Pro-Poor Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI) Risk Reduction Strategies in Africa and Asia

Stakeholder Workshop

July 3-4, 2008

ILRI Campus, Addis Ababa

1. Introduction and objectives

The stakeholder workshops were organized in relation to the DFID (Department for International Development of the United Kingdom) funded project *"Collaborative and multi-disciplinary research project to identify and promote pro-poor Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI) risk reduction strategies in Africa and Asia"*.

The project is implemented in four African countries (Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya and Nigeria along with Indonesia in Asia. The project is a multi-disciplinary multi-institutional research effort. The institutions involved are as follows

(1) International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)
(2) International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)
(3) Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO)
(4) Royal Veterinary College, and
(5) University of California at Berkeley

These institutions are executing this project in close collaboration with national partners from different research disciplines and different affiliations. The goal is to assist African and Asian governments and international organizations in making decisions to limit the spread of HPAI, while minimizing the impact on different socio-economic groups. The premise of the project is that sensitivity towards livelihood impacts of disease and control and prevention strategies is both efficient as well as equitous.

In Ethiopia and other African countries (listed above) the project is implemented by ILRI and IFPRI in closed collaboration with national partners. The first output planned in the project was a background paper providing relevant information for HPAI research and also to focus on initial identification of research gaps that were to be refined and revised in discussion with different stakeholders.

In this regard a background paper was prepared by national partners in collaboration with IFPRI and ILRI researchers. The first draft of the background paper was prepared and was circulated to workshop participants for their comments and critique.

The workshop lasted for two days and had the following components (Detailed agenda is attached in the annex)

(1) Presentation of the background paper
(2) Presentation by different stakeholders regarding the status of research in Ethiopia and their expectations from this DFID funded project.
(3) Group discussion focusing on research gaps to focus on in this project
(4) Stakeholder mapping to determine the channels for disease risk and the poultry value chains for assessment of livelihood impacts.

The objectives of the stakeholder workshop in Ethiopia were as follows (identical to the objectives in other countries:

- To present the background papers to the stakeholder and get their inputs towards finalizing the document
- To familiarize the stakeholders with the details of this project and in some cases introduce the project to people who have not been introduced before
- To determine the relevant research questions based on the research gaps identified in consultation with the stakeholders.
- To identify the national partners for the project

2. Participating stakeholders and institutions

Workshop organizers: IFPRI supported by ILRI Addis Ababa and Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research organized this workshop. Stakeholders were drawn from different fields and they represented research, operations, institutions and government sector in Ethiopia. The organizations, institutions and affiliations that were represented at the workshop are listed below.

(1) IFPRI
(2) ILRI
(3) Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research
(4) Animal Health Laboratory Center
(5) Ethiopian Nutrition and Health Research Institute
(6) Debrezeit Agricultural Research Center
(7) Department of Veterinary Sciences, Addis Ababa University
(8) Texas A&M University, SPS LMM program
(9) Regional Laboratory (Shola)
(10) Several Poultry Farms
(11) Several poultry traders
(12) Ministry of Agricultural and Rural Development

3. Workshop summary

The workshop was opened by Dr Berhe Gebreeziabher (Chief Veterinary Officer, Ethiopia) who provided an overview of the government and private sector activities regarding HPAI control and prevention strategies in Ethiopia. Dr Berhe also provided important details regarding the poultry sector in Ethiopia in term of its size, regional variation and its structure. Subsequently, Clare Narrod of IFPRI presented outlining the structure of the project, its planned activities and institutional and individual responsibilities.

This was followed with the presentation of the background paper by Dr. Dawit Alemu, professor at the Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural research. Open discussions were organized to comment and critique the paper from different stakeholders. Subsequently the authors provided response to those comments. There was lively discussion on the proposed research gaps where suggestions were made both regarding what to add on from the identified list and what to drop out. These points were noted and will be included in the revision of the background paper.

The second half of the day was spent in breakout discussion groups on (i) Disease Risk and (ii) Economic and Livelihood Impacts of HPAI and its control measures. The groups were presorted based on their interest, affiliations and expertise. Group 1 focused on disease risks while group 2 focused on economic and livelihood impcts.

The topics on which group 1 focused and made points about are:

Group 1: Disease risk, Institutional mechanism and Control strategies finding and research gaps

Disease risk

- *Ways of introduction for HPAI virus in Ethiopia*

- Illegal trade – Small traders at the border with Sudan, Djibouti and Eriteria were identified and agreed upon as an important risk for disease transmission even though their role is considered insignificant in terms of volume and value as of now.

Legal trade:

- Day old chicks (DOC): importation through air was identified along with import of (i) poultry equipment and poultry products and mechanical transport at the border with Sudan

Wild migratory bird

- Pathways of wild migratory birds was recognized as important but there was a strong debate regarding the size of risk from this source.

Following the discussion on the ways of introduction of the disease, there was discussion on ways of spread. These included

- Poultry market
- Feed processing
- Poultry equipment
- Poultry multiplication centre
- Human factor (worker of smalls or larger commercial farms)

In the area of risk maps it was commonly agreed that there is a need to update the previous or existing risk assessment via DOC and migratory birds.

Control option

The discussion on control options included the following different measures related to

- *Measures*

- Movement control
- Vaccination
- Quarantine measures
- Stamping out and compensation. There was a strong debate on the mechanism entailing linking of compensation to the level of bio-security as proposed in other countries such as Ghana.
- Disposal of carcass
- Disinfection of infected material
- Active surveillance
- Awareness creation (sensitizing)
- Level of bio-security of each poultry production including fencing of poultry premises
- Market closure on selected days.

It was decided to assess the role of all these control options from the point of view of their cost effectiveness.

Institutional mechanism

The following institutions were identified as crucial for HPAI control and prevention strategies.

- National coordination committee
- Technical coordination committee: Regional, woreda level
- Communication and awareness
- Surveillance disease and control for human health
- Surveillance disease and control for and animal health
- Resource and mobilization
- Public health

Group 2: Economic and Livelihood Impact of Disease Outbreak and Prevention and Control Strategies

The discussion on livelihood and economic impact of HPAI disease and control and prevention strategies focused on identifying the focus areas for research. The participants agreed that this is a very important issue and is not adequately researched upon.

The following areas were identified as relevant for research in Ethioia.

1. All the participants agreed that a value chain perspective is needed. Focusing just on the poultry producers could result in significant under-valuation of the impacts of the disease or the mitigation measures
2. The participants also agreed that the nature of the poultry sector has changed significantly in the last 6- 7 years and any assessment must employ updated data to be representative of the actual situation
3. The participants also suggested that disaggregation by gender is an important part of the assessment of livelihood impacts. Except in comparatively large semi commercial or commercial poultry sector, women and children play a very important role in the poultry sector. In fact several of the small trading activity in markets is undertaken by teenage children and women.
4. All the participants agreed that nutrition is an important part of livelihood and is potentially very important in Ethiopia especially in light of the rising prices for other animal source food. The participants also suggested that in order to research on this topic collaboration with stakeholders in public health is desirable.
5. All participants agreed that considering poultry as a source of income is not enough and this must be assessed as a source of small insurance and ameans to meet irregular expenses for the households.

Stakeholder Mapping

The second day of the workshops was used to introduce net mapping to the stakeholders. This tool was presented to participants by Eva Schiffer and Marites Tiongco (IFPRI). The participants were again divided into two groups based on their interests, expertise and affiliations.

Briefly, the exercise consisted of mapping the institutions, the flow of information about suspected outbreaks, and the responses to HPAI. In addition, attempts were made to identify influential institutions and constrains in relation to the flow of information and responses to the disease (for details see Schiffer 2008 report on the stakeholder mapping in Ethiopia).

The participants were asked to identify all individuals, groups and organisations what could influence that information about suspected outbreaks of HPAI reaches the responsible authorities and that appropriate action is taken.

The Actors:

The actors mentioned included the producers, traders, input-suppliers, government agencies, local level individuals and international organizations. The participants mentioned the different kinds of facilities where chicken and eggs are produced. They identified the different government entities responsible for making decisions on different fronts as well local level groups and individuals in the private sector. International organizations, research institutions and coordinating bodies were also identified.

After identifying the actors, the first question the participants answered was:
If there is a suspected outbreak of HPAI, how is the information about the outbreak transferred to the respective authorities. The flow of information was drawn for potential outbreaks on the different levels of farms, in the government run multiplication center, in the wet market and in case of suspicious dead wild birds. Further the group was asked: How strongly can these actors influence that the information actually reaches the respective authorities.

Concerning the communication of suspected cases, the group members reported a number of bottlenecks:

- Missing links for the communication of cases on the wet market and a lack of communication of HPAI information to the traders
- Lack of market inspections

The mapping was also done for the response in case of an outbreak. Details of the mapping exercise are available in Schiffer (2008). Some important results are listed below.

As Ethiopia does not have private media houses, the Government has a strong say about the risk communication via media. Further, the intervention on the farm level requires a high level of interaction and coordination between a number of different actors. The major differences are that commercial farms seem to be directly linked to national and regional actors such as the Federal Veterinary Services, National Reference Lab and Regional Lab. In the case of backyard farms the actual intervention would be undertaken by actors from the regional and Wereda level, while being coordinated from the national level.

One bottleneck that was mentioned numerous times by the working group is the high level of coordination that involved a great number of different actors and requires lengthy bureaucratic processes. In a system with numerous coordinators, it might be difficult to facilitate rapid, concerted and unanimous response.

The net map also confirmed that the local government is the most powerful and influential in terms of formulation and implementation of HPAI control measures. There was a general consensus between all stakeholders and national institutions about their interest in joining the presented project and as well as on the identified research priorities.

List of Participants

No.	NAME	INSTITUTION	Tel. No.	Fax No.	EMAIL ADDRESS
1	Abreham Ali	Ethiopian Nutrition and Health Research Institute	251-1-0911861774	251-2-757722	abraalimo@yahoo.com
2	Abreham Tefera	Debrezeit Poultry Farm	251-1-0911485712		abresh48@gmail.com
3	Alemshet Hailu	Debrezeit Poultry Farm	251-1-091400463		
4	Amsalu Demissie	MOARD	251-1-0911409067/ 251-116478593	251-1-6463686	tseddey@yahoo.com
5	Ato Ahadu Beneberu	Bora Animal and Poultry	251-1-0911541584/ 251-1-4338549		
6	Ato Asfaw Yemegnuhal	Faculty of Vetrinary, Addis Ababa University Debrezeit	251-1-0911619363		asfaw-2006@ethionetet
7	Azage Tegegne	ILRI			
8	Berhe Gebreegziabher	Ministry of Agriculture & Rural Development	251-1-0911254374/ 251-1-0116460119	251-1-11463686	berheg@gmail.com
9	Bojja Endebu	CIRAD	251-1-0913333591	251-1-4330077	bojiae@yahoo.com
11	Dawit Alemu	Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research	251-1-0911629149/ 251-1-0116454434	251-11-6461294	dawit96@yahoo.com
12	Dawit Kelemework	IFPRI	251-11-6172522		d.kelemework@cgiar.org
13	Devesh Roy	IFPRI			d.roy@cgiar.org
14	Dr. Wondwosen Tsegaye	Shola Regional Laboratory	251-1-0911408127		won952002@yahoo.com
15	Eva Schiffer	IFPRI			eva-schiffer@web.de
16	Fanaye Mebratu Ambaye	Girma Kebrekidan Farm (Debrezeit)	251-1-0911209266/ 251-1-0114333780	251-1-0113725403	g.g.kidan@ethionet.com
17	Fekadu Kebede	National Vet-Institute/Debrezeit	251-1-4338411		mycogs1@yahoo.com
18	Henok Endale	Debrezeit Poultry Farm	251-1-0912098120		henik2000@hotmail.com
19	Kebreab Abdissa	Adama Poultry Farm	251-1-0911228173		
20	Laikemariam Yigezu	SPS-LMM Program	251-1-0116185846/47	251-11-6185848	laike@siga.org.et
21	Marites	IFPRI			m.tiongco@cgiar.org

	Tiongco				
22	Melesse Balcha	NAHDIC	251-1-0911868942	251-1-3380220	melessebalcha2000@yahoo.com
23	Mesfin Sahle	NAHDIC	251-1-0113380898	251-1-3380220	mesfinsahle@gmail.com
24	Nega Tewolde	SPS-LMM Program	251-1-0911428723/ 251-1-0116185846/7	251-1-0116185848	nega@siga.org.et
25	Negussie Negash	Awasa Poultry Farm	251-1-0916823352		
26	Serge Nzietchueng	ILRI, NAIROBI, Kenya			s.nzietchueng@cgiar.org
27	Setotaw Ferede	Debrezeit Agri. Research Center	251-1-0912072890/ 251-114338555	251-114338067	setotawferede@yahoo.com
28	Seyoum Bediye	EIAR	251-1-0911173293		
29	Tadelle Dessie	ILRI			t.dessie@cgiar.org
30	Wondemeneh Esatu	Debrezeit Agricultural Research Center, EIAR	251-1-0114338555/ 251-10911732358	251-1-4338061	wondmenehesatu@yahoo.com
31	Wondosen Asfaw	SPS-LMM Program	251-1-0911695624/ 251-11-6185846/7	251-116185848	wondwosen@siga.org.et
32	Wondewosen Tsegaye	Animal Health Laboratory Center	251-0911408127/ 251-11-6461124		wong52002@yahoo.com
33	Workenesh Ayele	Ethiopian Nutrition and Health Research Institute	251-1-0911890967	251-2-757722	wayele@gmail.com