

November 2010



منظمة الأغذية
والزراعة
للأمم المتحدة

联合国
粮食及
农业组织

Food
and
Agriculture
Organization
of
the
United
Nations

Organisation
des
Nations
Unies
pour
l'alimentation
et
l'agriculture

Предприятия
сельскохозяйственная
организации
Объединенных
Наций

Organización
de las
Naciones
Unidas
para la
Agricultura
y la
Alimentación

COMMITTEE FOR INLAND FISHERIES AND AQUACULTURE OF AFRICA

Sixteenth Session

Maputo, Mozambique, 16-18 November 2010

REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON ESTABLISHING A “NACA-LIKE” NETWORK IN AFRICA

Background

1. The 15th Session of the CIFAA, held in Lusaka, Zambia from 9-11 December 2008, in light of the need to identify suitable institutional anchoring for the “NACA-Like” Network, now with the adopted title of the Aquaculture Network for Africa (ANAF), as well as the need to educate Members and other partners as to the value that can be added through such a network, recommended the Working Group continue its activities. In so doing, this Session also noted that, given the number of existing aquaculture networks and related structures, “*ANAF should take note of existing networks and collaborate with them, while emphasizing the need for synergies and harmonization between these different actors with the ultimate need for one acknowledged focal point to facilitate stakeholders’ access to needed information, and suggested that such a co-ordinating role should ultimately be part of ANAFs mandate*” [paragraph 35, Report of the 15th Session].

2. It should be recalled that the *ad hoc* Working Group began its assignment with its establishment by the 14th Session of CIFAA in 2006. From this beginning until the 15th Session in 2008, the Group met three times to define the new Network’s structure and functions. These meetings resulted in the formulation of the Terms of Reference for the Group itself as well as for the newly-named ANAF Network. The Group continued to examine possible institutional structures for the nascent ANAF, ultimately concluding that the best structure would be that of a formal Intergovernmental Organisation (IGO). In making this decision, the Group realised that the process would be long, involving formal ratification of the IGO by Members. However, the need for more effective and wide-spread information exchange was pressing. Thus, as endorsed by the 15th Session, the Group adopted a two-pronged approach; seeking short-term support whilst simultaneously beginning the steps required to establish an IGO. To this end, work involved developing a logical framework and project proposals to expedite these processes.

3. During the period over which the Group has been active, the Africa Region has seen a surge in networking. Among several information-sharing and related aquaculture structures, important links were forged with the Sustainable Aquaculture Research Networks for Sub-

This document is printed in limited numbers to minimize the environmental impact of FAO's processes and contribute to climate neutrality. Delegates and observers are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and to avoid asking for additional copies.

Most FAO meeting documents are available on the Internet at www.fao.org

Saharan Africa (SARNISSA). In line with the guidance offered by the 15th Session, efforts to align or merge various networking activities have begun through these relationships between ANAF and SARNISSA.

4. It should be noted that ANAF is seen as an integral part of the Special Programme for Aquaculture Development in Africa (SPADA). Whilst SPADA is foreseen to have a catalytic medium-term function in the sub-sector to accelerate the development of aquaculture, ANAF has a long-term commitment to oversee and contribute to this development, adding value through its own technical skills as well as the resources of its members.

Objectives

5. The overall objectives of the *ad hoc* Working Group (WG) have been to assess the conditions in which an African NACA [now ANAF] would be able to provide the much needed services to support an expanded regional aquaculture programme in the future, including improved skills, technology delivery and information dissemination, but with the understanding that the resources for its establishment must come from ANAF Member Countries.

Activities

6. During the intersessional period, the WG held two meetings: Lagos, Nigeria (24-27 August 2009) and Jinja, Uganda (26-28 June 2010). Furthermore, as approved by the 15th Session, a more consolidated “hub” was established in collaboration with the Lake Victoria Fisheries Organisation (LVFO); a transitional ANAF was co-located at LVFO offices in Jinja (Uganda) where there are comparative advantages in terms of connectivity along with information and communications technology (ICT) support; Members and FAO/RAF supporting these tentative arrangements.

7. Membership in ANAF expanded during the period, with ten current members: Cameroon, Ghana, Kenya, Mali, Mozambique, Nigeria, Senegal, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia.

8. Following-up on the recommendations of the 15th Session, and following a request from AU/NEPAD, the Network, in collaboration with FAO/RAF, prepared a proposal for Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) support for ANAF which was presented in 2009. Whilst the proposal for ANAF support has not been approved so far, there has been continued interest and it is anticipated that a revised proposal will be forthcoming.

Key findings

9. The report of the 2010 meeting, including a summary of the recommendations of the 2009 meeting, is attached in Annex 1.

10. ANAF needs to demonstrate in a tangible way the value it can add to the development of aquaculture sub-sectors across the Region.

11. ANAF has also identified priority areas that should be considered in any sub-regional or regional aquaculture development efforts, including: studying cage and pen zoning, feed options for ensuring availability of quality feed at affordable prices, business training in aqua-business and business planning as well as legal and regulatory frameworks for aquaculture.

12. As was highlighted by the 15th Session [paragraph 1 above], networking in Africa is growing both in terms of the number of individuals and institutions linking to networks and in regard to the number of existing and planned networks. This has become a very dynamic situation whereby the number of perceived networking units, previously quasi non-existent, is now expanding so fast it is difficult to keep track of all the various groups who have established networking functions in one form or another. This expansion could, and may be posing challenges for both users and service providers; a large number of individual units increases costs and adds to the risk of confusing, or even contradictory information processing. The suggestion of ONE focal point seems further substantiated by these events. This aim would require the merging or consolidation of a number of units.

13. Throughout its work, the WG has identified areas where the economies of scale favour work at sub-regional or regional levels; areas where it is most effective for countries to collaborate in the form of clusters or even on a continental level. Areas such as aquaculture research and education/training are indicative of actions where there are common issues confronting a number of countries – issues that can be most effectively addressed by working in close collaboration. These transcending issues form a core function for a focal regional network such as ANAF which should be more than an information conduit, but also a provider of services. Regionalisation of training curricula and research agendas are just two examples of where the best entry point is often above national level.

14. The WG recommends that the regional aspects of African aquaculture development be embodied in an ANAF that metamorphoses from a CIFAA Working Group to a more autonomous structure with more support from and to Members. This interim structure would be in place pending the formal establishment of the IGO [paragraph 2 above] and would be guided by Memoranda of Understanding as outlined in the 2010 Report [attached]. This interim structure would address a full gamut of regional issues [paragraph 13 above] and reflect a consolidation of effort [paragraph 12 above].

SUGGESTED ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE

- The Committee is requested to discuss and decide on the finding that the CIFAA Working Group on Aquaculture Networking should transform into a interim structure based on agreements between Members and ultimately leading to the planned IGO.
- In the event of its support for this transition, the Committee is also requested to discuss the best mechanisms for this to take place, including future relationships between the Committee and ANAF. Particularly ANAF should be the forum for discussing regional aquaculture emerging issues. Recommendations and work plan proposals coming out from ANAF should be discussed and endorsed during CIFAA Sessions.

Annex 1. Report of 2010 ANAF/WG Meeting

**REPORT OF AQUACULTURE NETWORK FOR AFRICA (ANAF)
HELD ON 26TH TO 28TH JUNE 2010**

JINJA, UGANDA

1.0 Introduction

The annual meeting of the Committee for Inland Fisheries and Aquaculture's (CIFAA) *ad hoc* Working Group on establishing a "NACA-Like" network in Africa, which was established during the 14th Session of CIFAA in 2006, was held at Hotel Paradise on the Nile, Jinja Uganda from the 26-28 June, 2010. The working group currently comprises ten member countries; Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania, Zambia, Mozambique, Mali, Nigeria, Ghana, Cameroon and Senegal.

During the first Working Group Meeting in 2007, the "NACA-Like" network was designated as ANAF: the Aquaculture Network for Africa. During this meeting, the five founding members (Cameroon, Ghana, Mali, Uganda and Zambia) also drafted the Terms of Reference for the Working Group. The Group met twice in 2008 to better identify the best developmental pathway for the network; concluding that ultimately ANAF should become an IGO (Intergovernmental Organization). That same year, at the request of NEPAD, TCP support was sought from FAO to accelerate the establishment of the IGO. At the end of 2008, the Working Group reported to the 15th Session of CIFAA. The Committee endorsed the aim to establish an IGO as well as the proposed TCP support. It further supported close links with existing Regional Fisheries Management Bodies (RFMBs) and Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization (LVFO) was recommended. LVFO offered its facilities as a temporary host for ANAF awaiting the establishment of the IGO. To this end, CIFAA 15 extended the mandate of the working Group through the 2009/2010 period whereupon the Group would need to again report during CIFAA 16. However, the anticipated TCP support to the Network did not materialize as anticipated.

Over this recent period, the Working Group met in Nigeria in 2009 and in Uganda for the present meeting. During this period, membership doubled to the current ten aforementioned members.

2.0 Opening

The meeting was attended by 26 individuals including representatives from seven of the current members of the Working Group (Ghana, Mali and Nigeria absent as well as the NEPAD representative) as well as FAO representatives from the Regional Office for Africa and the Sub-regional Office for Eastern Africa along with representatives from SARNISSA (Sustainable Aquaculture Research Networks for Sub-Saharan Africa), CIRAD (Agricultural Research for Development), IRAD (Institute of Agricultural research for Development) AquaFish CRSP (Collaborative Research Programme), Auburn and Moi Universities and the private sector (see Annex I)

The meeting was opened by the Commissioner for Fisheries Uganda, who welcomed the participants and noted that ANAF is one of those organizations which require a lot of time and planning to set up in a sustainable fashion. He urged members to work towards making ANAF a tangible organization that adds value.

The FAO Senior Aquaculture Officer then thanked everyone for attending and Uganda for hosting the meeting. He was thrilled to see new members in attendance. He conveyed regrets from the NEPAD representative, the Nigerian Delegation and the Mali Focal Point. He noted that since the network's membership has doubled over the years, there is now less of an urgent need to focus on looking for new members, but rather a need to focus on making ANAF a visible and useful organization. The challenge now is how to move forward and garner sustainable funding for ANAF.

The Officer gave an overview about SPADA (FAOs Special Programme for Aquaculture Development in Africa) and the SPADA approach focusing on aquaculture as a business. SPADA is seen as a potential vehicle to ANAF. If the extra-budgetary support required for SPADAs implementation can be secured, the ten-year program would establish a solid foundation upon which ANAF and an IGO would build.

Summary of the 2009 Lagos Meeting

A recap of the minutes of the Lagos meeting held in August 2009 was done and was summarized as follows:

1. With so many meetings taking place within and outside the region, to minimize cost, meetings should be combined
2. Members should be encouraged to make presentations about ANAF in aquaculture-related meetings.
3. Countries should make voluntary contributions
4. The TCP proposal through NEPAD should be supported
5. Improved coordination of information is needed
6. There is presently imperfect information flow
7. ANAF must engage the private sector
8. ANAF must have higher visibility
9. FAO should assist in developing ways and means of accomplishing the necessary work to establish a sustainable Network
10. More members should be encouraged to join.
11. Documentation should, to the extent possible, be provided bilingually (English and French)

3.0 Objectives

The meeting had the following objectives (**bold** words indicating the key elements of the agenda):

- To discuss the interim **structure and function** of ANAF pending the formal establishment of the IGO;
- To discuss how **Information Technology** can be further applied to ANAF, including such items as the ANAF website, national networks and possible products such as newsletters;
- To identify one or more central **targets** where ANAF can concentrate effort in the short-term;
- To agree on immediate **action** steps for ANAF to pursue these targets – what can ANAF do immediately to provide services?;
- To discuss possible **partnerships** and mergers with related groups and networks; and,
- To define the **report** for CIFAA 16.

3.1 Structure and Function

Key elements included: the process of establishing an IGO as well as the issue of addressing country contributions.

It was noted, considering economies of scale, that it is often much more cost effective to deal with issues at regional level rather than at national level. This is a fundamental principal of SPADA. It was agreed that the intention is not to get projects that build infrastructure but use existing facilities and therefore identify which member country has comparative advantage. Concentrating resources is the key.

Using NACA as a reference, its structure at the secretariat is very lean. A similar structure should be implemented by ANAF. There is a need to look at Lead Centres rather than Centers of Excellence.

It has been agreed to ultimately transform ANAF from a CIFAA Working Group to an IGO. However, the establishment of an IGO is a lengthy legal and administrative process. In the meantime, a transitional structure [ANAF Partnership] has been agreed upon as described in the MoU (see Annex II) which will serve as a basis for the partnership and will be signed by the current members.

The ANAF Working Group is to make a presentation to CIFAA in November and request for the approval and signing of this MOU with ANAF members as there are no financial obligations at this stage. ANAF will operate under the MOU until the full ratification of the IGO.

Voluntary contributions would continue until such a time as the members could approve alternative mechanisms. It is suggested that during CIFAA 16 approval can be obtained for an interim budgetary contribution based on a request from CIFAA. It will be recommended to CIFAA that ANAF's status as a CIFAA working group is ended in transition to ANAF-MOU [ANAF Partnership] and eventually an IGO.

Currently, FAO/RAF has a LOA with LVFO to keep process moving. This should, if possible, be continued. It is also important to identify immediate action where ANAF can add value and seek direct donor support.

A minimum amount of time by the respective National Focal Points (FP) is to be dedicated to fulfilling the obligations of ANAF. They will contribute a percentage of their time to ANAF. The structure that is hoped for will be like NACA which is based on minimising cost and strengthen the national networks. The proposed name for the new ANAF working group was ANAF Partnership. Pending more detailed assessment of the time requirements, *it was suggested that 10% of FPs overall workload should be tentatively devoted to ANAF matters.*

3.2 Information Technology

Key topic included: ANAF Website; how it should be modified; creating links to other aquaculture-related websites; creating a calendar with events; adding a component for Question and Answers regarding aquaculture; national web pages; what content should be added; filters-how do we provide Quality Control for the experts, research work and papers; electronic news letter; how relevant is it; training – how can the Focal Points use the website to update its content; hardware -- what are the requirements to make the current server more efficient; and what will the focal points need in terms of hardware to be able to use the website.

It was noted that since ANAF already has a website, it should be modified to meet the needs of the members. Although SARNISSA has a lot of good information there are often no direct answers to issues raised. It was therefore agreed that ANAF needs to have people who can directly address specific issues raised by people. A Question-Answer section (Forum) could be added to the ANAF website to meet this need.

It was also agreed that there should be country pages on the existing ANAF Website (i.e., the national pages should be embedded within the ANAF website). One of ANAF's roles should be to try and supply expertise and knowledge whilst there be some quality control measures to the services and expertise posted to the website. *It was agreed that FPs should be responsible for the quality control of material posted on the country pages and ultimately collated in the regional dataset. This requires that standards are set for National Networks that feed into the ANAF Network. These standards and filters apply to products [including information and thereby documentation/publications] as well as services.*

Further suggestions to improve the ANAF Website were that:

- The website should be made more interactive and active. What has been successful is so far is having an IT expert at the LVFO Secretariat.
- If a country has a website, then it can be linked to ANAF but still with an ANAF National Page; but where there isn't then can have national pages in the ANAF website.
- Formats be developed of what information is required, the quality, and filtration process.
- Quality standards need to be enforced to ensure that information posted on the website is genuine. A mechanism to evaluate and verify information needs to be enforced.
- More information be added to the field of expertise, including, among possible others, experience, level of education, projects worked on, etc.
- Filtering should be at the National Level, digging out details about the individual. A footnote /disclaimer should be added to ensure that the person who added the information should be contacted for further information.
- More columns should be added to the table of experts, for example referees for follow-up purposes.
- If the information is incomplete, should be removed from the website.
- There is need for a national committee to screen all information that is posted on the respective national pages.
- It was agreed that the Focal Point should be the responsible person and should seek for necessary input into filtering the information being posted into the National Web pages.
- The new home page of ANAF should have links to various websites of partners. ANAF Forum is available but focal points have not been actively using it, citing not having privileges to use the tool. The Information expert promised to make sure that all focal points will have full access to the forum.

Information Technology Training

The session started with a brief training on how to use the website and add information. It was conducted by the Aquaculture Information Expert and Information and Database Officer (IDO) of LVFO. All the members present are computer literate which made the training less demanding. However, the members suggested that one-day training on some specified day for two focal points from the countries should be held. They further requested to be provided with CDs with a user manual.

A presentation for the prototypic hardware requirements for ANAF website and information system was made by the IDO as shown below:

1. Server @ 4000 USD	2. Camera@ 500
3. Printer @450/500	4. Backup drive @600 (1TB)
5. Laptop @1200	6. Anti Virus Licenses
7. Scanner @500	

Other suggested requirements for ANAF include:

1. Business Cards for focal points
2. ANAF logo
3. Email addresses example@anafaquaculture.org

ANAF E-Newsletter

1. The Aquaculture Information Expert showed the members at the meeting a sample e-news letter he had created. There was a general argument that there is need to direct all the energies towards setting up ANAF. The relevance of the newsletter was therefore questioned.
2. The members however concluded that an e-newsletter is good idea. Member countries should therefore take it upon themselves to provide the articles and information for the newsletter.
3. The newsletter should be distributed as a soft copy and should be brief. It will mainly target those people who don't have reliable access to the Internet. The Consultant should therefore encourage and remind members to provide articles for the newsletter.

Group Work

Members were asked to review the structure of the website, the human expertise section of the website while another group was asked to draft a Memorandum of Understanding.

Review of Website Structure

- The group did not approve the general structure;
- More columns were to be added ,that is, for contacts, province, districts, species;
- Supplier should be changed to suppliers;
- News and Events: Should have a calendar, every focal point can add new events;
- Photo Library: need to add pictures that make sense, create thematic galleries (protocol should be developed for the pictures) for pictures to be posted. All pictures to be uploaded shouldn't exceed 100KB in size due to storage constraints;
- Virtual Library: Some standards on how to upload information should be enforced, that is, Indicate national papers, journals, annual reports and add disclaimers;
- Country page should have key guiding document like policies legislations should be posted
- Aquaculture Links: Links to partners like World Fish, SARNISSA need to added their contacts should also be added;
- Work done under major projects but not in any site, should have provision for such documents to be posted to the website.
- The design, that is, look and feel (appeal) needs to be improved.
- If possible video clips should be added to the website since they are very appealing.
- Try and make the website not too academic.
- It was noted that visitors look out for websites that are regularly updated. This encourages them to keep visiting the website.
- If possible, add a register link the website so that visitors can login and register as users. This enables the administrators to know who exactly is using their website.
- Consider using social networking media such as Facebook and Twitter to promote the website and activities of the network. Commercial companies in the different regions are

using Facebook especially for business. The ANAF forum is relevant but it is not being used. It is a good tool for exchanging ideas,

- Promote successful farmers/stories by advertising them on the website.
- FAO be requested to make the Economic Tool (its generic) available for it to be posted to the website. Investment opportunities in the countries need to be linked to the tool.
- Needed information on investment from every country, e.g one stop shop.

Human Resource Expertise

Under the Aquaculture Experts the following changes were recommended:

- Aquaculture Technician should be changed to Aquaculture Engineering;
- Boats and fishing gear to be removed;
- Environment and aquaculture impact changed to Environmental Impact Assessment;
- Fish Pathology be changed to Aquatic Health Management and Pathology;
- Hatchery and Reproduction be changed to Hatchery and Nursery Management;
- Processing Labelling, Traceability and Marketing should be added;
- The group 'Others' be removed;
- Water Treatment change to Water Quality;
- Policy and Legislation be added;

Columns changed as follows;

- Name, institution, Expertise, Qualification, Experience, Important projects participated in up to max of 5, Referees, Tel, URL- website name max-5(put an example) most relevant, no of papers
- A disclaimer should be added to the information.

Drafting of Memorandum of Understanding

A draft MOU was developed and can be found in Annex II.

3.3 Targets

Targets refer to one or more specific subjects where ANAF has a comparative advantage and can add value to resolving a critical issue affecting the development of aquaculture in the Region. The key element is to answer the questions What/How/Who? What is the area, or areas, of high priority needs where ANAF can add value? How can this be done and by whom? This provides an alternative mechanism given the difficulties experienced in sourcing direct funding to establish the Network; seeking funding to address crucial priority areas where ANAF can add value whilst simultaneously strengthening itself institutionally. Some of the possible areas to be considered include: cage regulation; women in aquaculture; improved seed; aqua-business planning; farm management; extension/outreach; and, marketing and Value Addition.

Specific priority areas (to be chosen from the chronic ("Big Five") general constraints of feed, seed, markets, capital and information) from which ANAF can add value and provide services at regional level were to be selected. The members were divided into groups. The criteria for selecting priorities were:

- Regionality
- Potential for adoptability
- Its contribution towards food security

After group discussions, the members suggested a number of areas (see Annex IV). It was suggested Seed be the target constraint area, in particular, with the needed 'laser focus', seed as it related to the requirements of the private sector.

The **first priority target**, therefore, was defined as: *Improvement of private seed (tilapia and cat fish) production and distribution channels in Africa.*

Another priority target was identified as: *regional approaches to identifying cage culture capacity in African waters.* Other priorities for further discussion were identified as marketing, specifically intra-regional trade, of aquaculture products and best practices for cage culture.

3.4 Actions

Tangible action by ANAF is needed. This action should now be defined as to how ANAF can add value in addressing the priority targets identified. What can ANAF do to provide aquaculture services? Some actions need to be taken. Proposals can be developed. To whom should they be sent?

It is suggested that a concept note on the top priority [i.e., seed] be prepared and circulated among members or review. The final note should then be used by members to seek support at either national or regional levels.

In addition to the concept for a funded ANAF-led project on seed, action to address the issue of increased visibility for ANAF was discussed. It was suggested that ANAF produce [possibly with FAO RAF and SFE assistance] a *three to five minute video on new approaches to aquaculture in Africa [i.e., SPADA and ANAF] that could be aired on national television stations; the FPs facilitating this promotion.* Funds can also be solicited from partners like Auburn University, SARNISSA, etc. It can then be translated to the difference local languages. The target thereof is to reach the policy makers, extension agents, etc. This is because there has been a substantial change in aquaculture practices. Based on its success, it can also be put on CD or other media outlets (internet, radio, etc). Members agreed to this suggestion by consensus.

After the logo has been made for ANAF, focal points should start to brand ANAF by finding was of promoting ANAF. Any aquaculture-related activity that is being done and could realistically be considered as fitting under ANAF's future role should be so identified. It is important to educate as many people as possible about ANAF whilst at the same time needing to have tangible results from the Network that demonstrate its value.

It is also proposed that ANAF organise a one-day meeting after CIFAA 16 to sensitise Directors of Fisheries. A possible subject of discussion could be successful aquaculture ventures in Africa and/or the role of governments in aquaculture. By the end of August 2010 each focal should send the ideas from their countries about the presentation.

Following this sensitisation event, it was suggested that ANAF members have a general meeting; this being in November 2010 after CIFAA 16. FPs were asked to verify if they could be able to secure funds for that extra activity.

It is hoped that ANAF will reach a dozen members by the end of the year. The immediate question that should be asked and should be discussed in the next ANAF merole of governments in Aquacultureeting is: What should be done after ANAF makes a dozen members? How should they start to provide services?

3.5 Partnerships/Mergers

Key elements included: links with such groups as AU/NEPAD, SARNISSA, RECs, CIFAA, CAPA, WAS and practical decisions on how we move forward. Concerned parties from those "sister" networks or groups present made presentations which are summarised below.

1. SARNISSA

A brief about the SARNISSA project's history, objectives, website and forums (role is sharing information) was presented.

Possible areas of Collaboration between ANAF and SARNISSA/ Lessons Learnt

- It was noted that for any network to be successful, it has to offer quality information to people and be the information they want. The network has to identify what goods and services they are providing from the onset.
- The question was raised of how SARNISSA will continue after its current funding ends early next year. One of the considerations /exit strategy is to commercialize the network and in particular the website.
- It was recalled that the integration of SARNISSA and ANAF was proposed when the former was started. Is a merger between SARNISSA and ANAF the solution to the next steps for both networks? To what extent do the two represent a duplication of tasks and responsibilities?
- Some members suggested, as originally proposed, that SARNISSA, after it winds in February 2011, merge into ANAF.
- It was noted, however, that there should be a clear role distinctions between ANAF and SARNISSA.
- It was also reiterated that ANAF and SARNISSA have a right to exist on their own. Their function should not be looked at exclusively from an IT point of view (their websites), but look at the overall functions. ANAF, following the NACA model, would ultimately be directly engaged in aquaculture development 9cf. ANAF Terms of reference) whilst SARNISSA is more of an information exchange network. A merger would need to ensure that the best of both networks was maintained and strengthened.
- It was underscored that any merger would be based on the consent from the SARNISSA partners and that these would have to be first consulted and the merger issue put to the vote. There was no general objection to the merger nor to who goes hierarchically above or below, but rather the need for an agreement be reached and to ensure that the two complement each other.

ANAF-SARNISSA: a possible merger?

A merger is an option to be further reviewed. It is presently envisioned that in a joint structure, SARNISSA would continue to manage the IT functions of the merged entity considering that there is a level of duplication in this area whilst FPs would continue to maintain their national pages, the FPs spearheading their national networks. The structure of the joint entity would need to be reviewed. The SARNISSA coordinators (regional coordinators), presently an important part of the network given the absence of national FPs, would need to be assessed and possibly given new functions depending on how the ANAF FPs function.

As an indication of joint action that could be undertaken in the short term, a directory for inputs, services, etc. related to aquaculture could be developed/compiled through the merger. It was also felt there should be some level of commercialization following the possible merger so as to generate some revenue. Both ANAF and SARNISSA will have to make some significant changes for this merger to work out.

With a positive feedback from SARNISSA, a concept note for a merged structure will be prepared and will be made available to the ANAF and SARNISSA stakeholders. It is hoped this can be done in time to report this to CIFAA 16. To this end, it is recommended SARNISSA advise as to their partners' views as soon as possible.

Reactions to the Proposed Merger: Both ANAF and SARNISSA agreed to the idea of a merger, although a lot of work has to be done to make it a reality. Members agreed there should be an extended workshop after the CIFAA 16 meeting in Maputo, Mozambique. However the agenda of this meeting can only be elaborated after there is a reaction to the present report.

Other foreseen functions of ANAF

As previously stated, the anticipated structure and function of ANAF is larger than a predominately IT role although this will be an important element. Other expected responsibilities of ANAF include:

- Coordination of research; identifying lead centres. Considering that research is more productive when done on a regional scale. Research priority areas should be identified.
- Coordination and training also at a regional level. Institutions with the strongest skills should be identified to provide the training. Training can also be done in specific skills for example, farm management.
- Standards, certification and best practices. ANAF can come up with best practices
- Harmonisation of rules and regulations
- Feasibility studies
- Technical Assistance
- Promotion and advocacy across the region
- Statistics; regional statistics can be collected, analysed and discussed.

2. CAPA

A presentation for CAPA (Commercial Aquaculture Producers of Africa) was made. This discussed the group's operations (SON in Jinja and Lake Harverst in Zimbabwe), the structure, activities and sources of finance (financial support) of the entity.

Possible Areas of Partnership with ANAF

It was noted that Africa has a big potential to produce fish, however there is need for the commercial farmers to know the limiting capacity for many water bodies (e.g., before introducing cages into the lake). Studies need to be conducted by the governments in these areas (environmental impact analysis). They need guidelines, strategies and policies to be available from governments. ANAF could play a catalyst role.

3. AquaFish CRSP Project

The presentation included the projects objectives, the predecessor FISH Project goals, its activities, case studies carried out, training and outreach undertaken. *CRSP has previously provided some support to ANAF and it was emphasised that this should be acknowledged by FPs as well as in any relevant ANAF or ANAF-related documentation.*

Possible Partnerships with ANAF

- CRSP operates on a research basis. It can be a resource which ANAF can tap into; other CRSP projects will be asked to add ANAF to their plans.
- CRSP can provide information, knowledge, human resource and training. They expect ANAF to identify possible countries for future collaborations (with CRSP), and hope to train some farmers from Tanzania.

3.6 REPORTING

In addition to the present, reports should be prepared as follows: report back to CIFAA 16 and report AU Ministers Meeting.

4.0 Concluding Remarks

The LVFO ICT Officer, on behalf of Uganda thanked all members for coming for the meeting and for their contribution towards making the meeting a success. He wished everyone a safe journey back to their respective destinations.

Attachment I: DRAFT MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE AFRICA AQUACULTURE ORGANIZATIONS AND INSTITUTIONS ON THE OPERATIONALIZATION OF THE AQUACULTURE NETWORK OF AFRICA (ANAF)**

This Memorandum of Understanding is entered into by the government organizations and institutions responsible for aquaculture of the Member Countries of the Committee for Inland Fisheries and Aquaculture of Africa and collectively referred to as "the Parties"

RECOGNISING the high potential for aquaculture development through regional cooperation among the Parties, and that aquaculture has high importance in the efforts to ensure food security and economic growth in the region;

DESIRING to further promote the cooperation between participating Parties in operationalization of ANAF;

WISHING to further strengthen the strategic partnership established between Parties through CIFAA and other national, sub-regional, regional and international efforts;

HAVE reached the following understanding:

ARTICLE I**OBJECTIVES OF ANAF**

1. Identify political, legal and administrative steps/requirements for establishing an IGO through the AU structures and processes
2. Identify mechanisms for maintaining and updating the website
3. Establish National Networks including National Aquaculture Institutes that will serve as the lead agencies or centres of excellence as well as identifying other partners (sub- regional/regional/global) that the network will partner with.
4. Identify priority areas of action for ANAF for 2009-2010
5. Ensure representation at the Ministers meeting in December 2009 in Banjul, Gambia
6. Facilitate NEPAD communications with FPs in CAADP to engage the FPs of ANAF in their activities
7. Identify training materials in the member countries for aquaculture and transform them into electronic format

8. Develop a regional aquaculture project/Project that will address some visible key critical aquaculture impediments in the region through ANAF
9. Further elaborate functions and terms of service of ANAF
10. Organize meeting (tentatively in August 2010) to review and prepare a draft report on ANAF to CIFAA 16
11. Engage in the CAADP Country and Regional processes to strengthen the contribution of fisheries and aquaculture to the 6% Agricultural growth agenda.
12. Promote and popularise ANAF through meetings conferences, newsletters in different parts of Africa and SARNISSA Network.
13. Identify corporate partners
14. Establish budgetary support by host countries to support ANAF

ARTICLE II

AREAS OF COOPERATION

1. Extension and outreach;
2. Success stories and scaling up of Best Management Practices in aquaculture;
3. Aquaculture products marketing and value addition;
4. Aquabusiness planning;
5. Aquaculture Farm management;
6. Improved seed, feed and other aquaculture inputs;
7. Women in aquaculture;
8. Cage culture and other high intensity production system regulation and guidelines;
9. Efficient system of information, notification and communication;
10. Collaborative research in areas of mutual interest within the scope of this Memorandum of Understanding;
11. Exchange visits of relevant personnel of the Parties:
 - i. Conduct training courses, seminars and other similar activities based on the needs and capabilities of the Parties, and in consideration of narrowing the development gap within region;
12. Aquaculture policy, strategies and plans;
13. Harmonization of relevant laws, regulations, rules and standards of the Parties related to the development of aquaculture in the region, and attendant standard operating procedures;
14. Research and Management of fish diseases;
15. Risk assessment procedures and methodologies of quality and safety of farmed aquatic products;
16. Certification of aquaculture products;
17. Development of intra-regional markets and trade in aquaculture products;
18. And any other issues that may be agreed to by the Parties.

ARTICLE III

IMPLEMENTATION

1. In order to implement this Memorandum of Understanding effectively, the Parties will establish a “ANAF Partnership” arrangement for operationalization of ANAF among participating Parties
2. For membership of ANAF the Parties shall be represented by the Heads of government organizations and Institutions responsible for Aquaculture and shall hold at least one meeting annually
3. In order to strengthen communication and cooperation, the Parties may establish technical working groups to study and consult on specific issues as and when required.
4. The contact points designated for the purposes of coordinating implementation and exchange of information under this Memorandum of Understanding shall be aquaculture technical representatives nominated by the participating Parties organizations responsible for aquaculture who shall be known as **FOCAL POINTS**, and their terms of reference are as set out in **TORs** annexed to this Memorandum.
5. The Parties shall be responsible for supporting the activities and requirements of the Focal Points.

ARTICLE IV

FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS

The financial arrangements to cover expenses for the cooperative activities undertaken within the framework of this Memorandum of Understanding shall be mutually agreed upon by the respective Parties on a case-by-case basis subject to the availability of funds.

ARTICLE V

CONFIDENTIALITY

1. Each Party undertakes to observe the confidentiality and secrecy of documents and information received from or supplied by any other Party during the period of the implementation of this Memorandum of Understanding or any other agreements made pursuant to this Memorandum of Understanding.
2. The Parties agree that the provisions of this Article shall continue to be binding between them until the Intergovernmental Organization (IGO) Status as agreed to by the Parties is achieved.

ARTICLE VI

SUSPENSION

Each Party reserves the right for reasons of national security, national interest, public order or public health to suspend temporarily, either in whole or in part, the implementation of this Memorandum of Understanding which suspension shall

take effect immediately after notification has been given to the other Parties through annual meeting.

ARTICLE VII

REVISION, AMENDMENTS AND MODIFICATION

1. Any of the Parties may request in writing a revision, modification or amendment of all or part of this Memorandum of Understanding.
2. Any revision, modification or amendment agreed to by the Parties shall form part of this Memorandum of Understanding.
3. Such revision, modification or amendment shall be made in writing and come into force on such date as may be determined by the Parties.
4. Any revision, modification or amendment shall not prejudice the rights and obligations arising from or based on this Memorandum of Understanding before or up to the date of such revision, modification or amendment.

ARTICLE VIII

SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

Any difference or dispute between the Parties concerning the interpretation and/or implementation and/or application of the provisions of this Memorandum of Understanding shall be settled amicably through consultations and/or negotiations between the Parties.

ARTICLE IX

FINAL PROVISIONS

1. This Memorandum of Understanding will come into effect on the date of signing and will be valid until the formal establishment of the IGO status of ANAF;
2. The termination of this Memorandum of Understanding will not affect the implementation of ongoing programmes, or programmes which have been agreed upon prior to the date of termination of the Memorandum of Understanding;

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned, being duly authorized by the respective Governments of the CIFAA Member Countries;

Done at, on this Day of the Month of in the Year in original copies done in English, French, Portuguese and Arabic