



EXTENSION OF THE PAN-AFRICAN PROGRAMME FOR THE CONTROL OF EPIZOOTICS (PACE)

Accounting numbers

7 ACP RPR 744

7 ACP RPR 745

8 ACP TPS 032

8 ACP ROC 009

8 ACP TPS 033

FINAL REPORT



January 14, 2004

FINAL REPORT

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	5
1. INTRODUCTION.....	8
2. BACKGROUND.....	9
3. REVIEW OF PRESENT PHASE.....	10
3.1 DESIGN AND ACHIEVEMENTS TO-DATE.....	10
3.2 FINANCIAL ANALYSIS.....	11
3.2.1 Introduction.....	12
3.2.2 National TA Funds Available.....	12
3.2.3 Use of Contingency Funds and Switch of Programme Funds.....	13
3.2.4 Contributions from AU to IBAR Personnel and Running Costs.....	14
3.2.5 CAPE and DFID Funding Termination.....	14
3.2.6 Availability of Decommited National Funds.....	14
3.2.7 Present Level of Regional Component Costs.....	15
3.2.8 Regional Component European TA and African Expert Costs.....	15
3.2.9 Research.....	16
3.2.10 PANVAC.....	16
3.2.11 Emergency Vaccine Supplies and RP Emergency Mobilisation Fund.....	17
3.2.12 Information Visibility Budget.....	18
3.2.13 Studies Budget.....	18
3.3 ORGANISATION AND MANAGEMENT.....	18
3.3.1 Introduction.....	18
3.3.2 Overview.....	18
3.3.3 Management Structure.....	20
3.3.4 Management Problems and Issues.....	20
3.3.5 Administrative Procedural Problems and Issues.....	21
4. TECHNICAL PRIORITIES FOR EXTENSION.....	24
4.1 INTRODUCTION.....	24
4.2 ERADICATION OF RINDERPEST FROM AFRICA.....	24
4.3 ENHANCEMENT OF PRIVATE SECTOR.....	26
4.4 CAPACITY BUILDING OF IBAR.....	27
4.5 INTEGRATION OF CAH ACTIVITIES IN THE EXTENSION.....	27
4.6 DEVELOPMENT AND PROMOTION OF COMMODITY-BASED TRADE.....	28
5. PACE EXTENSION.....	28
5.1 OPTIONS FOR EXTENSION.....	28
5.1.1 Limited Extension.....	29
5.1.2 One-Year Extension.....	29
5.1.3 Two-Year Extension.....	29
5.2 TECHNICAL PRIORITIES FOR TWO YEAR EXTENSION.....	29
5.2.1 Introduction.....	29
5.2.2 Main Objectives.....	30
5.2.3 Detailed Recommendations.....	30
5.2.4 Monitoring and Evaluation.....	32
5.3 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS.....	35
5.3.1 Availability of Additional Funds.....	35
5.3.2 National Component.....	35
5.3.3 Staffing of Regional Component.....	36

5.3.4 CAH Sub-Component Funding.....	38
5.3.5 Regional Component Budget.....	39
5.4 IMPROVEMENTS TO PROCEDURES AND MANAGEMENT.....	41
5.4.1 Procedures.....	41
5.4.2 Management.....	41
5.4.3 Alternative Management Strategies.....	42
5.5 RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS.....	43
5.6 COSTS AND BENEFITS.....	43
6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	44
6.1 Overall Conclusions.....	44
6.2 Financial Considerations.....	44
6.3 Overall Amended Budget for the Extension and AU Contribution.....	45
6.4 Management and Administration.....	46
6.5 Closure of Programme.....	47
7. OUTSTANDING ISSUES.....	47
7.1 Additional Contributions from AU to IBAR Costs and Sharing of PANVAC Costs.....	47
7.2 EU Ceiling Funds.....	47
ANNEX 1 TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	48
ANNEX 2 MISSION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY.....	55
ANNEX 3 LIST OF PERSONS MET.....	56
ANNEX 4 MISSION ITINERARY.....	58
ANNEX 5 BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	60
ANNEX 6 RESULTS OF WORKSHOPS.....	61
ANNEX 7 ORGANOGRAM FOR COORDINATION OF PACE ACTIVITIES IN THE SOMALIA ECOSYSTEM.....	72
ANNEX 8 PROGRESS ALONG THE OIE PATHWAY.....	73
ANNEX 9 ORIGINAL REGIONAL COMPONENT BUDGET.....	74

Abbreviations and Currency Equivalents

AC	Advisory Committee
ACM	Advisory Committee Meeting
AU	African Union
CAH	Community Animal Health
CAHW	Community Animal Health Workers
CAPE	Community based Animal Health and Participatory Epidemiology Unit
CSU	Common Services Unit
DFID	Department for International Development (UK Aid)
EC	European Commission
ECD	Delegation of the European Commission
EDF	European Development Fund
IBAR	Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources
FA	Financing Agreement
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NAO	National Authorising Officer
NC	National Coordinator
OAU	Organisation of African Unity
OIE	International Office for Epizootics
PACE	Pan African Control of Epizootic Diseases
PARC	Pan African Rinderpest Campaign
PC	Programme Coordinator
PCU	Programme Coordination Unit
PEU	PACE Epidemiology Unit
RAO	Regional Authorising Officer
RCU	Regional Coordination Unit
RP	Rinderpest
TA	Technical Assistance
ToR	Terms of Reference
VLPU	Veterinary Legislation and Privatisation Unit
WP	Work Plan

Currency Equivalents

EUR 1.0 = KSh 90.0

Executive Summary

The Mid-Term review (MTR) of the PACE programme, conducted in October 2002, concluded that: "...the agreed completion date, October 2004, is no longer realistic and needs to be extended if any results are to be achieved." In response to this conclusion, the seventh biannual meeting of the programme's Advisory Committee recommended that: "... a consultant be appointed as soon as possible to review the recommendations of the MTR report in the light of the comments made by the PACE Coordination Unit (PCU), to design a possible extension of the PP"(PACE Programme).

This Mission is the result of that review and that recommendation. The Mission comprised two consultants: an Agricultural Economist, Mr Ian Talks, and a Veterinary Surgeon, Dr Guy Freeland. Dr Freeland was briefed by the EC in Brussels and the OIE in Paris on 24th 2003 and commenced work in Nairobi on 26th November 2003. Mr Talks joined the mission in Nairobi on 1st December 2003.

The time schedule for the Mission reports involved presentation of a draft *Aide-Mémoire* to an in-house workshop on 17th December 2003, and submission of a final *Aide-Mémoire* before departure on 21st December 2003. The consultants then wrote a draft report and returned to Nairobi to present it, on 9th January 2004, to a larger workshop to which external stakeholders were also invited and, heeding the comments made by the participants, submitted this Final Report on 14th January 2004. Reports on these two workshops are attached as Annex 6.

Although designed to consolidate and build upon the Veterinary Service Strengthening initiatives set up under the PARC programme, PACE differs from PARC in one major aspect: it was designed as a regional programme, managed by AU-IBAR, with thirty-two participating countries, whereas PARC was designed as 26 country programmes harmonized in their complementary activities by a regional component in the IBAR office. Well intentioned though this change in design was, with its desire to establish IBAR as the Centre of Excellence and co-ordinating authority for regional or continental issues of livestock production, health, and trade, it has proved administratively too cumbersome and has occasioned much (but certainly not all) of the delay that the various country projects have experienced. The technical and institutional strengthening projects to be implemented at national level were to be advised, guided and supported by bodies of technical expertise housed in seven Common Service Units (CSU) housed in the IBAR HQ in Nairobi and its Regional Office in Bamako, Mali. These CSUs and the PCU were to be funded from the regional component of the PACE budget.

At the briefing in Brussels, Dr Freeland was advised that the EC was essentially sympathetic to the recommendation for a two-year extension, but that it would have to be afforded with a very limited extra budget (7% of the original budget). He was informed that it would probably be possible to find an extra EUR 5 million to cover the costs of the extension of the regional components of the programme, but that the costs of extension of the country projects should be afforded from within the original budget allocated to them against the global work plans they had proposed. If necessary, the Financing Agreement's 'withdrawing rights' could be used to remove money allocated to the projects of one country in order to supplement the resources of another.

In the time frame available, it was not possible for the consultants to meet representatives of more than a handful of the participating Countries, so they concentrated their efforts on interviews with the members of the Programme Co-ordination Unit (PCU) and various experts (African and expatriate) employed in each of the Common Service Units in Nairobi, as well as visiting the West Africa Regional Co-ordination Unit (RCU) in Bamako, and the Headquarters of the African Union in Addis Ababa.

It was clear from the outset that, if a two-year extension was to be proposed, it would necessitate a considerable pruning of the current operational resources and a narrower focusing of activities, outputs, and anticipated results. The mission therefore closely examined other options, including the possibility of a full strength extension but for only one year, and the zero option of no extension at all.

As a result of its interviews and review of the documentation provided, the Mission concurs with the conclusions of the MTR, and of the Programme's external monitors, that the Programme has been hindered by over-complex and cumbersome administrative processes and by indecisive management, which have combined to cause serious delays in the approval of budgets and authorization to spend. Furthermore, some of the CSUs have not performed as well as had been expected, neither individually nor as a team, and this has led to further frustration and loss of momentum. Nevertheless, the Mission believes that the key issues being addressed are of such importance to the development and prosperity of the livestock sector across Africa, that the Programme does merit a two-year extension to allow more countries to reap their intended benefits.

However, since there is still no concrete evidence of the AU's intention to finance the staff establishment of IBAR, nor any certainty that the participating countries will translate their current counterpart contributions to their development budgets into similar contributions to their regular budgets, the mission feels that the outputs of the extension should, principally, be targeted on items that will lead to important sustainable results, regardless of the eventual levels of the recurrent budget allocated to livestock services after PACE is ended. In order of importance, these results are deemed to be:

- Verified eradication of Rinderpest from the continent of Africa,
- Enhanced opportunity and support for the private sector to effectively participate in the delivery of veterinary services,
- Support to the long-term objectives of IBAR

These targeted results each fall within the ambit of the four areas of principal activity and output identified in the logframe of the 'Financing Agreement' for the programme. Targeting Rinderpest does not imply that surveillance and 'Participatory Disease Impact Assessment' for other diseases should cease, but does clearly indicate where the first priority and prime responsibility must be. As will be seen from the table of results and the quantified indicators attached to them, it is the PCU and CSUs that have the obligation to see that these targeted results are achieved and, in the first instance, they must ensure that the national work plans and budgets place sufficient emphasis and resources on them. Thereafter they must monitor the progress being made.

This report details how these conclusions have been reached and recommends the activities that must be pursued and the resources that are required to achieve the aforesaid results. It schedules the phased reduction of technical assistance that must be applied to stay within the financial limits that have been imposed. It also suggests some improvements to management and administration that would be necessary during an extension. These include the need for the preparation by senior PCU management of a definite management strategy and plan for measures to be adopted during the extension. Precisely what management conditions the EC will lay down will be a matter for the Lead EC Delegation in reaching agreement and approving the Extension. The Mission also makes some suggestions for simplification of the procedures for preparation and approval of work plans. It is strongly recommended by the Mission that the EC accepts the preparation of a two year work plan as a basis for the entire Extension period, coupled to approval of annual budgets, as this is an important requirement in relation to cutting back the National TA inputs in the second year.

The Mission has prepared a budget for a two-year extension of the Regional Component taking into account the following considerations and assumptions:

- the financial limitations imposed on the cost of extension of EUR 5 million; this has yet to be clarified by the EU,
- the proposed technical priorities for the Extension phase of two years,
- the assumption that the unused National component is adequate to fund a continuation of the National programme for a further two years, including a pruned National TA input.

- the proposal that the CAH activities in the three countries of the Somalia ecosystem are covered partly by PACE (policy activities with the suggested new unit for development of veterinary services and coordination activities under the PEU) and partly covered by sharing of the cost of the field work activities under the three national programmes under coordination and technical direction of PACE, the bulk of funding stemming from a contribution from the Somalia Programme towards the CAH fieldwork in that country,
- an AU contribution to IBAR costs and operating costs during the entire period and agreement of cost sharing of the PANVAC project
- the various suggested cut backs in the Regional Component staffing, mainly transfer of European TA inputs to African experts, to reduce the annual costs of this Component over the two years.

The total costs of the PACE funded Extension, excluding the AU contribution, is nearly EUR 6.0 million. Including deduction of the AU contribution it becomes nearly EUR 5.0 million – that is just below the ceiling of 5 million. The CAH fieldwork would be funded through contributions from the Somalia EU Programme (EUR 500,000 plus 10% contingency of EUR 50,000) and the Kenya and Ethiopia from existing reallocation of National Components (EUR 300,000). This would raise the total additional funding requirement to EUR 5.6 million including the contribution from the Somalia EC Programme.

The importance of receiving the additional AU-contributions to IBAR in time for the extension and gaining agreement on the funding sources for the CAH Somalia fieldwork is clear. The implications if the amendment ceiling remains at EUR 4 million, or if the AU contribution does not materialise, would be that either cuts would need to be made, including cutting out all support to IBAR posts not directly essential to the activities of the extension period and/or still more of some of the unused funds in the National Component lines for the Emergency Mobilisation Fund, Visibility and Studies should be reallocated to support the Regional Component. If the AU contribution does not materialise in addition to this lower ceiling (that is a total reduction in EUR 2.0 million available), or the EC Somalia Programme does not contribute as indicated, further cuts in the Regional Component would be required plus further reallocation of the above budget lines.

In spite of the narrowing of focus that is recommended and the quite rigorous cuts in Technical Assistance that are to be applied, meaningful success during this extension phase will be dependent upon the AU making its promised contribution to financing six permanent posts in the IBAR structure. Without this African expertise being available it would probably be better to have no extension at all, but simply to concentrate on establishing a new project to eliminate Rinderpest from the Somali ecosystem – strongly suspected of being the last remaining reservoir of Rinderpest in the whole world.

1. INTRODUCTION

This report presents the main findings and recommendations of a Mission to review and make proposals for an extension of the PACE programme, ToR for which are attached as Annex I. This Mission was commissioned in response to the main recommendation of the Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the programme, conducted in October 2002.

The MTR concluded that, as a result of the PACE programme having suffered so many delays in the first two years of its implementation: barely half the participating countries could complete more than two years of their projected five-year programmes of capacity building. Therefore the programme should be extended by two years. Whilst accepting the rationale behind this recommendation, and calculating that there was probably sufficient unspent money in the National Project Budgets to fund the extra period of in-country activity, the EU recognized that extra funds would need to be found to pay for the activities of the Regional and Common Service Units (CSU) components of the programme for this extra two years. Further, because, under EC rules, it is understood that there is a ceiling to the extra funds that may be allocated against any such a request, they also recognized that there would have to be significant cuts in the Regional TA (by time and/or number of posts) for this component to function effectively within this maximum allowable additional budget. The consultants have been advised by the EC that this ceiling has recently been raised from EUR 4.0 million to 5.0 million, but written confirmation of this figure is still awaited at the time of reporting.

In recognition of the difficult choices that these cuts would entail, the programme's 'Advisory Committee' (AC) recommended that an independent consultancy be commissioned to examine the Programme's key objectives, and its human, material and financial resources, and propose the priority areas on which the Programme should focus its efforts during the extension period.

The Mission was composed of two consultants, a veterinarian (Dr G.G. Freeland) and an agricultural economist (Mr K.I. Talks). Dr Freeland was briefed in Brussels (by the EC) and in Paris (by the OIE) on 24th November 2003 and started work in Nairobi on 26th of that month. Mr Talks on 1st December joined him. In the time frame available, it was not possible for the consultants to meet representatives of more than a handful of the participating Countries, so they have concentrated their efforts on interviews with the members of the Programme Co-ordination Unit (PCU) and various experts (African and expatriate) employed in each of the Common Service Units in Nairobi, as well as visiting the West Africa Regional Co-ordination Unit (RCU) in Bamako, and the Headquarters of the African Union in Addis Ababa. On each of these visits, opportunities were also taken to interview officers involved in the national campaigns of those two countries, and some of their Technical Advisers employed under the programme. In addition, the Programme has provided the Mission with a wealth of documentation from which it informed itself on the programme's problems, progress and potential.

A Draft *Aide-Memoire* was distributed on December 15th 2003 and presented and discussed at an essentially internal workshop held on 17th December. After consideration of the various comments received prior, during and after the Workshop, the consultants prepared a Final *Aide-Memoire*, which they submitted on 21st December 2003. A brief report on the Workshop is attached as Annex 6. The Draft Report was presented to a larger workshop, including representation from some participating countries and other stakeholders, on 9th January in Nairobi. Minutes of this workshop and a list of people attending are also attached in Annex 6. This Final Report, produced on 14th January 2004, represents consensus agreement on the staff structures and management mechanisms for the extension, having taken into account some strong views voiced from the floor and in written comment from stakeholders further afield, and subsequent discussion, on specific matters arising, with the EU, PCU, and EC Somalia Country Programme Officer.

Acknowledgements

The Mission consultants would like to acknowledge the assistance provided by all PACE and other staff met in Nairobi, Bamako and Addis Ababa during the course of the mission.

Disclaimer

The views and opinions expressed in this Draft Report are those of the independent consultants and do not necessarily represent the views of the African Union, the European Commission, or the Governments of the individual countries participating in the Programme. These bodies shall not be bound by the opinions and recommendations expressed herein.

2. BACKGROUND

The PACE Programme was designed as a five-year programme of EU assistance to the Livestock Services of a continuous belt of 32 countries spanning the continent of Africa, from Mauritania, Senegal, and Guinea Conakry in the west, to the Horn of Africa, Kenya, and Tanzania in the east. The overall or wider objective of the Programme is to relieve poverty of those involved in livestock farming in Africa by improving animal productivity, trade and food security. The specific objectives or purpose of the Programme is stated as:

1. Strengthening the capability (National and Regional) to assess the technical and economic aspects of animal diseases and generate appropriate programmes for their control.
2. Safeguarding animal health in Africa against major animal diseases (OIE List A diseases).

To facilitate the sustainable achievement of this dual purpose, the principal areas of necessary activity and results were stated as:

1. Reinforcing veterinary epidemiology services (information, diagnostics and follow-up) and control of major animal diseases in the participating countries.
2. Greater privatization of veterinary services, and public/private sector linkage in the field.
3. Eradication of Rinderpest (RP) from Africa; greater control of other epizootic diseases, especially CBPP.
4. At pan-African level, sustainable co-ordination of national animal health systems and arrangements for tackling epizootic diseases set up.

In respect of this last result, it was anticipated that the African Union (AU) would have completed its phase of re-organization, and by the end of the fourth year of the Programme would have recruited and be supporting, from its own resources, a full complement of permanent posts in IBAR.

The programme operates in 30 of the 32 countries originally identified, and these various national capacity building projects are given technical support and guidance by seven Common Services Units (CSU) headquartered in the Offices of the Inter-African Bureau of Animal Resources (IBAR) in Nairobi, and co-ordinated by Regional Co-ordination Units in Bamako (for the West and Central African countries) and Nairobi (for the East African countries). The programme overall is managed and coordinated by the Programme Co-ordination Unit (PCU), also based in IBAR.

3. REVIEW OF PRESENT PHASE

3.1 Design and Achievements To-Date

The PACE Programme was designed to consolidate and build upon the results achieved from the PARC (Pan-African Rinderpest Control) Programme, which ran from 1986 to 1999. However, in contrast to PARC, it was designed as a regional programme managed within IBAR, with 32 participating countries, each country being allocated a portion of the total budget. Within its budgetary limits, each country prepared a five-year global work plan of procurement, training, and other inputs and activities, designed to enhance the physical and intellectual capacity of its veterinary service to detect, diagnose, and assess the epidemiology and impact of major infectious diseases (especially epizootics), and then to design – in conjunction with neighbouring countries if relevant – appropriate, affordable, and socially and economically justifiable, systems for their monitoring and control.

The five-year plan – once approved by the Programme Co-ordination Unit (PCU) – would then be implemented through a series of annual work plans, each of which in its turn must go through a fairly stringent and lengthy process of scrutiny and approval by the PCU and by the EC delegations at country and regional level. It is principally the length and complexity of this approval system, coupled with the stringency of EC procurement processes that has caused most of the delays to project implementation and occasioned the need for an extension. However, it must also be said that some countries have shown much more interest and initiative than others in pursuing their project's progress.

The development programmes mounted in each country are backed-up by access to advice and expertise from seven Common Service Units (CSU) housed in IBAR, Nairobi, and in its regional office in Bamako. These CSUs provide specialist expertise in:

- Epidemiology and surveillance systems, including disease in wildlife
- Data management
- Economics
- Veterinary legislation and privatization
- Community animal health and participatory epidemiology (CAPE)
- Communications
- Financial Management

Whilst serving this wider development purpose at present, it was envisaged that ultimately they would reduce to become the in-house expertise of IBAR in its role as the African Union's centre of excellence for animal resources, health and promotion of trade: hence the fourth 'Specific Objective' of the programme.

Of the other three specific objectives, the greatest interest has generally (but not invariably) been in 'reinforcing veterinary epidemiology services' and in the 'eradication of Rinderpest', with less interest being shown in the 're-organization and privatization of services'. In line with this preference, the various countries have tended to make greater use of the Epidemiology and the Data Management units than they have of the others. Although in East Africa there has been a significantly greater use of the CAPE unit with its community and participatory focuses than there has in the west and centre.

Overall, progress has been very uneven, not just in the development of the different spheres of expertise within country but also, and more markedly, between countries. To date only 3 countries are starting on their fourth work plan; 21 are on their third work plan; 3 are in their second work plans; 1 country is in its first work plan and 1 country has only just received the initial advance to start implementation of its first work plan.

In part, this between country variation may be explained by the fact that there is a considerable variation in the importance of livestock to the people and economies of the different countries in the Programme. Also, a significant variation in the species which are of priority importance to the differing farming systems: PACE has tended to prioritize its focus upon ruminant livestock (particularly upon

bovines) with porcines, equines, and avians – which are of much greater importance to some of the more crop-based economies - receiving much less attention. Nonetheless, except where livestock are of very low importance, the general principles and processes being addressed and promoted by PACE should have relevance to all, with appropriate adaptation to the differing conditions, circumstances, and priorities prevailing.

The differing rates of progress apart, the other issue of major concern are the long-term sustainability of the processes and procedures being introduced/reinforced. Particular doubt has been cast by several people, and by some project reports, on the Epidemiological Surveillance Systems (ESS) that are simply being rejuvenated in several countries without thought to their comparative advantage, efficacy or their operational cost. There is also doubt raised in some quarters as to the degree of penetration these systems have anyway into the more remote pastoral and agro-pastoral areas of some countries. Previously, such systems have been seen as expensive luxuries, which, without the appropriate political and financial support needed to subsequently mount effective disease control programmes, yield only information but no really practical benefit. As a result, this prime responsibility of the State Veterinary Service has often been seriously under funded and withered into almost total inactivity. Many suspect it unlikely that the counterpart funds countries are currently putting into their development budget for operation of this rejuvenated surveillance service will be translated into similar sums in the regular budget once PACE comes to its end. It is the responsibility of the relevant CSUs to ensure that issues of purpose, long-term sustainability, efficacy, comparative advantage, and suitability, are properly discussed, addressed, and tested, before advocating and materially supporting the introduction/re-introduction of new concepts and programmes to a national service.

In January/February of 2003, the supporting expertise to the country projects was significantly strengthened by the arrival (two years later than planned) of nine national and regional technical assistants. Early signs are that their experience has given a new pace and impetus to the national projects of most countries.

Other specific issues noted by the Mission are as follows:

- The performance of the Communications Unit is considered by both the Mission and the Monitoring Mission to have not been satisfactory. PACE as a whole lacks a strong corporate identity to the outside world. This lack of a strong public image to-date results in a loss of credibility and lack of donor support. It was suggested that external media consultants be called upon to advise on a strategy for developing an image as a priority for the future. It is likely that the communications work will be taken over by the IBAR Documentation Unit and therefore PACE's role and funding support would change during the Extension phase, an issue that is discussed later under the Extension proposals.
- The performance of the Economics Unit is also of concern as there has been a lack of linkage between the technical and economic outputs of the CSUs, a link that is urgently required to justify to governments as to the value of some of the PACE activities. Every technical output needs to be linked to an economic appraisal. The Economics unit's outputs have not sufficiently targeted governments in persuading them of the long-term productivity, trade and socio-economic benefits and therefore in convincing them of the sustainability of PACE efforts.
- The above two issues are part of the overall need to improve dissemination of information and the image of IBAR in future, a priority identified in the Monitoring Consultant's Report.

3.2 Financial Analysis

A financial analysis of existing expenditure under the present Programme that is relevant to planning a possible extension is presented below.

3.2.1 Introduction

The total original budgeted cost of the Programme in the Financing Agreement is summarised in the following table.

Table 1 Total and Breakdown of Programme Costs as in FA (EUR 000)

Item	National	Regional	Total	%
TA	6,200	7,400	13,800	19
Local TA	0	1,280	1,280	2
Audit/Evaluation*	0	730	730	1
Studies/Research	690	1300	1,990	3
Training	5,390	300	5,690	8
Equipment	11,800	500	12,300	17
Inputs	8,760	120	8,880	12
Inform/Visibility*	580	320	900	1
Local Staff	3,230	1,050	4,280	6
Other	9,350	4,000	13,350	18
Special Funds	2,000	0	2,000	3
Contingencies	5,400	1,600	7,000	10
TOTAL	53,400	18,600	72,000	100

Source: FA * audit/evaluation and information/visibility headings are managed directly by the Commission. Special funds include an emergency mobilisation fund and vaccine bank costs for rapid mobilisation in the event of an outbreak of Rinderpest. Studies/Research is Studies in National Component and Research in Regional Component respectively.

The total Programme cost was budgeted at EUR 72 million of which the National Component was EUR 53.4 million, or 74% of total costs, and the Regional Component EUR 18.6 million or 26% of total costs. Actual expenditure to-date has been that National component costs are well behind that planned by the end of year 4 due to delays, but the Regional Component costs have overrun. By October 2003, that is four years after the start-up of the PACE Programme, EUR 48.8 million has been committed for the National Programme, but only EUR 21.02 million has been paid out on these commitments, or only 43% of the revised national budget. In addition, EUR 19.3 million has been committed under the Regional Component. Without some transfers from contingencies and various other transfers (outlined in Section 3.2.3 below) this Component would run out of funds in 2004, well before the original 5 years have been completed. In addition, there are several budget items, especially in the National Component, that have not been utilised to-date and are discussed below in Sections 3.2.11 to 13.

3.2.2 National TA Funds Available

The National TA contracted to GTZ commenced on 1st January 2003 for a period of twenty-two months ending October 31st 2004. It involves fielding some nine long-term TA positions, including six country-TAs in East Africa and Chad (Sudan, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Ethiopia and Chad) and 3 pooled-TAs covering the West African countries. These positions are summarised below:

Table 2 Summary of National TA Contract and TA Component Positions

Country	Position	No. Months*	Total EUR**
Long Term TA	Sudan	20	376,000
	Kenya	20	376,000
	Ethiopia	20	376,000
	Uganda	20	376,000
	Tanzania	20	376,000
	Pooled West African TAs	52	978,000
	Chad	20	376,000
	Reserve	15	282,000
Total International Long Term TAs		187	3,516,000
Other Items	Short Term TAs	28	678,000
	Other Sudan items		122,000
PMU local TA	Fight Lineage I	22	67,000
Rounding			4,000
Total TA			4,387,000
Sudan Running Costs			1,200,000
Total TA Contract			5,587,000

Source: GTZ. Notes: * Rounded figures; ** The actual contracted months are 87.5% of the period involved as the contract provides for 10.5 months out of 12 months as leave is not included in the fees. Cost of Long Term TA EUR 18,800/month includes fees, vehicle hire and running costs, office equipment hire and running costs, accommodation, out of station per diems, baggage allowances and air regional and international travel. Cost of Short Term TA includes fees, Per diems, Travel EUR 24,200/month

The total cost of the GTZ contract is EUR 5.6 million, but this includes EUR 1.2 million for running costs for activities in Sudan and therefore the effective TA total cost is EUR 4.4 million. In relation to the original FA budget for National TA of EUR 6.2 million, EUR 1.8 million could be utilised to extend the TA. Assuming an average monthly TA cost of EUR 18,800, this amount would be sufficient to fund about 96 months or about one year's TA based on the existing distribution of TA staff. To continue the TA to the end of the two-year extension in November 2006, some cutting back on some other TAs would be required to adapt to this funding limitation.

3.2.3 Use of Contingency Funds and Switch of Programme Funds

The Regional Component has already significantly overrun its budget. One of the main reasons has been higher TA costs: mainly due to significantly higher than budgeted rates being paid but also partly due to extending three TA positions that were originally only scheduled for three years.

This overrun is to be funded by a combination of contingency funds in the FA and some of the Regional decommitted (unused) funds from WPs 1, 2 and 3). There were a total of EUR 7.0 million contingencies in the FA comprising EUR 5.4 million under the National Component and EUR 1.6 under the Regional Component. The additional funding requirement for the Regional Component and how it is to be funded by a series of budgetary switches is summarised below.

- The Regional Component TA costs up to Oct 2003 have exceeded its total original budget by EUR 0.82 million, and the extension up to October 2004 of some Regional TAs (for Wildlife, Privatisation, and Communications that were originally limited to three years and would have terminated in February and March 2004), up to Oct 2004, will increase costs by a further EUR 1 million giving a total additional budget requirement for the Regional TA of EUR 1.8 million. This is currently being requested from a combination of EUR 0.22 million switched from the National Component contingencies and EUR 1.6 million from the total Regional Component's contingencies.

- A further EUR 1.5 million for various other budget lines of the Regional Component is required to sustain it up to Oct 2004 (increased costs of local staff - EUR 1.1 million, other operational costs - EUR 0.4 million). This is to be funded by transfer of some National Components contingencies.
- In addition, a further EUR 0.35 million of the National Components contingencies is to be used to fund the audit in each country as this was not included in the original FA budget.

The total switched contingency funds amounts to EUR 3.6 million or 52% of the total contingency funds in the FA. There remains, therefore, a total of EUR 3.4 million in the National contingencies that is available for use during an extension. Further switching to fund the Regional Component in the extension period may not be acceptable to national projects that may consider these funds necessary for their present requirements.

3.2.4 Contributions from AU to IBAR Personnel and Running Costs

Under the special conditions in the original FA, signed and agreed by the OAU, the OAU was supposed to:

“find the means of maintaining essential personnel for epidemiology and socio-economics part of animal health (4 officials) to ensure the sustainability of the Centre of Excellence. A Formal proposal along these lines must be made to the EU before the end of the fourth period of the Project”

At present the AU funds the salaries of two positions in IBAR, the Director and the Programme Coordinator, whilst PACE funds the other staff involved with the PACE Programme and the associated running costs. Although AU has produced an organogram for the proposed new structure of IBAR, no proposal has been received for the above and it seems clear that, due to the reorganisation and restructuring of the IBAR, no such funding contribution will be received during the course of the present Programme by October 2004. As it is an Extension being considered, the same conditions in the AU will apply, a factor that is discussed later in the report and under outstanding issues in the final Section.

3.2.5 CAPE and DFID Funding Termination

The CAPE Project funding by DFID terminates in September 2004, although DFID may extend the policy sub-component for a further six months to March 2005. If the key components of CAPE are to be continued as part of the PACE extension, additional funds will need to be provided by the Programme. A provisional budget for a two-year extension excluding DFID's extension (value of EUR 250,000) indicates the need for EUR 1,250,000 over the two years and would cover the three countries in the Somali ecosystem, namely Somalia, NE Kenya and SE Ethiopia. It includes fieldwork, two African experts: a policy adviser and a regional coordinator and some short term inputs of a Participatory Epidemiologist. It represents a huge cut in staff and inputs from the project containing two European TAs and seven African Experts. It does not however cover some support activities that would be provided through the national programmes in Kenya and Ethiopia.

How the activities of this CAH sub-component are to be integrated into the Extension proposals and how they should be funded and coordinated was found to be a major issue during the Mission and one that is discussed later in the report.

3.2.6 Availability of Decommited National Funds

The availability of unused or decommitted National funds represents an outstanding issue at this stage, as, due to the problems in the financial system, it is not known precisely how much of these unused funds would be available for an extension. The FC is pressing countries to close old accounts to be able to have such information at hand. Unfortunately the FC indicates that it may not be until February or

March 2004 before this process is completed and information of decommitted national funds is available. At this stage, the assumption is that whatever the level of decommitted funds, the national programmes will utilise their original drawing right and use the decommitted funds accordingly as they emerge. Should there be some unexpected larger amounts available for transfer to the Regional Component, this would be regarded as a bonus that may allow a slight extension of some of the Regional Components (within the overall two years). Decommitted Regional Component funds are being used to fund the overrun of this component in the present period up to the end of Oct 2004.

3.2.7 Present Level of Regional Component Costs

The total budget for the Regional Component in the original FA was EUR 18.6 million, or EUR 3.7 million per year. This included capital items, some CSU TAs finishing after three/five years, the CBAHWs Unit (CAPE - funded by DFID, although some EUR 80,000 was paid by PACE for vehicles), the Ndjamea Western Cordon Sanitaire (understood to have been cancelled) research, PANVAC, ACM costs, vaccines, monitoring and review missions and, at Bamako, EUR 240,000 for the OIE Veterinary Representative and his secretarial support and travel costs. Deducting for the capital items, the agreed extension of the three CSU TAs, exclusion of CAPE (excluding vehicle purchases), French Cooperation TA costs (excluding travel costs), and the Ndjamea Western Cordon Sanitaire, the total budget for the Regional Component is about EUR 16 million or EUR 3.2 million per year. Details of the Mission's breakdown of the Regional Component budget in the Global Plan showing the CSU and PCU and Other Costs, including these adjustments are attached in Annex 9. Some 78% of total costs are for the CSU and 22% for the PCU. The main cost items of the CSU are Epidemiology, including Wildlife, at 29%, "others" (mainly research and PANVAC) at 33% and Communications at 15%.

Actual total annual costs of the Nairobi and Bamako offices covering African experts, support staff, travel costs, office overheads, but excluding European TA costs are currently EUR 1.45 million for Nairobi and EUR 0.22 million for Bamako, giving a total of EUR 1.65 million. This, plus the total European TA costs funded by PACE (see following section) of EUR 1.65 million, gives a total annual cost of the Regional Component of EUR 3.3 million.

With only EUR 5 million available for the Regional Component, this is only sufficient for one year and a half based on the above budgeted expenditure levels. However, due to termination of DFID funding, the key activities (termed CAH sub-component) of the former CAPE will also have to be accommodated in the extension costs. Some reductions in the Regional Component will therefore be required, whilst maintaining its key objective of handing over to AU-IBAR at Programme completion at the end of the extension phase. The Mission's possible cuts in CSU units and/or TA inputs to accommodate the funding limitations, based on priorities for the extension period, are presented later in the report.

3.2.8 Regional Component European TA and African Expert Costs

A summary of actual expenditure on European TA and African Experts in the Regional Component is presented below.

Table 3 Summary of Actual European TA and African Experts Costs/Year (EUR)

European TA Africa Expert	Position	Inclusive Salaries*	Travel Allowance	Total Cost Per Year
European TA	Main TA			290,000
	Epidemiologist (3)			540,000
	Wildlife			200,000
	Privatisation			200,000
	Communication (W.A.)			200,000
	Financial Controller			225,000
Total European TA funded by PACE				1,655,000
African Expert	Epidemiologist	59,000	23,000	82,000
	Communications Nairobi	40,000	9,000	49,000
	Desk Top Publisher	23,000	-	23,000
	Senior Economist	65,000	9,000	74,000
	Knowledge Tr Specialist	36,000	4,500	40,500
	Bamako Reg Coordinator	54,000	16,000	70,000
	Data Manag. Specialist	51,000	13,500	64,500
	Accountant	39,000	3,500	42,500
Total African Experts				445,500
Total European TA and African Experts				2,100,500

Source: Financial Controller and Accountant PCU. Notes: European TA costs are fully inclusive of accommodation allowance, travel, and per diems *African expert inclusive salary also covers home leave; travel costs are shown separately, figures rounded. CAPE staff funded by DFID and not included above, although PACE have paid for some capital items (vehicles); Support staff in regional offices excluded, Director and Programme Coordinator funded by IBAR also excluded. The IAEA Laboratory Specialist is currently funded by IAEA and is therefore excluded from the above, although PACE pays his travel costs in WPs 3, 4 and 5. Similarly French Cooperation Epidemiologist in W.A excluded, although PACE covers travel costs. PANVAC not commenced by 2003. There is no Privatisation counterpart at present, but one is due to start in 2004. The OIE Veterinary Representative in Bamako is included in the PCU costs in the Regional budget. In year 1 it was paid under the Bamako WP and in years 2 and 3, a special contract was made with the AU and OIE.

Total annual costs of a staff of 8 European TAs and 8 African experts in the Regional Component amounts to a total of EUR 2.1 million per year of which the European TA amounts to 79% of total costs and African Experts 21%. A comparison of budget versus actual revealed that actual European TA costs were some 38% higher than the original budget, whilst African Expert costs including travel were 10% lower than the original budget.

3.2.9 Research

The total budget for research (for CBPP and Pirbright research) was EUR 1.5 million, but it is understood that EUR 1.3 million was to be paid by PACE (refer Table 1 Regional Component in the FA) and EUR 0.2 million by DFID. To-date, EUR 1.069 million has been committed and is likely to be spent (although actual expenditure to-date is only EUR 437,000). There are therefore unlikely to be any significant savings arising from the Research line to fund any of the extension activities. No research component is included in the extension proposal, as the research needed would need to be longer term and require substantial funds that are beyond the present funding limitations.

3.2.10 PANVAC

In the original budget in the FA the sum of EUR 900,000 is allocated from the Regional Component to support PANVAC for a period of three years. This Project, however, has not yet taken place but is scheduled to commence on 1st January 2004 with a 2 x 10-month TA input with support and running

costs under a PACE WP until the end of October 2004. It is then supposed to be transferred to the AU. The issue that was raised during the Mission was that the AU may not take over on time and therefore that some of the existing unused funds could be used to continue PANVAC into 2005 as a temporary bridging measure until AU takes over, so as to avoid the possible closure of PANVAC at the end of 2004.

Out of the original EUR 900,000, some EUR 500,000 were reallocated to fund the Wildlife TA as the funds were unutilised, and some EUR 400,000 will be utilised to fund the 2004 Project. This is approximately EUR 180,000 for the European Vaccine TA Specialist (10 months at EUR 18,000/month fully inclusive under CIRAD contract), EUR 145,000 for the European CBPP TA Specialist (10 months at EUR 14,500/month, under the GTZ short-term consultants contract) and EUR 75,000 for running costs. All the original PANVAC funds will therefore have been utilised by the end of the present phase.

This issue discussed by the Mission was if it were wished to continue funding PANVAC during the extension period, where would the funds be sourced? Several options were considered as follows:

- to keep to the original agreement that AU would take over at November 2004 and therefore funds should not be included in PACE extension costs,
- fund both TAs and running costs for two years (total cost of about EUR 800,000).
- share this with AU to commit funds for one of the TA for two years, whilst PACE funds the other TA and running costs are shared for two years (EUR 400,000 each).

The Mission has a concern relating to the sustainability of PANVAC as a whole. However, the Advisory Committee, when informed, at its Eighth Bi-annual Meeting, that "...despite their natural linkage, PANVAC and IBAR are not directly linked in the revised AU structure" made the following recommendation:

"In view of the important role expected from PANVAC and in order to ensure the cost-effectiveness and sustainability of its activities, the AC recommends that the Director of IBAR nominate one of the senior scientist to be recruited under the new IBAR programme as the Director of PANVAC working directly under his responsibility. This may entail a training period for the selected scientist by a Technical Assistant of the PP. It is stressed that PANVAC will be fully responsible for the independent quality control of veterinary vaccines. Quality control relating to safety, potency, purity and efficacy of vaccines produced in African laboratories will be extended to imported products. PANVAC will also be responsible for the maintenance of stocks of disease causing agents, vaccines, bacterial seeds and other reagents. Training of personnel will form an integral component of the on-going activities of PANVAC. The AC stresses that during the resumption of PANVAC activities, measures (including an action plan) must be put in place to ensure the long term financial sustainability of the institution."

Therefore, despite its own reservation, the Mission recommends that the third of its options above be the basis of funding during the Extension for which a definite commitment will be needed from the AU to share the funding from November 2004 for the Extension period. Should there be no evidence of sustainability of the Unit by November 2005, the Mission recommends that the PACE funds then be withdrawn.

3.2.11 Emergency Vaccine Supplies and RP Emergency Mobilisation Fund

Vaccines were purchased from Botswana from the Regional Component budget for about EUR 50,000; the issue of whether to replenish these stocks during the extension phase was raised during the Mission. The view of the Mission is that a minimum emergency reserve of vaccine should be held in a "bank" in the BVI. The storage costs of these vaccines should be paid by PACE but replenishment of stocks following an emergency withdrawal should be paid for by the country making that withdrawal. This currently applies to Kenya, which has withdrawn vaccines but not replenished the reserve stocks for use in another outbreak.

Should the vaccines expire before December 2006 then PACE should consider its obligation to replenish them from the emergency fund. However, should they deteriorate beyond reasonable use within the stated period of their shelf-life, the costs of their replacement should fall upon the producer and/or storer of the vaccines.

The original budget in the FA under the National Component contained a sum of EUR 2 million for special funds (refer Table 1) to cover vaccine banks and an emergency mobilisation fund for combating an outbreak of Rinderpest. To-date a sum of EUR 500,000 has been committed to transfer to OIE in Paris (only EUR 250,00 are actually transferred to-date) but none of the funds has actually been utilised to-date. Again the Mission's view is that any country it should replenish the fund after calling upon it. Its main purpose is speed of access to fight a disease outbreak, rather than provide funding support.

The main issue arising, however, at this stage, is whether some of this largely unutilised fund, under the National Component, say EUR 1.0 million, could be transferred to support the Regional Component in the Extension phase; whilst retaining the other EUR 1.0 million, half of which would be held in a bank account in Paris, for emergency use during the extension. This is unlikely to be agreed by the national programmes, however, as these unused funds would be seen as available for reallocation to supplement national programmes rather than the latter.

3.2.12 Information/Visibility Budget

The original budget in the FA also contains a line for information and visibility amounting to EUR 900,000 (EUR 580,000 under the National Component and EUR 320,000 under the Regional Component – refer Table 1) and which is to be managed directly by the Commission. Again the issue arises as to whether some of these funds could be used to support the Regional Component during the Extension. Again obtaining agreement on the reallocation of national funds in this manner may be difficult.

3.2.13 Studies Budget

A total of EUR 690,000 in the original National Component budget lies unutilised and could be reallocated for Regional use, but again obtaining agreement on the reallocation of national funds in this manner may be difficult.

3.3 Organisation and Management

3.3.1 Introduction

In considering extension of the Regional Component, it is clear that the total size of this unit has been allowed to grow into a relatively costly and unsustainable unit, as well as having some major management deficiencies. Whatever the AU's final strategy and staffing levels for IBAR, it is clear that, for the PACE Regional Component to become a sustainable IBAR unit in future, some cutting back of activities and staff will be necessary and that this should be accompanied by some considerable improvement and strengthening of management. The extension period provides an opportunity for these changes to be accomplished. The Mission's TOR specifically require that a review of the organisational, managerial and administrative aspects of PACE be carried out and that recommendations be made on how the overall design of the programme can be streamlined in future.

3.3.2 Overview

The Programme is large and complex with a Regional PCU, a Central Services Unit comprising some seven units working at a regional level, two regional components (one in East and one in West Africa) supporting 30 national components spread over a very large part of East, Central and West Africa. TA staff were drawn from a number of institutions with different approaches that in some cases were not

properly integrated (see later). In addition pan-African travel is often difficult and communications have been difficult with the Nairobi offices due to the lack of an appropriate satellite facility. Substantial travel out of office to all the countries involved as well as to pan-African conferences on technical issue has been necessary. Finally, some countries have had varying levels of internal unrest and insecurity such as Somalia, Cote d'Ivoire, Sudan, Rwanda, Burundi, Eritrea, Guinea Bissau, RDC and CAD.

Management deficiencies were noted by the second year of the Programme such that in November 2001 an input of a management consultant was called upon to review the management and internal working of the PCU in Nairobi and its relationship with the West Africa Region in Bamako. The report of this consultant highlighted the following deficiencies:

- the lack of clear cut definitions of responsibility and power of the PC
- the lack of a well defined delegation of responsibilities from the Director to the PC which in term leads to difficulties down the line with the Regional Coordinator and heads of units and the Administrative Assistant
- the lack of communication between different units and the feeling of belonging to a team with shared values and objectives
- the difficulty of assimilating the many long and detailed reports as a result of which their impacts tend to be small, as well as the lack of a workable reference system for future access to these reports

The report identified the following main needs:

- the need to reinforce strategy leadership and human resource organisation
- the need to promote a more efficient management organisation
- the need to reinforce the administrative and logistic sector

Accordingly, the report called for the following strategies to restore an efficient management in PCU:

- Strengthen the management capacity at Coordination level though provision of clear-cut responsibility and delegation from the Director and through the appointment of the Main TA.
- Develop at unit levels coherence of strategy and complementarity of actions of all units through a team building process and increasing inter-unit communications and developing capacity transfer to counterparts
- Introduce an internal information system to compliment the reporting system and develop a monitoring and control system to ensure better follow-up of the unit activities.

The Mission's impressions of the present situation since that report is that many of the findings are still relevant today and some noticeably worse. Some of the main changes since then identified by the Mission are as follows:

- The management responsibility and delegation is still not as recommended, though clearly the impact of the Main TA Adviser has made significant improvements in administration management with he and the PC working as a team; but personnel management within the PCU/CSU still remains relatively poor due to political and other influences.
- The internal coherence is still lacking, indeed it is probably worse due to the various internal disputes that have been allowed to arise and disrupt the PCU's work and management. The units appear if anything even more uncoordinated and morale is considered to be very low (this is partly due to the lack of leadership).
- The capacity building efforts of counterparts appears somewhat ad hoc without focus by certain European TA staff, as well as a lack of any counterpart in some cases (e.g. in privatisation and wildlife);
- Logistical management still appears to need improvement.

The EU Monitoring Mission has also reviewed management aspects of the Programme on a parallel mission to this Extension Mission and submitted its report at the end of December 2003 and the Extension Mission attended the debriefing session given by the Monitoring Consultant covering management issues. Some of its findings and recommendations have been included below.

3.3.3 Management Structure

The management of the programme is a complex and multifaceted arrangement, with different responsibilities lying in quite different places. Directly, however, the senior management structure of the Programme comprises the Regional Authorizing Officer (who is also the acting Director of IBAR), a PACE Programme Coordinator (IBAR staff member) and a Main Adviser (European TA funded under the Regional TA component). This structure is supported by a European Financial Controller (also funded under the Regional TA component) and local support staff comprising an Accountant, Assistant Administration Officer and secretarial staff. Operational management is therefore the responsibility of the Director, the PACE Programme Coordinator (PC) and the Main Adviser TA.

The EC Delegation in the form of the Finance Section and the Officer responsible for the Programme (the Senior Rural Development Adviser in the EC Delegation Nairobi) has also played a significant role in management and administration. As the representative of the lead EU Delegation, the latter is tasked with the responsibility of approving all the Programme Work Plans (from both concentrated and the “deconcentrated” countries), as well as approving expenditure under the Regional Component, especially the various TA contracts.

3.3.4 Management Problems and Issues

A number of significant management weaknesses and failures have been identified as follows.

Present Overall Situation

A fundamental problem in design was the failure to clearly define IBAR’s status, and the Acting Director’s position, coupled to the provision of inadequate structures and resources for administering such a large programme. PACE has proved a difficult programme to implement due to its scope and complexity, the relatively weak communication systems between countries, the relatively poor and cramped office facilities (these have given a relatively poor image to politicians), the major constraint of EU procedures and financial budgetary systems on timing and flexibility, the lack of dual language capacity in some cases and, most importantly, relatively weak management and direction. There has been a lack of clear cut responsibilities between the Project Director, the Programme Coordinator and the Main TA Adviser, coupled to a lack of delegation by senior staff during absence from the office due to the large number of countries to visit and international conferences to attend.

The Nairobi office has also been a focus of divisive conflicts and internal jealousies that management has failed to resolve. The main issues have revolved around differences between the French and English veterinary approaches concerning privatisation and CAHWs, the status and operation of the CAPE unit (separately funded by DFID) and the large disparity between the total remuneration packages provided under the international TA staff contracts and those of the African experts.

Some staff also referred to the impact of the EU bureaucracy on the whole system, as well as excessive micro-management in the early stages of the Programme. They feel they have been operating under difficult conditions, including delays, awaiting approval signatures and bottlenecks in the Lead Delegation in Nairobi. In addition, the present EC Officer complained that a considerable amount of his time is devoted to routine administration of the PCU expenditures, largely due to the low quality of some of the invoices submitted for approval from the contracting parties. This has proved a bottleneck in the Programme implementation, as has delays in the Finance Section. The Mission proposes that the EU Delegation in Nairobi looks at how these bottlenecks can be reduced, including possible allocation of additional resources in the finance section, as well as pressuring contractors to improve the quality of their submissions for approval.

In terms of overall management, the three senior management staff should have worked as a team, as more than one person is required to manage and administer the Programme. However, there have been cases where the Director has not always provided the necessary support or appropriate leadership when required, especially in relation to personnel management (e.g. changes in the hiring and firing of certain staff – both European and African). Details are not elaborated in this report as it is considered more appropriate to handle such issues confidentially. The reasons for this situation are various including political factors and differences in approach concerning the Francophile and Anglophile approach to veterinary controls and services, as well as the frequent absence from the office due to the considerable travel undertaken. In addition, the Mission notes the Monitoring Consultants' concern that keeping the Director in an 'acting' status for 3½ years can have done little to boost his authority, or confidence to make - and stick by - politically unpopular decisions, and that a decision by the AU to confirm this position is long overdue.

The net result of the above has been that efficiency has been low, staff morale is generally low and many of the operational units run as separate entities, rather than as coordinated units, with some acting in a divisive manner and further contributing to the general low level of effectiveness. Strong leadership should have stopped these internal disputes and intrigues before they disrupted the work of the unit and as a result of the national programmes. The net result is a perception by donors that the management is poor and that there is little confidence in management's ability to solve disagreements and manage the Extension effectively.

PACE took residence and augmented IBAR for the programme period, but now it is necessary for the AU to commit sufficient resources for IBAR's future. One of the aims of the extension should be for PACE to be identified as changing to an AU-IBAR programme, not an EU Programme. This is not an easy task at this stage, since the AU, due to its own restructuring process, has not yet completed its definition of the future role of IBAR and its staff positions, or its financial commitment.

Other Specific Problems

Some other specific additional problems identified are summarised below:

- The lack of a satellite dish in the Nairobi office to facilitate use of the Internet and to speed up communications generally is another major constraint.
- There has been a lack of feed back from the Regional head quarters to reports submitted by national offices and the West Africa Regional office.
- There has been a lack of proper office management including of reports and filing systems in the PCU/CSU office,
- Financial control has been difficult due to management problems, over-running of budgets, delays in EC Delegations and at the Lead Delegation and decommitment problems (see below), all these problems leading to some general inefficiencies in financial control.

At this stage, the Mission's conclusion is that it endorses the findings of both the original management consultancy report and that of the recent Monitoring Mission that many aspects of management have not been satisfactory to-date and that management improvements are essential for implementation of the extension phase. Some suggestions as to how this can be achieved are discussed in Section 5.4.2 below.

3.3.5 Administrative Procedural Problems and Issues

Introduction

Administrative procedural problems have characterised the Programme. The Mission's ToR asked for a review of administrative aspects in order to make recommendations on how the design of the administration procedures could be improved in future.

Summary of Present System

PACE is a regional programme that includes the coordination and planning of PACE national programmes for which the Director of IBAR acts as the Regional Authorising Officer (RAO) of PACE. The procedures entailed the initial preparation of a Global Work Plan by the PCU including an indicative budget covering the entire 5-year period for each country. The national components are financed through annual Work Plans based on indicative budget allocations to each country. Work Plans are prepared by the national coordinators and submitted for approval to the EDF National Authorising Officers and to the Heads of the local EC Delegations and then to the Lead Delegation for consolidation. The Global Plans were also subject to advice from the ACM which caused some delays due to the slow start up of the latter's meeting.

The consolidation of Work Plans aims to harmonise PACE programme implementation in the various countries and allow for financial control of national components. Since the beginning of PACE, there have been eight consolidations, two each year in April and October for start of Work Plans respectively on May 1st and November 1st. Deadlines for transmission of WP proposals for analysis from national coordinators and for WPs approved and signed by the Regional Coordination unit are defined by the PACE RAO.

This process was designed to reduce the number of applications for approval, which otherwise could have seen 30 different countries applying individually. All WPs for both "non-deconcentrated" countries (about 25 or the bulk of the countries) and de-concentrated countries are consolidated for approval by the lead Delegation. Subsequently, the WPs for the non-deconcentrated countries are sent to EU Brussels for issuing a "Secondary Commitment Number." This then allows the PCU (the RAO) to authorise National officers (NAOs) to advance 40% of the approved WP. The national EC office then draws funds through its local office and claims for actual expenditure from Brussels after the year-end. For the newly created "deconcentrated" countries (Senegal, Mali, Ethiopia, Tanzania and Kenya), the Lead EC Delegation in Nairobi issues the Secondary Commitment number, instead of Brussels and authorises the National officers as above.

The main problem has been delays in the submission of national WPs and as a result delays in mobilisation of funds for several months after and the starting dates of activities in the WPs. In addition, under EU regulations, individual country WPs and budgets cannot be approved and fresh funds released until the previous-but-one annual WPs have been closed and unused funds returned. The whole task of financial control and expenditure is complicated by the use of several EU accounts stemming from different sources such as the 7th and 8th EDF funds with differing regulations.

There is clearly a need to adapt PACE procedures to the EC's decentralised policy that allocates more responsibility to the local ECD, to simplify the approval procedures of national WPs and to be able to mobilise funds more quickly. Possible improvements are discussed later following further analysis below.

Design

The design of the organisation, management and administration failed to recognise the considerable administrative workload of such a large and complex programme and therefore to appoint sufficient appropriate resources to management and administration. Instead, this work was included in the ToRs of technical staff (veterinarians) at senior regional level and at country level, a decision that resulted in their work being dominated by administrative work to the detriment of their technical duties. In addition, the rigid application of EU procedures to planning and approval in a regionally managed programme covering some 30 countries working through national EC offices - some of which attached a low priority to this regional programme, as compared to their national projects, and were

inexperienced in EU procedures - has proved difficult with the resources provided, and resulted in major delays, inefficiencies and a relatively low effectiveness and impact. With the arrival of the TA, however, (delayed until 2003 due to procedural problems), progress has improved at national level during the last year in many, but not all, countries.

Problems in Procedures for Preparation and Approval of Annual Work Programmes:

Six main problems have been identified by the Mission to-date as follows:

- *Delays due to the consolidation procedure.* National WP approvals have been delayed whilst the PCU aggregates a number of countries (typically 10 countries) every six months to form consolidated WPs for approval. Unfortunately, some countries have been late in submitting their WPs, partly due to their being given a low priority in some of the national EC Delegations. As a result, if one six monthly deadline is missed, there is a delay until the next consolidated WPs are presented for authorisation etc. This system was set up to facilitate a more efficient approval process by Brussels, but in reality has resulted in delays for many countries on top of other delays and has even penalised countries that produced their plans on a timely basis.
- *Delays in returning the Global Plans* as they were also subject to advice from CSU and the ACM, which, due to the slow start up of the latter's meetings, also caused some delays.
- *Inflexibility.* Making extensions or amendments to budgets is relatively difficult, due to the need for WPs to be submitted several months in advance of the start of the year and due to delays in the consolidation and approval procedures. However, this results in an inherent lack of flexibility to be able to meet unexpected situations, a feature that is needed to tackle animal disease outbreaks. A more flexible budgeting system is essential if veterinary services are to be able to react rapidly and effectively against disease outbreaks. However, the Emergency Mobilisation fund was set up to provide a rapid financial resource to combat a disease outbreak.
- *Closure of earlier WPs.* This has proved a major problem. The system requires that each local EC Delegation is responsible for closure of the annual WPs after six months after the year-end, when the bank account should be closed and any unused funds returned to the EU ("decommitted" funds). Due to various problems including tendering, this has proved difficult in many countries resulting in delays to the disbursement of a new WP and shortages of funds and unpaid staff salaries funded by the Programme. This led to inefficiencies in implementing the Programme. However, the Programme has developed a mechanism to avoid such a situation through extending a particular WP period at no cost.
- *Confusion over Changes to Procedures.* This was widespread including in the PCU. In Ethiopia, a problem arose due to changes in the EU system from concentrated to deconcentrated procedures. In this case, approval was delayed as neither Brussels nor Nairobi was clear as to who was responsible, a situation worsened by the FC not noticing that no secondary commitment number had been issued. The net result was a shortage of funds including unpaid staff salaries, frustrations and staff resignations of two key contracted veterinarians.
- *Lack of Ownership at National Level.* The regional system of planning and control has resulted in a feeling of lack of ownership at national level amongst the agencies involved, including the country EC offices, giving rise to a general low priority being attached to preparing the WPs and budgets for the regional programme. This coupled to the lack of experience among national staff in the planning and budgeting procedures, has led to delays in submitting WPs for approval and in the return of incorrectly filed plans and budgets for correction. The net result is that prolonged budgetary procedures have led to delays and inefficiencies in implementation.

Problems in Tendering Procedures

Procurement of capital items according to EU tender procedures is undertaken at national level. The lack of experience in some national offices with such procedures, as well as changes to procedures has led to delays in procurement of items such as transport vehicles. At present three countries have not yet completed their EU investments (tender dossiers) intended for the first year. This includes Ethiopia, where the project has been trying to procure vehicles for the past three years, but as there were difficulties in getting sufficient local bids and the values were above the budget, approval was blocked and Ethiopia still does not have new vehicles for project implementation.

Regional level capital items and TA were also subject to delays due to EC procurement and tendering regulations, again due to a lack of familiarity with the regulations and some unrealistic requirements of the regulations. The procurement of the national TA for all counties was a significant example. Although included in the FA at the start of the Programme in 2000, the TA contract was not finalised and the TA staff mobilised until January 2003 due to tendering delays. In particular the regulation that three tenders are required for the TA, which proved to be difficult as the requirement for some ten veterinarians experienced in West and East Africa with appropriate language qualifications on each tender was beyond the capacity of European firms to provide. The resultant negative impact on the Programme was very significant. In many cases, it has not been until the TA was in place that the various procedural problems and delays were eventually resolved and the Programme implementation could progress more efficiently.

Problems in Financial Planning and Control Procedures

Delays due to the system of “committed” and “decommitted” expenditure as outlined above has meant that the PCU lacks information on the precise current status of budgeted expenditure on the Programme, or how much of budget is likely to be unused by the end of the Programme. As a result of this lack of information on how much of the funds will be decommitted, effective financial control and planning of future funding by the PCU Financial Unit is rendered difficult, and is a cause of concern in relation to planning any extension phase. The PCU is aware of the problem and has made a request for each country, as it is national EC Delegations that are responsible for closure of earlier accounts, to close its WPI and WP2 by a deadline of November 15th 2003 in an attempt to improve the situation.

Unfortunately, in WP 3, the difficulties of closure of accounts is likely to be more complex as different countries will be using different accounts for different funds such as the 7th and 8th EDF.

4. TECHNICAL PRIORITIES FOR EXTENSION

4.1 Introduction

After due consideration of the documents, and the views and opinions of the various persons interviewed, the Mission has concluded that there must be some considerable pruning, prioritization, and focusing of effort to bring the costs of the extension within the bounds of the sum that it is anticipated may be made available. Discussions with the AU indicate that it is still a long way from selecting candidates to fill the posts it has identified for establishment in IBAR. This being the case, it becomes less feasible for PACE to groom counterparts to fill them. The Mission feels, therefore, that the extension should concentrate upon those activities that are most likely lead to important and sustainable results, and that the African and expatriate expertise retained (under project funding) during the extension should be those most important to the effective pursuit of these results.

In order of importance, these activities/results are deemed to be:

4.2 Eradication of Rinderpest from Africa

At the present stage of progress, this result has two separate phases of action:

1. Pursuit, by as many countries as possible, of the OIE pathway to declaration of '*Freedom from Infection*'.

In West and Central Africa:

Current progress suggests that, with determination, 17 countries could, by the end of the extension, have completed the work and prepared the dossiers necessary to achieve this status. Cameroon and Chad would be the two major countries in central Africa that definitely could not achieve 'Freedom from Infection' within the timeframe, but they could go a long way towards it.

In East Africa:

Six countries could complete their work and prepare their dossiers for "freedom from infection" by the end of 2006. Additionally Sudan and Ethiopia could probably achieve it on a zonal basis (if the OIE were to change its rules and allow such recognition).

More details on the OIE Pathway progress are presented in Annex 8.

This exercise, properly concluded, would give conclusive evidence that the 'mild' strains of Rinderpest currently plaguing wild and domestic stock in the Somali ecosystem, had not broken out into areas west and south of it. Such knowledge would greatly improve the confidence of trade and movements of stock between these countries, and offer the potential to open/re-open markets further afield. At the same time, the full and effective pursuit of this 'freedom' would employ and consolidate all the clinical surveillance, serosurveillance, and data management skills and resources built up during the first years of the project.

In addition to the Rinderpest surveillance activities, countries should also be training select teams in 'Participatory Disease Impact Assessment', so that they may begin to identify what are – in their farmers' opinion - the next most important diseases, and so productively focus their future programmes on problems with which the farming community can identify and in the control of which they might readily be prepared to co-operate. These problems may vary with season, locality and farming system.

2. **In the Somali Ecosystem** (Southern and Central Somalia, and adjacent parts of Kenya and Ethiopia): the thrust must be to determine precisely the causative strains of this 'mild' infection, to understand better their epidemiology, and thence to *develop appropriate strategies and comprehensive plans for their eradication*. Failure to eradicate the last remaining strains of this virus would always leave Africa, and its trading partners, with the constant fear that they could 'hot up' and revert to virulence, causing a massive and deadly epidemic of 'classical' Rinderpest. Past observations of mild outbreaks in cattle did indeed reveal that they gradually became more virulent and more pathogenic, but also that they could be checked by appropriate programmes of vaccination and movement control. Moreover, even without hotting up, these mild strains are already causing severe mortalities in certain species of wildlife and could possibly endanger the survival of some of them: on this cost alone their eradication could surely be justified.

It is clear however, that the eradication of Rinderpest from this ecosystem cannot be completed during the two-year extension (indeed most of this time will be needed to properly identify, investigate, track and understand the epidemiology of the mild viruses causing the problem). So, it must be a priority activity for 2004/5 to gather all the necessary information and to prepare a specific project proposal, running from the end of PACE until 2012, for the continued and uninterrupted pursuit and verification of Rinderpest eradication from the Somali ecosystem. Furthermore, it is increasingly clear that success depends on the programme being properly co-ordinated across the three countries involved: **the Somali ecosystem programme must be**

much more clearly and closely brought under the technical direction and management of IBAR.

Just how best the technical direction and co-ordination of the Rinderpest programme might be achieved for all participating parties and stakeholders in the eradication programme was a subject of considerable discussion and, initially, some significant difference of opinion. It was also, of course, influenced by concerns of the costs (and their budgetary location) of the three main options considered. However, after a long and fairly hastily convened meeting on 13th January, which some 23 interested parties attended, it was the majority opinion that the prime responsibility for direction and co-ordination still lay with IBAR, and that, specifically, it should lie with the Somali ecosystem epidemiologist and the CAH co-ordinator sitting in the PEU.

In support of this eradication activity (and of 1 above) it will be essential for PACE to ensure that specified laboratories have the capacity to screen for the presence of Rinderpest antibodies. If necessary and appropriate, the use of private sector laboratories might be considered. Likewise, designated reference laboratories must be suitably equipped and resourced to confidently and speedily deal with samples from any suspect cases of the disease; any not so resourced should be struck from the list. At the earliest possible moment, **a decision should be taken to use PPR vaccine to control any new outbreaks of the disease**; for too long our ability to distinguish field acquired antibodies from those developed in response to vaccination has been frustrated by the absence of a marked vaccine.

In terms of technical assistance for this thrust against Rinderpest (both in the East and in West and Central Africa) **the principal need for support during the extension will be in the fields of surveillance, epidemiology, laboratory diagnosis, data management, participatory epidemiology, and the development of delivery systems and information systems effective at pastoral community level.**

The surveillance and serological sampling of relevant wildlife populations, as well as the regular monitoring of sentinel populations of buffalo will be an essential component of Rinderpest eradication and **it is essential that a counterpart is recruited as soon as possible into the wildlife unit: June 2004 should be the absolute deadline for this.**

To gain sufficient national support in each country for these field activities, it will be necessary for the economics unit, in liaison with the epidemiologists, **to prepare convincing economic and socio-economic assessments**, targeted at national governments, of the benefits of achieving these results and the potentially devastating consequences of failing to achieve them. This should be a high priority activity for the first quarter of 2004, so that the arguments can be presented early to any doubting governments. The communications unit should assist in presenting these arguments in as concise and punchy a style as possible to impress the targeted audience.

In terms of communications required for informing farmers and communities the CAPE project has developed good capacity in this field and its expertise should be used to the full, in the Somali ecosystem at least.

4.3 Enhancement of Private Sector

For at least twenty-five years it has been well recognized that few, if any, governments in Africa can afford to fund a full range of veterinary services from the public purse. The need to redefine the roles and responsibilities of the state veterinary service, to confine its activities to interests solely in the public good, and to cede private good activities to the private sector, has gradually become accepted. This activity, therefore, focuses on the enhancement of the conditions and opportunities for the **greater involvement of the private sector in the delivery of animal health services**. Legislation should be framed to suitably encourage, regulate, and protect, private sector activity, at whatever levels it may

operate. At the same time, the economic environment should be made favourable by the **strategic withdrawal of the public sector from private good activities**, and the commissioning of suitably licensed private sector personnel and businesses to implement some specified public good tasks.

There will be a need to **redefine the roles and responsibilities of the State Veterinary Services** to focus on the public good: on disease diagnosis, surveillance and control; and on normative functions such as quality control, and regulation of activities conducted by the private sector (whether just in the private good, or when commissioned by the State to implement its responsibilities to the public good).

It must also be recognized that, to serve the needs of the majority, livestock services must not only be suitably knowledgeable, but also affordable and accessible: often this will require that they are delivered by a cadre of sub-professional staff operating at low cost, close to the livestock owning communities, and familiar with the problems and priorities of their farming and livelihood systems. **Such is the role for community-based animal health workers (CAHWs), and the principles developed and promoted under the CAPE project for their training, recognition, regulation, and linkage to professional veterinarians, need to be pursued in earnest if any form of animal health service at all is to survive in remote or troubled areas.** This will be particularly important to PACE activities in the Somali ecosystem, and in Southern Sudan; but could be equally beneficial in many other areas too.

To further the improvement of animal health delivery systems, **it is recommended that a counterpart be urgently appointed to the Veterinary Legislation and Privatization (VLPU) Adviser** and that, upon the dissolution of the CAPE project in September 2004, he be joined by the Community-based Animal Health Policy Adviser to form a new unit 'Development of Veterinary Services', merging the CAPE and VLPU skills and approaches to the problem.

The warning expressed during the responses to the *Aide-Mémoire*, that few countries were enthusiastic about involving themselves in such a restructuring process, is heeded and it is recommended that the present target of assisting 5 countries in this process should be kept to. However, the issues must be approached positively, and with some flexibility. Furthermore, countries actively pursuing these changes should become instructive examples for others.

Within the regional component the responsibility for assisting countries with these programmes will be taken by the new Development of Veterinary Services Unit, which will comprise the counterpart (yet to be recruited) to the current VLPU TA, and the new CAH Policy Adviser. **It is imperative that the long delayed recruitment of the VLPU counterpart should be implemented forthwith.** The VLPU itself will cease to exist at the commencement of the extension.

4.4 Capacity Building of IBAR

This activity focuses on the grooming of counterparts for their possible succession in designated IBAR posts. Not all positions, African or expatriate, currently filled under the PACE project will be essential for all or part of the extension period. However, during the extension, where African counterpart staff do fill positions that correspond to posts identified in the proposed new structure for IBAR, the AU should pay them.

4.5 Integration of CAH Activities in the Extension

With the closing of the DFID funding of the CAPE programme in September 2004, it is recommended to absorb its various key roles and functions into other components of the programme. It is suggested that the **CAH Co-ordinator** be absorbed into the CSU structure and **be managed by the PEU to facilitate closer co-ordination of activities across the full field of play.**

The **CAH Policy Adviser** should, as mentioned in Section 4.3, join with the counterpart from VLPU to form a new PACE CSU, 'Development of Veterinary Services'.

The field level activities of CAPE should be funded from the three country programmes or, if it could possibly fund activities across its borders, entirely from the Somalia country programme. Assuming the former, the structure would be that the three CAH fieldwork programmes would be funded and managed by the national PACE Coordinator, but the activities technically directed and coordinated by the PEU in PACE in Nairobi. Funding requirements are discussed later in Section 5.3.4.

4.6 Development and Promotion of Commodity-based Trade

One of the significant successes of the pace programme is the influence it is having upon the thinking and attitudes of the OIE and other international bodies. One issue of particular importance to several pace countries is the removal or reduction of animal health barriers to trade. The conventional requirement of freedom from specified infections is really quite impractical for the vast nomadic systems of Africa. However, the risk associated with various livestock commodities is quite different and, through its main epidemiologist, pace is provoking interest in this concept, which could lead to much easier access to better markets. It is recommended that, during the 6 months extension of his contract, the main epidemiologist continue to pursue this initiative and draw up a proposal for how the impetus and interest may be maintained after his departure. With his experience and his membership of key international committees and fora, he is ideally suited to continue the pursuit of this issue on pace's behalf.

5. PACE EXTENSION

5.1 Options for Extension

The main extension options outlined below are: a very limited extension of core activities in the Somalia ecosystem, a one-year extension, and a two-year extension, either on a no-cost or an additional-cost basis. Other possible options arose, however, during the Mission's visit.

Terminate in October 2004 No Extension Option.

Due to the significant management problems, some observers felt the Programme should be terminated as planned with no extension. However, an important consequence of the delays in implementation is that a significant proportion of the funds allocated in the FA towards the national projects have not been utilised and could be made available to fund an extension to allow countries to complete their programmes. The case for extension of the Programme to allow most countries to concentrate on implementation, in terms of capacity building and disease surveillance etc, now that the TA is in place and the worst of the administrative and tendering problems have been overcome, is therefore strong. Termination of the Programme in October 2004 as scheduled would result in only half of the programme being completed and therefore an insufficient period to achieve sustainable results. Extension of the Programme utilising the available unutilised funds would allow the planned results to be achieved on a more sustainable basis provided the management and administrative problems that have characterised the Programme to-date are resolved. The Mission supports this view.

Continue Unchanged for Two Further Years

It became clear to the Mission that there are some staff who would prefer the whole Regional Component to continue in a "business as usual" approach and that sufficient funds (EUR 7-8 million) should be available from both unused national component funds and contingencies and from the additional funds on offer. The Mission, however, does not support such a continuation, as changes are required to improve efficiency and management and to focus activities on priorities and to hand-over to IBAR in the remaining two-year period.

5.1.1 Limited Extension

This option comprises focus on surveillance and eradication of RP in the Somali Ecosystem and therefore encompasses relevant national and field programmes including CAPE and other CAHWs in Somalia, NE Kenya and SE Ethiopia, plus associated support activities of Epidemiology, Wildlife and Data management. In effect, it represents a termination of PACE and establishment of a new RP Eradication Project, one that would need to run for more than two years. A PCU/CSU Regional Component would not necessarily be required, as it would require relatively little central management and coordination, which together with the above support services, could be contracted to an external consultancy company to implement. This option, however, militates against the strong technical argument for confirming the absence of RP across Africa (in West and Central and East Africa) as a whole, as well as the objective of strengthening a sustainable IBAR, and is therefore not recommended at this stage.

5.1.2 One-Year Extension

This represents a compromise option for a two-year extension on the grounds that only one additional year is possible due to funding limitations and that this would be sufficient for the Programme to achieve most of its goals. It would involve extending most of the national projects for one year as a no-cost extension of the national projects and an additional cost extension of the whole Regional Component for one year. However, provisional budgets using the ceiling of EUR 4 million that are understood to be available to fund the latter indicate that there are sufficient funds to run some activities for two years if some modifications to the TA and the CSU units are made. As a result, the one-year option is not considered further at this stage.

5.1.3 Two-Year Extension

This is the main option recommended by the ACM and in the Mission's ToR. Within this option are either an entirely no-cost extension, or an extension combining a no-cost extension of the National programmes and an additional-cost extension of the Regional component.

The no-cost extension would require a large reduction in the size of the PCU/CSU through termination of some of the CSU sub-components at Oct 2004, and a significant reduction in the number of countries involved, all aimed at releasing sufficient funds for continuation of a reduced PCU/CSU during the extension period without any additional funding support. Initial indications are that this option is unlikely to be acceptable to the majority of stakeholders for political and technical reasons and is therefore not developed further at this stage.

The additional cost extension would involve a no-cost extension of the National programmes to all the National Projects using existing unused funds for a period up to the end of Oct 2006, extension of the national TA within the TA funds available and an additional-cost extension of the supporting Regional activities in the PCU/CSU. This is the preferred option for which further details are presented below.

5.2 Technical Priorities for Two Year Extension

5.2.1 Introduction

As indicated in Section 4.1 *et seq.*: the activities of the extension phase should aim to leave, or prepare the ground for, some tangible and sustainable benefits to result from the years of effort put first into PARC and then into PACE. These activities should be clearly focused: they must be strategically restricted to be affordable within the limited funds available for the extension; and they should build upon the key activities already introduced by the programmes.

It is this Mission's conclusion that the prime objective must be to eliminate Rinderpest from Africa, and to prove its elimination. The activities to achieve this will primarily build upon the epidemiological surveillance and community animal health principals and capacities already introduced through PARC and PACE.

A second objective must be to promote and assist: the restructuring of the veterinary services; the clarification of the public and the private good (and shared goods) in respect of animal health and production; the redefinition of the roles and responsibilities of the State veterinary Service; and, the enhancement of opportunity for the private sector to more actively participate in the delivery of services – all leading to more affordable, more accessible, more acceptable, more appropriate, and generally improved systems of animal health service delivery and disease control. The activities to achieve this, guided by the new Development of Veterinary Services Unit, will build upon the work of the VLPU and of CAPE, and will bear appropriate reference to the OIE recommendations on the Structure of Veterinary Services.

Thirdly, the extension will, as much as possible prepare posts and personnel for the longer term role of IBAR as the AU's centre of excellence in the field of Development of the Continent's Animal Resources.

5.2.2 Main Objectives

The Extension would follow the original logframe in the FA although some changes in priorities are proposed for the Extension and described above. The main overall and project purpose are reiterated as follows.

Overall Objective *Reduction of poverty and enhanced food security amongst rural communities through sustainable improvements in animal production and productivity and increased trade in livestock and livestock products*

Specific Programme Objective *Through extension of the Programme for a further two years, to enable the achievement of sustainable results in a number of specific priority areas.*

5.2.3 Detailed Recommendations

Prior to the Extension:

- In the period prior to the Extension, it is strongly recommended that the EC make an exception for this project and accept a two year work plan as a basis for the entire Extension period, but still coupled to approval of annual budgets;
- there needs to be a preparation by senior PCU management of a definite management strategy and plan for measures to be adopted during the extension;
- counterpart specialists need to be appointed urgently to both the VLPU and to the Wildlife section. These appointments should have been made earlier, now they must be made as soon as possible, with a deadline of June 2004

For the Extension Period:

The main detailed recommendations concerning activities during the Extension phase are itemised below.

At least 15 countries in West and Central Africa (and possibly Tanzania in East Africa) **should pursue, to its conclusion, the OIE pathway to 'Freedom from Rinderpest Infection'**. Others should move as

far down this pathway as possible so that they may achieve this status as soon as possible after the project closes. (See para 4.2 – 1 and Annex 8)

OIE should be asked whether, for countries which ceased vaccination seven or more years previously and therefore have the majority of their large ruminant population eligible for Rinderpest serology, **it is really necessary to have a two year programme of serum survey or whether just one would suffice.**

In view of the heavy burden that will be placed upon the PEU during this extension, **it is recommended that the Main Epidemiologist be kept on for the first six months of the extension.**

The proper collation, analysis, and interpretation of the data collected, and its clear and detailed presentation in the dossier to OIE, will be vital to the *'Freedom from Infection'* process. It is also critical to the co-ordinating role envisaged for IBAR, that all countries regularly report their disease status using a common system. **It is critical that the PID data management system be completed and installed in as many countries as possible before the end of the project.**

For all participating countries it is important that they have ready access to at least one laboratory (preferably within their borders) that is fully competent and resourced in Rinderpest serology. It is also critical that the specified regional reference laboratories are properly resourced and fully competent to deal quickly with the diagnostic testing of samples taken from any stomatitis-enteritis cases encountered in the field. Any laboratory not consistently able to deal quickly with such specimens should be removed from the list. **The laboratory TA is currently supported under IAEA funding until March 2005: IAEA should be asked to extend this assistance including travel costs until December 2006.**

In East Africa, in the Somali ecosystem, the primary focus should be upon clarifying which strains of the virus are causing the mild Rinderpest disease syndrome which remains there, determining their epidemiology and the extent to which wildlife hosts are involved in maintaining them, identifying focal areas of virus maintenance in the field, **and then designing a programme for its final elimination.** (See para 4.2 – 2)

The field work of the surveillance and control programmes in the Somali ecosystem will need to be supported by appropriately trained sub-professionals and community-based animal health workers, suitably linked to professional veterinarians. Many of these para-professionals will operate through the support of NGOs. It is vital therefore that, after termination of DFID funding in September 2004, **the full scope of the work of the CAPE programme should be suitably absorbed into the regional PACE programme, and the Somalia, Kenya, and Ethiopia country programmes.** (See para 4.5 for details).

The Somali ecosystem programme must be much more clearly and closely brought under the technical direction and management of IBAR.

At the earliest possible moment, a decision should be taken to use PPR vaccine to control any new outbreaks of the disease.

A new project proposal should be prepared and submitted to donors for funding of this eradication programme, as it is clear that the virus cannot be eliminated and its elimination verified much before 2012.

This Rinderpest related component of the extension will require a considerable amount of expertise for its effective completion, **and it will be necessary to phase out the regional TA with care.**

Participatory epidemiology processes will be used in the Somali ecosystem to aid the investigation and surveillance programmes there. It is recommended that **countries in West and Central Africa should also train select teams in Participatory Disease Search:** not only to aid them in their clinical surveillance programmes for the OIE pathway but also to conduct **Participatory Disease Impact**

Assessments to determine which diseases cause their farmers the most concern and, therefore, should be considered next in line for the development of programmes for their mitigation and/or control.

In respect of improvement of animal health service delivery, it is recommended that the counterpart soon to be appointed to the VLPU should join with the CAH Policy Adviser from CAPE to **form a new unit called ‘Development of Veterinary Services’** (See para 4.3)

The recommended timetable and rationale for retention and termination of Regional TA / Experts is detailed in Tables 5 and 6.

In respect of support to the longer-term objectives of IBAR, it is critical that, where - during the extension period - an African expert occupies a position equivalent to a post identified for the new structure of IBAR, **his salary and AU should pay office support costs.**

It is inappropriate that the Directorship of IBAR should continue to be held in an ‘acting’ status. **Steps should be taken forthwith to confirm this as a substantive post.**

In respect of the country TA: although appointed very late in the project these nine TA have made a significant impact upon the progress of the country programmes. They should all be kept in post until the two-year work plans for the extension phase have been approved and activated under the first one-year budget (See para 5.4.1). The timetable for their retention and phasing out is detailed in Table 5, in sub-section 5.3.2

During the remainder of this current phase the Economics Unit, in liaison with the PEU, VLPU, and CAPE, and supported in their presentation and format by the Communications Unit, should be preparing convincing arguments to convince National Governments and Ministries of the political, economic and socio-economic benefits that will accrue from the successful achievement of the targets set for the extension. It is essential that these Governments are convinced and fully supportive before the extension phase is started.

Communications. As the communications unit so far has not been value for money, the Mission suggests that an external expert needs to be contracted to advise IBAR on a communications strategy, and that publishing and media expertise commercially available in Nairobi should be utilised in place of an expensive in-house capacity. However, the Documentations Officer, the Data Management Specialist, and the Desk-top Publishing Specialist could handle the majority of technical communications, and project communications between IBAR and its countries. In terms of communications to farmers, CAPE has demonstrated a very positive capacity and its expertise should be used for this purpose. However, at this stage, there remains an outstanding issue, namely that if AU funds the “communications” post part of this problem disappears. It is only if AU does not contribute any funds that this and the Economics unit may need to be cut out completely from the extension phase.

It is recommended that, during the 6 months extension of his contract, the Main Epidemiologist continue to pursue the initiatives he has started in respect of commodity-based trade, and other innovative systems, and draw up a proposal for how the impetus and interest may be maintained and converted into pilot projects after his departure.

5.2.4 Monitoring and Evaluation

The main proposed indicators to monitor and assess achievements during the extension period are summarised in the table below in relation to the main results and activities of the Extension

Table 4 Summary of Results, Activities and Proposed Indicators

Results

- 1) *Verified eradication of Rinderpest in West and Central Africa, and parts of East Africa, through achievement of the OIE Pathway's 'Freedom from Infection'*
- 2) *Eradication of Rinderpest in the Somalia Eco-system*
- 3) *Enhancement of the role of the Private Sector in the delivery of All services*
- 4) *Capacity building of IBAR*
- 5) *Concept and application of commodity-based trade developed in association with OIE to increase access for livestock commodities from the PACE region to international and intercontinental markets*

At least 20 dossiers submitted and found acceptable by OIE by 2007.

Eradication project proposal submitted to donors by September 2005
Acceptance by OIE of the principle of commodity-based trade and provision of guidelines for its implementation

Activities

For Result 1 Verified eradication of Rinderpest in West Africa, Central and East Africa:

- Clinical and sero-surveillance and laboratory analysis
- Management of epidemiological data
- Development of participatory disease impact assessment (PDIA)
- Ensure budgetary sustainability of surveillance systems implemented by national governments

Appropriate random serosurvey frames designed by November 2004, and sero-sampling and laboratory analysis completed by November 2006

PDIA trainers trained in 3 courses of 10 participants, and first teams trained by them active by June 2005

For Result 2 Eradication of Rinderpest in Somali Ecosystem

- Surveillance/lab analysis to determine causative strains
- Investigate/understand the epidemiology of mild viruses
- Develop appropriate strategies and plans for eradication
- Prepare long-term project for continued Rinderpest eradication
- Develop delivery system effective at pastoral community level
- Preparation of economic and socio-economic assessments targeted at nat. governments
- Direction and coordination of CAII fieldwork in three countries
- Wildlife sampling properly supported to facilitate eradication processes

PDS adopted in 5 more countries

Participatory fieldwork leads to a 100% increase in the sampling of fresh cases, and to info on recent occurrences

A practical and affordable eradication strategy by designed by Sept. 2005

Somali ecosystem prog. brought under PACE technical direction and co-ordination – November 2004

The three wildlife sentinel herds sampled on an annual basis

Other wildlife populations sampled as the need arises

Wildlife counterpart appointed by June 2004, at latest

Serum testing must be completed within one week of submission to the laboratory so that any necessary repeat sampling and investigation can be conducted before the herds move away

In the case of suspect cases, samples for virus identification or isolation should immediately be split and sent forthwith to the Regional Reference Lab. and to WRI., Pirbright

For Result 3 Enhancement of Private Sector

- Examine enhancement of conditions and opportunities for greater involvement of private sector in delivering animal health services
- Redefine roles and responsibilities of state veterinary services
- Define roles and regulation of community based animal health services
- Facilitate the above through establishment of a new Development of Veterinary Services Unit in the CSU combining advisors on CAH Policy and VLPU.

For Result 4 Capacity Building of IBAR

- Grooming of counterparts for possible succession in designated IBAR posts.

For Result 5 Enabling commodity-based trade

- Co-operation with OIE and other international organization to gain acceptance of the principles enabling commodity-based trade and exploitation of innovative export systems suitable for African countries using short-term consultancies where necessary
- Develop, using short-term consultancies where necessary, proposals to international donors for support to identify suitable pilot projects and assist in their design
- Exploit available meetings and scientific forums to propagate the concept these new concepts and the opportunities that they represent for African countries

Development of Veterinary Services Unit formed by 1st November 2004

Counterpart to VLPU appointed by June 2004 at latest

Supportive subsidiary legislation framed (June 2006), and gazetted (Dec.2006)

Independent/autonomous Veterinary Boards/Councils registered to regulate the profession

Strategic withdrawal of State Vet Services from private good activity

Implementation of some public good activities contracted out to specified private practitioners.

CAH workers legitimised and linked to registered Vets
20% more Private Practices registered in rural areas.

During extension, expatriate TA will gradually be withdrawn and technical and management responsibilities handed over to counterparts.

Identification of potential pilot projects and a plan of action to acquire finance for them

Articles published in the popular and scientific press and appropriate meetings addressed to promote trade based on commodities

Source: Mission.

5.3 Financial Implications

5.3.1 Availability of Additional Funds

Under the 7th EDF rules for a supplementary commitment, the maximum amount of additional funds that can be made available to the PACE Programme as a whole without seeking approval by the EDF Committee, to support the additional requirements of the Regional Component, is understood from Brussels to be EUR 5 million, although the regulations for the 7th EDF indicate this ceiling to be EUR 4 million. Requests above either amount, and below 20% of the original financing decision, would need approval by the EDF Committee, a process that would take too long to be applicable in this case.

In addition, there is an issue concerning the transfers from the National Component budget. The analysis shown in this report indicated that there are still some funds available in the National contingencies and unused funds under the Special Funds (emergency mobilisation fund) and Information/Visibility lines, both under the control of the Commission, as well as some funds under Studies. The issue is whether these are restricted to supplementing national budgets or whether they could be transferred to support the additional Regional component costs for the Extension.

The proposals for a restructured National TA presented below indicate that no funds would be available from unused National TA funds, as shown in Table 5 below. The cutting back of many of the second years of the TA inputs is linked to the proposed preparation of a single two-year Work Plan in the first year.

In relation to continuation of CAH activities during the Extension, a number of options are discussed below as to how regional coordination and national fieldwork could be funded during the extension.

5.3.2 National Component

In relation to the National Programme costs, the Mission could not in the time available and limited travel, review each national programme costs in terms of achievements and performance to-date. The approach adopted by the Mission is that the national component would continue as a non-cost extension and that it will be management's task to decide on any changes in national withdrawal rights according to performance, specific need, strategic position, or otherwise. Certainly, the narrowed focus of activity during the extension period should reduce the costs of most national programmes. On the other hand, certain key countries such as North and South Sudan will require significant extra funding to carry on any activities after October 2004.

Number of Work Plans in the Extension

In principle, the national programmes would be limited to 5 WPs during the Extension as under the original FA. Any surplus unused funds should be returned for use by other countries in need of further funds, such as Sudan. Hence those countries currently in their WP 4 would not be able to undertake 6 WPs by the end of October 2006. However, during the 6th year some expenditure on specific capital items could be covered (such as vehicle replacement) but not on-going operating costs. At this point these countries should have completed their 5 year global work plan and handed over to their respective governments. Those countries still only in their second WP will only be able to complete 4 WPs after the two-year extension.

National TA Costs

The mission reviewed the National TA costs to determine whether there would be any funding problems if extended and/or whether there may be any surplus funds available to transfer to help fund the additional cost extension of the Regional Component. It became clear that there are insufficient

funds available under the National TA budget in the FA (EUR 1.8 million) to fund a two-year extension of all national TA positions for two years. The Mission therefore reviewed priority areas and hence possible cost savings to enable the priority TA to continue for the overall two-year period. The Mission's compromise proposals were discussed with the PCU and the Financial Controller from which proposed TA inputs in the National Component included in the extension phase are presented in the table below.

Table 5 Summary of Proposed Extension National TA Positions and Budget

Country	Position	Until end of	No. Months*	Total EUR**
Long-Term TA	Sudan	June 06	16	301,000
	Kenya	May 05	6	113,000
	Ethiopia	May 05	6	113,000
	Uganda	May 05	6	113,000
	Tanzania	May 05	6	113,000
	Pooled E. A. TA (1)	June 05 -Sept 06	14	263,000
	Pooled W.A. TAs (3)	May 05	20	376,000
	Pooled W.A. TAs (2)	June 05-Sept 06	27	507,000
	Chad	May 05	6	113,000
Total International Long Term TAs				2,012,000
Other Items	Short Term TAs		2	48,000
Total TA				2,060,000

Source: Mission Estimate. Notes: * Months is 10.5 out of 12 months (87.5% of actual time) in one year and rounded; ** Cost of Long Term TA based on GTZ contract is EUR 18,800/month including fees, vehicle hire and running costs, office equipment hire and running costs, accommodation, out of station per diems, baggage allowances and regional and international air travel. Cost of Short Term TA including fees, per diems and travel is EUR 24,200/month.

The main assumptions of the Mission were to continue the five East Africa TAs for six months until end of May 2005 and pool these countries into a single TA from June 2005, except in Sudan, where the TA is continue well into 2005. The three West African TAs would be further pooled by June 2005 into two pooled-TA positions. Part of the justification for these cuts relate to the proposed change in procedure to prepare only a single two-year Work Plan for the extension period and is discussed further below.

The proposed National TA budgets to a total of just over EUR 2.0 million. This is slightly above the original FA budget available of EUR 1.8 million but could be accommodated from some savings in the present contract so that no transfers from for example National Component contingencies would be required and it would therefore remain a no-cost extension.

5.3.3 Staffing of Regional Component

The Mission focused its attention on the Regional Component staffing and costs, as this will be the subject of the additional cost-extension. It has taken into consideration comments received at both workshops and in subsequent written comments and the staffing also relates to which financial option is concerned.

The main changes are that the European TA in the Regional Component would be reduced through a transfer to of some the present posts to African Experts and as French Cooperation would fund the salary of the West Africa Epidemiologist. The remaining European TA would comprise four persons: the Main TA, the Financial Controller, the Epidemiologist (East Africa responsible for the CAH activities in the Somalia Ecosystem) and the Wildlife Specialist. The former two TA posts are a requirement of the EU donor and are needed to ensure efficient implementation of the extension phase and closure of the Programme. The Wildlife TA is justified as specialist expertise that is needed and

would work with an African wildlife specialist to be appointed during 2004. The main epidemiologist has been included for a short term input of six months as it is felt he is needed to ensure hand over to African Epidemiologist Expert, to assist in WP preparation and to facilitate efforts concerning changes in export regulations with OIE.

In conjunction with these cuts, a greater allowance for short-term consults (STC) with specialist expertise as required has been made. These are not specified at this stage to provide flexibility but may include experts in Participatory Epidemiology, Privatisation, Communications and Export Zones. The IAEA Laboratory Specialist is assumed to be funded by the AIAE after his initial contract expires.

There would be ten African Expert posts, plus the PC and Director giving 12 positions in total. The African Expert positions are as follows: Epidemiologist (currently counterpart to European epidemiologists), Privatisation Specialist (counterpart to be recruited during 2004 with some additional short-term support if necessary during initial part of extension) and to be entitled Delivery of Veterinary Services Specialist, a new appointment (to be made in 2004) of a counterpart African Wildlife Expert, an African CAH Policy Adviser (to be transferred from the former CAPE Unit to work with the Delivery of Veterinary Services Specialist), an African CAH Coordinator to work with the European EA Epidemiologist, a Data Management Specialist and the Desk-To/Publication Expert. The latter two posts would be continued under a new Information Technology Unit that would work with the Communication Expert who would be continued as an AU-IBAR appointment in the planned IBAR Documentation Unit and funded by IBAR, not PACE. A summary of these changes and justifications are presented in Table 6 below.

Table 6 Summary of Main Staff Positions and Changes to Regional Component

Position	Activity and Change
European TA	
Main TA	2 years to complete Programme and closure of Programme
Epidemiologist (EA)	2 years to technically direct Somalia Ecosystem and CAH activities
Main Epidemiologist	Continued for 6 months to ensure hand over to African Epidemiologist Expert, to assist in WP preparation and to facilitate efforts concerning changes in export regulations with OIE
Wildlife	2 years to continue during extension (2 nd inter wildlife TA not continued)
Epidemiologist (WA)	Not continued as French Cooperation Epidemiologist
Financial Controller	2 years continued control and closure of Programme
IAEA Lab Specialist	Funding continued by IAEA after initial funds end in March 2005
Privatisation Specialist	Not continued after Oct 04 (hand over to Del of Vet Serv African Expert)
African Experts	
Epidemiologist	2 years
Del of Vet Services	2 years (formerly Privatisation counterpart)
Economist	2 years
Bamako Reg. Coordin.	2 years
Data Managem. Spec.	2 years in new Information Technology Unit
Desk Top/Public. Offic	2 years in new Information Technology Unit
Wildlife Specialist	2 years
CAH Coordinator	2 years Coordination of CAH activities in the Somalia Ecosystem
CAH Policy Adviser	2 years integrated with Delivery of Veterinary Services
Communication Expert	Funded under IBAR Documentation Unit

The resultant budget for the European TA and African experts in the Regional Component are presented in Table 7 below.

Table 7 Extension TA/African Experts in the Regional Component and Budget

Europe/Afric.	Position	Years	Total EUR
European	Main TA	2	580,000
	Epidemiologist (EA)	2	360,000
	Wildlife	2	400,000
	Financial Controller	12.25	500,000
	Main Epidemiologist	0.5	125,000
	Short term consultants*	16m	400,000
Total European (4 positions)			2,365,000
	Director	2	-**
	Programme Coordinator/ EA Reg Coord	2	-**
African Expert	Epidemiologist	2	164,000
Comm. ... Kno ...	Delivery Vet Services	2	140,000
	Economist	2	146,000
	Desk-Top/Public	2	46,000
	Wildlife	2	140,000
	Bamako Reg Coord.	2	140,000
	Data Manag. Specialist	2	128,000
	CAH Policy Adviser	2	120,000
	CAH Coordinator	2	120,000
	Accountant	2	85,000
	Short term experts	3m	20,000
Total African Experts (10 positions)			1,249,000
Total Regional Component Staffing			3,614,000

~~580~~ 380
 280
 200
 200
 580
 180
 200
 200
 580
 780

140
140

Source: Mission estimate. Notes: International TA costs as per contracts. African Expert costs include salaries, home leave and travel costs based on actual costs **Director and Programme Coordinator/EA Regional Coordinator already funded by IBAR. All posts to continue until end of October 2006 except the Financial Controller who would remain a further 3 months to handle the Closure activities up to end of January 2007. * Short term includes consultants on privatisation; export zone development and Participatory Epidemiology as backstopping for the CAH activities. The IAEA specialist not included after March 2005, as assumed IAEA funding will also be extended. The OIE Veterinary Representative in Bamako is included in the total Regional Component budget. French Cooperation Epidemiologist TA continues in W.A. CAH Coordinator and CAH Policy Adviser integrated with PEU and Delivery of Veterinary Services Unit in CSU respectively.

5.3.4 CAH Sub-Component Funding

In relation to funding of the important CAH activities, both their regional direction/coordination and the national fieldwork activities in Somalia, Kenya and Ethiopia, three main options were considered. The total cost of the entire sub-component is budgeted at nearly EUR 1.5 million including 10% contingencies over the two years extension phase as follows:

<p> Sem I MTA 290 Epid. 180 Wlfe 200 Fin 200 Consult. 200 <hr/> 1090 </p>	<p> Sem II MTA 580 Epid. 360 Wlfe 200 STR 200 <hr/> 760 </p>
---	--

Table 8 Total Costs of CAH Sub- Component over Two Years Extension Period

Item	EUR
European Epidemiologist TA	360,000
African CAH Coordinator	120,000
Operating Costs for CAH staff in CSU	60,000
Fieldwork in three countries	550,000*
Participatory Disease Impact Assessment (STC)	200,000*
Laboratory Specialist in Muguga, Kenya	50,000*
Total	1,340,000
Contingency 10%	134,000
Total inc contingencies	1,474,000

Source: Mission estimate based on information from CAPE. Note: * Total fieldwork costs of EUR 800,000 shared by 3 national programmes

The main options considered were as follows:

- **Option 1. Include the CAH Coordinator and the European Epidemiologist working on the Somalia ecosystem in the Regional Component budget** and share the CAH field activities under the three national programmes. The fieldwork costs would amount to a total EUR 800,000. It is suggested that some EUR 500,000 would be sourced from the EU Somalia Programme and EUR 150,000 each for Ethiopia and Kenya would stem from national programme budgets through transfer from some unutilised funds within the National Component such as from the Emergency Mobilisation Fund, the Visibility or Studies budget lines.
- **Option 2. As above, but also transfer the European Epidemiologist TA and the CAH Coordinator under the EU Somalia Programme.** This was raised during discussions and would imply the bulk of the funds (EUR 1,108,000) would come under the EU Somalia Programme, with and the above contributions from the two national programmes in Kenya and Ethiopia (EUR 300,000).
- **Option 3 Include the total cost of the CAH Somalia ecosystem sub-component in the Regional Extension budget, namely EUR1.4 million including contingencies.**

These options involve some major issues relating to management, coordination and cross border-activities, and were discussed at a further meeting of interested parties on January 13th 2004, from which the Mission recommends Option 1 for the Extension, as Options 2 and 3 are not considered feasible for financial, technical and management reasons.

5.3.5 Regional Component Budget

A summary of the recommended budget for the Regional Component is presented below.

Table 9 Summary of Recommended Regional Component Budget (EUR)

Unit	Inputs	Cost
CSU/PCU	Staff: European TA/African Experts	3,614,000
Others	ACM meetings (4)	200,000
	Final evaluation mission suppl.	150,000
	External Communications	180,000
PANVAC (shared costs with AU and operating costs)		400,000
OIE Representative in WA including Secret & travel		190,000
Sub-Total TA/Expert Staff and Other Costs		4,734,000
Nairobi	Running costs of CSU	170,000
	PCU support Staff	170,000
	Running Costs PCU	160,000
	Travel for Director and PC	80,000
	Operating costs for CAH staff	60,000
Bamako	Support staff	43,000
Bamako	Running costs inc French Epid.	77,000
Sub-Total Support staff and running costs		760,000
Total Staff and Support Costs		5,495,000
Contingencies (approximately 10%)		500,000
TOTAL Regional Component ex AU contrib		5,995,000
Less Additional AU contribution		1,000,000
TOTAL PACE Regional Component inc AU contrib.		4,995,000
CAH contribution from Somalia EU Programme		500,000
Contingency 10%		50,000
TOTAL PACE + Somalia EU less AU contribution		5,545,000
TOTAL PACE + Somalia EC excl AU contribution		6,545,000

Source: Mission Estimate. Notes: OIE Representative salary and secretary and running costs included. IAEA Specialist excluded. Meeting of national Ministers excluded. Final evaluation is top up to funds in present budget. Accountant under African Experts, not support staff. Bamako includes travel costs for French Epidemiologist. AU contribution covers 4 African posts and running costs pro-rata, but is a broad cost estimate at this stage. National CAH field costs in Ethiopia and Kenya paid from existing National Component.

The total PACE funded Extension, excluding the AU contribution, is nearly EUR 6.0 million. Including deduction of the AU contribution it becomes nearly EUR 5.0 million – just below the ceiling of 5 million. The CAH fieldwork would be funded through contributions from the Somalia EU Programme (EUR 500,000 plus 10% contingency of EUR 50,000) and the Kenya and Ethiopia from existing reallocation of National Components (EUR 300,000). This would raise the total additional funding requirement to EUR 5.55 million including the contribution from the Somalia EC Programme.

The importance of receiving the additional AU-contributions to IBAR in time for the extension and agreement on the funding sources for the CAH fieldwork is clear. The implications if the amendment ceiling remains at EUR 4 million or if the AU contribution does not materialise, would be that either cuts would need to be made and/or some of the unused funds in the National Component lines for the Emergency Mobilisation Fund. Visibility and Studies should be reallocated to support the Regional Component.

Possible cuts could be exclusion of PANVAC, exclusion of OIE funding (to be replaced by direct EU funding) and reduction of 8 months of STC European TA and 3 months of STC of African experts giving a total reduction of EUR 930,00. If the AU contribution does not materialise in addition to this lower ceiling (that is a total reduction in EUR 2.0 million available), further cuts in the Regional Component would be required plus further reallocation of the above budget lines. The main further cuts could be a reduction of one year from the Main TA Advisor, employment of an African Epidemiologist

in the CAH sub-component and deduction of the African Economist and the Desktop/publication Specialist. This would liberate approximately EUR 700,000, which together with the above reductions and addition of some EUR 400,000 contribution from the National Component such as from the National component contingency line, the Emergency Mobilisation fund and the Studies budget line, would result in a net additional PACE requirement of EUR 4 million.

5.4 Improvements to Procedures and Management

5.4.1 Procedures

Whilst there is a strong desire to change and simplify the whole planning and financial procedures, any new system would have to be relatively simple and easy to apply, as seeking to fundamentally change the operating system of the Programme in the remaining period could simply divert efforts into applying new administrative and time consuming procedures, a situation that could continue inefficiencies and constrain the implementation of the desired capacity building activities during the extension period. In addition, due to the EU procedural regulations, changes that can be made in practice are limited.

Two main proposals were reviewed by the Mission to-date:

- The first involves greater decentralisation of planning and budgetary approval procedures to national level in order to increase their ownership and remove the present centralised approach. The system in outline would be that the PCU would propose guidelines (including regional technical matters) for each country to prepare the WPs according to a budget ceiling, that is the PCU would summarise the activities according to the logical framework, compile a budget and develop a technical and financial framework document. This would be submitted to the RAO for approval and the lead delegation and then transmitted to the local ECD, NAO and National Coordinators in each country. The National PACE coordinators would then prepare their WPs and submit them to the local ECD who would approve them and with the NAOs would commit and execute the payments.

Whilst this proposal represents an improvement at national level and is in line with EU's deconcentration policy, and would remove potential delays caused by consolidation, the Mission are concerned that this proposal may simply shift the workload of the present system to the PCU and the already overloaded lead Delegation in Nairobi and therefore may not achieve the desired benefits. Nevertheless, this change is worthy of further detailed consideration by the senior management and the Financial Controller.

- The second proposal involves the preparation of a two-year WP and overall budget for each country with the approval processes as at present. Annual budgets under the two-year WPs would be approved at each country EC Delegation. The main benefits would be the reduction in workload for the second year and it would simplify the continuity of funding between the two years. It would not necessarily increase the workload at country level and should create the desired increased national ownership and reduce delays. The Mission strongly recommends that the EU, if it is necessary, should make an exception to allow this variation in procedure in this case.

These proposals, however, would not resolve the outstanding problem of account closure and decommitment of funds for which greater priority and a more timely approach must be instituted at national programme level.

5.4.2 Management

The major weaknesses identified in management will prove difficult to resolve in entirety but some improvements could be made, some relatively quickly, but some will require changes in attitudes that

will take longer to achieve. They are however considered essential for implementation of the extension phase. A management plan outlining how management leadership and management efficiency will be improved and the various changes that are to be made should be prepared and agreement on this should become a condition of extension approval by the EC. Some of the changes suggested by the Mission are indicated below.

- Installation of a permanent Director of IBAR. This may not be strictly PACE business, although his quality and authority of his decision-making affects the programme's progress.
- A clearer definition should be made of the division of responsibilities between the Director and the PC and the role of the Main TA so that other staff members know to whom they should refer and from whom they should expect a response. In addition, regular weekly senior management meetings should be held to ensure a unified management approach.
- Management should also work with AU to clarify its IBAR strategy and to produce a strong vision of way forward including its link to the PACE Extension. This would involve gaining agreement on the main priority areas during the extension and production of a strategy document for the future.
- Change of Office in Nairobi. It is understood that a request has been made to the host nation to relocate to a larger office.
- A major internal exercise should be undertaken to integrate the various CSU units. This would be partially through a reorganisation of the privatisation and CAH Policy Adviser to a combined unit entitled Delivery of Veterinary Services, integration of the CAH coordinator into the PEU and a clear structure for integrating the CAH activities into a new coordination unit to handle the Somalia Ecosystem activities, improvement of the linkage between the Economic Unit and the technical units, coupled to a more targeted dissemination of outputs, and the creation of an Information Technology Unit to work with IBAR's Documentation Unit.
- A staff appraisal system should be implemented as soon as possible to identify staff strengths and weaknesses. Again this should be done in relation to the new IBAR organisational structure.
- Ensure greater bilingual communications, by ensuring key documents are rapidly translated for use either way.
- Senior management staff should limit their out of office travel and always ensure a clear delegation of responsibility is left behind when travelling.
- Management should pay greater attention to providing feed back to reports and WPs produced by both national and regional staff.
- A satellite should be installed on the present or new office in Nairobi to improve Internet access and email communications. An application to the Kenyan authorities is understood to be underway.
- A major effort should be made to improve integration of the CSU inputs in terms of working as a whole team through regular meetings to record and discuss work in progress with other Units and to exchange views.

5.4.3 Alternative Management Strategies

Should the EC not be satisfied with the management improvement proposals, and/or the AU does not make its financial contribution, the Mission was made aware that in the FA under the special conditions is the following clause that would still apply in the Extension:

"The Commission reserve the right to reconsider the arrangements for implementing the PACE Programme should the OAU decide to restructure the IBAR significantly and/or not to increase its financial contribution to that institution."

The Mission discussed alternative management strategies such as contracting management of the PCU to a private based company agency, or to divide the management of the Programme into the East, run by say FAO, and the West, run by say OIE, with a small central coordination secretariat, or to abandon the Regional Component altogether and operate the Extension as 30 separate national programmes

without further coordination or supporting expertise, but did not pursue these alternatives further at this stage as they are fundamentally less attractive than improving the present arrangement.

5.5 Risks and Assumptions

The main risks and assumptions are summarised below:

- Additional EC Funds are available for Regional component and the AU contribution is agreed.
- Reallocations of National Component budgets are agreed and made in good time and reallocation of withdrawal rights for all various countries as a result is agreed in good time,
- A permanent Director is appointed, improved leadership and management is achieved. A management plan and strategy is prepared and agreed with the EC.
- A staff appraisal is undertaken as soon as possible.
- Some administrative procedures are simplified and agreed, especially the preparation of a two-year WP with two annual budgets. These WPs need to be prepared in advance during the fifth year to be in place for November 1st 2004.
- The quality of invoices for approvals is improved and the Lead Delegation improves its efficiency in approving invoices.
- Governments support epidemiological surveillance work.
- Laboratories are adequately equipped to undertake analysis.
- Improvements in economic outputs and in communications strategy and outputs.
- Agreement is reached on CAH direction and coordination between the three countries in the Somali ecosystem and agreement is reached on sharing the funding of the CAH fieldwork.
- Counterpart on VLPU appointed and hand over before October 2004.
- Counterpart in wildlife is appointed before October 2004.
- Management rapidly resolves internal disputes over CAHs, privatisation and the role vis a vis Veterinarians in the PCU/CSU.
- AU agrees to share PANVAC costs for two years and provides some evidence of likely sustainability after one year.
- IAEA agree to extend the Laboratory Specialist for the extension period after the end of present contract.

5.6 Costs and Benefits

The additional costs associated with the proposed extension should be considered as not only the direct EUR 5 million required to extend the Regional Component, but also that the extension allows access to the considerable amount of unused funds from the present phase National Component that otherwise would be returned unutilised should the Programme terminate on October 2004 (estimated at EUR 30 million).

The benefits to this expenditure by the extension are considered to be substantial and include movement towards the complete eradication of RP from Africa, a potentially devastating disease causing severe economic losses and hardship amongst pastoralists, disrupts traditional cross border stock movements and has huge implications for trade in livestock and livestock products from West, Central and East Africa. Whilst these benefits cannot be quantified by the Mission, it is likely to run into millions of Euros affecting over 24 counties throughout the PACE region. This last effort for two years represents a continuation of the last 15 years of EC assistance to eradicating RP a task that will not be finished for perhaps another 6-8 years and for which the extension should prepare an on-going project to finalise the task. Surveillance work would also lay the foundation for combating other diseases of strategic importance and the capacity building and awareness building efforts will ensure sustainability of these efforts.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Overall Conclusions

As a result of its interviews and review of the documentation provided, the Mission concurs with the conclusions of the MTR, and of the Programme's external monitors, that the Programme has been hindered by over-complex and cumbersome administrative processes and by indecisive management, which have combined to cause serious delays in the approval of budgets and authorization to spend. Furthermore, some of the CSUs have not performed as well as had been expected, neither individually nor as a team, and this has led to further frustration and loss of momentum. Nevertheless, the Mission believes that the key issues being addressed are of such importance to the development and prosperity of the livestock sector across Africa, that the Programme does merit an extension to allow more countries to reap their intended benefits.

However, it is clear that, if the favoured two-year extension is to be proposed, it will necessitate a considerable pruning of the current operational resources and a narrower focusing of activities, outputs, and anticipated results. The mission therefore has closely examined other options, including the possibility of a full strength extension but for only one year, and the zero option of no extension at all. During the course of the Mission however, it has been intimated by Brussels that, in fact, it may be possible for the Programme to receive EUR 5 million of extra funds, not just EUR 4 million. Clearly, this would ease some of the stringencies that must be imposed upon the extension Programme, but still would not allow any significant broadening of its focus.

One of the specific objectives of the PACE programme was to be to support IBAR in its development as the AU centre of excellence on livestock development issues, and to serve as the normative and co-ordinating body for programmes – especially disease control programmes – requiring common approaches and harmonized activity between groups of countries or regions. Unfortunately however, since there is still no concrete evidence of the AU's intention to finance the staff establishment of IBAR, nor any certainty that the participating countries will translate their current counterpart contributions to their development budgets into similar contributions to their regular budgets, the mission feels that the outputs of the extension should be targeted on items that will lead to important sustainable results, regardless of the eventual levels of the recurrent budget allocated to livestock services after PACE is ended. In order of importance, these results are deemed to be:

- Verified eradication of Rinderpest from the continent of Africa,
- Enhanced opportunity and support for the private sector to effectively participate in the delivery of veterinary services,
- Support to the long-term objectives of IBAR

6.2 Financial Considerations

Under the 7th EDF rules for a supplementary commitment, the maximum amount of additional funds that can be made available to the PACE Programme as a whole without seeking approval by the EDF Committee, to support the additional requirements of the Regional Component, is understood now to be EUR 5 million, although existing documents seen by the Mission indicate that it is EUR 4 million. The Mission has prepared a budget for a two-year extension of the Regional Component taking into account the following considerations and assumptions:

- the financial limitations imposed on the cost of extension of EUR 5 million; this has yet to be confirmed by the EU,
- the proposed technical priorities for the Extension phase of two years,

- the assumption that the unused National component is adequate to fund a continuation of the National programme for a further two years, including a pruned National TA input and that with some reallocations of budget lines in the National Component, the costs of CAH field work in Ethiopia and Kenya can be accommodated within the existing funds available.
- the cost of the CAH activities in the three countries of the Somalia ecosystem are partly absorbed into PACE (coordination and direction) and the field work costs will be shared by the three national programmes, with the bulk stemming from additional funds provided under the EC Somalia programme.
- the various cut backs in the Regional Component staffing, mainly replacement of European TA with Africa Experts to reduce the annual costs of this Component over the two years.

The resultant total budgeted cost amounts to nearly EUR 5 million and assumes a contribution of about EUR 1 million by the AU to IBAR's senior and support staff and operational costs during the entire two-year period. In addition, a further approximately EUR 850,000 would be needed to supplement the three national Programmes to cover CAH field costs over the two years; this would be from the Somalia EC Programme (EUR 550,000) and reallocation of national budgets to fund the Ethiopia and Kenya programmes (EUR 150,000 for Kenya and EUR 150,000 for Ethiopia).

The AU contribution is therefore crucial to the Extension. Should the AU contribution not be forthcoming, and either the funding for the CAH fieldwork not be available/agreed or the EUR 4 million ceiling apply, the Regional Component's aims, staffing and budget would need to be further pruned down to match funding availability, including cutting out all support to IBAR posts not directly essential to the activities of the extension period, and/or some of the unused funds in the National Component lines for the Emergency Mobilisation Fund, Visibility and Studies should be reallocated to support the Regional Component.

The main outstanding financial issues at this stage are therefore confirmation of the ceiling funds allowable under EU rules, agreement on the contribution from AU to IBAR's costs and to share PANVAC costs and agreement on sharing funds to support the CAH fieldwork in Somalia, Kenya and Ethiopia under PACE-IBAR coordination and technical direction.

In spite of the narrowing of focus that is recommended and the quite rigorous cuts in Technical Assistance that are to be applied, meaningful success during this extension phase will be dependent upon the AU making its promised contribution to financing six permanent posts in the IBAR structure. Without this African expertise being available it would probably be better to have no extension at all, but simply to concentrate on establishing a new project to eliminate Rinderpest from the Somali ecosystem – strongly suspected of being the last remaining reservoir of Rinderpest in the whole world.

6.3 Overall Amended Budget for the Extension and AU Contribution

The original FA budget, adjusted for the various transfers that have been carried out since, and the additional PACE funding required as a basis for the application for extension, along with other funding sources involved is summarised in the following table.

Table 10 Summary, Budget Amendments for Extension and AU Contribution (000 EUR)

Item	Amended FA Budget at Dec 2003*	Extension (all Regional Comp exc AU contrib.)	AU Contrib (approx)	Total Amend. Budget includ Extension
National TA	6,200	-		6,200
Regional Europe TA	9,220	2,365		11,585
Local African TA	1,280	1,249	550	1,979
Sub-Total TA	16,700	3,614	550	19,764
Audit/Evaluation	1,080	350		1,430
Studies/Research	1,990			1,990
Training	5,690			5,690
Equipment	12,300			12,300
Inputs	8,880	180		9,060
Inform/Visibility	900			900
Local Staff	5,380	213	150	5,443
Other Oper. Costs**	13,750	1,137	300	14,587
Special Funds***	2,000			2,000
Contingencies	3,330	500		3,830
TOTAL	72,000	5,994	1,000	76,994

Source: Mission Estimate * Including Amendment Application of December 2003;

*** use of these funds to pay for CAH fieldwork in Ethiopia and Kenya.

** Other Operating Costs includes PCU/CSU operating costs and CAH staff operating costs. PANVAC and OIE Representative in WA costs. Inputs included additional external communication costs. Audit evaluation includes additional final evaluation cost and ACM costs. No discussion has been held with the AU to agree the precise size of its contribution – the figures are therefore provisional at this stage.

The total net PACE extension funding after deduction of the AU contribution would amount to nearly EUR 5.0 million, or an additional 7% funds above the original EU commitment.

6.4 Management and Administration

The Mission's conclusion is that it endorses the findings of the Monitoring Mission that many aspects of management have not been satisfactory to-date and that management leadership and improvements are essential for implementation of the extension phase and to restore confidence in management. Management should prepare a management plan outlining how the various changes are to be made and agreement on this should become a condition of extension approval by the EC. Some of the main changes suggested by the Mission are summarised as follow.

- Installation of a permanent Director of IBAR with a clearer definition of the division of responsibilities between the Director and the PC and the role of the Main Adviser and establishment of a single line of internal command with responsibilities balanced by authority.
- Institution of regular senior management meetings to coordinate management of the Programme.
- A major effort on the part of management to improve leadership and remove internal disputes and conflicts and raise moral of the PCU and CSU staff, including integration of some of the CSU units and TA inputs as outlined in the Report.
- Management should work with IBAR to clarify its strategy and to produce a strong vision of way forward including its link to the PACE Extension.
- Change of Office in Nairobi.
- A staff appraisal system should be implemented under the new IBAR organisational structure.
- Ensure greater bilingual communications.
- Management should pay greater attention to providing feed back to reports and WPs.

- A satellite communications dish should be installed on the present or new office.

Precisely what management conditions the EC will lay down will be a matter for the Lead EC Delegation in approving the Extension. Other management strategies were reviewed briefly by the Mission should these conditions not be met.

In relation to administrative procedures, whilst there is a strong desire to change and simplify the whole planning and financial procedures, any new system would have to be relatively simple and easy to apply, and due to the EU procedural regulations, changes that can be made in practice are limited. The main proposals that should be followed up in detail by the Financial Controller and the EC are:

- Greater decentralisation of planning and budgetary approval procedures to national level as part of the EUs deconcentration policy,
- The preparation of a two-year WP and overall budget for each country; this links to the proposed cut back of the national TA inputs in the second year of the Extension.
- Provisions to ease the bottleneck at the Lead EC Delegation

It is recommended by the Mission that the EC accepts the preparation of a two year Work plan as a basis for the entire Extension period coupled to approval of annual budgets, as this is an important requirement in relation to cutting back the National TA inputs in the second year.

These proposals, however, would not resolve the outstanding problem of account closure and decommitment of funds for which greater priority and a more timely approach should be instituted at national EC Delegations in preparation for and as part of the Extension.

6.5 Closure of Programme

The Mission proposes a three-month period after the end of the Programme by the end of October 2006, which should be devoted solely to closure of the financial accounts etc and therefore this phase would continue until the end of January 2006. The Financial Controller would be the main person involved in this activity for which a further three months of his input is included in the proposed staffing schedule.

7. OUTSTANDING ISSUES

7.1 Additional Contributions from AU to IBAR Costs and Sharing of PANVAC Costs

The same special conditions included in the original FA regarding OAU financial support to ensure sustainability of IBAR should still be considered appropriate for the Extension. At this stage it remains an outstanding issue that needs to be resolved between the EU and the AU. The AU needs to finalise the various positions in IBAR, accelerate the appointments and agrees to funding of salaries and running costs in time for commencement of the extension on November 1st 2004. In addition, agreement on sharing PANVAC costs as recommended by the Mission will also be needed.

7.2 EU Ceiling Funds

As it has not yet been confirmed whether the ceiling is EUR 5 million, this remains an outstanding issue at this stage. It has been assumed as available in this report, but the consequences of the ceiling being EUR 4 million in terms of additional cut backs and/or reallocation of some at present unused budget lines under the National Component are discussed in the report.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

EXTENSION OF THE PAN AFRICAN PROGRAMME FOR THE CONTROL OF EPIZOOTICS

Accounting numbers

No 7 ACP RPR 744

No 7 ACP RPR 745

No 8 ACP TPS 032

8 ACP ROC 009

8 ACP TPS 033

CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND

The PACE programme is a major development programme in the field of animal health in Africa and aims at building upon the headway made in the campaign against Rinderpest in order to establish affordable national and continental epidemiological surveillance networks for the main animal diseases, provide the countries with the capacities needed to organize economically and technically justified control programmes and develop effective and sustainable distribution of veterinary products and services.

The overall objective of the programme is to relieve the poverty of those involved in the livestock-farming sector (producers, service providers and consumers) in Africa by improving animal productivity, trade and food security.

The specific objectives of the programme are:

- to strengthen national and regional capabilities to assess the technical and economic aspects of animal diseases, and to generate appropriate programmes for their control;
- to safeguard animal health in Africa against major epizootic diseases (list A of the OIE).

The organizational chart of the programme includes a programme Coordination Unit (PCU). The PACE programme covers 32 sub-Saharan Africa countries. It is coordinated by the Inter-African Bureau for Animal Resources (IBAR) of the Organization of African Unity (OAU/IBAR, since July 2002 African Union)). The programme includes national operations planned and implemented in each country and also sub-regional and regional support and coordination components. Regional Coordinations are being provided by two Coordination Units in Nairobi for East Africa and Bamako for West and Central Africa. They form a single administrative unit headed by the PACE Programme Coordinator In addition to an epidemiological unit based in N'Djamena (today shifted to Bamako).

The Common Services provide a range of technical services to the national programmes.

A Mid-Term Review has been carried out during the second quarter of 2002 by a team of independent consultants. After reviewing the programme at its different levels of implementation, the MTR came up with several recommendations summarized in the Annex to the TOR. Some of the main observations are highlighted below:

- ❖ The scope of the project to be reviewed and thus to the agreed overall budget and duration. It is not realistic any longer to respect the original completion date of October 2004.
- ❖ The logical framework should be updated and impact indicators be developed focusing on output and effectiveness rather than on degree of functionality (MTR report pages 16 and 19)
- ❖ Biannual work plans, as originally intended could replace annual plans
- ❖ Poor management of impress accounts and delays in closure of annual accounts

- ❖ Countries will be advised about the kind of surveillance system and control strategy to adopt
- ❖ Impact of PACE may be greatly enhanced if control strategies can be applied. A first step in this respect is the formulation of project proposals for funding, whether by donors on a grant basis or funding agencies such as ADB.

The PACE Advisory Committee, a non decision-making technical advisory structure for the EC and the AU-IBAR, is ensuring that activities at all levels are in line with the programme's objectives and approaches, and also with the policy guidelines. This is composed of eight members who meet regularly every six months to review the progress of the programme. Up to now eight ACMs have been held. The 7th ACM made the following recommendations:

- At the finance level, that a request be put forward by the RAO to the EC for the use of funds from the contingencies of the Financing Agreement (FA) to enable the PCU to extend the regional activities and implement the programme until October 2004;
- At country level, 30 of the eligible countries are implementing the programme. The 7th ACM recommends that the PACE Coordination and Common Services units make special efforts to promote information exchange and regular dialogue and provide appropriate advice to assist countries in preparing proper work plan.

The eight ACM from 4-6 Nov 2003 made several recommendations, amongst others confirming the specific recommendations of the 7th ACM that a consultant be appointed to review the recommendations of the MTR in light of the comments made by the PACE Coordination unit (PCU) and to design a possible extension of the PACE programme. The activities of the regional coordination as well as the national countries will require adjustment taking into account the limited available resources, and the consequences of the IBAR restructuring. These recommendations will be made available and discussed with the consultant. Moreover, the 15th OIE Regional Commission for Africa, which took place in Maputo Mozambique recommended, and extension of the programme for two years, until 2006.

As recommended by the 8th ACM it is proposed that a consultant be appointed as soon as possible to examine the technical as well as the economic and financial aspects of the PACE Programme and to design a possible extension of the PACE programme until end of December 2006.

This study will be commissioned and be undertaken during a period of six (6) weeks. A team of two independent consultants, one in the technical and the other one in the financial fields, will conduct the study. It should be noted that the team leader will be the technical expert. The duration of the study is estimated at 6 weeks during a period from the last week of November 2003 to mid January 2004.

The PACE 3rd Annual Coordination Meeting recommends a focus on Rinderpest eradication in the Somali ecosystem.

Additional funding will be needed in order to extend the programme, which will have to be trimmed down and require adjustment to the national PACE programmes.

OBJECTIVE OF THE CONSULTANCY

In reference to the recommendations of a number of available documents and consultations with various stakeholders the consultants have the overall task to adjust the PACE Programme at a level, which is affordable to the participating countries, regions and at IBAR, and assures sustainability of the epidemio-surveillance systems as the core element of the programme.

In reference to the above recommendations formulated during various meetings, the consultancy study will have the following main objectives:

1. Based on documentation and information made available during the mission, present an overview of the PACE programme and in particular: with reference to current objectives of PACE taking into account the recommendations and conclusions of the MTR .
 - review and assess the progress made and state the relevance of the objectives for the future;
 - make a brief assessment of the countries for which a continuation of activities may be warranted with regard to the fundamental objectives of PACE.
 - evaluate the opportunity to undertake specific actions and give priority to countries that have not yet fulfilled the implementation of 2 WPCE and where Rinderpest eradication remain the main objective;
 - a priority intervention plan should be developed for the PCU, which will define the way forward and the actions to be taken in the future.
2. Identify and formulate a global work programme for the implementation of PACE during the extension period from October 2003 to December 2006.
3. The design of the extension of the PACE programme will take into account the main recommendations of the MTR, different meetings including ACMs, the EC External Monitoring Reports of the individual PACE countries, consultancies, back to office mission reports etc
4. Estimate/comment on the chances for sustainability of the results formulated (best practices).
5. In the proposed programme the consultants shall take into account the development of the livestock sector in the framework of the New Partnership for Africa's Development as provided in the action plan. Alternative funding to implement specific activities may be recommended.
6. Based on the findings of the study the consultant shall facilitate a workshop for the PCU, the common services, other development partners attached to PACE as well as selected stakeholders and assist them in a SWOT analysis and in the formulation of an exit strategy for the future.
 1. Results achieved with success and a high chance of sustainability (strength)
 2. Results achieved but with a weak chance of being sustainable (weakness)
 3. Results not yet completed but with a real chance for successful achievement and for sustainability (opportunities)
 4. Results not achievable because they are too ambitious or not clearly enough formulated for implementation (threats)

For the category 1 results, the Consultant together with the project team/participants should consider how these achievements can be improved and define the means, funds and time periods required.

For the category 3, the Consultant together with the project team should formulate strategies on how to achieve them, defining the means, institutions, funds and time periods required.

• **Assignment**

With reference to the above consultants will design a programme taking into account technical, financial, management and organizational measures required for the effective and efficient implementation of the extension of PACE at regional and national levels. They will provide a project document, including a global work plan that takes into account, the current status of PACE, the need of member countries, carry out a SWOT (Strength, Weakness, Opportunity and Threat) analysis and identify the key elements that need to be addressed as well as the priorities of the extension phase of PACE at national and regional levels.

By doing so, they will develop an up-dated logical framework for the extension phase of PACE and identify and define practical indicators and milestones for monitoring and evaluation following the EC's guidelines for Project Cycle Management

• **Technical Expert**

- Review the technical design of PACE and propose ways as how to overhaul and streamline the design of the programme in the future.
- Assess the functionality and sustainability of the epidemiological surveillance systems at country, regional and Pan-Africa level
- Review the strategies adopted by the PACE Common Services and propose solutions to fulfil the PACE main objectives.
- Identify priorities for the extension given the current disease control status (with particular reference to Rinderpest) and the financial constraints. In view of the recent outbreak of RP there may be a need to concentrate on the Somali ecosystem. Approach in this respect should be proposed.
- Propose indicators for each thrust and technical services to monitor and assess the degree of achievements during the extension period
- The consultant will propose appropriate improvements in light of experience gained during the technical implementation of the programme at country, Common services and coordination level taking into account the recommendations made by the ACM and the MTR
- Specific proposals should be made regarding the function of the epidemiological surveillance system at country level, regional level (information exchange) and IBAR level (Pan African level)
- Specific recommendations should be made as regard the specific contracts, grants research contracts, etc
- Make a proposal on the inclusion of the external structures and their future strategies such as PANVAC, OIE etc.

Financial Expert

- Review the design of PACE in particular the organizational, managerial and administrative aspects of PACE in collaboration with the technical expert and make recommendations how the overall design of the programme can be streamlined in the future.
 - Make a realistic financial proposal for the extension of the PACE Programme taking into account the remaining and future EDF funds. (Identify the major and key programme components and make priorities.)
 - Review the achievements in capacity building of PACE at the regional and national level as well as institutional strengthening under the current management and organizational structure Comment on the future management and organizational structure proposed by AU taking into account art. 3.5.3 of Special Conditions of the FA.
 - Review and propose adequate inputs (financial, organizational, management, implementation, monitoring..) taking into account the various identified or selected topics to meet the objectives set.
 - Review the technical and administrative provisions of the Financing Agreement and including the budget breakdown and propose revision of the FA including a revised budget based on the prioritization of the key components identified for an extension up to December 2006 if availability of funds permits.
 - Identify, additional donors funding directly related to PACE in order to make better use of it during the extension period.
 - Review the potential for PACE (IBAR) to play a facilitating role in the development of a future phase of the programme after termination of donor/EC support.
 - Review the financial allocation to the national PACE programmes and to propose a mechanism for the financing operations in line with ample financial monitoring and control as well as the reallocation of financial resources based on country performance and priority activities in relation to animal disease surveillance and control during that extension period applying the drawing rights systems
- Invite the participants during the workshop to suggest possible financial sources for the implementation of the Programme extension phase.

EXPECTED RESULTS

The study is expected to present a comprehensive proposal for an extension of the PACE programme, which will allow implementation of the programme to December 2006. The objectives are:

- ◆ Make a thorough plan of the best use of Technical Assistants during the extension phase, where necessary
- ◆ Analyze and prepare an extension programme document for two years upon completion of the PACE initial contractual period ending October 2004.
- ◆ Review and make recommendations on the PACE manual of procedures to facilitate implementation of national programmes.

• **Issues to be studied**

The consultants will underline the design of the extension of PACE as a regional program. SWOT analysis should be undertaken.

The consultants will propose a sound relationships between the activities and the results of the extended PACE. They will identify the resources to be mobilized, and make a proposal on the extension of PACE from October 2004 to December 2006.

- The results of the consultant's initial findings will be incorporated in an aide-mémoire, which will be presented at a stakeholders meeting. Based on the observations and comments a draft final report will be formulated and presented to AU/IBAR and EC.

Recommendations

Recommendations for the future extension of PACE will be presented to the stakeholders and any comments of relevance will be incorporated into the Draft final report. This may entail a review of the logical framework, any modification to the project timeframe, and financial allocations (including member countries) and reflected in final review of the financing agreement.

DURATION OF THE ASSIGNMENT

Time Schedule

The final aide-mémoire will be submitted by 21st December 2003 before departure of the consultants. The draft final report will be presented by the consultants on 9th January 2004. The final report will be presented on the 14th of January 2004.

A total of 90 man-days for the team of two persons is allocated with a provisional schedule as below

Table 1: Tentative schedule of the consultancy

Main activity	Number of Days/person
Briefing at PACE Programme Co-ordination Unit AU-IBAR, Nairobi and discussion with PACE staff	6 days
Briefing at EC Lead Delegation	2 days
Meeting in Addis Ababa (AU HQ, EC Delegation and PACE Ethiopia)	1 day
Visit to PACE Regional Coordination unit, Bamako Mali	5 days
Visit to selected PACE national programmes, Kenya, Mali, and Ethiopia.	4 days
Presentation of the aide-mémoire including programme proposals	5 days
Preparation of the Consultants draft report	6 days
Preparation and presentation of draft report	16 days
Preparation of final report	
Submission of final report	
Total Number of days	45 days

ORGANISATION OF THE CONSULTANCY

The consultancy will start with a briefing of the experts in the Europe Aid Co-operation Office in Brussels. They will also pay a visit to the OIE headquarters in Paris, after which they will travel to Kenya. The mission will start with meetings with AU-IBAR and with the PCU. A joint meeting will follow with IBAR, EC Delegation/PCU/GTZ/PACE. A tentative schedule is given in table 1. The consultant will undertake a mission to the African Union-Inter African Bureau for Animal Resources and at the PACE Regional Office for West and Central Africa in Bamako. Some selected PACE countries will also be visited. The consultant will undertake visits to relevant organizations or bodies as well

A workshop will be held in Nairobi on 17 December 2003 to present the draft *Aide-Mémoire*. This draft should be communicated to the workshop participants (RAO office, the EC Delegations, OAU/IBAR) on 15 December 2003. To assist the consultants in their assignment, the PCU will provide to the consultant the following material:

- PACE Financing Agreement
- PACE Global Plans
- ACM Reports
- PACE Policy Committee reports
- PACE consolidated WPCE
- PACE final MTR Report
- PACE 3rd Annual Coordination Meeting Report
- PACE Manual of Procedure

COMPOSITION OF THE MISSION AND EXPERTISE REQUIRED

- The evaluation team should comprise two experts, each of whom should have the expertise required in the relevant discipline of EDF finance procedures and in the livestock development in Africa with particular reference to animal health and disease control. They should have a university degree and preferably a higher degree in a relevant discipline with a proven experience in the development cooperation and, in particular regional EDF funded projects
- A veterinarian experienced with epizootic diseases and strong knowledge on epidemio-surveillance and disease control in Africa;
- An Economist/financial expert, acquainted with managerial and organisational aspect of project operations as well as knowledgeable in EDF accounting procedures
- Language skills and experience: Each consultant should have at least 10 years of experience relevant to African countries and be fluent in English and preferably a working knowledge of French with working experience from Western, Central and Eastern Africa.

REPORTING

The *aide-mémoire* and the original final report should be in English and translated into French by GTZ. The report will be availed by the consultant firm towards the end of the mission and the consultants will present a first draft report which will be presented to AU-IBAR and the European Commission for consideration of an extension of the PACE programme.

The draft and final reports will be comprehensive, consistent and concise and written in a clear language (maximum of 50 pages, excluding annexes but including executive summary of no more than 4 pages). Annex will include:

- Terms of reference

- Comments of the consultants on the terms of Reference (if any)
- Methodology applied for the mission
- List of persons/organizations consulted
- Results of internal interviews and/or workshops
- Literature and documentation consulted
- Technical annexes
- Others as may be advised during the briefings in Brussels and/or Nairobi.

Three hard copies of each of the draft and final reports will be delivered to EC in Brussels and eight copies of the draft and 10 copies of the Final report will be sent to the EC Delegation in Nairobi, which will forward them to the RAO, Director AU-IBAR.

The Final report will also be submitted in a CD ROM version (2 for the EC and two for the AU/IBAR)

All correspondences, communications and reporting will be in English.

ANNEX 2 MISSION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The Mission itinerary is summarised in Annex 4. The Mission was composed of two consultants, a veterinarian (Dr G.G. Freeland) and an agricultural economist (Mr K.I. Talks). Dr Freeland was briefed in Brussels (by the EC) and in Paris (by the OIE) on 24th November 2003 and started work in Nairobi on 26th of that month. He was joined by Mr Talks on 1st December.

In the time frame available, it was not possible for the consultants to meet representatives of more than a handful of the participating Countries, so they have concentrated their efforts on interviews with the members of the Programme Co-ordination Unit (PCU) and various experts (African and expatriate) employed in each of the Common Service Units in Nairobi, as well as visiting the West Africa Regional Co-ordination Unit (RCU) in Bamako, and the Headquarters of the African Union in Addis Ababa. On each of these visits, opportunities were also taken to interview officers involved in the national campaigns of those two countries, and some of their Technical Advisers employed under the programme. In addition, the Programme has provided the Mission with a wealth of documentation from which it may inform itself on the programme's problems, progress and potential.

A Draft *Aide-Memoire* was distributed on December 15th 2003 and presented and discussed at an essentially internal workshop held on 17th December. After consideration of the various comments received prior, during and after the Workshop, the consultants prepared a Final *Aide-Memoire*, which they submitted on 21st December 2003. A brief report on the Workshop is attached as Annex 6. The Draft Report was presented to a larger workshop, including representation from some participating countries and other stakeholders, on 9th January in Nairobi. This Final Report, produced on 14th January 2004, represents consensus agreement on the staff structures and management mechanisms for the extension, having taken into account some strong views voiced from the floor and in written comment from stakeholders further afield, and subsequent discussion, on specific matters arising, with the EU, PCU, and EC Somalia Country Programme Officer.

ANNEX 3 LIST OF PERSONS MET

Mr. Gary Quince	Head of EC Delegation (ECD), Nairobi
Mr. Otto Moller	Senior Rural Development Advisor ECD, Nairobi
Dr. Friedrich Mahler	EC Somalia Unit, ECD, Nairobi
Dr. Bernard Rey	Administrator, EC Brussels
Dr. Dewan Sibartie	Deputy Head, Scientific and Technical Dept, OIE, Paris
Dr. Jotham Musiime	Director, a.i, IBAR, Nairobi
Dr. Renee Bessin	Programme Coordinator, PACE, Nairobi
Dr. Daniel Bourzat	Chief TA, PACE, Nairobi
Mr. Paul Mertens	Financial Controller TA, PACE, Nairobi
Dr. Gavin Thomson	Main TA Epidemiologist, PEU, PACE, Nairobi
Dr. Kebkiba Bidjeh	Counterpart Epidemiologist, PEU, PACE, Nairobi
Dr. Gijs van't Klooster	TA Epidemiologist, PEU, PACE, Nairobi
Dr. Richard Koch	TA Wildlife East Africa, PEU, PACE, Nairobi
Dr. Yvon Le Brun	TA Privatization and Legislation, PACE, Nairobi
Mr. Francis Nganji	Communications Officer, PACE, Nairobi
Mr. Sammy Mwirigi	Desktop Publishing Officer, Communications Unit, PACE, Nairobi
Dr. Andy Catley	Veterinarian, CAPE, Nairobi
Dr. Tim Leyland	Head of CAPE Unit, Nairobi
Dr Karim Toukara	AU/IBAR PACE IAEA Regional Expert
Mr Onesmus W Maina	AU/IBAR PACE Economist
Dr Emmanuel Tambi	AU/IBAR PACE Economist
Dr. Wondwasen Asfaw	CAPE, Somali Ecosystem
Dr. Henry Wamwayi	Project Adviser to PACE Somalia
Dr. Martin Nyamweya	Vet. Adviser for Puntland
Dr George Gitau	AU/IBAR Scientific Officer
Dr Abdi Abdullatif Mohamud	Somali PACE Project Coordinator
Dr Eric Fermet Quintet	AU/IBAR Technical Assistant (RALEA)
Dr. Bryony Jones	VSF (Belgium), Rinderpest Project Co-ordinator for Southern Sudan
Dr. Ankers Philippe	Head of Mission VSF-Suisse
Dr Mohammed M. Bahari	PACE Tanzania National Coordinator
Dr C.S. Rutebarika	PACE Uganda National Coordinator
Mr. Douglas McLure	Team Leader, EU Monitoring Team
Mr. Gerry Farmer	Consultant, EU Monitoring Team
Mr. Ibrahim Kegnecko Diallo	Director, a.i. Rural Economy & Agriculture, AU
Mr. Foday Bojang	Senior Policy Officer, Rural Econ/Agriculture, AU
Mr. Levi Uche Maducke	Assistant Coordinator, PATTEC, AU
Mr. Nicolas Petit	Rural Development Advisor, ECD, Ethiopia
Ms. Hadera Gebru	Director of Livestock, Ministry of Agriculture, Ethiopia
Dr. Sifeshi Zewdie	DVS, and PACE National Coordinator, Ethiopia
Dr. Taye Ephrem	Senior Veterinarian, Quarantine and Inspection, Ethiopia

Dr. Michael Handlos
Dr. Tariku Sintaro
Dr. Berhanu Admassu

TA Veterinarian, PACE, Ethiopia
PACE Epidemiologist, Ethiopia
Veterinarian, CAPE, Ethiopia

Dr. Amadou Samba Sidibe
Dr. Bouna A. Diop

OIE Regional Co-ordinator for Africa, Bamako, Mali
PACE Regional Co-ordinator, West and Central Africa,
Bamako, Mali

Dr. Fatah Bendali
Dr. Daniel Grigoire
Dr. Patrick Bastiaensen
Mr. Ibrahim Ba
Dr. Mawadou Racine Ndiaye
Mr. Géza Strammer
Mr. Bounafou Sanogo
Dr. Nicolas Denormandie

PACE Regional Epidemiology Adviser, Bamako, Mali
PACE Regional Communications Adviser, Bamako, Mali
PACE Regional TA, Bamako, Mali
Administrator, PACE Regional Office, Bamako, Mali
PACE National Co-ordinator, Bamako, Mali
Adviser, EU Delegation, Bamako, Mali
Programme Officer, EU Delegation, Bamako, Mali
Regional TA (Coastal Francophone countries) PACE Mali

Dr. Manfred van Eckert

Regional Director, GTZ-International Services, East and
Central Africa, Nairobi

Mr. Francis N. Chabari
Mrs. Helga Scholl
Mr. Robert Schrembs

Co-ordinator, PACE Support Programme, GTZ-IS Nairobi
Regional Finance Manager, GTZ-IS, Nairobi
GTZ Department Regional Director IS

ANNEX 4 MISSION ITINERARY

DATE	ACTIVITIES AND ASSIGNMENTS	LOCATION	OBSERVATIONS
24 Nov. 2003	Debriefing meeting with the officials of the Commission of the European Community	Brussels BELGIUM	
25 Nov. 2003	Meeting with DG OIE/Chairman of the PACE Advisory Committee Meeting	Paris- FRANCE	
26 Nov. 2003	Travel to Nairobi Meeting with GTZ-IS TA Coordinator	KENYA GTZ Office	
27 Nov. 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meeting with the RAO ▪ Introductory meeting with PCU & CS ▪ Meeting with GTZ-IS Regional Director 	AU-IBAR AU-IBAR GTZ-IS Nbi Office	
28 Nov. 2003	Meeting with PACE Southern Sudan Sector	VSF-B	Dr. B. Jones
	Meeting with PACE Somalia	PACE Somalia Coordination & EC	Freidrich Mählér
	Meeting with PACE Kenya	Kabete GTZ-IS	Dr. W. T. Chong; Dr. B. Mugenyo Mr. Chabari Dr. M. van Eckert
01 Dec. 2003	Specific meetings with PCU & CSU	AU-IBAR	- PEU - DMU - Economics - Communications - CAPE - VLPU - FINANCE - PCU
02 Dec. 2003	Joint Meeting with IBAR/EU/PCU/GTZ/ PACE	IBAR Conference room	
02 Dec. 2003	Travel to Addis Ababa		Evening Flight
03 - 04 Dec. 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meeting AU HQ ▪ Meeting with the EC delegation Addis ▪ Meeting with NC in Ministry of Agriculture ▪ Meeting with PACE Ethiopia 	-AU Headquarters Addis Ababa EC Addis Ababa Ministry of Agriculture Addis PACE office, Addis	
04 Dec. 2003	Travel Addis Ababa to Bamako		Night Flight
05 Dec. 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meeting with EC Delegation Mali ▪ Meeting with PACE Regional coordination Unit Bamako ▪ Meeting with national programme - PACE Mali 		

06 Dec. 2003	Further meetings in Bamako		
07 Dec. 2003	Travel back to Nairobi		Day and Night Flight
08 Dec. 2003	Working session with the EU Monitors	Nairobi, Kenya	PCU-Consultants-EU Monitors
09 Dec. 2003	Reporting		
10-13 Dec. 2003	Preparation of the draft aide memoire for the workshop	Nairobi, Kenya	
15 Dec. 2003	Submission of the draft Aide Memoire to PCU	Nairobi, Kenya	
16 Dec 2003	Debriefing Meeting of EU Monitoring Consultant	Nairobi, Kenya	
17 Dec. 2003	Workshop to present the draft Aide Memoire	Nairobi, Kenya	
18-20 Dec. 2003	Preparation of Final Aide Memoire, Further meetings with PCU/CSU and PACE Somalia	Nairobi, Kenya	
21 Dec. 2003	Submission of Final Aide Memoire	Nairobi, Kenya	
22 Dec. 2003	Depart for Europe		
23 Dec 2003-06 Jan. 2004	Draft report preparation in Europe	Europe	
Jan 6 2004	Submission of Draft Report	Europe	
07 Jan. 2004	Travel back to Nairobi via Brussels meeting with OIE and EC (Dr. Freeland only)	Brussels	
08 Jan 2004	Preparation for Presentation	Nairobi, Kenya	
09 Jan. 2004	Workshop to present and discuss draft report	Nairobi, Kenya	
10 Jan 2004	Follow up meeting with Main Adviser, PC and WA Reg Coord	Nairobi, Kenya	
11 Jan. 2004	Preparation of final report	Nairobi, Kenya	
12 Jan 2004	Meeting with EC Rural Advisor and report preparation	Nairobi, Kenya	
13 Jan	Meeting at IBAR to discuss Somalia Ecosystem, other PCU/CSU discussions and report preparation	Nairobi, Kenya	
14 Jan. 2004	Report preparation and Submission of final report	Nairobi, Kenya	
15 Jan. 2003	Departure/travel to Europe		

ANNEX 5 BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Mid Term Review, Final Report Vol I- Main Report, May 2003, DRN/EC
2. Mid Term Review, Final Report Vol II- Annexes, May 2003, DRN/EC
3. Interim Financial Report Volume I 8th Advisory Committee Meeting, November 2003, PACE
4. Memorandum of Understanding between RAO and NAO for Countries in PACE, April 2000
5. PACE Manual of Procedures, January 2001, PACE
6. Global Plan for PACE Coordination Units & Common Services, January 2000, PACE
7. Proposal for Review of the Procedure of Approval of Work-Programmes of the National PACE Components, 8th Advisory Committee Meeting, November 2003, PCU, PACE
8. Extension of PACE Regional and Country Programmes 2004-2006, PACE 2003
9. National PACE Programme Progress Report Western and Central Africa, October 2003
10. Minutes of 7th Advisory Committee Meeting, April 2003, PACE
11. Minutes of 4th Advisory Committee Meeting, September 2001, PACE
12. Report of the 8th Advisory Committee Meeting, November 2003, PACE
13. Report of the 7th Advisory Committee Meeting, April 2003, PACE
14. First Half Year Progress Report on National TA, July 2003, GTZ
15. Draft Request for Use of Contingencies No.1 to the PACE Financing Agreement, October 2003 PACE
16. Financing Agreement for PACE, 1999, EU –OAU
17. Extension of PACE – PCU's Vision, Drs Bessin, Diop & Bourzat, Dec 03-Jan 04
18. Monitoring Report, December 2003, G. Farmer and D. McLure, EU Monitoring
19. Backstopping Mission to the Management of the PACE PCU, Draft Report, December 2001, J.E. Ternoy, External Consultant Consortium lead by AGRIFOR Consult of Belgium
20. Various Consolidation Reports for National Programmes
21. Various Monitoring Reports on individual counties visited
22. Bulletins for the PACE Somalia Project
23. Various publicity materials produced by the Communications Unit
24. Pace Progress Report: Contribution of The Pace Coordination Unit, Pace Mission Statement, Drs R. Bessin; D. Bourzat; B. A. Diop
25. Reports of the EC Monitoring Missions: various country reports
26. Creation Of Export Zones as a means for promoting exports of livestock and their products from countries in the PACE region – prepared by PEU, Oct. 2002.
27. Consultancy on the Dynamics of CBPP Endemism and the Development of Effective Control/Eradication Strategies for Pastoral Communities: Jeffrey C. Mariner, November 2002
28. General Concepts of Epidemiological Surveillance: PACE Epidemiology Unit, Oct. 2001
29. Contagious Bovine Pleuro-Pneumonia: possible future strategies for the control of the disease in the PACE region -- PEU July 2003
30. Workshop on development of PACE logical framework Machakos, October 2000
31. Policy on Community-based Animal Health Workers, AU-IBAR, April 2003
32. Reports of the first and second meetings of the OIE ad hoc group on the role of private veterinarians and paraprofessionals in the provision of animal health services
33. PanAfrican animal health yearbook, 2003
34. PACE – Somalia component: Terms of Reference for a Project Evaluation
35. PACE – Somalia component: Global Plan October 2000 to October 2000
36. Community-based Animal Health Workers in Kenya, AU-IBAR
37. Animal Disease and Trade: has the time come for a more focused commodity-based approach? OIE Scientific Commission for Animal Diseases

ANNEX 6 RESULTS OF WORKSHOPS

1. Workshop Held in Nairobi on December 17th 2003 to Discuss Draft *Aide-Mémoire*

Present: P. Coordinator (Chairman) Chief TA, PCU and CSU Senior Staff, GTZ Representatives. Absent were the Director and an EC Delegation Representative.

a) *Dr. Guy Freeland* (Mission Team Leader and Veterinarian) presented a summary of the priorities seen by the Mission for the Extension in relation to the need to fit the additional funds available of EUR 4 million. Given the uncertainty of whether the IBAR posts will be filled and therefore on one of the main objectives of PACE (strengthening of IBAR), the Mission prefers to prioritise the sustainable benefits in order of preference as follows:

- Eradication of Rinderpest from the continent through pursuit of the OIE pathway to “freedom from infection” in West and Central Africa and through further surveillance and investigation of the various strains of Rinderpest in the Somalia Ecosystem in East Africa.
- Enhancement of Conditions for greater involvement of the Private Sector
- Sustainability of IBAR (difficult choices needed as cannot support all present TA and experts).

b) *Mr. K I. Talks* (Mission Financial Consultant) briefly covered the financial implications and presented summary budgets for the National TA and Regional Components including staffing levels, adjustments of the costs of the Regional TA based on individual contracts rather than the levels shown in the provisional budgets based on the rates given in the Global Work Plan and discussed possible improvements to financial procedures.

c) *Dr. Bourzat* (Chief TA) raised the possibility that the ceiling for additional funds may be EUR 5 million instead of EUR 4 million but that it was not yet clear. He also pointed out that the overrun of the Regional component in the present phase was mainly due to extension of some of the TA consultants in the CSU (wildlife, communications and VLPU). In addition, he did not accept that the contingencies shown in the original FA for the National Component could not be used to fund the additional Regional Component requirements, that is, they should be made available for this purpose.

d) *Dr. Bessin* (PC) noted that the Draft *Aide-Mémoire* did not deal with individual country programmes or with the Vaccine Bank.

e) *Dr. Thomson* (Main Epidemiologist) disagreed that privatisation should be a priority as many countries would find this difficult to accept, but endorsed the need for a participatory approach to epidemiology work.

f) *Dr. Lebrun* (Privatisation TA) also raised the relative unattractiveness of privatisation by some countries and in discussion agreed that a new holistic approach to delivery of veterinary services was required combining privatisation and other services. In addition, the word privatisation should be dropped and greater economic inputs were needed to assess the costs of service delivery.

g) *Mr. Nganji* (Communications) complained that Communications staff was dropped in the Extension phase and that he believed that capacity building of IBAR should be the main priority including a Communication Unit. Dr. Freeland’s response was that communications was important to the long term sustainability of IBAR but that how this should be developed needed further analysis, including possible direct use of external communication resources.

h) *Mr Paul Mertens* (Financial Controller) raised several issues including the vaccine bank and future funding for Southern Sudan as funds were used up. The latter needed urgent attention perhaps through adjusting withdrawal rights from non-performing countries to assist S. Sudan.

i) *Dr. Gijs van’t Klooster* (Epidemiologist) stressed the need for a regional coordination and approach to continuing the CAPE activities during the Extension in the three countries involved, rather than

transferring this to the Somalia national programme. Others at the meeting found that continuation of CAPE activities was unfair as it would cause internal problems in PACE.

j) Dr. Catley (CAPE Epidemiologist) emphasised that the proposed extension of CAH activities would focus on cross border areas that national programmes did not cover and that, if omitted from the Extension, the Programme would fail in its objectives to eradicate Rinderpest, especially as Somalia lacked the capacity to implement CAHWs effectively and undertake cross border activities. What was needed was that IBAR should take over coordination in the three countries and its technical direction. Dr. Freeland agreed and Dr Bourzat endorsed the importance of collecting solid data on the epidemiology of RP in the Somalia ecosystem from as many sources as possible, including both CAHWs and private vets. However, he noted that the CAH field-work budgeted in the Extension was not a regional activity and outside the original FA and therefore funding would need to be sourced from national programmes. This issue remains outstanding.

k) Dr. Bessin (PC) stressed that the Extension needs to complete its work towards RP eradication, that a new long-term programme would need to follow the Extension, and that the CAPE and Privatisation Units should be combined under one umbrella – Provision of Veterinary Services. He reiterated that if agreement on the integration and extension of CAPE activities could not be agreed, then the Programme could forget eradication of RP as one of its objectives.

Further written comments were expected in due course for consideration by the Mission and that if received later than Friday, they would be considered for the Draft Report due in January.

2. DRAFT Minutes of Workshop on the PACE EXTENSION Draft Report 09/01/2004

(Based on Minutes Prepared by Richard Kock)

Present: Director IBAR, Senior Rural Development Adviser ECD, PC, Main Adviser, WA Regional Coordinator, Extension Mission Consultants, PCU and CSU TA and African staff, TA staff and National Coordinators from a number of West and East African countries, GTZ staff and NGO staff. Total of 36 people – full list attached at end of minutes. Absent was the AU Commissioner and Head of EC Delegation, Nairobi.

Agenda:

1. Introductory Remarks – Dr Rene Bessin PACE coordinator
2. Welcome address – Dr Jotham Musiime Ag. Director AU-IBAR
3. Address – Mr Garry Quince Head of the EU delegation in Kenya
4. Presentation on the draft final report - Consultants
5. Discussions on the draft final report - Participants
6. Main recommendations - All
7. Closure

Introductory Remarks – Dr Rene Bessin PACE Coordinator

Key issues – completion of the PACE programme cannot be achieved in the original time period allocated. This is particularly important for the eradication of rinderpest in the Somali ecosystem and completion of verification of eradication of the disease across Africa. In the East African region the focus should be the eradication of rinderpest in the Somali ecosystem. An enabling environment must be provided to ensure the National programmes are sustained. There needs to be reinforcement of AU IBAR and National Veterinary services capacity to ensure a sustainable delivery of animal health in member countries.

A document has been produced by IBAR PCU as a vision and can be used as a guide for discussion.

Welcome address – Dr Jotham Musiime Ag. Director AU-IBAR

The mid term review identified the fact that the objectives would not be reached within the original planned period. The recommendation was for an extension of 2 years to enable the completion of the work and achieve the objectives. The PACE advisory committee (8th) endorsed this and advised a consultancy to examine how this could be achieved.

The commissioner sent her regrets that due to her tight schedule she now could not attend but she wishes to be kept informed of the deliberations.

Address – Mr Otto Moller RDA EU delegation in Kenya

The Delegate Mr Gary Quince sent his apologies for not being able to attend the meeting.

The main reason for the extension is to ensure the National Programmes can complete the objectives and the final eradication of rinderpest from the Somali ecosystem remains a high priority. The comments and clarification on the draft report were received. Thanked the consultants for the report. Hoped the discussions will reach a common understanding and consensus on the issues and recommendations from the report.

Only 2 countries have completed the 4th Year work programme.

It is highlighted that there are institutional and management weaknesses, which need to be addressed.

The draft report of the consultants will be the subject of discussion today.

The aim is to find a suitable basis for adjustment of the finance agreement for the extension of the PACE programme. However special conditions and the management weaknesses have to be discussed between the AU and EC before the recommendations can be sent forward to Brussels. The resolution of the management issues will be a pre-condition of the PACE extension.

Presentation on the draft final report - Consultants

Dr. Guy Freeland

The main issues in the report were highlighted.

The principle agreed was to enable countries time to complete the planned activities at no extra cost with extra money sought for the continuation of the Regional component with reduction in the overall size of the regional staff.

Alternative project management strategies were considered. The preferred option was to maintain the current situation with internal adjustments.

There were considerable concerns over the commitment of AU to the programme and capacity building at IBAR was dependent on this. There were also internal concerns amongst PACE technical staff over the potential sustainability of the Epidemiosurveillance system and particular in the likelihood of National Budgets being set aside for this purpose. Reassurances were given from the National level but it is a fact that often these assurances are not honoured in practice.

Eradication of rinderpest from Africa is the main objective and within the time frame remaining in PACE this should be the focus. This will involve work in all PACE countries. Pursuit of the pathway to the freedom of rinderpest in Africa is a main objective. This does not mean other surveillance is not carried out but the priority should be made clear to Governments. The other aspect of importance in surveillance is to establish what are the important animal health issues to poor farming and pastoral communities. Often the priority at the National level differ e.g. FMD which has low impact on actual animal health but high impact on trade. Haemorrhagic septicaemia is one disease which has wide impact and the sales of vaccine are higher globally than for any other disease and yet this disease does

not sit high on National agendas. Clearly governments need to set priorities. Resources are key and these should be made available whether financial or material. The quality of the material goods and advice should be of a high standard. Often remote and poor communities have little access to advice or materials or where they do, the quality is dubious. Re-definition of the role of the Public sector has been an ongoing process and the realisation exists that few if any countries in Africa could provide an effective Veterinary Service from the public purse. Few if any countries have acted on this to rationalise the approach. To ensure service delivery for the public good there needs to be delegation of other duties to the private or community level.

Until there is financial and political commitment to PACE from AU it is difficult to ensure that the commitment from the international donor community continues. If there is no movement on this the recommendations will be of little effect and alternatives will need to be looked at. Vaccine banks upon which countries draw will need to be replenished by the countries as there will be no allocation of funds once PACE is closed. The OIE emergency fund however will remain.

Mr. Ian Talks

Presented the highlights of the financial component of the report.

There are still some questions as to the availability of extra funds for the regional component and at what level extra support is possible (4 or 5 million euro?) under the rules of the EDF for PACE. There is no question of the funds available to the National Components from EC but there is uncertainty as to the availability of funds budgeted from AU for the final stage of the programme. This is partly a result of the restructuring of AU. This problem will need to be rapidly resolved if progress is to be made.

The logical framework should not be changed just amended otherwise it will cause difficulties.

The National TA component is a compromise with a budget of 2.4 million Euro of which 0.8 m would have to be accessed from National programme contingencies. There would a certain amount of consolidation in the final phase and withdrawal of some TA s in the second year of the extension. In the International TA component there will be a phased reduction according to priorities with a hand over procedure to IBAR staff over the period.

The total cost of the Common services is EUR 5 million of which EUR 1 million must come from the AU. Assuming that National contributions are made to the CAHS, if this is not availed another EUR 800,000 would be needed.

There is considerable concern in relation to the management of the programme. Alternatives were raised including removal of responsibility. The recommendation was made not to do this as the time factor is too short. Delays from the EC side were looked at and the decentralisation process may help but the EC rules are complex and would need to be simplified in order to achieve the necessary changes and enable the programme to complete its work efficiently.

In Summary on the feasibility of extension:

- We need to know the financial ceiling for the extension of the regional component.
- National component adjustments need to be made under guidance of the PACE coordination.
- The AU contribution must be consolidated.
- The management of the programme must be strengthened.
- CAH activities and coordination of these under the regional component must be included and disagreements between CAPE and the Privatisation unit must be resolved.

Discussion on the draft final report - Participants

Risto Heimonen: The TA at the National level need to understand at what level discussions will be held and where the focus of the extension will lie at PCU/CSU or National level. Rinderpest is an important

component but we need to make sure the programme remains attractive to the governments and addresses their concerns. Need to know how the finances will be split to enable project development particularly for W&C Africa.

Director IBAR: There were limitations to the consultancy as it was urgent. Not all countries could be consulted. The report is draft so any contributions will be considered.

Guy Freeland: Country budgets have not been touched but we ask the focus to be according to the agreed priorities coordinated by the Regional component. Finance agreement does allow drawing rights to put money where there is a greater need and where money is not being effectively spent. There will need to be some movement but this unlikely to be significant. Finances for the extension were a major aspect of the consultancy. Taking rinderpest to the point of eradication is essential as the experience of JP15 showed the damage and consequences of a breakdown. This should be a clearly targeted focus of the PACE programme and extension period. Countries will need to decide how best to use the resources within the extension period and sustainable capacity should be established and where possible countries should demonstrate capacity.

Ian Talks: Countries need to complete full 5 years and this can fit within the extension period.

Detlef TA PACE Kenya: There is confusion on pg 36 as to where the money for the continuation of CAHS will come from. PARC is mentioned.

Guy Freeland: PARC money is not available and this is confirmed from Brussels.

Detlef: Kenya not happy about the general tenor on rinderpest. They are worried about the responsibility that Kenya will have if rinderpest is not eradicated.

Guy Freeland: The focus of the document on outputs is towards rinderpest eradication and verification. There was consideration of providing a simplified management approach to the eradication of rinderpest for example through the Somali programme.

Fritz Mahler: There is consideration of some Somalia funds being allocated to the rinderpest eradication. There is also a question on the management of the CAH Somalia ecosystem field activities and if transboundary this may be difficult. Under 7.2 it is not clear how the management is integrated between PACE and EC Somalia.

Guy Freeland: The CAH activities should not be confined to the Somali ecosystem but it is of particular importance in this system. The manner in which CAHWs participate need to be coordinated by PACE through the PEU.

Andy Catley: There is a need for the CAH to have a cross border approach – it will be difficult for PACE Somalia to undertake activities in Kenya or Ethiopia. One reason for the regional component is to finance and execute the cross border activities. At the moment if field level funding is restricted to National level there will not be sufficient funds for the cross border activities.

Chris Rutabarika: The TA contribution was seen for 2 years with short term consultancy to cover remaining needs. Has this position changed? There is also a question of the requirement of an annual work plan at the EC level how does this fit with the suggestion of a single 2 year work plan.

Guy Freeland: The original plan was for more than 2 years it was simply delayed. The presence of the TAs has assisted to improve the speed of work plan management and preparation. There needs to be a much smoother process to ensure the work can be done in the 2 years when compared to the previous 5 years. One way to achieve this is to have a single preparation with 2 budgets which are drawn up against a single work plan. The period of TA extension is advised that 9 TA are retained for the first year and 4 for the second year.

Director IBAR: AU has been undergoing restructuring since the signing of the financing agreement. This takes time. At the HQ level the top management is in place. There is a technical head of the organisation and deputy and all commissioners are technical = professionalisation. There is movement now to the regional components and the principle is technical competence. The process has therefore been slowed down. By October there will be a full compliment of staff at IBAR.

TA Tanzania: From the donor point of view reading the document, how to justify the result 4 (strengthen IBAR capacity) when the fashion is decentralisation and a participatory approach. The other issue is the regionalisation of concern on rinderpest Tanzania is left out by neither being in the Somali system or in W&C Africa. The other concern is that will total privatisation and community based health delivery improve Animal Health delivery to the poor farmer.

Guy Freeland: Tanzania could fit in the OIE pathway timeframe for verification of freedom from rinderpest infection. On privatisation it is not an all or none approach but we know from bitter experience that with funding public sector veterinary services have been a partial or complete failure.

As the public purse remains static and demands increase the chance of vet services being sustained are difficult to see. There will always be concerns of public good and this will need to be addressed but the mechanism of doing this will involve community based systems to be sustainable. Veterinarians are expensive and not necessarily keen to be located where the service is required in remote and difficult areas. Legislation should be adjusted to enable the functioning of the system.

Francis Nganji: The priorities of the extension are not consistent with the IBAR policies and those of the National Programmes. Rinderpest eradication is a component but there are other issues and in particular CBPP was identified and control of transboundary disease. Improvement of capacity to do this was a recommendation of the Ministers.

The belief that TA input to enable the work plans to move forward is essential in my opinion is not the issue. The concerns over management are also surprising as the structure exists in IBAR and is functional. There has been too much micromanagement of the programme by the donor. The recommendation of contracting out is not well received as we have examples where this has failed. There have been 4 experts who have worked from Europe in the programme and these were responsible and if they have gone the communications cannot stop. Communication must continue. It is a serious issue that needs to be addressed.

Guy Freeland: the rinderpest issue is not seen as a problem by many countries but sadly the evidence is such that until it is eradicated the risk is a major concern. The implications of giving up now are serious. The approach of a programme without time bound and specific verifiably achievable objectives is not acceptable to the donors. One of the outputs must be a new proposal on the final and verifiable eradication of rinderpest perhaps by 2012.

The comments on communication were based on a consideration of the overall programme – those outputs are needed before the beginning of the extension period. There needs to be operational support for certain units. AU needs to come up with support for the communications and economics unit.

Jan Talks: Where TA support is drawn is not exclusive to Europe it is up to the programme and IBAR to decide on the sourcing of appropriately qualified personnel.

Daniel Bourzat: The *Aide-Mémoire* has too much a project approach and not enough of a PACE mission. The PCU believe it is a budget driven recommendation. TA extension and international expertise with an emphasis on advancing African expertise with short term consultancy as required. There is no chance of eradicating rinderpest from the current focus during the life of PACE including the extension. Eradication will need a coordinated approach using the PACE Somalia funds and soliciting other funds and support from available resources –NGOs, International Bodies. The main outputs of the extension should be:

1. Appropriation and ownership of PACE at national and regional level
2. Reinforcement of capacity at National and Regional Level
3. Consultants mobilisation
4. Rinderpest eradication in Somali ecosystem

Rene Bessin: Need a structured approach to the final preparation of the report. There needs to be full discussion and details on the CAHWs approach to eradication of rinderpest. The situation at country level is not well analysed in the document.

Bouna Diop: The draft report is lacking in analysis of country programmes. The definition of activities at the National level should be confirmed. We need to agree what to do and work together to decide on what is to be done within coordination. The meeting will benefit from agreement on the 4 priorities listed in the document.

Bernard Mtigenyo: I only received the document this morning and I am concerned that the document does not represent the views that were given to the consultancy. They were captured in the mid term review report. Please read it and this will assist in the understanding. Kenya needs to be left with the funding originally approved and the extension phase needs further funds with the critical role of Kenya within the Somali ecosystem. The proposal to remove euro 150000 to finance PACE Regional coordination extension from Kenya is strongly objected to by Kenya. It must be remembered that PACE Kenya was slow in starting due to delays in the release of funds and it has had to deal with at least 2 rinderpest emergencies unlike any other country. Kenya is in a critical position in rinderpest eradication and will need the support for the extension period to 2006.

The CAHWS approach must be properly defined and the sustainability of the Veterinary Services examined further. We repeat there has not been time to discuss the report internally. Another small point is that although interviewed I am not acknowledged in the document.

Director IBAR: The reason there is no country specific information is because the time constraint did not allow a fair examination of each country position in the consultancy. A few priority countries were selected. The omissions of persons interviewed is no doubt unintentional and will be corrected (Kenya and economics).

Guy Freeland: We have not commented on all country programmes because this was not possible in the time allowed but we have focused on realistic time bound targets for the extension. This will impress the governments and provides a framework. Targets are made for different levels – e.g. 10 dossiers are submitted to OIE on rinderpest freedom by 2007. This is the responsibility of the PCU. If this is not done the credibility of the Veterinary Services will ultimately suffer.

Risto Heinonen: it was mentioned that it was important to develop a strategy for the Somali ecosystem. It is stated in the consultancy that the time period for eradication within the PACE timeframe is insufficient. Additional resources will have to be sought and maybe the PACE Somalia funding might be the appropriate mechanism. An exit strategy for rinderpest eradication will be needed soon.

Otto Moller: Where are we on the mid term review of the Somali programme?

Fritz Mahler: This starts next week. An aspect will be the continuation of the activities for rinderpest eradication whether under extension or the wider Somali programme.

Otto Moller: If the mid term review can look at the consultant's report this would be advisable so that aspects can be incorporated in the submission to Brussels from the Somali review.

Jotham Musiime: Why not look at the ecosystem rather than the country? This will allow a better coordinated approach.

Henry Wamwayi: In the extension phase there is no research component. All the budget is for community based approaches. We have had 10 years of activities with this strain and much needs to be done on the precise identification of the current circulating strain(s) this can only be achieved through scientific research Will you consider a budget allocation for this. Based on the strains recovered (1 over 10 years) is strategy formulation realistic by December 2005.

Emmanuel Thambi: Ref. Table 5 and 7 I believe the main criteria is the budget limits and need for priorities. Why do we need to propose 3 new positions? The provision from AU is not guaranteed so what implications has this. Communications and economics are considered the component to be provided for by AU. For sustainability this should be considered. 2/3RD of the allocation are for international positions. We should look for savings and where should these come from? What are the objectives? We need to re-examine the most appropriate output. The extension period should take into account the four staff at AU currently under PACE as counterparts to allow AU enough time to consolidate the positions.

Gavin Thomson: If the report has to be finalised in a few days, the general thrust cannot change. Two issues are important, one the eradication of rinderpest and the lack of this being a priority to many countries and the other trade. We know that trade is an imperative and rinderpest is only one of many diseases of concern. Considerable progress has been made especially in the area of export zones and these ideas are accepted by the countries and the international communities. We need to keep a focus on this to persuade countries to support PACE and the future Veterinary services. There is considerable latitude available (increasingly) under international veterinary rules within the regulatory functions to enable Private delivery. We should not focus too much on the privatisation aspect as the only solution.

Director IBAR: The objective is to get a compromise between AU and EC on the main issues. The commission funds a number of AU activities. The issue of TA support is controversial in relation to the proportion of international to local support. Unless this is addressed it will be difficult to move forward.

Guy Freeland: This is always a difficult issue. The cuts proposed are higher proportionately to those of African expertise. The budgetary proportion is less due to the discrepancy between unit costs which right or wrong is the situation currently. The issue of African expertise following on into PACE. The lack of commitment by AU to the posts makes it very difficult for EU to fund positions which will not be sustained.

Ian Talks: The comment that 3 new positions have appeared is not correct.

Guy Freeland: They are not new posts just new names for the delivery of veterinary services. The focus was the integration of the CAPE and VLPU activities.

Emmanuel Thambi: I still believe the problem is there is too much emphasis on the funding of international TAs.

Richard Kock: I would like to support Thambi's point even from the point of view of an International TA. I am concerned that individual positions are not always justified especially in relation to areas of expertise where there is no counterpart. This does not amount to capacity building. This is relevant within my discipline in wildlife where the absence of an African counterpart has been of considerable concern to me ethically. I made this position clear at the last advisory committee that the ideal is 1 International and 1 local expert given the technical difficulties in wildlife veterinary work and lack of capacity for this in Africa.

Guy Freeland: Why is there no counterpart? I must re-emphasise that the commitment from AU is critical.

Director IBAR: The discussion should not be blocked by the concern over AU as this is unacceptable.

Daniel Bourzat: We need to de-personalise the issues and look at posts in relation to the need. International or otherwise depending on the speciality and availability of qualified staff.

TA Tanzania: Regional coordination of the CAHWs seems unnecessary. It is not likely that one size fits all in relation to this aspect of veterinary service delivery. There is a need for the policy and regulations to be supported.

Director IBAR: These activities are ongoing but they remain unofficial and difficulties arise once you come to veterinary boards and at the University level. These issues are now at the international level and the OIE has a committee looking into this. Avoiding the issues will not help there is a need for official recognition and regulation.

Abdul Latif: With CAHWs in a country like Somalia there are considerable problems with NGO initiated activities. This needs to be spearheaded by the professionals. The approach should be changed. If the professionals are sidelined this will destroy morale. There is no problem in integrating CAHWs into a veterinary delivery system in principle it is how this is done.

Director IBAR: The Somalia situation is unique as there is no central authority which is factor that will affect the application of veterinary services involvement of NGOs etc.

Dominic Kiarie: There are errors in the table 3 on actual salaries, home-leave and travel allowances on a number of lines, these need to be corrected.

Regional TA West Africa: Need to look at the country level and the sustainability of the programme especially in relation to the coordinators activities with governments to persuade buy in by the countries.

Director IBAR: The point is well taken as there needs to be commitment at both levels regional and National. This will need more emphasis in the extension period.

TA PACE Kenya: There is no mention in the report of many countries in East Africa such as Congo Rwanda etc. The regional TA is expected to do a great deal of work in 12 months.

Director IBAR: These countries are placed under the Central African coordination.

Risto Heinonen: The data management unit is a lone person and the outputs on the data system have been a considerable achievement. Support should continue on the establishment of this system.

Andy Catley: The CBPP policy has been moved forward by PEU and is a considerable achievement especially in regard to its real impact. There is no evidence of this as a focus in the report.

Otto Moller: One concern is there is a perceived need to disseminate the success stories of PACE. This must be addressed.

Is IAEA/OIE to continue support under the extension period? Are there other donors.

Karim Tounkara: There has not been an official approach beyond March 2005.

Director IBAR: A 3 day meeting was held with IAEA and they recommend a consultancy to look into further funding and support. TOR are being prepared.

Otto Moller: 5 million appears to be the figure that is available but an answer should be available soon. There are a number of these issues that need to be clarified between AU and EC. The issue of rescheduling of TAs will also need to be clarified. Savings from PARC were 3.5 m euro

Guy Freeland: Advised Brussels had commented on the TA position but the recommendations did not make any savings.

Mohamed Bahari: Looking at the logframe there are some clarifications needed. How binding are the global work plans in preparation of the extension work plans?

Otto Moller: There is some flexibility through the drawing rights clause.

Risto Heinonen: The Machakos logframe was simply a working document to attempt to operationalise the Financing agreement logframe.

Guy Freeland: Answered the question of Bahari by saying in summary that the logframe would not be changed it is simply the extension provides specific targets time bound for the project.

Otto Moller: Asked if there was a SWOT analysis?

Guy Freeland: The monitoring team advised there was no point doing a swot analysis.

Fritz Mahler: Enhancement of private sector under output 3 and in activities in the logframe. Is the meaning to underline the private public sector linkages. Cross border harmonisation is not reflected in the log frame and an exit strategy should be seen within the activities.

Daniel Bourzat: Recommends a full TA team to at least October 2004.

Guy Freeland: There is a special situation in Somalia – no state system exists. Nevertheless the public private aspects need to be resourced. They need to be fully defined.

Otto Moller: Sustainability – what about the trade issues and export zones. There might be reference to this in the report.

Gavin Thomson: There is a process, which is ongoing to look at the potential for export zones and it is recognised as a way forward even within international circles. There is considerable latitude within these ideas for involvement of both private and public sectors in the establishment and management of these zones.

Rene Bessin: The way forward is now for the PCU and the consultant team to try to sit down and incorporate for the Commission in Brussels all the comments into a final document. This document should be ratified by AU IBAR.

Detlef: The lack of knowledge on the ceiling will constrain the conclusion of the document.

Guy Freeland: The position of EC was that the funds for country programmes are adequate for completion of the 5 year programme in each country. There is also facility for drawing rights. On the issue of the ceiling the report is worked on the basis of 4 million.

Director IBAR: The country issue will dealt with separately from the regional issue.

Paul Mertens: No problem with the National programmes going for the 2 years of extension as they will have adequate funds for 5 or 6 years. The problem is the regional component.

Director IBAR: This will be dealt with directly between countries and the coordination and donor.

Paul Mertens: There is capacity within country programmes for funding of TAs.

Daniel Bourzat: The issue of TA at the country level – it is a matter of discussion between PCU and the countries and establishment of criteria for the need.

Otto Moller: PCU has drawing rights strategy.....

Daniel Bourzat: This is being handled by Bouna Diop in relation to countries.

Ian Talks: There are certain special budget lines which are unused 2 m euro and 800,000 e.g. visibility and it is not clear whether these could be used for country programmes etc.

Otto Moller: Brussels should be asked if these funds could be utilised.

TA Tanzania: This visibility fund. Is it possible from a national programme level to request some funds to develop small projects for promotion of the programme?

Rene Bessin: This money is controlled out of Brussels.

Otto Moller: It might be possible for the regional delegation to authorise this.

Solomon Haile Miriam: The objectives of rinderpest eradication mean that 2007 is too early to stop. There needs to be a conclusion to the initiative, which requires funding. This must be addressed in the report.

Guy Freeland: The work to eradicate rinderpest should be finished by 2006 and the remaining aspect is verification and this will be something desired by the country. Countries should find it in their own interest to ensure their status is recognised internationally. There may be some modifications in the pathway to reduce the complexity especially for some countries which have not vaccinated for many years.

Gavin Thomson: There are 5 proposals made to the OIE and an ad hoc group is this week sitting to consider the modifications. IBAR have influenced OIE on this matter which is an achievement.

Otto Moller: I need support in the next 3 months for the preparation of the extension and some money must be allocated for the final evaluation of the project.

Director IBAR: AU constitutive act allows for acting positions, which are substantive. The Director is able to act. On management shortcomings – we need to know more specifically what is of concern.

Guy Freeland: The specifics are that management has been weak leading to delays in execution of the programme. There are elements of responsibility in IBAR and in the Donor offices.

Director IBAR: This is not reflected in the document accurately. The responsibilities and failures should be more clearly defined.

Guy Freeland: The relevant sections will be revisited and attempts at improved clarity will be made.

Daniel Bourzat: There is no point in attempting funding at EDF level. The ceiling is chosen to simplify the process and ensure we have an agreeable document for submission within a week.

Director IBAR: This should not be too complicated but we need to get our act together to ensure a good document. Please make contributions in writing before leaving.

Nicolas: Asked that the contribution from Bamako on the conditions for extension be considered by the consultants.

Daniel Bourzat: Advised that this has been done.

MAIN POINTS OF DISCUSSION:

National level PACE

Country programme extension straightforward with some concern from Kenya at least on the use of contingencies for the regional component.

Some concern over the possibility or not of a single country programme to use funds transboundary e.g. PACE Somalia.

Concern over the structure and implementation of the CAH in countries under the programme.

Need to create a single work plan for 2 year extension raised some concern over procedures.

Concern over impact of regional policy/priorities on National programmes i.e. priorities under extension.

Regional coordination and common services – IBAR capacity

Financing a problem and attempts to cut back and save costs especially in TA not considered fair or appropriate by AU and a number of participants. The crux of this argument lies with the commitment by AU to the IBAR expert positions currently funded under PACE EC money. There appears to be polarisation on this.

Management weakness at different levels – at IBAR PACE and EC were considered and discussed and the need to be more specific emphasised.

Rinderpest as a regional issue was re-emphasised and problems over the eradication highlighted including the difficulty in achieving verification of eradication in the life of PACE and the continuing need to improve understanding through research surveillance and PDS and the need to develop an appropriate strategy and mechanism to achieve eradication especially with improved CAH. The focus on rinderpest at the expense of other activities was a concern to many and it was recommended that within the framework of the activities under rinderpest surveillance and eradication that other diseases and priorities should be addressed where possible. There should be continued efforts particularly from Common Services to tackle the issues such as export zones, international regulations on disease control at OIE, policy on diseases in Africa such as CBPP.

A number of other less critical issues were discussed.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Dr Michael Handlos	TA Ethiopia – Addis Ababa
Dr Mohammed M. Bahari	PACE Tanzania National Coordinator
Dr C.S. Rutebarika	PACE Uganda National Coordinator
Mr Francis Chabari	GTZ-IS TA Programme Coordinator
Mr Robert Schrembs	GTZ Department Regional Director IS
Dr Guy George Freeland	Veterinarian Consultant
Dr Philippe F.R. Leperre	TA PACE Tanzania
Dr Detlef W. Hoereth-Boentgen	TA PACE Kenya
Dr Ankers Philippe	Head of Mission VSF-Swisse
Mr Otto Moller	Rural Development Advisor, Delegation of the EC, Kenya
Mr Friedrich Mahler	Somali PACE National Coordinator, EC, Kenya
Dr Bernard Maina Mugenyo	PACE Kenya National Coordinator
Dr Jotham Musiime	Ag. Director AU/IBAR
Dr Solomon J.M. Munyua	AU/IBAR Pastoral Policy Specialist
Dr Solomon Haile Mariam	AU/IBAR FITCA Regional Coordinator
Dr Bernard Toutain	FITCA-EMMC Coordinator
Mr. Ian Talks	Consultant Agricultural Economist
Dr Daniel Bourzat	Main Adviser, AU/IBAR PACE
Dr Rene Bessin	Programme Coordinator, AU/IBAR PACE
Dr Gavin Thomson	AU/IBAR PACE Main Epidemiologist
Dr Gijs Van't Klooster	PACE Epidemiologist for E.Africa
Dr Karim Toukara	AU/IBAR PACE IAEA Regional Expert
Dr Bidjeh Kebkiba	AU/IBAR PACE Counterpart Epidemiologist
Dr Bouna Diop	PACE Regional Coordinator for West and Central Africa
Dr Nicolas Denormandie	Regional TA (Coastal Francophone countries) PACE Mali
Dr Daniel Gregoire	AU/IBAR PACE Communication Bamako
Dr Andy Catley	AU/IBAR, CAPE
Dr Emmanuel Tambi	AU/IBAR PACE Economist
Mr Onesnius W Maina	AU/IBAR PACE Economist
Mr Paul Mertens	AU/IBAR PACE Financial Controller
Dr Richard Kock	AU/IBAR PACE Wildlife Officer
Dr Francis Inganji	AU/IBAR PACE Communications expert
Dr Eric Fermet Quinet	AU/IBAR Technical Assistant (RALEA)
Dr Henry M. Wamwayi	PACE Somalia Component Project Advisor
Dr George Gitau	AU/IBAR Scientific Officer
Dr Abdi Abdullatif Mohamud	Somali PACE Project Coordinator

ANNEX 7 ORGANOGRAM FOR COORDINATION OF PACE ACTIVITIES IN THE SOMALIA ECOSYSTEM

ANNEX 8 PROGRESS ALONG THE OIE PATHWAY

West Africa:

The 9 countries that have already obtained “freedom from disease” status, could obtain “freedom from infection” by 2005, while Cote D’Ivoire which obtained the status of “freedom from disease” in 2004, could reach “freedom from infection” by 2006. It must also be expected that Mauretania’s “freedom from disease” status should soon be restored to it.

At least 5 of the following countries, Gabon, Gambia, Equatorial Guinea, DRC, Congo Brazaville, Guinea Bissau and Nigeria, could reach “freedom from disease” status at country-wide level in 2005 and “freedom from infection” in 2007.

East Africa:

Eritrea should obtain “freedom from disease” in 2004 and “freedom from infection” in 2006.

Burundi, Djibouti, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Uganda, could each obtain “freedom from disease” in 2005 and “freedom from infection” in 2007.

Ethiopia and Sudan could each achieve zonal “freedom from disease in 2005. Currently, OIE does not recognize “freedom from infection” on a zonal basis but, again, **IBAR should make a case to OIE for such status to be recognized.** Having serological proof of absence of virus from these two very important areas would be of enormous significance.

In summary, therefore:

- 9 countries should be able to obtain “freedom from infection” status by end of 2005
- 2 countries should be able to obtain “freedom from infection” status by end of 2006, plus Mauretania perhaps
- 12 countries should be able to obtain “freedom from disease” status by end of 2005, followed by “freedom from infection” status by end of 2007

IBAR should make a case to OIE that, where countries have neither had any clinical case nor have vaccinated any animals for several years, the **“freedom from infection” status might be applied for after just one year’s serological survey instead of the current two.** If this were to be accepted most of the above countries (23 in all) could have completed their dossiers by end of 2006 (or earlier) and have their status officially confirmed by OIE early 2007.

Additionally, 2 countries, Ethiopia and Sudan, could achieve zonal “freedom from disease” status by 2005. If the OIE were to permit “freedom from infection” status on a zonal basis, then they too might have the incentive to complete their serum surveys before the end of the project

ANNEX 9 ORIGINAL REGIONAL COMPONENT BUDGET

Table 1 Summary of Budgeted Regional Component in Global Plan

Unit	Item*	Total Cost EUR**	EUR/Year
CSU			
Epidemiology	Central Unit	1,800,000	360,000
Epidemiology	Sub-Regional Unit, Nairobi***	890,000	178,000
Wildlife		887,000	177,000
Communication		1,862,000	372,000
Economics		600,000	120,000
Privatisation		880,000	176,000
CAPE		-	-
Financial		1,025,000	205,000
Data Managm't		335,000	67,000
Others	Research	1,500,000	
	Advisory Committee	287,000	
	PANVAC	992,000	
	Other Monitoring Costs	280,000	
	Review and Evaluations	812,000	
	Veterinary Schools Support	290,000	
	Sub Total	4,161,000	832,000
TOTAL CSU		12,442,000	2,487,000
PCU			
Nairobi		1,693,000	339,000
Bamako		1,822,300	365,000
TOTAL PCU		3,515,000	704,000
TOTAL PCU/CSU		15,957,000	3,191,000

Source: Mission estimate based on Five Year Global Plan. Notes * includes TA, local staff, running costs, excludes capital items. ** For Five years *** Bamako Regional Unit separate budget and TA provided by French Cooperation. Also, Ndjamenia Western Cordon Sanitaire excluded. Other Notes: 1. The IAEA Laboratory Specialist is funded by IAEA (until March 2005). 2. DFID funds the CAPE Unit and therefore excluded from above. 3. The Bamako PCU costs include EUR 240,000 for the OIE Veterinary Representative and his secretarial support and travel costs.