



**African Union**

Interafrican Bureau for Animal Resources

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

## **SPINAP- AHI**

**Fifth steering committee**

## **Minutes**

Gaborone / Botswana 11 November 2009



# Contents

---

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction and opening remarks</b>	<b>3</b>
	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
	<b>Opening Remarks</b>	<b>3</b>
	<b>Review and adoption of the agenda</b>	<b>3</b>
	<b>Review and adoption of the minutes of the 4th PSC meeting</b>	<b>3</b>
	Matters Arising	3
<b>2</b>	<b>SPINAP team presentations and discussions</b>	<b>4</b>
	<b>SPINAP Progress Report and plans for the next 6 months</b>	<b>4</b>
	Institutional collaboration	4
	Integration of the Pandemic influenza (H1N1)	4
	Involving more partners	5
	Communication strategies	5
	Strengthening team spirit	5
	INAP-SPINAP	5
	Regional coordination mechanism	5
	Proposals for PSC endorsement	6
	SPINAP Implementation priorities for next 6 months	7
	<b>SPINAP Financial Report</b>	<b>8</b>
	<b>Programme M&amp;E Report</b>	<b>9</b>
	Key Lessons Learned	11
	Future M&E Direction	12
	<b>Mid Term External Evaluation</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Resolutions of the Fifth PSC</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Appendices</b>	<b>17</b>
	Appendix 1: Agenda	17
	Appendix 2: List of participants	17

# 1 Introduction and opening remarks

---

## Introduction

The Fifth Steering Committee of the SPINAP-AHI program was held on the 11th of November 2009 back to back with the 14th Alive Executive Committee Meeting in Gaborone. All the key PSC members were present and the agenda for the meeting was fully discussed. The 5th PSC meeting was chaired by Prof. Ahmed El Sawalhy, the director of AU-IBAR.

## Opening Remarks

The Chairman started off the meeting with a brief background on the SPINAP program and implementation experiences in the immediate intervening period. He welcomed the participants and thanked them for finding time to take part in the meeting. The chair invited Mr. Christer Hermansson, of AIDCO C4 to make opening remarks. In his remarks, Christer gave the rationale of the programme as a response to an emergency. He retraced the history of the 4 steering committee meetings to the 1st one where hard discussions led to the setting of clear direction for the program. He noted that subsequent PSC meeting have progressively build a satisfactory plan of program execution. He further made it clear that the recommendations drawn by the mid term evaluation term were not binding for the EC and/or IBAR but that the report provided suggestions that could be considered for future planning purposes. Where proposed changes are feasible, they could be taken on board. He looked forward to see reports, assess progress and map out the way forward.

## Review and adoption of the agenda

The meeting chair presented the draft agenda for review and adoption. The agenda was adopted without amendment.

## Review and adoption of the minutes of the 4th PSC meeting

The meeting noted that the minutes of the 4th PSC had been circulated and commented on by participants shortly after the meeting in March 2009. It was therefore proposed that they be adopted as they were. The meeting agreed and the minutes were adopted without any amendment.

## Matters Arising

Participants were informed that measures recommended by the 4th steering committee had been implemented and would be reported against during the current meeting. Among those successfully implemented were; the amendment of the EC – AU-IBAR contribution agreement to accommodate the use of additional €3,000,000 provided by the donor, secondly the initiation of actions to establish the regional AHI coordination mechanism, thirdly the successful conduct of the Mid-Term Evaluation of SPINAP and finally the support offered to countries with special needs.

## 2 SPINAP team presentations and discussions

---

The SPINAP program coordination unit made presentations covering various aspects of program implementation. These covered the progress made, integration of pandemic influenza, expenditure, monitoring and evaluation of the program. All reports captured achievements, challenges, lessons learned and proposed actions to improve implementation where bottlenecks had been identified.

### SPINAP Progress Report and plans for the next 6 months

The SPINAP Coordinator made a detailed presentation of the progress made by SPINAP in terms of key activities implemented under each result areas. The challenge encountered, the lessons learnt and future planned activities were also presented.

Synthesis of issues raised and discussions ensuing:

#### Institutional collaboration

Participants shared the appreciation by the programme management of the increasing WHO collaboration in the programme. The WHO representative informed the meeting that WHO was very happy with the high level of its involvement in the program and its close cooperation with the SPINAP management. Also other partners reiterated their availability to render support to the programme, thereby adding value to SPINAP.

#### Integration of the Pandemic influenza (H1N1)

The meeting was informed that the SPINAP management has fully integrated the H1N1 pandemic in its implementation at the national and central levels as foreseen in its design documents. The integration, it was noted, has not in any way compromised program objectives, but has instead added value to it. They noted that, though pandemic Influenza is more a human rather than a zoonotic problem, the flexibility built in the SPINAP contract should be used to tackle it without the necessity of an additional amendment. As "one cannot change the objectives of the SPINAP funding " only interventions that do not contravene the current contract should be undertaken.

Participants appreciated the threat posed by a possible H1N1 / H5N1 mutation in supporting integration of H1N1 into SPINAP implementation. They also appreciated emphasis on IDSR support to countries. Noting the fact that viral mutations occur at all times, the meeting challenged scientists and health professionals to maintain vigilance.

The meeting also took cognizance of the fact that support to countries to prepare against avian influenza had also helped preparations against pandemic influenza.

#### Action points

- The PSC supports flexibility to allow integration of Pandemic Influenza into the implementation of the SPINAP program
- The PSC urges the AU-IBAR to strengthen its efforts for stronger collaboration between AH and HH institutions at national and regional levels

## Involving more partners

Participants expressed the need to broaden the management team by involving economists who would look at interventions impacts. The need for closer collaboration and better integration among actors was expressed. The meeting was informed that there will be funding for country level surveillance from USAID in the near future.

### Action point

- The PSC encourages AU-IBAR to continue its efforts to assure complementarity between the different programs and agencies targeting AHI and other TADs preparedness and response on the Continent

## Communication strategies

The meeting noted that many institutions are working on communication and expressed the need to put in place a mechanism of measuring the impact of this activity within SPINAP. It was noted that there are plans to assess the impact of communication interventions through KAP studies.

### Action point

- Considerable investments have been done in the field of Communication and awareness creation by SPINAP and other programs. AU-IBAR should track the impact of these investments

## Strengthening team spirit

Participants expressed the need to strengthen the team spirit SPINAP being a wide programme managed by a small team. It was strongly suggested that the regional coordinators should attend the PSC meetings in the future.

## INAP-SPINAP

Some participants raised the issue of INAP usefulness to SPINAP implementation and requested for some clarifications. The meeting noted that SPINAP implementation is based on the INAP wherever the latter is in existence. It was also noted that where the INAP has not been fully carried out, a preliminary in-country assessment served as a basis for the formulation of the National SPINAP.

### Action point:

- The PSC supports the JRAM in the remaining countries

## Regional coordination mechanism

The meeting welcome the initiative taken by IBAR to put in place and / or strengthen regional coordination mechanisms for the control of HPAI and other TADs

## Action point

- Considering the signing of a rider to the SPINAP contract and the work so far done towards execution of a regional coordination mechanism, the PSC supports and encourages its expeditious establishment/strengthening through the RECs for AHI and other emerging zoonoses.

## Proposals for PSC endorsement

The SPINAP management team also made proposals for consideration by the 5th PSC, partly to expand program impact and also address new issues arising from the evolving AHI scenario.

Among the key proposals were the following:

- a. Review of country funds allocation based on performance (performance based criteria also proposed for endorsement)
- b. Place greater emphasis to capacity building at national and other levels targeting the following areas:
  - i. Epidemio-surveillance
    - Procurement of Motor Vehicles and Motor Cycles to boost field level surveillance in SPINAP supported countries
    - Conduct training of national teams on Risk Based Surveillance
    - Training of IBAR staff on Risk Assessment and Mapping
    - Provide equipment and other forms of required support to focal laboratories within the existing laboratory networks among the Africa ACP countries
  - ii. Wildlife capacity building
    - Provide basic training on wildlife surveillance to national teams from eligible countries
  - iii. Enhance Support to Pandemic Influenza Interventions
    - Support Countries to update and harmonize their contingency plans toward pandemic influenza
    - Support countries to update their IDSR technical guidelines with incorporation of pandemic influenza A (H1N1) 2009 in line with the new International Health regulations, IHR (2005) and to conduct relevant training of staff
    - Support countries in supplies of IDSR laboratory specimen collection kits, antibiotics, and antiseptics (10 to 20,000 US \$ per country, collective purchase through WHO procurement unit)

- Support countries in supply of some additional doses of Tamiflu in synergy with the already provided doses by WHO Support countries in supply of some additional personal protective equipments (PPEs) in synergy with the already provided kits by WHO

## **Actions**

- The PSC endorses the PCU proposals for implementation as part of its priorities for the next 6 months. This includes greater emphasis to capacity building, targeting specific areas of weakness in epidemio-surveillance systems:
  - i. Risk based surveillance training
  - ii. IBAR capacity for risk assessment and mapping
  - iii. Procurement of vehicles & motor bikes to facilitate surveillance and disease investigation through a centralized international tender.
  - iv. Strengthen Laboratories, through targeting regional network focal laboratories
  - v. Essential support to pandemic influenza interventions in line with flexibility built into the program document.

## **SPINAP Implementation priorities for next 6 months**

### **Result Area 1 – Capacity for prevention and Control of AHI strengthened at national level**

- 1.1 Facilitate audits & transfer of funds to countries
- 1.2 Provide technical & admin support to countries
- 1.3 Provide technical assistance to countries with weak capacity to implement the project -Sao Tome, Gabon, Liberia, Somalia, Sierra Leone, Cap Verde, Comoros.
- 1.4 Provide implementation support to countries (training, mentoring, facilitation, M&E, management support & backstopping)
- 1.5 Gather implementation data at continental basis, analyse, disseminate/share the information
- 1.6 Provide monitoring & evaluation of program implementation
- 1.7 Provide capacity building support to epidemio-surveillance and laboratories
- 1.8 Facilitate training and procurement of supplies and equipment

## **Result Area 2- Increase Awareness Creation and Behaviour Change**

- 2.1 Expand and maintain IBAR website
- 2.2 Finalize and facilitate printing and dissemination of prototype communication materials
- 2.3 Strengthen links with partners for collection, sharing and dissemination of AHI information
- 2.4 Develop & execute communication strategy for AU-IBAR in line with the new Regional Coordination Mechanism
- 2.5 Monitor impact and gather lessons learned from country level execution of communication activities
- 2.6 Facilitate closer collaboration between communication and health professionals on HPAI risk communication
- 2.7 Facilitate visibility of donor and IBAR

## **Result Area 3 – Implementation of INAP Supported**

- 3.1 Organize Implementation Peer Review & workshops at regional levels
- 3.2 Organize bi-annual steering committee meetings in April and December 2010
- 3.3 Participate and share information in regional and international AI/PI forums
- 3.4 Develop a Regional Coordination Mechanism for AHI and other zoonoses in line with Naivasha Road Map
- 3.5 Coordinate & Support coordination of actions at national & regional levels (NTFs, TTXs, peer review mechanisms etc)
- 3.6 Forge/sustain linkages with other AI/PI actors
- 3.6 Team building – internal coordination, strategic focus & capacity development
- 3.7 Provide M&E training to countries

### **Action Point**

- The PSC endorses the PCU implementation priorities for the next 6 months.

## **SPINAP Financial Report**

The financial advisor presented the financial status of the project, focusing mainly on the allocation of funds, disbursement to countries, expenditure and accountability and demonstrated program execution trends against expenditure using MS project derived graphics.

The meeting commended the presenter and encouraged him to share the tool with other donors. The question of how the information generated is being used to assist program execution at country level was asked. Also raised was the issue of addressing countries with low absorptive capacity.



With effect of 1st July 2009 the previous budget was increased by € 3,000,000.00 to be incorporated into the SPINAP-AHI overall budget.

The meeting was informed that the number of Beneficiary Countries receiving their 2nd tranche is increasing as countries get financial transfers as soon as they provide 70% approved vouchers to AU-IBAR, condition of the contract, the next tranche will be released.

Through capacity building support, it was also observed that more and more Beneficiary Countries understand the requirements to account in a transparent manner to be in a position to request for more funds.

To ensure smooth closeout, continuing effort is exerted to ensure:

- The Beneficiary Countries provide, through their relevant Regional Coordination Offices, monthly technical performance reports to AU-IBAR.
- AU-IBAR finance department prepares monthly reports to the Program Coordinator advising on technical performance as well as financial performance.
- Internal audits are undertaken annually
- Vouchers not included in English or French must be translated
- Financial reports from AU-IBAR are forwarded to the Donor as required
- Relevant documents are assembled continuously for the final audit by the Donor

#### **Action points**

- Considering that 66% of the implementation period has elapsed and that 48% of the funds have been disbursed and considering that implementation in 21 countries is so far regarded as non-satisfactory, the PSC decides that countries with weak performance will be further assisted to implement the current contracts.
- Additionally, country allocations can be reviewed, based on criteria proposed by AU-IBAR during the meeting, with clearly defined timelines
- The PSC strongly recommends AU-IBAR to further develop and implement the present financial management systems at Regional Coordination level.

## **Programme M&E Report**

The SPINAP program has an internal M&E system and is also subjected to external monitoring and evaluation in accordance with donor rules and regulations. The program monitoring and evaluation team undertook key M&E activities as stipulated and presented their findings to the 5th SPINAP Steering Committee meeting. The objectives, methodologies, findings and conclusions drawn from various monitoring and evaluation activities were highlighted. Key lessons were also drawn as well as recommendations for follow-up and decision making.

Key highlights of the M&E Findings include the following;

- Relevance & Likelihood of SPINAP Achieving Goal-
- Quality of support provided by the PCU for project implementation has been a key determinant of country's ability to realize intended results.
- Analyses have shown that Countries which have received field support missions, made significant progress in implementation level. Increasing the projects supervision/monitoring by IBAR will therefore continue to be a priority in 2010.
- SPINAP Overall Objective still remains consistence with government policies as support to the INAPs takes into account the multi-dimensional realities at country level.
- Conducive political environment in most of the countries. IBAR has opportunities to inform and influence that environment
- Effectiveness-Achievement of Purpose & Results- IBAR has the obligation to ensure that re-sources provided by the EC are used in the most efficient way possible to achieve purpose of SPINAP:
- Efforts have been made by IBAR to increase administrative efficiency to avoid compromising the quality of administrative services, upon which IBAR's operational effectiveness depends
- SPINAP M&E team strengthened awareness and capabilities of national coordinators to manage risk and embed risk management into their existing management processes.
- Knowledge imparted has made an impact on the quality of reports produced.
- Effectiveness was further sought in part by taking advantage of the expertise of external consultants particularly in the area of surveillance and communication for behavioural changes.
- Efficiency-Sound Management & Value for Money:
- The recent active participation between animal and human health personnel has gone a long way to increase the absorptive capacities in some countries.
- Unplanned results: Capacities developed in the fight against H5N1 are now being adapted to H1N1, like surveillance, communication and laboratory diagnostic facilities.
- Progress towards Impact & Sustainability- While it is early to measure SPINAP impact and sustainability, progress has been made ensure tangible sustainability:
- SPINAP as a support to INAPs is fully coherent with the national requirements, strategies, and policies.

- SPINAP is embedded in Local Institutional Structures, and efforts are made to operate within such national structures, schemes, operations for the project benefits. Capacity building is one of the tools used ensure attainment of results.
- Behaviour change is taking place as investment in bio security measures is increasing in order to reduce the likelihood of virus introduction into their flocks (bio-exclusion) and to minimize the risk of transmitting disease within their farm and to other farms (bio-containment).
- SPINAP has started broadening its approach to create systems which can handle multiple disease emergencies, including AHI, and their inclusion in the national disaster management strategies.

### Key Lessons Learned

- The lack of certain conditions at the design is negatively affecting execution. For instance, M&E findings are revealing that the majority of the countries are expressing the absence of incentives for field personnel, coordinator and accountant as a major constraint to effective implementation, especially on reporting. In addition, the lack of a provision in the contracts to purchase or maintain vehicle has negatively affected effective surveillance. The running costs for the old PACE vehicles which are inherited by SPINAP, is unsustainable.
- The absence of permanent staff to work purposely for SPINAP at country level is also an explanatory factor for poor performance and low implementation rate. From what was observed, levels of preparedness for prevention of Avian Influenza as well as rate of SPINAP-AHI implementation also differ from country to country, depending on the country's human capital.
- At the national level, communication for behavior change and education to communities has actually boost implementation. The active participation of communication experts at country levels enhance public awareness, especially stakeholders involved in poultry production chain. The emergence of the Pandemic Influenza H1N1 has necessitated countries to re-visit their priorities.
- The Regional Technical Review Meetings significantly boost Countries performance. An explanatory factor may be the realization of the impending allocation of funds from slow spending countries to those of fast implementers. The Technical Review Meetings further demonstrated the importance of a multi-sectoral approach to effectively implement SPINAP activities at country levels. Countries adopting a team approach in SPINAP implementation, it was realised, have generally made more progress than those that have not. This is exemplified by Ethiopia, Zambia, Madagascar and Lesotho.
- Persistent follow-up of implementation at countries level is required for effective execution of the project. Some coordinators are handling multiple responsibilities.
- To sustain SPINAP's results, AHI should be incorporated with the transboundary diseases of the country, which would also be part of the National disaster management system

## Future M&E Direction

The M&E team further reported on the future direction regarding effective performance based on performance criteria developed jointly with country beneficiaries. The rationale to have performance criteria for SPINAP implementation includes, among others, the following:

- Considerable challenges remain to achieve full absorption of the SPINAP funds.
- Need to enhance implementation and assure optimal absorption of funds by the end of the program
- Need to closely track progress made towards achieving the SPINAP results and purpose.
- Pace of implementation differ from country to country; revealing low absorption capacity, leading to low or slow implementation.
- Criteria are required to facilitate the analysis of country's operations and performance.
- Criteria will facilitate decision-making to provide the tranche to countries.
- Criteria further set the condition to provide or prevent the transfer of additional funds to certain countries. Where additional funds are to be provided, a clear and realistic plan (to be judged by the reg. coordinators) to use the additional funds should be evident.

It is based on the foregoing that the PCU in collaboration with country beneficiaries identified and agreed on a set of indicators to determine whether the national program is well performing or under-performing. These performance based indicators will assist decision on the reallocation of funds from under-performing countries and further serves as guideline for additional funding to well performing countries

Table 1 below depicts key performance indicators to be tracked and the baseline (using September 2009 as base) and the target in 2010.

**Table 1. Key Performance Indicator**

Key Performance Indicators	Baseline (Sept. 09)	Target
Number of Countries absorbing 70% of the 1st Tranche by November 30th, 2009	21	47
Number of Countries absorbing 70% of the 2nd Tranche by March 30th, 2010.	9	38
Number of countries absorbing 70% of total allocation is utilised by July 15th, 2010	0	47
Number of Countries meeting financial/technical reporting obligations in terms of regularity and timeliness on a monthly basis.	39	47
Number of Countries implementing SPINAP through an active multi-sectoral task force that meets regularly.	29*	47
	* Feedback from 39 Countries	

Country performance will be gauged on a case by case using the above indicators. Performance is categorized as follows;

- i. Highly Satisfactory (75 points and above; - this is fully in accordance to work plan & contract);
- ii. Satisfactory (60 to 74 points - positive out-weights negative gains);
- iii. Unsatisfactory (0-59 points - not sufficient gains as negative out- weights the few positive).

Application of the criteria on current status of countries indicates the kind of results expected and how decision making will be shaped (table 2).

**Table 2. SPINAP Country Performance Status**

<b>Region</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b> (75 points and above; - fully according to work plan & contract)	<b>Satisfactory</b> (60 to 74 points - positive out-weights negative gains)	<b>Unsatisfactory</b> (0-59 points - not sufficient gains as negative out-weights the few positive)
<b>Western &amp; Central Africa</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Mauritania; <input type="checkbox"/> Guinea Bissau; <input type="checkbox"/> Gambia; <input type="checkbox"/> Ghana; <input type="checkbox"/> Gabon; <input type="checkbox"/> Mali; <input type="checkbox"/> Niger;	<input type="checkbox"/> Guinea Conakry; <input type="checkbox"/> Togo;	<input type="checkbox"/> Cameroon; <input type="checkbox"/> Burkina Faso; <input type="checkbox"/> Senegal; <input type="checkbox"/> Liberia; <input type="checkbox"/> Sierra Leone; <input type="checkbox"/> CAR; <input type="checkbox"/> Nigeria; <input type="checkbox"/> Chad; <input type="checkbox"/> Cap Verde; <input type="checkbox"/> Cote d'Ivoire; <input type="checkbox"/> Sao Tome; <input type="checkbox"/> Benin
<b>Eastern Africa</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> DRC <input type="checkbox"/> Kenya <input type="checkbox"/> Rwanda <input type="checkbox"/> Sudan <input type="checkbox"/> Uganda	<input type="checkbox"/> Congo <input type="checkbox"/> Brazzaville <input type="checkbox"/> Djibouti <input type="checkbox"/> Ethiopia <input type="checkbox"/> Seychelles <input type="checkbox"/> Tanzania	<input type="checkbox"/> Burundi <input type="checkbox"/> Comoros <input type="checkbox"/> Eritrea <input type="checkbox"/> Somalia
<b>Southern Africa</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Lesotho <input type="checkbox"/> Madagascar <input type="checkbox"/> Zimbabwe <input type="checkbox"/> Zambia	<input type="checkbox"/> Namibia <input type="checkbox"/> Swaziland <input type="checkbox"/> Malawi <input type="checkbox"/> Botswana	<input type="checkbox"/> Angola <input type="checkbox"/> Equatorial Guinea <input type="checkbox"/> Mauritius <input type="checkbox"/> Mozambique

Based on the results of performance assessment using the above criteria, countries will be notified on potential decisions in accordance with the contractual provisions before a final decision is reached ahead of the 6th PSC meeting.

The presentation was followed by a lively discussion culminating on the following actions;

### **Performance criteria**

The meeting agreed on the performance criteria that will serve as a basis for decision making on funds transfer from one country to another but drew the attention of the project management on the need to strike a balance between financial performance and technical achievements. The programme management was urged to objectively

identify which countries are performing well and which ones are not. It was agreed that decision has to be made before the next steering committee

### **Capacity building**

Implementing countries should be further supported by the SPINAP M&E unit to harmonize the system with their national systems and capacitate the coordinators to undertake in-country M&E.

## **Mid Term External Evaluation**

The Midterm Evaluation report was presented by the Monitoring and evaluation expert. The presentation was followed by discussions which highlighted the following:

- i. The MTE findings as a useful guide

The meeting agreed that the findings are useful for current implementation and future programming.

- ii. Few unrealistic recommendations

It was noted that some recommendations were not very useful:

- Auto-evaluation should not be viewed as a problem. It should in fact be inbuilt in management
- It can also be used to support capacity building at the national/implementation levels

- iii. Rational for opening dollar accounts in countries

The issue of requesting countries to open USD accounts was raised and this was explained by the need to avoid high currency fluctuations and the ease it brings about when it comes to procuring from a foreign supplier.

- iv. Motivating national project accountants

The issue of incentives or top up to coordinators and accountants was not endorsed because the proposed approach was found to be in conflict with prevailing development aid management principles. The management was tasked to look for other ways of motivating people such as training opportunities, cross-border meetings etc.

### **Decisions points**

- The PSC accepts the mid-term review report as useful for strengthening current implementation and future programming.
- The PSC supports the MTE recommendation that donors should consider providing “budget support” to AU-IBAR on the basis of the finding that it is a maturing institution and considering AU-IBAR's new Strategic Plan 2010-2014.

### 3 Resolutions of the Fifth PSC

---

The 5th Project Steering Committee recognises unanimously that significant progress has been achieved since the last PSC meeting in March 2009 and that all relevant documents have been distributed to PSC members in a timely manner.

1. The minutes of the previous meeting were endorsed without amendments.
2. The progress report was presented by the project Coordinator and endorsed by the PSC.
3. The PSC endorses the PCU proposals for implementation priorities for the next 6 months. This includes greater emphasis to capacity building, targeting specific areas of weakness in Epidemio-surveillance systems:
  - Risk based surveillance training
  - IBAR capacity for risk assessment and mapping
  - Procurement of vehicles & motor bikes to facilitate surveillance and disease investigation through a centralised international tender.
  - Strengthen Laboratories, through targeting regional network focal laboratories
  - One Health Orientation courses – OWOH

Considering that 66% of the implementation period has elapsed and that 48% of the funds have been disbursed and considering that implementation in 21 countries is so far regarded as non-satisfactory, the PSC decides that country allocations can be reviewed based on criteria proposed by AU-IBAR during the meeting with clearly defined timelines. The first priority, however, remains to urge and support weak performing countries to implement the existing contracts.

4. The PSC supports flexibility to allow integration of Pandemic Influenza into the implementation of the SPINAP programme.
5. The PSC urges the AU-IBAR to strengthen its efforts for stronger collaboration between AH and HH institutions at national and regional levels.
6. Considerable investments have been done in the field of Communication and awareness creation by SPINAP. AU-IBAR should track the impact of these investments.
7. The PSC encourages AU-IBAR to continue its efforts to assure complementarity between the different programmes presently targeting other TADs and AHI preparedness and response on the Continent.
8. The PSC accepts the mid-term review report as useful for strengthening current implementation and future programming.

9. The SPINAP PSC supports the mobilization of resources for the continuation of the JRAM in the remaining countries.
10. The PSC supports the MTE recommendation that donors should consider providing “budget support” to AU-IBAR on the basis of the finding that it is a maturing institution and considering AU-IBAR’s new Strategic Plan 2010-2014.
11. Implementing countries should be further supported by the SPINAP M&E unit to harmonise the system with their national systems and capacitate the coordinators to undertake in-country M&E.
12. The PSC strongly recommends AU-IBAR to further develop and implement the present financial management systems at Regional Coordination level.
13. Considering the signing of a rider to the SPINAP contract and the work so far done towards execution of a regional coordination mechanism (IRAP), the PSC supports and encourages its expeditious establishment/strengthening for AHI and other emerging zoonoses in close collaboration with the regional economic communities (RECs).



## 4 Appendices

---

Appendix 1: Agenda

[Click here to download Agenda/PDF](#)

Appendix 2: List of participants

[Click here to download List of participants/PDF](#)