



**African Union**

Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources

# **SUPPORT PROGRAMME TO INTEGRATED NATIONAL ACTION PLANS FOR AVIAN AND HUMAN INFLUENZA**

## **SPINAP- AHI**

**First steering committee,  
AU headquarters**

## **Minutes**

**Addis Ababa / Ethiopia, 21 September 2007**

## Contents

---

Contents	1
1 Preamble and adoption of the agenda	2
Overall objectives	2
Meeting agenda	2
2 Presentation and adoption of the terms of reference	3
3 Inception period progress report	6
4 Fund allocation	8
5 Guidelines for the preparation of countries requests	9
6 Manual of administrative and financial procedures	10
7 Conclusions and recommendations	11
8 Any other business	14
9 Closing	15

# 1 Preamble and adoption of the agenda

---

The 1st Steering Committee Meeting of the Support Programme to the Integrated National Action Plans for Avian and Human Influenza (SPINAP-AHI), was formally launched by H.E. Rosebud Kurwijila, the AU Commissioner in charge of the Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture.

The formal launch of the programme was preceded by a welcoming statement by the Director of AU/IBAR, Dr. Modibo Traoré and technical presentations giving an overview of HPAI situation globally but with specific reference to Africa, highlighting the strategies currently in place, as well as the socio-economic consequences and preparedness for the human pandemic. These were made by Dr. Joseph Domenech of FAO', Dr. Bernard Vallat of OIE and Dr, David Nabarro (via audio DVD) of UNSIC respectively.

## Overall objectives

SPINAP is a partnership programme between the AU/IBAR and the European Commission (EC). Its primary aim is to strengthen the national capacities to prevent and control AHI through the provision of financial support and technical expertise to the eligible countries that give priority to the implementation of integrated national action plans (INAPs). To this end therefore, the Steering Committee (SC) representing relevant international partners active in the fight against avian influenza in Africa would play a pivotal role with the mandate to provide the overall policy guidance.

## Meeting agenda

1. Adoption of the Agenda
2. Presentation and adoption of the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Steering Committee
3. SPINAP Inception Work Plan , Budget and the current status of Implementation
4. Fund Allocation
5. Guidelines and Preparation of Country Requests for funding
6. Manual of Administrative and Financial Procedures
7. Conclusions and Recommendations

The agenda was unanimously adopted with a minor change in the order of items.

## 2 Presentation and adoption of the terms of reference

The Terms of Reference (ToR) detailed out the core areas that would govern affairs and business of the Steering Committee (SC); namely: the SC's mandate and functions, the composition and membership and the functioning modalities (See Annex 1, attached, of the revised document).

During the discussion that followed, Members took cognisance of the fact that the contract had already been signed between the EC and the AU/IBAR and, since the TOR must be in tandem with the contract, the SC was limited on what and how much they could amend. Secondly, they equally felt limited by the fact that they did not have a copy of the contract to appreciate the various clauses that had significant impact on the mandated functions. Therefore, since the ToR was a draft to be reviewed and endorsed by the SC, it was necessary that, for ease of reference, each member be availed a copy of the contract to the extent to which it was not confidential.

With the above understanding, members proceeded to review the document, making amendments, most of which were on the choice of words used, especially in the specific functions. These were quickly incorporated into the document and a revised copy of the ToR was reproduced and tabled for further deliberations: Following are the comments and amendments made:

### Functions and Composition

1. It was agreed to delete the part of a sentence that reads " and will be the highest collective decision making body or organ of the programme"; on the grounds that there is the need to empower the implementing agencies. Indeed, it was noted that there were also decisions that would of necessity be taken by signatories to the contact.
2. Regarding membership and representation, and with the clarification from the EC representative that the contract was not specific on who is to represent a designated institution but that the total number of representation was limited to 15, members agreed that it be left to each Institution to decide internally who its respective representative to the SC should be.
3. EAC sought clarification as to why it was not among the listed REC members, to which the response was that it would, for now, be co-opted as an observer

4. On the issue of duplication of mandate touching on ALIVE, it was agreed that Dr. Francois Le Gall would give to the secretariat written comments specifying the exact areas of the said duplication of mandates
5. While AU/IBAR is the current chair of Alive, The WB is better to placed to represent AHIF

### Membership criteria

6. No changes, except to delete the word 'all' in (a) – “The SC members are all the relevant international ....”

### Meeting Frequency, convening and chairing

7. After due discussions from the floor, it was agreed that for the 1st and 2nd Vice Chairs, a donor and a REC respectively be given the seats. Consequently, ACP got the 1st Vice Chair and ECCAS (on the decision of the RECs present) was elected 2nd Vice Chair.
8. OIE wanted on record its reservations about the dual role of the Director of AU/IBAR – by virtue of his also being Chair of the ALIVE Executive Committee. The concern was due to the possible conflict of interest and by the fact that both chairs (of SPINAP SC and ALIVE) were from the AU.
9. AU/IBAR Director sought to allay such fears and explained that such ambiguities could be avoided by ensuring that information that is shared is both timely and correct. He also made it clear that the Commissioner, after due consultations with her, had designated the Director/DREA, Dr. Babagana, chair to the SC. This was in line with members' request that the arrangement be to have, a technical person as opposed to political one chairing the SC.
10. On the issue of duplication of mandate touching on ALIVE, it was agreed that Dr. Francois would give to the secretariat written comments specifying the exact areas of the said duplication of mandates.

### Procedures for Agenda & Minutes

11. In 3(b), replace 'disbursement' with '**distribution**'
12. All documents to be distributed in the two working languages of English and French.
13. Item 3 (j) to be deleted altogether. Members felt the idea of 'out of session decisions' would set a dangerous precedence.

### Additionally

14. It was also observed that, for this first meeting of the SC, it would be important to give minutes with input of members and have the same circulated for comments and that the recommendations be part and parcel of the minutes.

The ToR was then adopted as amended.

### 3 Inception period progress report

---

Members received a report for the period May 1st to October 31st 2007 outlining the activities undertaken, based on defined expected results. Principally, there were three main expected results around which the activities revolved:

1. Capacity for prevention and control of AHI strengthened at national level
2. Information and communication for the creation of awareness is enhanced
3. Coordination of IAP implementation is supported.

AU/IBAR had undertaken various information campaigns to inform the eligible 47 African ACP countries and other stakeholders about the programme, including guidelines on IAP funding requests, through newsletters, its website and electronic mail. It was anticipated that once the SC approves the country funding, the project coordination unit (PCU) would then prepare contracts with beneficiaries on the conditionalities and funding prerequisites and also carry out monitoring and evaluation. It was further reported that recruitment process was on to engage requisite staff and to strengthen capacity as appropriate, in the regional offices of Bamako, Gaborone and Nairobi. The SC, whose ToR is to be discussed and endorsed during the current meeting, is anticipated to meet every 6 months.

Members expressed concern and due note taken of the fact that participants had just received the document and had not had sufficient time to study it in order to make meaningful contributions to the discussions.

Additional observations and comments were:

- Members asked that the implementation of SPINAP be correctly linked to INAP with regards to the 1st grant.
- On the issue of project validation, it was noted that INAPs were already validated and it was now for the SC to update and help countries to better integrate animal and human health, using experts from both Alive and IBAR.
- \$30m was earmarked as emergency fund given by the ACP and EC and would be used in priority countries; namely those in dire need but not be in contradiction with those in INAP. The idea would be to set up a minimum package so that in case of an outbreak, the countries concerned can take immediate action.

## Recommendations

- i) Members agreed to have the opportunity to revisit and study the presentation and give their approval via email within 2 weeks of the conclusion of the meeting.
- ii) Members gave the go ahead in the case of countries with immediate needs
- iii) The linkage with INAP must be clearly and succinctly spelt out.

## 4 Fund allocation

---

It was noted that the beneficiaries of the fund, €21.5m from the EC and 1.2m in-kind contribution from AU/IBAR, are the 47 ACP countries in Africa. Out of the €21.5m, €18.1m is designated to be channelled directly to the said African countries. The programme's short and medium terms are being dedicated to strengthening the national institutional capacities to control avian influenza and to ensure rapid response to and containment of human cases of the disease. For the longer term, the designated countries are expected to experience sector reforms and greater awareness of zoonotic diseases and thus be better armed to fight the disease and be better prepared to handle emerging ones.

In arriving at the allocated amounts, a scientific method had been applied with the following as the principal influential factors: per capita, relative importance of poultry in a country; level of commitment by budget allocation; size of backyard poultry and the AHI risk.

Members discussed and endorsed the Paper with the following recommendations:

1. Disbursement to be done in trenches
2. IBAR to sensitize all countries concerned
3. Proceed with the allocations as proposed, subject to further review as the programme progresses.
4. Surplus funds, if any, are to be discussed in the next SC meeting

## 5 Guidelines for the preparation of countries requests

The meeting noted the guidelines which had been undertaken as one of the inception activities. To further facilitate the work of beneficiaries, AU/IBAR had also prepared a template, adopted to the EC format for funding requests. A deadline of 15th November 2007 had been set for receiving request from countries. Highlights on the paper were different levels at which the requests would be assessed, a prerequisite on external audits, ceilings on procurements and the fact that technical and financial guidelines are to be used in tandem with the template.

In the ensuing discussions, members observed that the reference to INAP must be implicit and went on to recommend that:

- AU/IBAR reviews and comes up with realistic date and make it clear to the countries that the first set of requests would be for immediate needs - using the ADB model, then the second set of requests would be with INAP.
- Release only 25% of the funds to give time to monitor implementation, and the balance on justifiable evidence for use of funds
- Inconsistencies be addressed in reviewing documents

Members then adopted the paper with the proposed amendments.

## **6 Manual of administrative and financial procedures**

Members received and adopted the paper with minor amendments.

## 7 Conclusions and recommendations

---

Following are the key observations and recommendations made and adopted by the SC:

### General Comments

Documents should be in both English and French and should be circulated at least 2 weeks before the meeting of the SC

### ToR of the SC

**Mandate and Functions:** The overall mandate as stated in the ToR, vests a lot of power in the SC at the expense of the implementing authority. Subsequently, the second part of the first sentence under 'Mandate and Functions' that reads 'and will be the highest collective decision making body or organ of the programme should be deleted.

**Meeting Frequency, Convening and Chairing:** Meetings will be held back to back with ALIVE and SPINAP will cater for the travel expenses of participants if not already paid for by ALIVE

### Technical and Financial Guidelines

1. A few inconsistencies and contradictions were noted, especially the Technical and Financial Guidelines and Annex 5 of the Template for country funding requests, for instance on compensation and allocation of funds to human health.
2. IBAR should retain the same dates but base it on emergency cases only
3. It is very important that countries are informed that SPINAP funds are for immediate needs / emergencies; and that the medium and longer term needs as outlined in the INAPS in the second trench. Consequently, letters should be sent immediately to member countries to this effect.

### The Fund Allocation Method

1. Adopted, as proposed, while surplus funds, if any, are to be discussed in the next SC meeting
2. Flexibility should be exercised in distributing the subsequent tranches
3. Maximum allocated funds (USD) to eligible countries having validated INAPS is as follows:

N o.	Country	Allocated Fund (US\$)	N o.	Country	Allocated Fund (US\$)	No.	Country	Allocated Fund (US\$)
1	Angola	300,000	17	Ethiopia	600,000	33	Niger	1,100,000
2	Benin	500,000	18	Gabon	300,000	34	Nigeria	1,900,000
3	Botswana	300,000	19	Gambia	300,000	35	Rwanda	400,000
4	Burkina Faso	600,000	20	Ghana	500,000	36	Sao Tome & Principe	300,000
5	Burundi	600,000	21	Guinea	500,000	37	Senegal	600,000
6	Cameroon	500,000	22	Bissau Guinea	400,000	38	Seychelles	300,000
7	Cap Verde	300,000	23	Kenya	700,000	39	Sierra Leone	400,000
8	CAR	500,000	24	Lesotho	300,000	40	Somalia	600,000
9	Chad	400,000	25	Liberia	300,000	41	Sudan	1,700,000
10	Comoros	350,000	26	Madagascar	300,000	42	Swaziland	300,000
11	Congo	300,000	27	Malawi	350,000	43	Tanzania	900,000
12	Cote d'Ivoire	500,000	28	Mali	900,000	44	Togo	500,000
13	Djibouti	300,000	29	Mauritania	500,000	45	Uganda	800,000
14	DRC	400,000	30	Mauritius	300,000	46	Zambia	500,000
15	Equatorial Guinea	300,000	31	Mozambique	500,000	47	Zimbabwe	400,000
16	Eritrea	500,000	32	Namibia	300,000		<b>Total</b>	<b>24,400,000</b>

## Manual of Procedures for countries implementing SPINAP

It should be stated that the procedures are based on the financial rules and regulations of the 9th EDF.

### Progress report on the Inception of Work Plan

1. The link between SPINAP and the ALIVE should be stated clearly in the document
2. SPINAP to give priority to emergency needs
3. More time is required to allow members of the SC to revisit and make inputs into the inception report within 2 weeks for final consolidation and adoption

## 8 Any other business

---

1. It was agreed by the meeting that any further comments that members may have on the issues presented and discussed, should come as an annex to the minutes
2. Convening of the next SC meeting should be subject to when the proposals for funding are going to be ready.
3. Finally, it was proposed and agreed that, for emergencies, consultations can be carried on by electronic mail.

## 9 Closing

---

The Chair thanked the participants for their contributions and patience and wished them a safe journey back to their respective stations.

There being no other business, the chair adjourned the meeting at 19.20 hours.