

Group Discussion on Economics & Livelihood Impacts of HPAI

Prof Janice Olawoye (UI)

Dr Ekin Birol (IFPRI)

Methodology

- Reviewed several published and grey literature and data from various sources (NBS, FDLPCS, etc.)

Discussion

- *Are there any data sources and/or studies that have not been included in the background papers?*
 - Data sources
 - 1976 study on poultry production in Nigeria by Ikpi et al.
 - 1990-1991 RIM Livestock census
 - Access to raw data from NBS Nigeria Living Standards Survey (2004) and NBS Livestock Survey (2006) available at the www.nigerianstats.gov.ng
 - Some other stakeholders to interview
 - Contact World poultry Science Association Nigeria Branch and the Animal Science Association of Nigeria

Discussion Continued

- Other studies that should be included
 - Some journals not captured:
 - Nigerian poultry journal,
 - World poultry Science journal
 - Local journals should capture 70% of the PhD/Msc theses
 - FAO Newsletter International Network for Family Poultry Development (AI special issues)
 - Some grey material not captured:
 - Small study on cost of production by Prof Dafwang
 - FEWSNET and Dr Maina, quick study on Avian Flu
 - NAPRI socio-economics documents
 - NGO actively involved chicken multiplication and production system
 - NISER.

Summary of Key Findings

- Poultry is a vital component of rural livelihoods (income and nutrition).
- Especially women derive significant incomes from poultry.
- Poultry is an important source of protein and micronutrients, but there are deficiencies.
- HPAI outbreaks have caused significant reductions in income and nutrition from poultry.

Discussion Questions

- *Do you agree/disagree with the key findings of the background paper?*
 - Almost all seem to agree with these
- *Do you have anything to add to these?*
 - Issues on export (not much due to domestic demand and SPS conditions specified by WTO)
 - 60 or 70% rural poultry statistics debatable
 - Clear definition of small scale producer and village producer

Knowledge Gaps

- Very few studies on the contribution of poultry to household income and nutrition, conducted in a handful of LGAs. A recent, uniform national level data base is missing.
- There is few information at national level on the intra-household dynamics of poultry production, and gender specific information is limited.
- Inaccessible/limited studies which estimated the impact of HPAI on rural livelihoods (income and nutrition).
- There is few documented information on the knowledge, attitude and perceptions of rural households with regards to HPAI and the impact of the compensation schemes on household livelihoods and biosecurity practices.

Discussion Questions

- *Do you agree/disagree with the knowledge gaps identified?*
 - All seem to agree with these
- *Are there any other gaps that should be included in the list?*
 - Also look at economic and livelihood impacts on
 - Households with 1-2 birds
 - Poor households who don't rear poultry
 - Urban poultry producers
 - Other actors in the chain (feed millers, vet drug sellers, transporters etc.
 - Consumers of poultry

Discussion continued

- At the household level also investigate
 - Impact of HPAI on food security
 - Level of recovery since outbreak
 - In addition to various sources of income, access to food and food expenditure
- Value chain approach
 - Influence of actors other than producers/farmers (e.g., processors/marketers, toll millers reusing bag) on AI spread and management
 - Behaviour in live bird production, marketing, processing and consumption

Discussion Continued

– Institutional analysis

- The role of various institutions (e.g., associations) in the system

– Disease risk

- Cross border movement and trade within the region, especially in the North

– Experiments

- Agricultural insurance/guarantee scheme for poultry

– Communication

- Communication strategy especially at the farm level, making use of local forms of media

Initial proposal to fill these gaps

- Country wide qualitative and quantitative data collection in selected sites through
 - Structured household surveys
 - Focus group discussions and participatory poverty assessment
 - KAP surveys
 - Anthropometric measures and food consumption data
- Data collection should be implemented in all six geopolitical zones, selecting sites depending on several criteria (role of rural poultry production, HPAI status (control and eradication measures), distance from the HPAI outbreak)

Discussion

- *Are there any other methods that should be used or data that should be collected to fill these gaps?*
 - Impact assessment: Investigate the impact of AI by looking at those states/farms that are affected and that are not affected
 - Gender and generational variations/dynamics should be factored in the livelihoods research
 - Nutrition- differential distribution of micronutrient consumption within households (impact of socio-cultural factors)

Discussion Continued

- Value chain approach and entry points of risk
- In the KAP survey also collect information on attitudes towards insurance
- Sampling and Logistics
 - Data collection and sampling support from NBS
 - 4 agro-ecological zones (NE/NW, Middle belt, SW, SE) some convergence with socio-cultural factors
 - Purposeful sampling of sites
 - States selected according to HPAI status (eradication and control measures)
 - Administrative areas within states to be selected depending on various criteria (e.g., HPAI status, time, distance, compensation)
 - Qualitative data to be collected on selected sites within these

Additional Comments

- All the literature used in the background paper (including grey literature, reports etc) should be made available on the internet
- Soft copies of all presentations should be made available to the workshop participants