

RTE – Follow up reporting – February 2009

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
1. FAO now needs to adjust its overall approach to begin to gradually move from the early mainly 'fire-fighting' emergency mode to include a longer-term perspective which seeks the solution to the continuing HPAI crisis in terms of the larger development and economic context.	<p>Accepted – however, there is a need to keep in mind that the situation still remains an emergency from the public health and poultry sector perspectives. Emergency response capacity is still crucial to stop any incursion of the disease in newly infected countries or regions. It is acknowledged that the disease will not be eliminated in the short term.</p> <p>Condition for a longer-term development approach to HPAI crisis management to be sustainable is the availability of (extrabudgetary) resources for sustaining such an approach. Given the short-term, emergency-type funding so far available to the programme, this paradigm shift will require corresponding shifts in donor strategies and priorities.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Revision of the Global Program, Feb 2008</p> <p>OWOH strategy, October 2008</p>		<p>The last version (February 2008) of the FAO's Global Program - updated after the first RTE - provides a framework for an appropriate balance between the short and longer term actions through FAO's commitment to both emergency and strategic planning sector interventions. While there is still a need for emergency responses to address requests from countries that have been infected recently or re-infected, greater attention is increasingly given to strategic and longer-term issues such as socioeconomic factors, impact of disease and control programmes on the food security of the most vulnerable, protection of biodiversity, and restructuring of poultry industries and farming systems. Together, these two dimensions, emergency response and longer-term actions, will ensure effective prevention and control of the disease in the animal population while protecting livelihoods</p> <p>The medium to longer planning horizons are reflected in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FAO's normative (AGAH) activities, with as the main example the development of guidelines on the poultry sector restructuring (Poultry in the 21st century, November 2007; biosecurity for highly pathogenic avian influenza, October 2008; role of the insurance system in HPAI and the poultry sector, on-going). Many country projects supporting the HPAI Global programme now support longer term assistance and almost all systematically include national poultry sector reviews as well as assessments of national biosecurity in place. - FAO's operational (ECTAD) activities: while large part of the funding of the ECTAD programme is still based on contributions for maximum of 18 months activities are planned, when possible, to ensure medium term assistance. Projects now almost all systematically include national poultry sector reviews as well as assessments of national biosecurity in place. <p>It is important to note that the flexibility of the Global Program allows shifts to short- or longer-term interventions in response to new circumstances, challenges or priorities.</p>

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
				<p>In terms of funding, close to 80% of FAO's funding portfolio for HPAI activities are dedicated to non-emergency short to medium term interventions. It is too early to say whether donors will embark to longer term funding. Winnipeg technical meeting (March 2009) and Hanoi International conference on AHI (early 2010) will be crucial milestones to try and shift Donors' vision towards longer term objectives.</p> <p>The transition away from short-term responses towards more sustainable capacity and systems strengthening is even further reinforced in the newly developed 'One-World-One-Health strategy discussed and adopted in the Sharm-El-Sheik International Conference on AHI, October 2008, addressing HPAI and other Infectious Emerging Diseases. THE OWOH Strategy encourages a long-term vision to address issues of public good, beyond the normal 3–5-year political time horizons This will consequently be reflected in the subsequent OWOH Program FAO is currently developing, as the next step to FAO's Global Program for the prevention and control of HPAI.</p>
2. FAO needs to revise the format and content of the <u>Global Programme</u> with wider participation (and buy-in) inside and outside FAO, careful attention to the March 2007 Global Strategy document, careful consideration of budget needs, identification of clear indicators of success and means of measuring them, and incorporation of the gradual change of emphasis of the campaign from the short-term to the longer-term. Following revision and with highest priority, FAO needs to approve, publicly	Accepted	Yes. Revision of the Global Program, Feb 2008		<p>The Global Program has been revised in February 2008 taking into account of the RTE results, in line with the FAO-OIE Global Strategy for the prevention and control of H5N1 HPAI (version dated March 2007). The major modifications – also based on the lessons learnt from the first 2 years of implementation – mainly include: a shift towards longer term-interventions, with a better consideration of the socio-economic factors (See Recommendation 1); a new prioritisation in terms of targeted countries, according to the constant evolution of the epidemiological situation.</p> <p>A detailed logical framework, comprising verifiable indicators and means of verification for each outcome, was included to the last revision of the Global Program (Feb 2008), see its annex 1. The evaluation of the first phase of the Global Program (2006-2008) scheduled in 2009 will be based on the logical framework. In line with the HPAI Global Program, all HPAI projects are now designed using a logframe approach with clearly defined objectives and performance indicators to measure progress. This encourages field officers to report on results and will also facilitate the Global Program overall evaluation (2009).</p>

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
present and widely distribute this revised Global Programme document to clarify its actions to beneficiaries, donors and all stakeholders.				<p>It is to be noted that the last revision of the Global Program was based on a wide internal consultation process both at HQ and decentralised offices, taking full account of concerns from key partners and donors.</p> <p>This version has been widely distributed through FAO's field offices, during the Sharm-El-Sheik international conference on AHI (October 2008) and is currently available on FAO public website at: http://www.fao.org/avianflu/en/index.html</p>
3. The <u>Global Strategy</u> needs to be revised to provide direction and structure to the longer term work above and in addition to the immediate disease control response to avian influenza. In orchestrating the conceptual aspects of the shift from emergency to rehabilitation and development, the experience and collaboration of TCER would be most valuable.	Accepted - however, it is unclear how familiar TCER is with livestock development issues. An appropriate balance between both tracks (immediate/medium- and long-term perspectives) to be maintained as commented above under Recommendation No.1	Yes Revision of the Global Strategy, October 2008		<p>The FAO-OIE Global HPAI Strategy was lastly revised – in collaboration with WHO - in October 2008 and reflects the latest development of the HPAI epidemiological situation worldwide.</p> <p>The revised global strategy presented here is based on the experience and lessons learned from the involvement of FAO and OIE in the global control of H5N1 HPAI over the last four years. As a result, the updates include a shift in emphasis in countries with entrenched/endemic infection away from emergency measures to longer-term measures that address the factors in the poultry production and marketing systems (that allow the viruses to persist).</p> <p>As mentioned in Recommendation 1, the new strategy OWOH is based on long term and multidisciplinary approaches to animal diseases prevention and control.</p> <p>The revision process involved a large group of staff from FAO and also experts from OIE and WHO. TCER has not been associated with this revision exercise.</p>
4. The Global Strategy, as all design documents of the HPAI work, needs to indicate means of measuring progress toward its goals. A serious log frame exercise would be beneficial, and indicators for understanding	Accepted (see response to recommendation No 3)		No	<p>A logical framework per se has not been included into the Global Strategy. The Global program is the expression and the implementation framework of the Global Strategy and therefore it is expected that the evaluation of the FAO Global Program (2006-2008) and the subsequent phase (2009-20011) in addition to close follow up and monitoring of the situation on the disease will contribute to measuring progress of the FAO implementation work within the Global Strategy on HPAI.</p>

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
success or failure as well as suggested means of measurement are essential. This might be achieved through a facilitated exercise with a planning and log frame expert.				In 2008, a quantitative and qualitative technical assessment of the countries capacities based on 9 selected indicators (preparedness at the animal source; surveillance capacities; laboratory capacities; response capacities; vaccination; compensation; biosecurity level; sectoral coordination; geographic coordination) has been conducted. While this is not an evaluation of the Global Strategy <i>per se</i> , it however gives quite precise indications of the progresses the countries – following the Global Strategy - made towards the eradication of the disease. The assessment is available upon request.
5. FAO needs to focus sufficient resources in both the Global Strategy and the Global Programme on better understanding these factors and developing specific strategies and policy recommendations to address them, as they will be a key element in achieving success with the return to 'normal' after the HPAI crisis. This work should be done with leadership from AGAL.	Partially accepted. Comment: Underlying factors and long-term strategies refer to both biological factors (biology of the pathogen), capacity of animal health services to prevent and control TADs (including institutional, policy and socio-economic tools) and institutional, socio-economic and farming system factors. There is a need to keep an appropriate balance between these various dimensions which are all important to be considered when addressing the prevention and control of diseases. Strengthening the socio- economic, farming systems, policy and institutional programme dimensions is strongly supported. This needs to be reflected also, however, in the donor profiles and	Yes since 2007 – on-going		<p>AGAL and AGAP continue to work together within the thematic group to bring elements of socio-economics and production within the programme. Through 2007-8, representation at regional and country level was expanded (staff in East and West Africa, RAP, Indonesia, Egypt). In Viet Nam there was never a permanent presence but quite a lot of backstopping time was provided by those in the HQ team who had previous work experience in the country. In Bangladesh there was a strong resistance to the presence of a social scientist in the team. Details of the programme and outputs will be provided to the RTE.</p> <p>The “Friday morning” seminars of the Socio-economic group, which are open to wide attendance within and outside ECTAD, have continued to be used as a vehicle to present issues of both strategic and tactical relevance in controlling HPAI taking a multi-disciplinary perspective (presentations an minutes of the meetings re circulated and can be made available to the RTE upon request). The group has also used multi-disciplinary teams and approaches to explore questions (most notably in linking value chain mapping to identification of potential risks).</p> <p>Funding was partially secured at global level using TSS and a number of socio-economic and farming system activities were included in many of the country projects. But longer term contracts of experts in this field were still missing due to the nature of the donor agreements which are mostly short-term. This makes difficult to put together a coherent programme.</p> <p>In addition:</p>

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
	preferences in order to materialize.			<p>- A combined 2009 planning workshop for 2009 activities was held in December 2008 with attendance by AGAL, AGAP and TCE staff resulting in a 2009 workplan approved by AGAH;</p> <p>- a working paper on combining epidemiology and value chain analysis was produced in December 2008.</p>
6. Starting with an in-depth re-examination of the functions required for FAO's HPAI efforts, FAO will need to renew the management structure of its HPAI response along the lines described below and in Section III.6.F, in order to incorporate the non-animal health aspects into the structure on an equal footing with animal health and emergency response work, and to strengthen the existing management arrangements in areas where they have been inadequate	<p>Partially accepted.</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>As confirmed above, the need to strengthen the socio-economic programme activities is recognized; however, the basic question posed to FAO centres on how to prevent and control HPAI and other TADs. Non-animal health disciplines should not to be put in a leading position but rather at the service of animal health improvement. The focal point in FAO regarding animal health, for coordinating FAO's response to livestock diseases, whether emergency or long-term in nature and for interfacing with the authorities responsible for animal health in the member countries (national CVOs) has to be FAO's CVO.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Revised ECTAD structure, organisational chart and ToRs, September 2007</p>		<p><i>Remainder - The Emergency Centre for Transboundary Animal Diseases (ECTAD) was officially established by the Director-General in December 2004 in the context of FAO's commitments in the fight against HPAI H5N1 to guarantee an enhanced response by associating the Animal Production and Health Division (AGA) and the Emergency Operations and Rehabilitation Division (TCE) in this operation. From 2004 to 2007, the following entities have been added to the ECTAD initial structure: the FAO-OIE CMC-AH (under TCE); the EMPRES-AH, the Socio-Economic, Production and Biodiversity, and the Communication Units. The EMPRES-AH Unit is broken down into 4 sub-Units: the epizootic strategies, policies and guidelines, FAO-OIE-WHO GLEWS, OIE-FAO OFFLU and wildlife. Such a structure is able to respond to immediate needs (CMC-AH) and longer-term interventions. The profound structural changes FAO underwent within less than 3 years demonstrated the Institution capacities to promptly adapt and respond to the needs of its members countries.</i></p> <p>In September 2007, the ECTAD Oversight Committee approved the revised ECTAD organizational structure, Terms of Reference and organigramme (documents available upon request). The note on ECTAD structure and function was further revised and approved by OCD, ADG-AG and ADG-TC and distributed to all FAO country, sub-regional and regional representations clearly indicating the relationship between ECTAD and FAO decentralized offices. Terms of reference have distributed clear roles and responsibilities among the established Unit (they are available upon request). This revision was driven by the need (i) to address the HPAI H5N1 situation that had become progressively globalized affecting Asia, Europe, Africa and the Near East, (ii) to reflect lessons learned in the first two years of ECTAD operations as well as (iii) to respond to the increased requirements of the effective and efficient delivery of the avian influenza programme.</p>

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
				<p>The revised structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confirmed the importance of a unified command system in ECTAD, with the leadership responsibility conferred to the FAO's Chief Veterinary Officer (CVO) - also the head of the Animal Health Service. The CVO therefore has a pivotal and unique command role to define appropriate strategies and to lead the implementation and monitoring of the Global Program for HPAI. - Established professional working groups which encompass socio-economics, farming systems, policy and institutional dimensions, as well as wildlife aspects and media & development communication tasks (see also Recommendation 1).
<p>7. It is recommended that this should be the responsibility of an HPAI Coordination Unit under the leadership of an HPAI Director at D2 level. It will require the creation of an <i>ad hoc</i> position, funded with extrabudgetary funds, possibly in TCD (rather than a technical department) to allow access to technical divisions across departments. The Coordination Unit should be small, with no more than 3-4 staff in addition to the director. ECTAD would continue to function similarly to its current situation for emergency response, under the coordination of the HPAI Director.</p>	<p>Deferred:</p> <p>While management agrees with most findings in this Section, it has reservations with regard to this recommendation on migration of the programme to a new coordination/management structure, suggested to be led by a D2-level official. In line with the recommendations of the IEE, management is working to improve and streamline FAO's emergency response, including its management structure, through the introduction of a corporate framework based on the Incident Command System (ICS) which envisages a systematic, organization-wide transition to assembling emergency management teams under the leadership of dedicated full-</p>			

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
	time coordinators recruited from across the Organization and released by their units to undertake such assignments; once established, animal health-related emergency management operations will follow such arrangements. Management is committed to closely follow the consolidation of ECTAD in its current format and assess the efficiency of the HPAI programme management through its Oversight Committee and introduce changes as appropriate. The recommendation of the RTE will need further study with regard to cost implications and suitability in light of these processes.			

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
<p>Consolidation</p> <p>8. After a period of fluctuation and uncertainty, ECTAD is being consolidated at the management, systemic and procedural level and plans to consolidate regional presence through decentralized units is underway as well. The recent ECTAD team meetings were a positive step in this process. This work should continue and be supported but also be given a clear time frame to achieve that consolidation. Meanwhile no major structural changes should happen in the short run as that will diminish the positive effects of the consolidation taking place this year. This consolidation process should include the following (see greater detail in Section III.6.F):</p> <p>a. Develop and consolidate a strategy and a plan of action for ECTAD today</p> <p>b. Conduct a "talent review" within ECTAD to determine existing profiles and skills</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Process to be driven by the strategic and operational plans, not as an independent exercise.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Revised ECTAD structure, organisational chart and ToRs, September 2007</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structural consolidation (f) (g) <p>Under the ECTAD Oversight Committee,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ECTAD's consolidation at the central level: see Recommendation # 6. - ECTAD's consolidation at the decentralized level entailed the establishment of ECTAD regional, subregional and country units - distinct from FAO's regional, subregional and country offices but with which they work in close collaboration -, funded from extra-budgetary resources. <p>Whenever possible, and to enhance the needed collaboration between FAO and its global and regional partners in the combat against HPAI, some ECTAD decentralized units were located within the Regional Animal Health Centres. For example, the ECTAD subregional unit in Nairobi is hosted by AU-IBAR and the ECTAD subregional unit in Gaborone by OIE.</p> <p>To date, there is one ECTAD Regional Unit (Bangkok), 6 ECTAD subregional units (Kathmandu; Bamako, Nairobi, Gaborone, Beirut, Tunis). The opening of an ECTAD subregional unit for Central Asia in Ankara is being considered. Other countries/regions not covered by an ECTAD subregional unit (i.e. Eastern Europe, Latin America and Central Asia for the time being) are directly supported by ECTAD at FAO headquarters.</p> <p>ECTAD country teams have been established in several countries infected with HPAI, also funded on extra-budgetary resources. In most cases, ECTAD country teams are staffed with a country team leader and an operations officer.</p> <p>The first among equals concept of shared accountability but single leader is applied to the Directors of AGA & TCE as well as to lower levels of management.</p> <p><i>Conclusion:</i> less than 4 years after its initiation, ECTAD was consolidated at the central, regional, sub-regional and country level. Current concern is the sustainability of these entities funded on non-regular program resources and therefore linked to the current (and temporary) interest of the international</p>

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
<p>c. Invest more effort on the internal front to, better managing staff and their expectations</p> <p>d. Put accent on FAO's corporate identity for staff to develop a sense of belonging to FAO</p> <p>e. Better integrate the added value of EMPRES and GLEWS in the Global Strategy</p> <p>f. The Oversight Committee must take on full responsibility for the consolidation of ECTAD</p> <p>g. Apply 'first among equals' concept of shared accountability but single leader to the Directors of AGA & TCE</p> <p>h. Use external management consultants as resource to accompany the consolidation process</p>				<p>community of donors for HPAI. It is however foreseen that ECTAD will continue to be funded via the under development OWOH FAO Program (targeting HPAI and other IEDs). ECTAD's integration within the new framework of the CMC-Food Chain has also been agreed upon. This transition may ensure sustainability of ECTAD; however a key pre-requisite is that the direct chain of command from the FAO CVO remains unchanged.</p> <p>• Functional / operational consolidation (a) (c) (d)</p> <p>Arrangements for collaboration between HQ, decentralized FAO's offices and ECTAD Units have been clearly defined as follow:</p> <p>- The ECTAD Oversight Committee sets FAO's corporate policies concerning HPAI-TADs in the context of overall guidance by Governing Bodies assisted by FAO's CVO who formulates corporate HPAI - TADS policies and determines FAO's day-to-day response to the evolving global situation of HPAI – TADs and manages global partnerships (OIE, WHO, AU-IBAR and others).</p> <p>- Regional Representatives, subregional Coordinators and FAO Representatives lead FAO's overall response to, respectively, agreed regional, subregional or country assistance priorities following corporate policies including those on HPAI-TADs. Heads of decentralized offices provide guidance to the CVO on regional, subregional and country situations and priorities. Conversely, the CVO guides Heads of decentralized offices on corporate policies applicable in the field of HPAI-TADs.</p> <p>- The managers of ECTAD regional/subregional or country units work in the line of command of FAO's Chief Veterinary Officer (CVO). They provide technical assistance to regional/subregional organizations/groupings in close collaboration with the concerned regional Representative/subregional Coordinator and provide technical assistance to countries through the FAO Representative. Managers of ECTAD units assist Heads of decentralized offices with mainstreaming HPAI and TADs concerns into FAO's overall regional, subregional and country strategies and priority framework. Heads of decentralized offices provide ECTAD regional units with functional guidance on managerial and administrative issues, as well as regional</p>

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
				<p>priorities. In particular, the Assistant Director-General, Regional Representative for Asia and the Pacific, provides functional guidance to the ECTAD regional unit for Asia and the Pacific.</p> <p>- The ECTAD subregional units (Bamako, Beirut, Gaborone, Kathmandu, Nairobi and Tunis) coordinate their interventions with the respective subregional Coordinators. In addition to the livestock officers in the subregional offices, the managers of the ECTAD subregional units in Africa are members of the respective subregional multidisciplinary teams (MDTs). The subregional manager for West and Central Africa is expected to be a member of the two concerned MDTs.</p> <p>- In providing technical assistance on HPAI and TADS, the ECTAD country team operates under the direct supervision of the ECTAD country team leader who works in the line of command of the FAO CVO through the ECTAD regional/subregional managers. The ECTAD country teams receive functional guidance from the ECTAD regional units and ECTAD headquarters units. On the matters concerning the general FAO response to country priorities, on advocacy, policy, security and general managerial issues, ECTAD country team Leaders follow the functional guidance of the FAO Representative.</p> <p>In terms of better involving FAO staff in the process / program (c and d), four important meetings took place where FAO's role in the fight against HPAI has been comprehensively discussed:</p> <p>- 2nd CTA meeting for Asia (Bangkok, Thailand 23-28 January 2008)</p> <p>- 3rd Annual Regional Meeting for Asia (Pattaya, 11-13 February 2009),</p> <p>- 2nd CTA Meeting for Africa (Nairobi, 15-18 July 2008),</p> <p>- AGAH Retreat (8-9 December 2008 and 19 February 2009).</p> <p>It clearly emerged from recent meetings (ie Pattaya in February 2009) that staff substantially increased their sense of belonging to FAO.</p> <p>Talent review (b) is linked to the strengthening of technical and operational</p>

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
				<p>units within ECTAD as mentioned above. Each unit has reviewed the existing human resources, identified the skills needed and established the ToRs for head of units and subunits.</p> <p>Finally, ECTAD Management meetings have been reshaped / modified as follow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2 meetings are held per week; one of them is entirely dedicated to management issues and operational decisions; - More decision-making is provided during the meetings; - Specific thematic discussions are scheduled every other weeks; - Regional Unit in Bangkok systematically attends the meetings by audioconference; other regional and sub-regional Units attend the meetings when relevant by video or audioconference. <p>• Strategical consolidation (e)</p> <p>The revised FAO-OIE Global Strategy for prevention and control of H5N1 HPAI (October 2008) clearly states and emphasizes the roles of EMPRES and FAO-OIE-WHO GLEWS in its global level approach (see pages XIV and 5).</p> <p>The new CMC-FC describes the functional and structural organization and relations between EMPRES and the ECTAD levels.</p> <p>(f) Oversight committee has met regularly and has provided guidance to the implementation and overall strategy of ECTAD. Minutes are available. This OC-ECTAD is integrated into a wider CMC-FC OC involving animal health, plant health and food safety</p> <p>(h: no action taken)</p>

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
<p>Migration</p> <p>9. Once the consolidation is done successfully, and taking into consideration the immensity of the job at hand, ECTAD should migrate to the new coordination structure which is able to accommodate necessary change, regrouping functions and responsibilities along new work categories and placing a Director (at D2 level but outside the FAO Regular Programme structure and on extrabudgetary funds) to head the new organization. This transformation process should include the following (see greater detail in Section III.6.F):</p> <p>a. ECTAD must have a clear time frame to migrate to the new and lighter structure.</p> <p>b. Strengthen the decentralized structure in line with the Global Strategy</p> <p>c. Establish a decision making cascade system clearly delegating</p>	<p>Some parts of this recommendation (decision making cascade system, clear strategy for fund raising for Global Strategy) are agreed.</p> <p>The rest is rejected (v. response to recommendation No 7)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Revised ECTAD structure, organisational chart and ToRs, September 2007, May2008</p> <p>+ Crisis Management Centre for the Food Chain (CMC-FC) framework (March 2008).</p>		<p>It's to be mentioned that all ECTAD consolidation/strengthening work mentioned in Recommendation #8 is progressing to achieve 9b-9c.</p> <p>Time frame for migration (a): ECTAD has deferred the proposition in recommendation #7, however ECTAD work is now being streamlined within the framework of Crisis Management Centre for the Food Chain (CMC-FC): The CMC-FC is FAO's primary instrument for action in support of Member Countries and for institutional collaboration in the global governance of threats to the human food chain at all stages from production to consumption; such action and collaboration focuses on the response to potential or verified substantial emergencies threatening the food chain and on necessary steps for rehabilitation. The CMC-FC facilitates horizon scanning for improving forecasting, preparedness and prevention of emerging threats to the food chain; the CMC-FC also undertakes and promotes risk communication.</p> <p>Strengthen the decentralized Structure (b): ECTAD continues to invest in maintaining its decentralized structure (country, sub-regional and regional units) see comments in recommendation # 8 a, c, d.</p> <p>Decision cascade (c): See Recommendations # 6 and 8; emphasis is brought on the fact that a unified central command system (under the leadership of the FAO's CVO) is key to the efficient prevention and control of HPAI and other IEDs and cannot be reconsidered; this is why the Recommendation # 9 point c was partially rejected. Also, considerable efforts are being made, with external support, to streamline Incident Command System principles within the CMC-Animal Health (rapid response unit).</p> <p>Funding strategy (d): As part of its public information strategy, ECTAD adopts and promotes a series of advocacy initiatives in support of the Global strategy and the Global program with focus on the visibility to be provided to donors. These initiatives include but not limited to (i) the annual Global Progress Reports published ahead of international conferences and major donors meetings and widely disseminated on the web – the last report was published in October 2008 -, (ii) Specific progress reports for majors donors,</p>

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
<p>downwards where possible</p> <p>d. Develop a clear strategy for fundraising for the global strategy and the new structure</p> <p>e. The transformation process should be accompanied by external consultant resources</p>				<p>(iii) partnership programs and initiatives with strategic donors, (iv) advocacy documents and briefs, (v) donors' meetings and informal consultations, (vi) PowerPoint presentations for use in meetings with donors, beneficiary countries or general public and (vii) specific meetings with donors and/or visits to their headquarters.</p> <p>As of January 2009, the total ECTAD funding envelope amounted to 282 M (including 18.4 M in the pipeline) out of a total FAO's Global Programme estimated requirement of 308 M.</p> <p>(e: not achieved)</p>
<p>10. FAO needs to have a clear position with regard to its own interventions which articulates the reasons for targeting or not targeting each of the sectors. Governments of affected countries in many cases have different priorities and FAO needs a clear rationale for its approach in relation to its mandate.</p>	Accepted	<p>Yes</p> <p>On-going</p>		<p>FAO's interventions are primarily driven by Internationally agreed strategies and by FAO's corporate priorities, as defined for example in the HPAI Global Strategy and Global Program. In this case, priorities are mainly set up according to epidemiological (importance of GLEWS), socio-economical or public health criteria. Other documents and reports (AGAH Retreat, OWOH strategy) also define the priorities known through constant dialogue meetings, NMTPF approaches, etc...</p> <p>Despite it constant advocacy in favour of the various sectors, donor resources remain in most cases earmarked to a large degree.</p>
<p>11. Clear criteria need to be set for deciding on priorities for country assistance in the HPAI campaign: what concentration of which resources are to be used for which activities. In collaboration with the national and regional FAO representations, other UN agencies and OIE,</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>It should be recognized that much support is donor driven and other strategies and agendas come into play. FAO should influence donor priorities</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Revision of the Global Program, Feb 2008</p>		<p>Prioritization of countries and regions for assistance is critical to implementation of the Global Programme in order to rationalize mobilization of resources and ensure the most effective contribution to HPAI control efforts. The Global Program focuses assistance on affected countries and hotspots where the disease is endemic and in the countries considered at risk, with different focus and sets of activities.</p> <p>All countries free of the disease can be considered at risk, but those with inadequate veterinary and laboratory services and weak disease control and prevention capacity are at higher risk than those with stronger capacity. Many of the countries considered at risk have disrupted social and civil structures where it is easy for the presence of HPAI to go undetected and</p>

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
<p>FAO/ECTAD needs to improve the existing system for categorizing countries that are at greatest danger of new outbreaks and where there is a risk that the disease would become endemic, and become an international threat. Categorization should also be according to the amount and the type of resources that would be required in case of an HPAI outbreak. FAO needs to maintain a <u>dynamically updated priority list of countries</u> that will need a major input if there is an HPAI outbreak to improve the speed of response.</p>				<p>unreported.</p> <p>Although it is possible to set priorities, one of the great challenges facing the global response to HPAI is the inability to predict exactly where it will occur next and under what circumstances. Therefore the Global Programme foresees the need for contingency funds to ensure that resources are available for immediate provision of emergency assistance to newly-infected countries to mobilize technical and operational support in the event of outbreaks.</p> <p>Rinderpest eradication (GREP), FMD global FAO-OIE initiative, Tsetse and Trypanosomiasis (PAAT)... are among the priority diseases FAO addresses. These major threats will remain among the priorities but other diseases are eventually to be chosen as new priorities according to the evaluation of the risk of emergence or the occurrence of new health events. This has happened in 2008 with RVF in ASF for example. A tool to help prioritizing diseases is being developed by AGAH. Regarding categorizing countries, constant work and dialogue with countries allow to adjust the list of priority countries. This is done for HPAI (see above) and it has to be developed further, which is one of the objectives of the OWOH strategy (identify “hot spots”). Some other studies are helping adjusting the priority list of countries such as the OIE PVS tool and the FAO-OIE gap analysis which assess the compliance of Veterinary Services to the OIE norms and standards. The NMTPF FAO-National Government plans are also a major tool to define the country priorities.</p>
<p>12. The Global Strategy should focus on ensuring that resources are provided to achieve ongoing support for the governments of high priority countries (at the time of this report, these were Egypt, Indonesia, Nigeria and possibly Bangladesh) deemed to be critical countries for the</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Same comments as above response to recommendation No 11</p>			<p>The Global Strategy and the Global Programme clearly identify the priority regions and countries for targeted intervention as those where the disease is entrenched. Most of the times donors' response match with these priorities and the bulk of earmarked resources is allocated to priority countries in South and South East Asia as well as to Egypt. ECTAD constantly advocates with donors for their contributions to be allocated to high priority countries. In some cases substantial donors support is allocated to non-affected countries but with weak veterinary capacity and limited resources (Chad) or where the donor has a special interest (Great Lakes region of Africa). <u>Disbursement of funds for the 10 ten countries — including Indonesia, Bangladesh, Nigeria and Egypt — are available upon request.</u></p>

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
control of HPAI.				The SFERA contributions continue to play an essential role to plug critical gaps in priority countries and regions especially when there is a shortfall of earmarked funding. For example SFERA was critical to kick start the ECTAD response in Egypt and remains essential to provided most needed support to Nigeria where it funds about 85% of FAO HPAI activities in the country.
13. For each country, a brief contingency plan should be prepared to enable a fast response in case an outbreak occurs. Ensure that each FAO regional and national representation has full awareness and ownership of this plan ahead of time, to be able to activate it rapidly in the event of HPAI being diagnosed in that country.	Accepted	On-going		<p>FAO overall assessment of the countries capacities to prevent and control HPAI (report available upon request) showed that most of the surveyed countries (96%) had a preparedness plan including a contingency plan, in line with the FAO-OIE Global Strategy principles.</p> <p>FAO has largely participated in this encouraging result by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Including preparedness activities in most of its projects; - Developing a methodology for desktop simulation exercises, especially addressing communication, coordination and chain of command between the different sectors involved; - Organizing simulation (desktop and field) exercises in Africa, Eastern Europe, central Asia and the Balkans regions; - Organizing – jointly with OIE, WHO and IBAR, under the ALive framework – rapid assessment missions in Africa in order to assess the capacities of the countries to prevent and control HPAI (includes an assessment of their contingency plan). To date, 21 rapid assessments missions have been carried out and 5 additional ones are in preparation. The technical outputs of the RA missions – the Integrated National Action Plans – are still to be funded for most of the countries; however, preparedness is usually priorities that most governments are willing to finance without the need for external resources. This specific activity explains why Africa is shown to be the best 'prepared region' to date. <p>Most countries with active FAO programs and projects have submitted their contingency plans for FAO review and validation through the FAO office and</p>

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
				ECTAD decentralised units. In addition all FAO offices are being regularly informed about HPAI situation in their duty stations and also in the region.
14. In making recommendations on country interventions, regional strategic frameworks should avoid prescribing specific tactics for countries, but instead, as has been done in Asia, present a portfolio of options that are consistent with the components of the comprehensive response under the Global Strategy.	Accepted	on-going		<p>FAO supports governments to design the country strategies in coherence with the FAO-OIE Global Strategy for the prevention and control of HPAI.</p> <p>Some issues are of particular importance when preparing tailored country strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vaccination: The choice of the vaccination strategy should be based on a risk analysis, a cost-benefit analysis as well as on the country capacities to implement the vaccination campaign (VS / laboratory capacities). To support countries in their decision making and estimation of the cost-effectiveness of vaccination strategies, FAO has developed (i) a vaccination costing model and (ii) a cost model (combined to the poultry population model). These models are an important component of OFFLU vaccination strategy development projects. A FAO working group has also been formed to specifically provide advice at country level. It also has provided major inputs to the section on vaccination of the global HPAI control strategy. <p>A concrete example is the case of Vietnam: the country is currently trying to move from a mass to a targeted vaccination strategy. FAO therefore proposed the following options: (i) to envisage a public-private cost sharing of the vaccination, in order to bring government support to a level that is sustainable in the long term and spare budgetary reserves for other key interventions; (ii) to change from twice yearly mass vaccination campaigns to those carried out throughout the year in each flock at the optimum age of birds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compensation: FAO provides overall guidance in the best compensation scheme to implement. It has therefore produced, in addition to the already existing guidelines on compensation schemes and policies – an Operational Manual which guides step by step the country to implement the most appropriate compensation scheme. FAO is also currently elucidating the possible role of insurance schemes in HPAI, to later propose a cost-sharing mechanism best adapted to the countries situation and their financial capacities.

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
				<p>- Biosecurity: Biosecurity programs must be designed and established with the active participation of the stakeholders, and be tailored to what is needed and possible, not what is perfect. FAO has therefore produced a Paper on biosecurity for HPAI which provides a set of measures according to their feasibility (potential effectiveness in reducing risk; persistence of his effectiveness; speed of implementation; set up cost; recurrent cost; disruption of the production system; social and cultural acceptability) which may be different from one country to the other one as well as according to the system it will be implemented in (large-scale commercial; small-scale commercial; scavenging poultry; hatcheries; live-bird markets; duck/rice; intermediaries and service providers). Two other elements also shows that FAO is not providing ready-made specific tactics but tries to propose the most adapted solution case by case: (i) FAO is encouraging the use by stakeholders of an HACCP-like approach by the stakeholders and (ii) it developed in its Paper the concept of the 'traffic-light' system indicating changing biosecurity needs (and therefore practises) as the HPAI threat increases or decreases.</p>
15. It is recommended that FAO press forwards with the development of an HPAI Communications Team to focus more on policy advocacy, programme communication, social mobilization, and communication capacity building with the goal of controlling HPAI. There should be a clearer distinction between the public good objectives of the information activities of FAO and the HPAI communication activities.	<p>Accepted</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>ECTAD's thinking on communication is fully in line with the RTE analysis and recommendations</p> <p>FAO recognizes that current investments in an ECTAD Communication Unit, which although is focused exclusively on HPAI today, will bring back invaluable returns in terms of experience and expertise for responding to other TADs in the future</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>2007 – To date (on-going)</p>		<p>Several actions have been taken, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The ECTAD Communication Unit took a strategic decision that in the communication domain, FAO's comparative advantage lay in a multi-disciplinary approach. Specific examples and outcomes of being closely linked with the technical and socio-economic/farming-systems group include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Joint missions in West Africa, East Africa and SE Asia to understand better risk and risk perception along production/market chains, as well as jointly advocating for a multi-disciplinary approach to member states and key partners (UNICEF, WHO and OIE). New projects in South Asia sub-region to focus specifically in this area of work. - Conduct of multi-disciplinary strategic communication planning workshops in 4 regions involving 40 countries and over 100 participants. Inputs included linkages of communication with bio-security practices, compensation policies, and small-holder poultry systems. - Participation in inter-agency (FAO-WHO-UNICEF-OIE) processes to review and revise global guidance on HPAI communication using

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
		Yes Nov / Dec 2007		multi-disciplinary approaches; as well as joint participation at inter-ministerial conferences (New Delhi 2007, Sharm-al-Sheikh 2008, and the upcoming One World One Health process 2009). - Communication made integral to major programs initiated by FAO/ECTAD – Biosecurity/decontamination; Public-Private Partnerships; Communication competency and leadership development.
		Yes Nov / Dec 2007		- Organigram, TORs, workplan, staffing, budget etc of the Communication Unit presented to ECTAD Management Team, and subsequently approved by the ECTAD Oversight Committee. - Organigram of ECTAD clearly outlines the linkages between the ECTAD Communication Unit and KCI Division – the corporate information arm of FAO. The TORS describe clearly roles and responsibilities of both teams, and has been approved by the Oversight Committee. Specifically, KCI Division has the lead and responsibility for ECTAD information released to the international media (e.g., all press releases are developed and released by KCI), as well development of relevant products and information for specific (corporate-level) events. ECTAD Communication Unit focuses strictly on programmatic communication, capacity-building, updating of the avian influenza website, technical publications/products, and technical support to member-states.
		Yes April – august 2008		- Four major regional multi-disciplinary and multi-lingual (English, French, Russian) workshops on strategic communication planning were conducted for Ministries of Agriculture/Livestock in North Africa (Tunis, April), West Africa (Dakar, May), Central Asia (Ankara, August), and East Africa (Nairobi, August). A total of 40 countries and more than 100 participants (which included national vet services, national UN agency counterparts, private sector, and NGOs) were given inputs on outbreak, risk, and behavior change

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
				communication for HPAI. Furthermore, small surveys and facilitated discussions helped countries and regions identify their own regional/country priorities – which is now being used to develop a major communication capacity-building program. Furthermore, regional networks on animal health communication are being set up as an outcome, and for on-going support and peer interaction.
16. As part of an information strategy, FAO together with OIE and WHO should take the lead in coordinating and launching a platform for the exchange of information not only on HPAI control strategies and programmes, but also on <u>donor commitments</u> and <u>government policies</u> and <u>positions</u>.	Accepted but to be part of the coordination function of the ECTAD Management strategy	yes on-going		<p>- At present there is no such platform lead by FAO but there are rather many coordination initiatives for exchange of information under the umbrella of UNSIC such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the Meetings of the Steering Committee on Avian and Human Influenza where all UN and international agencies participate to discuss burning issues and exchange relevant information - With regards to donors commitments, UNSIC publishes with the WB progress and financial reports within the framework of UNCAPAHI with contribution from all international agencies including FAO. The ECTAD Programming unit ensures FAO contribution to these reports (documents 2007 and 2008 available upon request), contribution which has been highly appreciated by the UNSIC Coordinator. <p>Actually UNSIC is the real leading entity for AHI coordination among the United Nations System (and OIE) as reflected in its mandate. FAO together with OIE is in charge of Objective 1 (animal Health and Biosecurity) and Objective 2 (Sustainable Livelihoods) of the United Nations consolidated Action Plan for Avian and Human influenza (UNCAPAHI) and de facto it places FAO (and OIE) as the leader agency for animal health. UNSIC with the support of the World Bank reports on donors' commitments to AHI, notably in preparation of the annual International conferences on AHI (last one was held in Sharm-El-Sheikh, October 2008; financial reports available upon request).</p> <p>- In addition to these initiatives, ECTAD uses as part of its information strategy advocacy initiatives including web page, technical brochures, press releases, country briefs and FAO in action to provide and share information not only on the programme but also on donors commitment and policy issues in priority countries.</p>

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
				<p>- 'Ensuring coordination, collaboration and information exchange among donors, international and regional organisations, others agencies and national government to facilitate HPAI prevention and control' is the first strategic objective of the global dimension of the FAO-OIE Global strategy. This is also reflected in the FAO Global Program.</p> <p>- The overall framework to exchange information on HPAI control strategies and programs is the joint FAO-OIE Global Framework for Transboundary Animal Diseases (GF-TADs) to which WHO is also partnering for zoonotic aspects. Over the past two years, the global and regional governances have been reinforced (detailed ToRs produced and endorsed for each body at the global and regional level – information is available upon request) and roadmaps precisely established. Annual global and regional meetings ensure the appropriate level of knowledge and information sharing among technical, financial and political stakeholders. On a more technical side, the GF-TADs tools and entities - FAO-OIE-WHO GLEWS, FAO-OIE CMC-AH, FAO-OIE OFFLU, the FAO-OIE Regional Animal Health Centres and the regional networks of laboratories, socio-economics and epidemicsurveillance – share information on a routine daily basis and allow the adequate level of response.</p> <p>- FAO is a major technical partner of the ALive partnership (www.alive-online.org), one Pillar of which is related to knowledge sharing on all livestock-related issues in Africa – of course including HPAI information. The elaboration of donors' livestock portfolio is a top-priority of the ALive Action Plan (see the Tool).</p> <p>Under ALive,</p> <p>** FAO is also responsible for leading and coordinating the AHI Rapid Assessment (RA) missions in collaboration with the OIE, WHO and AU-IBAR. The objectives of RA include (i) evaluation of the country's veterinary and public health services, the communication capacity to respond to avian and human influenza (AHI); (ii) strengthen the national AHI prevention and response capacity; and (iv) determine the financing needs to achieve the above objectives. The main output of the RA is the</p>

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
				<p>Integrated National Action Programme (INAP). INAPs are cleared by the institutions (FAO, OIE, WHO, and AU-IBAR) and the Governments and then presented to the partners for funding during a final donors' round table (indications of commitments and harmonized financial plan) (See also Recommendation # 13).</p> <p>** FAO took the lead for the elaboration of the Need and Gaps for Africa Paper (see document 2007), which provided a technical and financial stocktaking of all interventions related to AHL in Africa.</p> <p>- In 2009, FAO will be closely involved in the PVS Gap Analysis exercises, which are the next steps of the OIE PVS evaluations for the strengthening of the national Veterinary Services, under the overall leadership of OIE and based on priorities identified and selected by governments.</p>
17. During the course of such a crisis, FAO, as with other partners, should be realistic with donors as to its delivery capacity and counsel donors on the strengths of a measured response, on occasion delaying acceptance of funds where expectations are unrealistic.	Accepted	Yes On-going		<p>ECTAD has developed strategic partnerships with major donors under which funding is best matched with actual programme requirement and delivery capacity constantly reviewed and strengthened whenever required and feasible. Allocation of funds and duration of projects is also subject to joint review with donors which are requested to support activities and also the human resources capacity to implement them.</p>
18. At the same time, it needs to be accepted by all that, in an emergency, there is a greater level of inefficiency than in more planned situations. FAO needs to continue to develop standby contractual arrangements with suitable staff for all types of sudden onset	Accepted	Yes On-going		<p>- Incident Command system principles are being streamlined within the CMC-Animal Health (rapid response unit).</p> <p>- Several stand-by partnership agreements with relevant organizations, agencies, professional associations and collaborating centres are in place and being developed.</p> <p>- A number of 'stand-by contracts' and when actually employed contracts have been adopted with qualified staff for their rapid deployment when and as required.</p>

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
emergency, in particular animal health and plant protection emergencies which require especially narrow technical expertise.				
19. FAO needs to have its own set of priorities beyond the availability of money, and be willing to challenge donor priorities when they are not coherent with FAO's vision of the best way to do the work. FAO needs to provide guidelines and convincing, technically sound arguments seeking to orient donors with regard to use of their funds in the animal health domain (and all the other development issues).	Accepted	Yes On-going		<p>The vast majority of projects under the Global programme have been developed in the field taking into account national and regional priorities and designed in line with the main orientations of the Global strategy and the Global Program (role of the ECTAD Programming Unit) including whenever possible long term development issues. These documents are made available to potential donors as project profiles or concept notes, thereby informing and supporting their funding decisions. This process has been used in the past and further strengthened in recent funding contracts with donors such as USAID, EC, ADB, etc</p> <p>At the country level, ECTAD is promoting a national medium term priority frameworks (NMTPFs) approach and the preparation of related sectoral documents (AH-NMTPFs) to ensure that priorities regarding FAO's assistance are jointly agreed with host country governments and in line with the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers, based on the attainment of the MDGs. AH-NMTPFs specifically target animal health priorities and mainly HPAI so far. They can either contribute to existing NMTPFs by refining the Animal Health Component or represent a very useful contribution to future NMTPFs when it does not exist. They have been developed for Nigeria, Congo DRC, Burundi and Rwanda. More are in the pipeline.</p>
20. In support of requests for funding, it would also be important for FAO to clarify how its programme for avian influenza addresses the UN Millennium Development Goals, an important element in the decision-making of many donors.	Accepted		no	<p>It is obvious that HPAI prevention and control activities are geared directly to protecting food production, maintaining safe food distribution systems and improved nutrition, and preserving income opportunities and livelihoods of rural populations, including the most vulnerable groups. These activities, having a huge impact on food security in particular in DCs, therefore contribute to MDG1 (eradicating extreme poverty and hunger).</p> <p>The preparation and complementing of over fifteen poultry sector country reviews have provided new information on the importance of the poultry sector for both the national and household economy (conducted from Feb 08</p>

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
				<p>to Feb 09).</p> <p>They also contribute to MDG6 (Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases), by notably working at the animal source and therefore reducing the risk of a pandemics.</p> <p>Considering the huge efforts made successfully towards increased collaboration among international, regional and national institutions to combat against AHI, this program has contributed to the development of an international partnership and therefore to MDG8 (Develop a Global Partnership for Development).</p>
<p>21. The RTE highly recommends that donors use the SFERA fund to the maximum amount possible. A precursor evaluation to the RTE which focused on SFERA also strongly recommended to donors that they carry on providing a maximum of funding through this mechanism, in particular for regional and country work. As a corollary however, the RTE highlights the importance for FAO to continue to build the confidence of donors in its technical expertise and efficiency and effectiveness in using these funds.</p>	Accepted			<p>The programming of funds under SFERA is based on a financial analysis of the gaps vis-à-vis the priorities set in the Global and regional programmes, the urgent needs and taking into account the donors' requirements/preferences in terms of thematic and geographic areas. The use of SFERA funds is based on the programme approach in which funds contribute to the overall implementation of the programme and have key function in targeting areas which are priority in the Global Strategy and Global Programme but have not received sufficient funds.</p> <p>Donors are regularly informed about the usefulness of the SFERA mechanisms especially of crises such as HPAI which need flexibility in allocation of funds and in reorienting funding priorities depending on emerging needs (unexpected outbreaks).</p> <p>Briefings on the SFERA are regularly included in the agenda of formal and informal donors meetings to raise donors' awareness on this funding mechanism and facilitate its acceptance.</p> <p>The increasing donors interests in UN pool funding mechanisms at central and country (ie CERF) will contribute to increase confidence in the SFERA.</p> <p>While in some cases there is a donor resistance to fund mechanisms in which their specific contributions cannot be closely monitored and given specific visibility, others clearly perceive that they contribute to a global effort and therefore see clear benefits in terms of overall impact. Most of these donors also feel an increased ownership of the programme as a whole.</p> <p>All donors contributing to SFERA receive regular progress reports on the</p>

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
				implementation of the Global Programme to which SFERA funds contribute to. These reports always include a note on the funds provided through the SFERA and how these funds contribute to programme activities. These reports are available upon request
22. In assisting member countries where governance is an issue, FAO's strategy needs to explicitly confront obstacles and possible pragmatic 'work-arounds' (which may not be to everyone's liking) in order to do a better job responding to HPAI. Where this involves facilitating countries' own efforts at improving governance, FAO should not hesitate to bring in the assistance of a sister agency or outside expertise that has more specific experience and capacity in this area as part of its effort.	Accepted Comment: FAO supports very much the approach on good governance for preventing and controlling TADs, particularly through efficient and transparent national Veterinary Services, through appropriate laws and regulations and their enforcement, and emphasizing a central chain of command on animal disease management	on-going FAO and OIE Chart, May 2008		<p>Good governance issues related to HPAI prevention and control primarily concern national Veterinary Services (VS) capacities. Good governance principles have been described in the joint OIE-FAO Paper on 'Ensuring good governance to address emerging and re-emerging animal disease threats: supporting the veterinary services of developing countries to meet OIE international standards on quality'.</p> <p>The upstream stage to VS capacity strengthening is their evaluation, under the leadership of OIE. FAO is involved during the OIE PVS evaluation (provision of experts) and the PVS Gap Analysis (on-going discussion of FAO's role as the main implementer). FAO will play a major role during the VS capacity building <i>per se</i> – investment programs based on the results of the evaluation stage.</p> <p>Distribution of roles between OIE and FAO regarding VS strengthening has been clarified in the Chart on FAO and OIE competencies and complementarities and its companion Vade Mecum (documents available upon request), officially endorsed in their last version on May 2008.</p>
23. FAO and its partners must pay more attention to understanding and addressing issues of international governance and institutional architecture pertinent to the control of trans-boundary animal diseases and in particular HPAI.	Accepted	Yes Revised OIE-FAO Global Strategy, Feb. 2008 OWOH Strategy, October 08		<p>The current FAO-OIE Global Strategy (update Feb. 2008) set as strategic objective of its global dimension (objective # 10): 'improve the implementation of standards and regulations for international trade and movements of birds and poultry products. This involves strengthening VS including appropriate legislation and improved governance to ensure safe trade and movements according to OIE standards'. This is to take place within the GF-TADs framework.</p> <p>The Under development FAO-OIE-WHO OWOH strategy also underlines the importance of good governance issues and proposes to build more robust public and animal health systems based on good governance compliant with the WHO International Health Regulations (IHR 2005) and OIE international</p>

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
				standards.
24. More specifically, FAO and OIE must clearly identify their specific individual and joint roles in combating HPAI, which should be outlined and agreed upon in the Global Strategy and the proposed Global Programme to control HPAI, as the current confusion and disagreement is an impediment to effective joint work.	Accepted To a large extent already implemented/under implementation (GF-TADs agreement, 'Good Governance Initiative', joint FAO/OIE Global Strategy, establishment of regional animal health centres in Africa, Near East and Asia,...).	Chart and vade-mecum, May 2008		<p>The mandates of OIE and FAO converge in the field of animal health. For some tasks in this field, OIE and FAO have primary responsibility; for others, the two organizations join forces and work synergistically.</p> <p>To optimize the collaboration, avoid overlaps and provide clear and coherent messages to all FAO and OIE teams as well as to countries and partners including donors, complementarities and synergies in the mandates of the two organizations have been assessed and agreed in detail in a Chart on the competencies and complementarities of FAO and OIE. It delineates the agreed responsibilities and synergies for seven areas – standards, guidelines and recommendations, strategies and best practices, sanitary information and epidemiological intelligence, expertise, scientific and technical publications, training; and development programmes - and several cross-cutting issues - awareness, research, communication, and coordination. A Vade Mecum complements the Chart, providing detailed explanations in each listed areas (Chart and Vade-mecum are available upon request).</p>
25. Based on the experience with the HPAI response reviewed here, this evaluation strongly recommends that a thorough high-level review of the international architecture for animal health and transboundary animal diseases be carried out in the near future in an effort to rationalize and improve efficiency of the division of labour and responsibility between FAO, OIE and other actors in this field when facing this type of	Accepted	Partially Chart and vade-mecum, May 2008		<p>See Recommendation # 24 on FAO-OIE Chart.</p> <p>A second evaluation of the GF-TADs should clarify even further the expected complementary roles among FAO, OIE and WHO for the prevention and control of HPAI and other IEDs. This was not conducted in 2008 but is scheduled for the first semester of 2009.</p> <p>Again, the UNSIC UNCAPAHI properly delineates the responsibilities falling under FAO, OIE and WHO mandates.</p>

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
zoonotic crisis.				
26. FAO/ECTAD should be careful to distinguish the results of its own investigative work in the context of field activities and strategy development as informal applied research, not formal research with rigorous testing of results. For that, it must (continue to) partner with research institutes, universities, etc. It should clearly define its role in identifying or commissioning research, and the resources it is willing to commit to this.	Accepted	Yes On-going		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EPIdemiology of Avian Influenza in Africa (EPIAAF) study has been conducted with CIRAD in 2008; - Epidemiological analysis and information database (EMPRES-i) has been shared with Google Earth, BBC, USDA-CEAH, UC-Davis, Columbia University, Université Libre Bruxelles as a way that others can contribute or undertake their own analysis in a similar situation. - LoA with IZSvE in 2007, 2008 and pending for 2009, for funds for testing and whole genome sequencing. Articles published with FAO as co-author or acknowledged; - grant given to the head of poultry virology for 4 month in IZSvE to study 150 H5N1 viruses; - OFFLU vaccination project in Indonesia: 2 articles pending with large co-authorship. - The EMPRES Wildlife Unit has partnered with other institutions in Europe, Asia and Africa to contribute (technically and financially) to understand the role and behaviour of wild birds in Avian Influenza epidemiology. -The DFID-funded Pro-poor HPAI risk reduction project funded by DFID (which is not run through ECTAD but through AGA) is a partnership between FAO, four international research partners and several national government and research organisation in which each has clearly defined roles. See http://www.hpai-research.net/index.html for more information on the consortium and the programme. The PPLPI makes a considerable effort to link with ECTAD and others (one of the project team is specifically designated to do this). Work in the Mekong has been joint with ECTAD or done with the knowledge of ECTAD country teams. - Almost all of the investigative work done by the socio-economics and production group of ECTAD has involved national partners or local consultants, whose names appear on the reports produced and has been reported at meetings in country, often by the local teams that did the work.

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
27. FAO has a major role to play (better than it is doing at the moment) in managing, using and making available to others the knowledge emerging from research, rather than in generating it. FAO should serve as identifier and disseminator of valid and useful research results pertinent to making policy decisions in dealing with HPAI.	Accepted	Yes On-going		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional networks: in annual meetings, where all countries are represented: sharing of recent knowledge. Mailing lists and ECTAD/FAO websites (http://www.fao.org/avianflu/en/index.html) also to disseminate knowledge. - Verona conference: AI at the human-animal interface organised with WHO and OIE in October 2008. Was aimed at reviewing the knowledge in AI at the interface and identify gaps. http://www.fao.org/avianflu/en/conferences/verona_2008.html - FAO has purchased in 2008 150 books on AI and ND (Springer) to be distributed to countries - Laboratory training on AI: in region, in OIE/FAO laboratories. Many training sessions for laboratory staff (excel file available) - CMC training on AI (3 sessions in 2007/2008) - OFFLU day at the 7th Symposium on AI (April 08) http://www.offlu.net/OFFLU%20Site/offluday_notice.pdf - Several efforts to make information more readily available e.g. International meetings, newsletter (RAP), DFID pro-poor project website and e-consultation, FAO HPAI website, abstracts at international research meetings. The DFID pro-poor project puts a considerable effort into establishing links with other organisations and websites and because of its consortium is linked in to IFPRI, ILRI, UC-Berkeley. Royal Veterinary College, IDC (STEPS) websites. <p>But simply providing information is not enough to make an impact on policy formulation. This requires a sustained effort in working with national and regional institutions, each with their own agendas and competing influences.</p>
28. The HPAI socio-economics programme should develop a clear strategy to support	Accepted Applies also to socio-economic and farming	Yes On-going		Building capacity is a complex issue because it requires sustained engagement on questions of mutual interest where each party has something to bring to the collaboration. More efforts is still to be done to

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
research and build capacity of economics and social science programmes working on HPAI-related issues in targeted countries. Work should be encouraged with in-country partner institutions where possible.	systems research			develop it. To take one simple example which can be “ring fenced”: work on compensation strategies. FAO’s work began in 2004-5 in Viet Nam. It has grown to involve missions to several countries to assist in building strategies and operational plans, collaboration with the World Bank and IFPRI on a broad set of recommendations, collaboration with USDA on a CD to summarise experiences (upcoming) engagement in regional meetings for the past 3 years (the most recent one took place in February in Asia, to compare experience and examine the role of insurance). We had a full-time specialist engaged for 2 years who worked to strengthen our collaboration with the World Bank, UNDP and USDA and to unearth and build local strengths. There is a great deal more understanding of how to do it than 3 years ago, but still no sustainable funding source. And this is just one topic, addressing just one small aspect of disease control.
29. Collaborative work with economists and social scientists in other FAO departments should also be encouraged. Looking outwards, UNSIC encourages the linkages between IFPRI and World Bank, of which FAO has recently become a part. FAO should work to ensure that post-HPAI-crisis socio-economic rehabilitation is addressed in the research work of those institutions.	Accepted. Applies also to socio-economic and farming systems research			The socio-economics and production has ALWAYS collaborated widely, from the time in 2004 that we set up the working group involving people cross-house plus WFP and IFAD, and we continue to do so. We have worked on all of the issues mentioned under “proposed actions” although least on gender impact assessment. The biggest challenge at the moment, however, is not “post crisis rehabilitation” in the sense that it would apply to building back after a cyclone, but the question of the future of smallholder poultry production. IFPRI and ILRI are certainly looking at this question we are in touch with them. But the most challenging work is on the ground in countries that are daily reviewing “restructuring” plans for their poultry sectors and here ECTAD has no coherent strategic approach. There ought to be a multidisciplinary ECTAD working group with strong engagement from the country teams.
30. The Global Strategy should position responsibility for <u>vaccination</u> programme design largely at the country level (with outside advice if	Accepted – keeping in mind that the RTE Report statement (quote “set of guidelines as to when and where vaccination is	Yes On-going		- Guidelines for vaccination have been available since early recognition of the H5N1 HPAI problem, but required research (and its results) have not been disseminated (i.e. efficacy is different among species) or standardized (serological, virological monitoring, vaccine matching).

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
desired), including major decisions regarding when and if vaccination is appropriate. The public good nature of animal health means that to some degree this will also need to be tempered by regional priorities and constraints. A more clearly worded set of guidelines for vaccination is needed that directs attention to three levels of recommended use: newly infected, sporadically infected, and endemic countries	appropriate and how it could be used with other tools including stamping out, targeted slaughter, market and movement controls, and restructuring.”) is not correct: see FAO/OIE Global Strategy, Conclusions and recommendations of the FAO-OIE-IZV Reference Laboratory International Conference, Verona, 2007, and OIE/FAO guidelines.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paper: Experiences with vaccination in countries endemically infected with highly pathogenic avian influenza -: the FAO perspective (to be published in the OIE technical review). - Indonesia: OFFLU project on vaccine efficacy implemented by FAO (Oct 07-Oct 09) FAO interim recommendations on vaccination (on behalf of OFFLU) provided to the Indonesian MoA on April 2008. A reviewed version will be generated in March 2009 (documents available upon request). As this project is focused on vaccine strains and vaccine types only, an OFFLU committee on the vaccination strategy was held in Jakarta by FAO and Indonesian MoA on 14 November 2008 with international partners to review results of project in Indonesia and make recommendations on vaccination (a second version of OFFLU recommendations is under preparation). Socio-economics component in the project. - Vietnam: external experts appointed by FAO as vaccination expert to review the national vaccination strategy (3 attachments) - Egypt: OFFLU project on vaccine efficacy and SAIDR project. Technical meeting on vaccination planned in September 09 with partners of both projects (adaptation of the Indonesian vaccine work above in an Egypt context). - OFFLU technical group on vaccines formed in March 2008 with international experts from OIE/FAO reference laboratories, vaccination experts, FAO experts, research institutes in NL, UK and USA. - Verona Conference (6-9 October 2008) on vaccination. - Participation to 2 electronic conferences with World Bank on AI vaccination (5 invited countries each time) (2007/8). - OIE Working Group on Vaccination with FAO participation.
31. FAO needs to present vaccination as one of several tools to use concurrently, and to be used	Accepted Already supported by FAO: see comments on recommendation No 30).	Yes On-going		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is what FAO constantly recommends in countries (see previous comments and documents). It is described in FAO manual on 'Preparing for Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza', produced in 2004. - FAO interim recommendations on vaccination (on behalf of OFFLU)

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
only where there is a well-funded and responsive veterinary service with and appropriate levels of geographic coverage.				provided to the Indonesian MoA on April 2008) (document available upon request). - Paper: Experiences with vaccination in countries endemically infected with highly pathogenic avian influenza -: the FAO perspective (to be published in the OIE technical review).
32. FAO needs to promote greater country level and international dialogue on the strengthening of veterinary public health policy and its direct impact on global public goods as exemplified by crises like HPAI.	Accepted FAO has strongly promoted the need to see HPAI as only one of various potential veterinary public health concerns when facing the emergence of important transboundary and zoonotic disease agents	Yes On-going		The OWOH Strategy is guided by the key principle that the prevention and control of HPAI and more generally of IEDs is an international public good and requires strong political and financial commitments at national, regional and international levels. FAO organizes / participates in many international and regional conferences and meetings to raise the awareness of the public at large on the Public Good Dimension of the prevention and control of the major animal diseases. One of the key meetings was the conference co-organised by the World Bank, OIE and FAO (October 2007, Washington) on the Global Animal Health Initiative: The Way Forward.
33. FAO needs to improve its own processes and mechanisms for rapid response in the context of protracted emergencies, of which HPAI is a prime example.	Accepted	Yes 6 Feb 2008: Matrix on current status of CMC-AH implementation issues (including administrative) submitted to senior management		Despite of the needs to focus on medium and long-term prevention and control of diseases, the short-term emergency capacity to respond to new outbreak events is an important axis of the FAO strategy. The CMC-AH (renamed "Rapid Response Unit" of the CMC-Food Chain) team, working as a "fire-brigade" team was established with OIE and it works with WHO when outbreak events are of zoonotic nature. The CMC-AH has been guided and over sighted several times by its Steering Committee (2 meetings): the partners and donors have acknowledged the good work done and have confirmed their continuous support. CMC-AH implementation has involved brainstorming on methods of expediting FAO procedures for rapid response. Matrix includes: <u>Procurement</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waiver for expedited CMC-AH procurement under discussion • Development of contingency stock arrangements underway

Recommendations	Accepted, partially accepted or rejected (Management Response, October 2007)	Actions taken?		Comment / explanation (examples to be provided)
		Yes (with date)	No	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faster/larger post-mission assistance capacity suggested <u>Human resources</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core team established; increased numbers and training advised for food chain; • Availability of specific animal health consultant roster; development of more emergency type roster under discussion • Delegation of authority for travel issues still to be obtained Partnerships strengthened within FAO externally for improved information exchange, joint mission deployment and/or supply of deployable experts
34. FAO needs to define an institutional policy indicating how resources should be allocated between addressing animal health (or other) emergencies, other Regular Programme thematic areas, or both. In the case of the HPAI crisis, FAO needs to assess what loss of Regular Programme activity has resulted from the increased focus on HPAI and how work on other important TADs may have suffered.	Accepted	Yes On-going		<p>The definition of priorities for resource allocation is a very difficult exercise as said above. New emergencies can occur any time despite the improvement of prediction. The continuum between short-term/emergency and long-term activities, between prevention, detection and response is obvious and FAO advocates for better understanding and acknowledgement of this concept. Therefore, constant interaction and transfer of HR and budgets between emergencies and more long-term Regular Programme (RP) funded activities should be ensured. This is what EMPRES and ECTAD constantly do. The importance of HPAI programmes resulted to a HR problem at the beginning of the crisis in 2004 and 2005. However, progressively, almost all other RP programmes have resumed and the major ones (GREP/RP eradication, FMD global initiative, T&T PAAT activities...) have not really suffered from a lack of attention from FAO. Having said that, it is evident that to make this long-term programmatic exercise sustainable without sudden crisis response interference, a stronger RP expert team should be established in FAO-AGA, with a pluridisciplinary critical mass able to address capacity building, disease intelligence, and normative activities as well as guiding and supporting field prevention and control programmes on a long-term sustainable manner.</p>