

The technical workshops brought together animal and human health professions from countries and regional organizations. In total 32 human and 43 animal health professionals took part. Technical and regional organisations were represented at all the workshops\(^4\). Thus the coordination meetings were effective in meeting their objective of improving the coordination of IAP/INAP implementation as well as achieving common understanding and application of HPAI prevention and control strategies. The meetings also enabled the identification of special challenges that required attention and made important recommendations that will go a long way in improving effectiveness in the coordination of HPAI interventions on the African continent.

**Activity 4: Other coordination activities**

As part of their efforts to support the coordination of IAP implementation, the SPINAP technical team has continued to participate in key HPAI events at regional and national levels to share information with other stakeholders and articulate the SPINAP strategy. Additionally, presentations made by the team seek to address broader HPAI issues and share lessons learned with stakeholders. During the reporting period, SPINAP team members participated at the following HPAI events:

- Meeting on trans-boundary diseases (human and animal) organized by the East African Community Secretariat in Arusha. The Meeting had a special focus on HPAI and was attended by medical and veterinary professionals from four of the five member states. A presentation on SPINAP was made – progress, challenges and the issue of coordination of EAC supported and SPINAP activities at national level were discussed. Coordination between EAC and AU/IBAR and other actors was also discussed. The meeting also discussed the one health approach and capacity building.

- ALive INAP orientation clinic – attended by SPINAP coordinator, Public Health Expert, Regional coordinator for Western Africa and AU/IBAR regional Animal Health Centre Coordinator for Western Africa. The meeting was organized to discuss the INAP development process and address gaps that had been identified through missions already undertaken.

- Inception meeting of the project OSRO/RAF/718/USA on strengthening capacity of the Eastern Africa sub-region to prevent and control avian influenza organized by FAO. SPINAP coordinator attended and shared information. The issue of coordination between the project and SPINAP at national level in the target countries (Kenya, Sudan and Tanzania) was discussed.

\(^4\) Proceedings of the workshops are available on the SPINAP page on AU-IBAR website (www.au-ibar.org).
Global AI Communication Leadership Meeting, organized by AI.COM was attended by AU/IBAR communications advisor who is also the main driver of the SPINAP communications objective. The involvement of AU/IBAR in HPAI communication and establishment of web links was discussed.

Meeting of the SADC Avian Influenza Joint Technical Committee (JTC) meeting organized by the SADC secretariat was attended by SPINAP coordinator for southern Africa. Members of the JTC are representatives from the Ministry of Health and Ministry of Agriculture in Namibia, DRC, Tanzania, Mozambique, South Africa, Zimbabwe and Botswana in addition to the SADC chair which is Zambia. International organizations active regionally were present (OIE, FAO, GTZ, UNSIC, UN-OCHA, STOP AI, WHO, among others. SPINAP was presented. Concept notes on SADC regional HPAI strategies were discussed and recommendations made.

The regional SPINAP coordinator for Western and Central Africa attended a regional workshop on the database to the attention of ECOWAS countries and Mauritania: WAHIS, TAD info and ARIS from 6 to 10 October 2008. For the presentation of ARIS the AU/IBAR regional team received support from USAID. Participants expressed an interest in the new version of ARIS

HPAI integration workshop for Kenya – attended by the regional SPINAP coordinator for Eastern Africa. Various integration and coordination issues were discussed.

Workshop on Pro-Poor HPAI Risk Reduction Strategies, organized by ILRI. The workshop was attended by Regional SPINAP coordinator for eastern Africa who made a presentation of the program. Potential synergies and sharing of information were discussed.

International Ministerial Conference on HPAI, Sharm El Sheikh – Organized by the UN system coordinator and Government of Egypt. SPINAP continental coordinator was invited to make a presentation on lessons learned on inter-country HPAI preparedness. The presentation highlighted lessons learned and made recommendation on best practices from these lessons.

Regional coordination meeting for DVSs and other HPAI actors in eastern Africa organized jointly by AU-IBAR and FAO ECTAD at the RAHC (December 2008). It was attended by the entire SPINAP PCU team and representatives from EAC and COMESA and IGAD, USAID and Rockefeller foundation. Among issues discussed included the potential of using new castle disease as an entry point for HPAI prevention and control preparedness in the region, formation of a regional CVO’s network on trans-boundary animal diseases and prioritisation of TADs in the region. Important resolutions were reached and are the focus of further action by both FAO and IBAR.

The regional SPINAP coordinator for eastern Africa participated in a two day inception workshop (12-13 February, 2009) for the EU-funded FAO component project on: the East African Community Regional Plan for the Prevention and Control of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza – HPAI (osro/raf/802/EC). The workshop, also attended by representatives of EAC Secretariat, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, and Burundi, discussed project objectives, harmonization of work plans and implementation schedules and synergy with other HPAI Project in the region.
Achievement

Sharing information in these events was yielded excellent outcomes with some countries calling HPAI actors together to develop joint action plans as a way of avoiding duplication. Tanzania, Uganda, Lesotho among others have successfully adopted this approach. Additionally, a strong foundation has been established for effective coordination of interventions by the leading stakeholder in the three program regions.

Participation in these meetings had enormous benefits in creating visibility for SPINAP, AU/IBAR and the donor. It also served to highlight key coordination issues, challenges and point out best practices in the coordination of HPAI activities at national and regional levels. Lessons learned from these meetings assisted the SPINAP team to guide country interventions in the best way possible.
## Summary of achievements by result area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Logic</th>
<th>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Overall objective:**  
To contribute to the reduction of the socio-economic impact of AHI and the potential loss of human lives. | ▪ Progress on HPAI preparedness of African ACP countries in respect of the UN system influenza coordination indicators by end of 2009. | ▪ UN system Influenza Coordinator reports  
▪ OIE, World bank and FAO (ECTAD) reports and website  
▪ WHO Reports and website | | |
| **Purpose:**  
Strengthen national capacity to prevent and control AHI | ▪ 80% of participating countries have established strategies and implementation mechanisms to prevent and control AHI according to international guidelines by mid-2009 | ▪ Project Reports  
▪ Country Reports to OIE and AU/IBAR  
▪ UN System Influenza Coordinator reports  
▪ FAO & OIE reports | | |
| **Results:**  
1) Capacity for early detection and rapid response to AHI strengthened at national level | ▪ By mid-2009, recommended emergency preparedness and response structures in place and operational in 80% of participating countries  
▪ All AI suspicions successfully investigated within two weeks of their reporting  
▪ 75 % of available IAP funds committed within 12 months of main program implementation phase  
▪ M&E and financing systems developed by end May 2008 | ▪ Project and country reports  
▪ Reports of international organisations  
▪ Disease investigation reports  
▪ Laboratory analysis reports | | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Logic</th>
<th>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2) Information and communication for the creation of awareness and behaviour change in relation to the prevention and control of AHI enhanced | - Website updated at least twice monthly  
- Quarterly newsletter published and disseminated  
- The project HPAI communication and information-sharing strategy is presented to the third steering committee meeting. | - Internet  
- News letters  
- Published strategy | | |
| 3) Coordination of IAP implementation is supported. | - Inception meeting organized within 12 months of start of project  
- Two technical coordination meetings per region organized in the three project regions during the project duration  
- Six steering committee meetings are organized linked to ALive Executive and GF-TADs meetings  
- At least three coordination events at national and/or regional level supported for participating countries  
- Information resulting from international HPAI forums shared with participating countries | - Meeting reports and proceedings  
- Correspondence from IBAR to the countries  
- Number of people visiting the website | | |

1.1. Inform eligible countries on support opportunities and conditionalities  
Correspondence, templates and guidelines, meetings & website  
All 47 countries sensitized and have responded by sending in their applications

1.2. The project receives funding requests and reviews them to assure alignment with international guidelines for early detection and rapid response  
Criteria for proposal assessment, assessment reports to countries  
Number of proposals received, assessed and feedback given, Number of proposals approved  
- All received applications assessed and feedback given to countries  
- 47 Applications approved and contracts developed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Logic</th>
<th>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Selects and proposes IAP funding requests to the steering committee and donor for endorsement</td>
<td>Forwarding of approved contracts for endorsement, feedback from SC members</td>
<td>Number of contracts endorsed</td>
<td>43 contracts and MOUs forwarded to and endorsed by the PSC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 The PCU prepares contracts with beneficiaries on selected IAP funding requests</td>
<td>Preparation and signing of contracts</td>
<td>Number of contracts signed</td>
<td>- 40 contracts signed - First tranches transferred to 26 countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5. Programme supports administration of funded interventions</td>
<td>Provision of mentoring, financial and administrative support and capacity building</td>
<td>Support missions &amp; training sessions held</td>
<td>- 7 finance and admin training sessions held with participation of 45 countries - finance support missions to 4 countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Programme monitors and evaluates implementation of contracts</td>
<td>Development and operationalisation of an M&amp;E system and regular field M&amp;E missions</td>
<td>M&amp;E system developed and operationalized, number of M&amp;E missions undertaken</td>
<td>- Programme M&amp;E system and tools finalized - Missions undertaken to 10 countries to test the system - Reports received from countries and regional coordinators - Mid term review of the program is already planned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 The project monitors and evaluates national capacity for early detection and rapid response</td>
<td>Support missions to countries, assessment of applications and feedback, review of country IAPs and INAPs</td>
<td>Number of missions conducted/facilitated, Feedback on INAPs/IAPs</td>
<td>- National capacities of SPINAP countries were appraised through their applications - 14 countries physically visited and their capacities evaluated and actions taken to address gaps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Logic</td>
<td>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</td>
<td>Means of Verification</td>
<td>Achievements</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 The project facilitates access to or provides expert technical and management support to the implementation of funded HPAI interventions</td>
<td>Support missions to countries, consultancies for technical support, collaboration arrangements for technical support</td>
<td>Number of support missions, Technical support arrangements made and collaborations</td>
<td>- information posted to IBAR website on a sustained basis - Initiated a pilot technical support joint initiative with FAO on HPAI communication in Eastern Africa - identified technical expertise to support countries in surveillance, RRT and communication - Funds set aside for special needs</td>
<td>- TORs developed and adverts sent out - MOU developed with CDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Maintain SPINAP website providing relevant and timely information</td>
<td>Regular updates with internal and externally collected information</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Website developed and continuously updated - Regular website updates with new information monthly - Website is linked to others for information sourcing and dissemination - Development of AI directory is underway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Contribute to the creation of awareness about prevention and control of HPAI among public and other stakeholders</td>
<td>Posting of informative materials on website dissemination of information to national officials and support to information and communication activities at country level</td>
<td>Budget devoted to information and communication, number of communication spots and materials produced and disseminated</td>
<td>- About 21% SPINAP support to countries is allocated to awareness creation and behaviour change through various media - Technical needs identified and TORs developed to identify consultants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Strengthen links with other partners (WHO, UNICEF, USAID, World Bank, OIE, FAO, GTZ, EC etc.) for collection, sharing and dissemination of information on HPAI</td>
<td>Events organized jointly, browsing of relevant websites for downloading and dissemination of information</td>
<td>Number of events participated in, visits to relevant websites, information downloads and dissemination</td>
<td>The SPINAP team has utilized strategies and information generated by various partners to inform national veterinary authorities and program coordinators and to shape interventions proposed for support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Logic</td>
<td>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</td>
<td>Means of Verification</td>
<td>Achievements</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Organise inception meetings in collaboration with other partners</td>
<td>Organization of inception meetings, invitation of stakeholders and partners</td>
<td>Number of inception meetings held</td>
<td>3 meetings held improved understanding of SPINAP and stimulated faster response by countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Organise technical coordination meetings in three project regions</td>
<td>Organization of technical coordination meetings, invitation of stakeholders and partners</td>
<td>Number of technical coordination meetings held</td>
<td>- 3 meetings held and information shared for the coordination of IAP/INAP implementation and common understanding and application of HPAI prevention and control strategies.</td>
<td>- Identified special challenges and made important recommendations for improving the coordination of HPAI interventions in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- improved inter-agency coordination and consensus building between animal and human health professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Organise bi-annual steering committee meetings.</td>
<td>Organization of steering committee meetings every 6 months</td>
<td>Number of SC meetings held</td>
<td>3 PSC meetings have been held to date. They provided guidance and approval of program implementation strategies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Provide technical and management support to funded interventions including M&amp;E</td>
<td>Country visits and virtual communication, development of guidelines and procedures</td>
<td>Number of support missions, number of trainings given</td>
<td>- Intensive follow-up plan developed to ensure close interaction with countries</td>
<td>- National project coordinators and their accountants trained for 3 days by SPINAP professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Participate in international forums on HPAI and share relevant information and experiences with all stakeholders.</td>
<td>Participation in various workshops and presentation of SPINAP</td>
<td>Number and type of workshops</td>
<td>SPINAP is widely perceived as a result of presentations at various international including those of the OIE, FAO, ALIVE, ministerial meetings, REC meetings, and program workshops etc</td>
<td>SPINAP coordinators and experts take part in relevant meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Challenges and adaptations during implementation

Challenges and mitigation

In the course of programme implementation, some challenges were encountered and actions taken to mitigate them. This initial set of lessons learnt was primarily taken from the country proposal development process and information sharing exercises at the regional SPINAP inception and technical workshops. A lot has also been learned through interaction with other agencies involved in HPAI work at regional and international levels.

Wide scope of the program

Covering 47 countries means addressing a multitude of different implementation scenarios and administrative contexts resulting in challenges for logistics, technical support and timely program delivery.

This challenge has been addressed through standardization of procedures and provision of guidelines on various aspects of program implementation and control. The implementing team has built in training and technical support interventions throughout the implementation process to ensure the national counterparts understand and abide by the recommended procedures. Additionally, management systems, including intensive M&E have been developed to assure close follow-up on a continental scale. Where possible these systems are synchronised with the national systems. Such strategies coupled with the establishment of coordination at regional and national levels will make it easier to deliver program objectives across the wide geographic and socio-economic coverage.

Uneven capacities across the target groups

The SPINAP target countries differ remarkably in capacity across all sectors of administration and governance. Similarly, their technical and service delivery capabilities differ. Many countries lack effective veterinary and public health systems, a situation that poses serious challenges in the implementation of SPINAP.

Program management has taken note of these gaps and aims to tackle them on a case by case basis. The approach is to be analytical, flexible and practical, to enable the team to make accurate decisions on specific national situations on how best to bridge specific capacity gaps. It is also envisioned to link the veterinary and public health authorities with sectoral NGOs and seek additional technical assistance through
consultants. In addressing these disparities, the PCU has undertaken needs assessments and documented their findings for PSC approval, with proposed actions to mitigate the gaps⁵.

**Access to alternative funds**

Some of the target countries have access to other sources of AI funding. In most cases these funds are more flexible and often more easily accessible than the SPINAP funds. At the same time, due to reasons of technical sustainability, accountability and financial responsibility, IBAR demands from the countries detailed quality proposals prior to the release of funds. This necessity contributed sometimes to delays, reluctance or lack of capacity to produce proposals speedily.

In mitigation the team kept encouraging the national counterparts to comply with the SPINAP conditions and take advantage of its demand-driven nature to address the most pertinent short-term emergency preparedness priorities in their INAPs. The team demonstrated that this approach would allow for a prioritisation of their most important needs. An additional advantage of adhering to the proposed SPINAP methodology was explained with the possibility of more cooperation between countries and AU/IBAR that can be utilised for multiple projects and other cooperation. This has turned around the perception of most countries who now see SPINAP as their own program.

**Tremendous financial gaps**

Most SPINAP countries have huge gaps in their INAPs. Therefore, the support extended through SPINAP is often seen to be too little to make a difference. Such perception dampens enthusiasm with some authorities to pursue SPINAP funds as voiced repeatedly at the inception workshops.

However, the programme team took up the challenge to convince countries where such feelings may prevail to view “SPINAP as one of the many eggs that should go into filling their INAP basket, rather than view it as the only egg that should actually fill the whole basket”. In this way, the national counterparts showed great appreciation for the available funds and what they could do for emergency preparedness and response as well as the possibility to provide a basis for negotiating additional resources from other sources. It is important to note, that for some countries, SPINAP funding is about the only external investment to the INAPs, and therefore makes a huge difference.

**Weak coordination amongst different actors**

There is a large number of HPAI actors working largely in uncoordinated manner. Many of their activities, especially poor synergies and sharing of information results in duplication and inefficient use of resources.

---

⁵ Needs assessment tool and findings
SPINAP is attempting to address this challenge by inviting all major actors to its coordination events and pushing for the coordination of HPAI interventions through the National Task Forces at coordination meetings. This proposal has been well received by the national coordinators and other stakeholders. AU/IBAR through the communication and knowledge management unit is also in the process of mapping HPAI actors and their activities in Africa with support from GTZ. Once complete, this will go a long way in facilitating coordination and communication among all actors.

**Weak collaboration across sectors**

Collaboration between animal and human health sectors has been traditionally weak, undermining the fight against HPAI. This disposition has however, been challenged by HPAI with global strategies advocating for integrated approaches. SPINAP has picked the queue and is taking this strategy forward by organizing joint coordination meetings for both sectors with significant achievements. We hope to further promote this approach by integrating HPAI activities of IBAR into the AU public health unit and installing a permanent institutional linkage between AU/IBAR and the WHO. The SPINAP program recruited human health expert is helping with the Inter-sectoral integration process.

**Weak veterinary and public health systems**

It is common knowledge that many African countries lack effective public and animal health systems. Insufficient human resources, poor financing, weak infrastructure, weak governance etc. are some of the most pressing problems.

Measures were put in place to identify and address specific national needs on a case by case basis. Those lacking technical expertise will be assisted to access it on a short term capacity building basis, while those with other needs likely to compromise SPINAP implementation will be similarly supported. The SPINAP team will also seek to coordinate and share such information with other organizations involved in the capacity building of governance systems in animal (OIE, FAO) and human health (WHO) sectors with the view of attracting further support for such countries.

**Political context**

The political context in some target countries may compromise speedy and or smooth implementation of SPINAP supported activities. Some pre-existing situations have permitted manoeuvre but new scenarios such as the upsurge in Guinea Bissau, Mauritania and Madagascar pose more serious challenges. The political context is expected to continue to evolve throughout the program duration but actions taken and decisions made will depend on individual case scenarios. It is not possible to predict and pre-plan for what may happen.
Declining attention on HPAI

There is rising concern that attention on HPAI is declining and that it will affect the availability of resources to deal with its current and potential impacts, including the prevention of a pandemic.

To address these concerns, the SPINAP program and AU/IBAR will adapt the “one world one health” concept in line with global strategy, to ensure its support to countries is relevant beyond HPAI. The programme technical experts and coordinators will also keep in touch with developments in pandemic preparedness and control networks and adapt new approaches to SPINAP implementation and the animal health sector strategies.
Changes introduced during implementation

Minor changes have been made during program implementation to date. Key changes:

Logical framework

The SPINAP team reviewed the original program logical framework to make it more realistic and sharpen the means and sources of verification and align the log frame with the global HPAI indicators and strategic thrusts. Approval of the revised Log Frame will be sought soon after the mid term evaluation of the program when other inputs may be forthcoming from the exercise. A review of the global Log frame will obviously be accompanied by similar reviews at country level.

Inception meeting

The initial plan was to hold one program inception meeting. However, a decision was made to split it into three on a regional basis to allow for the participation of more stakeholders and facilitate closer interactions during the workshops. This decision was informed by our judgement that budgeted funds would be sufficient for such an arrangement and would yield better outcomes than one large meeting.

Implementation period

Due to the unprecedented scope of the SPINAP program and the complex nature of its implementation, it has become necessary to request for a no-cost extension. The countries need sufficient time to carry out the funded interventions. There are substantial time lags while concluding official transactions at country level due to systemic inefficiencies and bureaucratic requirements. The team has tabled a request for the maximum possible eight months extension of the implementation period. The request for a 8 months no cost extension discussed during the 3rd steering committee meeting in November has already been granted.

Budget amendment

A budget amendment has been recommended to:

- Align financial allocation to realities of the program implementation to meet special needs identified in countries and regions and to increase technical support to countries
- Accommodate additional 3 million Euro channelled to SPINAP by the donor

The proposed amendment is expected to contain the following features:
• Reallocation of savings from already concluded activities

• Boost the technical support budget line to allow for access to additional expertise to address gaps identified in countries and on regional level. Based on requests formulated during technical and inception meetings, a considerable investment is proposed to develop a regional strategy and coordination mechanism.

• Inclusion of a (regional) HPAI emergency fund/special needs in cases of outbreak which is another weakness that has been identified in the original design of the program

• Some additional HR resources to support implementation. This need has become apparent after findings on capacity shortage in some countries and the management team.

• Audit funds to provide the financial means for AU/IBAR to audit country activities appropriately is another need to be addressed. An intermediate audit to inform support and a final audit as required by fiduciary rules are foreseen.

Administrative and Financial Training

Following lessons learned through interaction with countries, the management team made a decision to train all national SPINAP coordinators and their accountants on the administrative and financial procedures governing the program. Monitoring and evaluation processes were also introduced during the training sessions. The training sessions were designed to give the participants hands-on understanding of what is required for effective program implementation and accountability. It is expected that this will impact positively on the implementation process.

Regional Technical Workshops

Initially six regional technical workshops were planned. The management team has however, discussed the issue and decided to hold 5 technical workshops; 3 on a regional basis and the 6th on a continental scale. The continental workshop will address technical and coordination issues at inter-regional levels and pressure Africa’s leaders to support investments in their INAPs as a long term measure against HPAI and similar infectious incursions.
7 Work plan for the upcoming 12 months

The updated work plan indicates the priorities for the first half of the 2009/10 program year. It aims to present a consolidated guide for the implementation of program activities between April 2009 and March 2010 by;

- Laying out the planned activities and targets
- Distributing the roles and responsibilities of all actors at central and regional levels
- Providing an indicative basis for budget allocation
- Providing a guide for monitoring and evaluation of progress and reporting against the three targeted results

3.2 The Expected results

- **R1 – Capacity for prevention and Control of AHI strengthened at national level**
- **R2 - Information and Communication for the creation of awareness is enhanced**
- **R3 - Coordination of IAP implementation is supported**

Activities planned in this annual plan are structured along these results areas.

7.1 The Planned Activities

7.1.1 **R1 – Capacity for prevention and Control of AHI strengthened at national level**

7.1.1.1 Provide technical & admin support to countries with weak capacity to implement the project-Sao Tome, Gabon, Liberia, Somalia, Sierra Leone, Cap Verde, Comoros.

7.1.1.2 Provide implementation support to countries (training, mentoring, facilitation, M&E, management support & backstopping)

7.1.1.3 Gather implementation data at continental basis, analyse, disseminate/share the information

7.1.1.4 Provide monitoring & evaluation of program implementation

7.1.1.5 Provide expert support to certain countries to develop epidemi-surveillance systems for HPAI and other infectious diseases
7.1.2   **R2 - Information and Communication for the creation of awareness and behaviour change on HPAI prevention and control is enhanced**

7.1.2.1   Maintain SPINAP web site providing relevant and timely information

7.1.2.2   Contribute to the creation of awareness about prevention and control of HPAI among public and other stakeholders;

7.1.2.3   Strengthen links with other partners (WHO, UNICEF, USAID, World Bank, OIE, FAO, GTZ, EC etc.) for collection, sharing and dissemination of information on HPAI

7.1.2.4   Participation by RCs, PC, M&E, communications advisors; etc in relevant AHI networking and information sharing forums

7.1.3   **R3 - Coordination of IAP implementation is supported**

7.1.3.1   Organize Steering Committee meetings

7.1.3.2   Coordination and Harmonization of actions with Regional Economic Communities

7.1.3.3   Coordination and Harmonization with technical and other organizations involved in HPAI prevention and control (WHO, ILRI, UNICEF, OIE, FAO, World bank/ALIVE, GTZ, USAID, EC, DFID, etc) for purposes of sharing information with the countries

7.1.3.4   Organize a Pan African HPAI Technical Coordination Meeting with the participation of all HPAI technical partners and actors

7.1.3.5   Participate in international forums on HPAI and share relevant information and experiences with all stakeholders.

7.1.3.6   Team building and capacity building of the SPINAP teams Bamako and Gaborone in July 2009 AND February 2010 respectively.
## Detailed breakdown of the planned activities, time lines and MoVs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result Area</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Program Year: 2009 (April 09 – Mar 2010)</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Capacities for prevention and control of AHI strengthened at national level</td>
<td>1.1 Provide technical &amp; admin support to countries with weak capacity to implement the project-Sao Tome, Gabon, Liberia, Somalia, Sierra Leone, Cap Verde, Comoros</td>
<td>Q1 Apr-Jun</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Provide implementation support to countries (capacity building, mentoring, facilitation, management support &amp; backstopping)</td>
<td>Q2 Jul-Sep</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Gather implementation data at regional and continental levels, analyse, disseminate/share the information</td>
<td>Q3 Oct-Dec</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Provide monitoring &amp; evaluation of program implementation</td>
<td>Q4 Jan-Mar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Provide expert support to certain countries to develop epidemio-surveillance systems for HPAI and other infectious diseases</td>
<td>Q1 Apr-Jun</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6 Organize training on wildlife surveillance for countries with low capacity</td>
<td>Q2 Jul-Sep</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.7 IDSR strategy sensitisation</td>
<td>Q3 Oct-Dec</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.8 Training of Joint Rapid response Teams (Animal/Human Health)</td>
<td>Q4 Jan-Mar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 Develop and carry out SPINAP</td>
<td>Q1 Apr-Jun</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Q1 = April - June, Q2 = July - September, Q3 = October - December, Q4 = January - March.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result Area</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Program Year: 2009 (April 09 – Mar 2010)</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1 Apr-Jun</td>
<td>Q2 Jul-Sep</td>
<td>Q3 Oct-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Information and communication for the creation of awareness and behaviour change in relation to the prevention and control of AHI enhanced</td>
<td>communications strategy - AU/IBAR level communication - Support to national level communication - Intra-SPINAP communication</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Maintain SPINAP web site providing relevant and timely information</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Contribute to the creation of awareness about prevention and control of HPAI among public and other stakeholders</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Participation by RCs, PC, M&amp;E, communications advisors; etc in relevant AHI networking and information sharing forums</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordination of Integrated Action Plans (IAPs) implementation supported</td>
<td>3.1 Organize Steering Committee meetings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.1 5th SC meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1.2 6th SC meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Coordination and Harmonization of actions with Regional Economic Communities - participation in joint forums etc - Information sharing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Coordination and Harmonization with technical and other organizations involved in HPAI prevention and control</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result Area</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Program Year: 2009 (April 09 – Mar 2010)</td>
<td>Means of Verification</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(WHO, ILRI, UNICEF, OIE, FAO, World Bank/ALIVE, GTZ, USAID, EC, DFID, etc) for purposes of sharing information with the countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 Organize a Pan African HPAI Technical Coordination Meeting with the participation of all HPAI technical partners and actors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Workshop Proceedings</td>
<td>PCU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5 Participating in national, regional and international forums on HPAI and share relevant information and experiences with other stakeholders</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Mission reports, proceedings and action points</td>
<td>PC, RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6 Team building and capacity building of the SPINAP teams at HQ in July &amp; December 2009</td>
<td>Bamako</td>
<td>Joint plans and Improved communication</td>
<td>AU/IBAR, RAHC/PCU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8 Finances

The pace of SPINAP spending has increased over the reporting period since the program is now harvesting the fruits of the intensive work involved in preparation of contract documents for signature, clarification of bank details and transferring the relevant amounts. The signing of the remaining contract agreements with the beneficiary countries is expected to be finalized during the beginning of the next working period. The reported expenditure mainly draws from recurrent costs, activity costs and grant transfers to countries.

Overview of disbursements by country

As of end of February 2009 we have transferred a first tranche to the following countries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>Amount in USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>375,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>140,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea Bissau</td>
<td>160,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
<td>110,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>190,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>272,532.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>575,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo Brazzaville</td>
<td>135,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>700,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>98,775.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>120,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>230,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>900,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AMOUNT TRANSFERED</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,281,307.28</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(3,953,074.3 Euro)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(3,953,074.3 Euro)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the course of the upcoming six months we should be able to transfer the first tranche of all the remaining countries. We also expect that some of them will account for the first tranche and we will be able to start releasing the second tranche to them, not to jeopardize the progress of the program. It is anticipated that countries with spend their grants and account in time to receive subsequent transfers.
### Overview of expenditure by budget line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account description</th>
<th>EC Contribution (EUR)</th>
<th>IBAR co-financing (EUR)</th>
<th>TOTAL (EUR)</th>
<th>EC Contribution (EUR)</th>
<th>IBAR co-financing (EUR)</th>
<th>TOTAL (EUR)</th>
<th>Remaining Balance</th>
<th>% of total budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee and Coordination Meetings</td>
<td>573,520</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>603,520</td>
<td>367,810</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>367,810</td>
<td>235,710</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordination Unit</td>
<td>896,616</td>
<td>800,480</td>
<td>1,697,096</td>
<td>209,301</td>
<td>256,005</td>
<td>465,306</td>
<td>1,231,790</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Missions</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>47,162</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47,162</td>
<td>102,838</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance to PCU</td>
<td>122,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>122,000</td>
<td>7,847</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,847</td>
<td>114,153</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Coordination</td>
<td>480,924</td>
<td>261,051</td>
<td>741,975</td>
<td>152,585</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>152,585</td>
<td>589,390</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total Coordination Cost</td>
<td>2,223,060</td>
<td>1,091,531</td>
<td>3,314,591</td>
<td>784,705</td>
<td>256,005</td>
<td>1,040,710</td>
<td>2,273,881</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to IAP*</td>
<td>18,100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,100,000</td>
<td>4,807,401</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,807,401</td>
<td>13,292,599</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>176,940</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>176,940</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>176,940</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin recovery (app. 5%)</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>286,698</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>286,698</td>
<td>713,302</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Program Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,091,531</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,591,531</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,878,804</strong></td>
<td><strong>256,005</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,134,809</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,456,722</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- US $ converted with 1.336
- to the EURO

Total EC contribution to expenditures May 2007 to February 2009: 27.34%
Total IBAR Contribution to expenditures May 2007 to February 2009: 23.45%
9 Conclusions

- Significant progress has been made in all the programme result areas. The development of funding applications and signing of contracts is almost concluded. Transfer of funds to countries is also well underway with exhaustion of the first tranche.

- The SPINAP programme is now widely understood by all stakeholders. One of the major achievements of SPINAP is the renewal and advancement of IBAR’s working relations with all PACE countries (30) and the establishment of many (17) new relationships with AU member states. That achievement alone is a huge contribution of SPINAP to the functions of the AUC and offers an unprecedented foundation for the delivery of the wider AU/IBAR mandate in the livestock sector. This is very significant both technically and strategically for the IBAR and the AU membership.

- SPINAP has provided an unprecedented opportunity for AU/IBAR to work closely with other technical organisations involved in HPAI notably FAO, OIE and the WHO, and donor agencies. Successful development of these opportunities and experience gained from the program will unequivocally strengthen the position of AU/IBAR as the preferred institution to collaborate with in the livestock sector in Africa.

- The European Commission, ACP secretariat and AU/IBAR through SPINAP introduced a new way of delivering support to African countries, including new financial responsibilities and management challenges for the institution. This new reality requires careful and systematic approaches. Progress might therefore not have been as fast as anticipated due to the need to constantly assess and make decisions on evolving realities in the implementation context, plus the need to put in place the necessary checks and balances to minimize liabilities. This may even call for institutional realignments at IBAR, taking into account the ongoing reform processes at the AUC (co-financed by the EC). African Union institutional needs have also had an impact on the progress of some aspects of program implementation.

- It is noteworthy that though SPINAP was designed as an emergency intervention, the implementation process has adopted a hybrid strategy that combines short term capacity building and emergency preparedness approaches. As such, the target countries stand to gain much more than anticipated initially, from available support.

- Programme delivery has not realized the desired pace due to embedment of the in the national bureaucracies. Many of the slow-down factors are related to institutional arrangements in the implementation process and low capacities in the beneficiary countries. Besides the bureaucracy of the national systems, capacity gaps due to limited numbers of staff, limited knowledge and understanding of the processes are also to blame. The approach taken will none the less profit the countries through newly acquired capacities.
• The complexity and wide scope of SPINAP will continue to tax the imagination and endurance of the implementing agency, target groups and partners alike. Its successful implementation requires continuous understanding and adjustment to rapidly evolving situations. This equally needs patience, innovation and flexibility.