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Introduction

• Importance of Livestock:
  – World economy
  – Food security
  – Source of livelihood and traction for poor people
  – Social aspect

• Increasing demand for animal proteins and international trade of livestock and its products

• Major constraint to productivity and trade = animal diseases

• Among these diseases: Foot-and-Mouth (FMD): multi-species – transboundary nature – spread rapidly – high morbidity
Introduction (Cont’)

• FMD impact at “Macro-economic” level (global market disruption, national economies...) well studied (e.g. 2001 UK crisis – US$ 13 billion)

• But impact on poverty and food security at household level less described

• Eradication of FMD is possible* – although long and expensive process so needs strong commitment from all stakeholders. However Benefit-Cost Analysis (BCA) showed high benefit-cost ratios...

• ... thus efforts to control FMD merit sustained support from the international community and donors
RATIONALE FOR INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY’S INVOLVEMENT IN FMD CONTROL: THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF THE DISEASE

Figures are estimates and are presented as relative size. Source: FAO-OIE-WHO-UNICEF presentation “One World, One Health”, Washington, USA, July 2008
1. FMD = “macro-economic” disease with impact on international trade and national economies:

   • e.g. 2001 crisis in UK or models in Australia* and Tennessee;
   
   • BCA in developing countries (Philippines & Zimbabwe): benefit-cost ratios range from 1.5 to 12 depending on the scenario and the countries;

   • FMD: OIE list of notifiable diseases, FAO-OIE GF-TADs

   • FMD: GPG as “infectious disease that do not respect national or economic boundaries and impose high costs to society” (OWOH conference in Winnipeg, Canada, March 2009). Win-win investment.
2. FMD impact on smallholders farming systems:

- FMD: negative effects on animal production by
  (i) reduction of milk yield, (ii) abortions and mortalities among young animals, (iii) lameness (draught power) and (iv) weight loss.

- Studies (India, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Vietnam*, Sudan) highlighted impact of FMD on poverty and food security

- Gender dimension
  
  CCL: Overall UN MDGs – Pro-poor growth (DFID)
MAIN CONSTRAINTS TO INTERNATIONAL FUNDING OF FMD GLOBAL CONTROL

1. False perception of FMD:
   • Not recognized as a priority disease impacting poverty – not a “Killer Disease”;
   • “Indigenous livestock naturally resistant”; *

2. High Costs of FMD Prevention and Control versus few Cost-benefit Analyses at the Household Level:
   • Tools exist but expensive (e.g. needs assessments** in SE Asia: vaccination and monitoring campaign: US$ 4.67 / head / year)
   • Lack of extensive microeconomic impact studies to counterbalance these perceived high costs
3. National approach insufficient for FMD control and eradication:

• Experiences in South-America and Southern Africa show that maintaining a disease free status is difficult and depends upon close cooperation among neighboring countries;

• Need to adopt a regional or sub-regional approach – might be a constraint for donors*;

• Regional Organizations
  (African RECs, ASEAN)**;
• Conclusion:

– well-described effects of major animal diseases: (i) direct, (ii) ripple, (iii) spillover, (iv) long-term, and (v) remote effects...

– ... but investments in Animal Health remain too limited in many developing countries;

– When investments in Animal Health, other diseases that are perceived as more important for poverty alleviation compete with FMD for investment attention;

– distorted perceptions regarding this disease lead to a lack of political will at the National and International levels
ELEMENTS FOR AN INCREASED DONORS’ INVOLVEMENT IN FMD CONTROL AND ERADICATION

1. Lessons from past and ongoing experiences:
   - National level:
     * FMD recovery project in Uruguay – WB*
   - Regional level:
     - OIE-SEAFMD¹ – Aus., Thailand, NZ, France
     - PHEFA² – FAO, USA, Canada, Brazil
     - EuFMD³** - FAO, EC
   - Regional approach: comparative advantages as it allows integrated and harmonized approaches, cooperation and transparency among the key stakeholders, and economies of scale for specific actions

¹ Southeast Asia Foot-and-Mouth Disease Campaign
² Hemispheric Plan for Eradication of FMD
³ European Commission for the control of Foot-and-mouth disease
2. Areas of interventions

- Interventions must fall within the framework of actions developed by the international technical organizations, and firstly FAO and OIE through the GF-TADs.

- Action plans developed in the different regions (e.g. PHEFA, SEAFMD Roadmap 2020...).
2. Areas of intervention (Cont’)

• Investing in analytical work*

• Investing in research (new and cheaper tools and technologies)**

• Investing in national, regional and global surveillance and laboratories’ networks

• Investing in communication and public awareness

• Investing in good governance of VS as a GPG*** - OIE-PVS Tool and Gap Analysis; FAO national projects on prevention and control of animal diseases

• Investing in Monitoring and Evaluation****
CONCLUSION

• Livestock contributes significantly to the world economy...

• ... however animal diseases remain a major constraint to economic growth, poverty reduction and food security, as well as people’s health and well being

• Among them, FMD: a multi-species highly contagious disease

• FMD list of OIE notifiable disease and its eradication = GPG – More than 100 countries not recognized a FMD-Free by the OIE

• Cost of prevention and protection is low compared to the cost of FMD outbreaks;
CONCLUSION (Cont’)

• “Win-win” situation for rich countries to invest in FMD control and eradication;

• Lessons from Americas, Europe, Southeast Asia – regional approach has clear comparative advantages;

• Global control of FMD might become a priority for donors, with:
  – National authorities demonstrating their political commitment* – cooperation & solidarity among nations;
  – Design and implementation of a global strategy based on the technical recommendations from FAO/OIE (GF-TADs);
  – Long term view (e.g. Rinderpest > 20 years);
  – Involvement from private sector;
  – Concerted financial support from donors (Paris Declaration);
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