

TECHNICAL ITEM I

Eradication of Peste des petits ruminants (PPR): results and perspectives



Henry Wamwayi

Outline

- Overview of Socio-economic Importance of sheep and goats
- The importance of PPR
- Global, Pan African and Regional PPR Eradication Strategies
- Status of National PPR Strategies
- Available tools to support implementation of national PPR strategies
- Implementation of PPR control programmes
- Application of PPR vaccinations
- Knowledge of WOAHPPR Vaccine Bank and vaccine procurement practices and choices
- WOAHPPR status recognition and endorsement of PPR official control programmes
- Impacts of animal movement control on the national PPR situation
- Stakeholder engagement in PPR Activities
- Perceptions on PPR as a priority and its eradication by 2030
- Conclusions

Introduction

- ▶ Examines perceptions/ perspectives of WOAHA Members of the Regional Commission for Africa, on the importance of sheep and goats, available strategies, tools and other important factors, critical for PPR eradication.
- ▶ Based on analysis of responses provided by 34 Members in a questionnaire

Aim: to highlight the PPR situation in Africa and identify key factors hindering progress towards the attainment of PPR free status of Members by 2030.

Objectives:

- ▶ Identify some gaps, challenges and opportunities for appropriate interventions for timely eradication of PPR from Africa by 2030.
- ▶ Reiterate the availability of technical tools and support mechanisms from WOAHA/FAO, regional and sub-regional organisations to enhance capacities of Members for PPR eradication
- ▶ Highlight critical areas for further support to Members by WOAHA and partners

Participating countries

| Geographical Region | Countries | No. |
|----------------------------|--|------------|
| Northern Africa | Algeria, Morocco | 2 |
| Western Africa | Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cote d'Ivoire, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone | 11 |
| Central Africa | Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Republic of Congo, Gabon | 5 |
| Eastern Africa | Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Somalia, South Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda | 9 |
| Southern Africa | Comoros, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Seychelles, Zambia. | 7 |
| | TOTAL | 34 |

Overview of Socio-economic Importance

- ➔ Sheep and goats considered to have socio-economic importance through contribution to household incomes (>70%); household food and nutrition security (>70%); supporting the resilience of vulnerable households to shocks/crises (>70%); ; rebuilding of herds after disasters (75%); international trade (<60%) and national economic growth (> 80%).
- ➔ Overall, positive socio-economic contributions in the majority of Members.
- The AfCFTA, operational since January 2021, provides opportunities for greater contributions of sheep and goats to economic growth through enhanced intra-African trade.
- Effective exploitation of trade opportunities under the AfCFTA will require improved capacities and investments to enhance sanitary measures to ensure safe intra-African trade in live sheep and goats and their products.

The importance of PPR

- Acute contagious disease caused by PPR virus (a small ruminant Morbillivirus) in the family Paramyxoviridae
- Affects mainly domestic sheep and goats although cattle, camels, buffaloes and some wild ruminant species can be infected
- PPR is a WOAHA-listed disease; countries have an obligation to report its occurrence in conformity with provisions of the Terrestrial Animal Health Code
- PPR reported in 37 countries across Africa and is endemic in northern, western, central and eastern Africa.
- Six Members (Botswana, Eswatini, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mauritius and South Africa) and two non-contiguous territories (Reunion and Saint Helena) are officially recognized as PPR free by WOAHA; one Member (Namibia) has an officially recognised PPR free zone
- Mozambique, Malawi, Seychelles, Zambia and Zimbabwe in southern Africa, Cabo Verde in western Africa, Sao Tome and Principe in Central Africa have never recorded outbreaks of PPR.

The importance of PPR..

- Research has associated PPR with increased poverty (10%); food and nutritional insecurity; environmental degradation; school dropout and migration of households.
- A benefit-cost analysis of PPR eradication estimated total discounted costs of US\$2.26 billion for a 15 years' eradication programme with a net benefit of US\$74.2 billion and a benefit cost ratio of 33.8.
- PPR eradication will therefore have positive impacts on household food and nutrition security, livelihoods, household incomes and the conservation of ecosystems.

Global, Pan African and Regional PPR Eradication Strategies

- ▶ PPR Global Control and Eradication Strategy (GCES) jointly launched in April 2015 by WOAHA and FAO
- ▶ PPR GEP (2017 – 2021) developed by FAO and WOAHA in consultation with stakeholders.
- ▶ The second phase to eradication developed after extensive stakeholder consultations and launched on 4th November 2022
- ▶ A pan-African PPR control and eradication strategy aligned to the GCES developed by AU-IBAR and stakeholders in December 2015.
- ▶ Sub-regional PPR strategies developed for ECCAS, ECOWAS, IGAD and SADC
- ▶ Strategies and related tools in place to support PPR eradication in Africa.
- ▶ Need to reflect on achievement of the 2030 eradication target considering the needs and capacities to implement national PPR strategies.

Knowledge, contribution, participation and relevance of strategies to Members

| | Inadequate knowledge | Non contribution or participation of Members in development | Activities not relevant to country needs | No linkage mechanisms |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---|--|-----------------------|
| Pan-African PPR Strategy | 9 | 4 | 3 | 6 |
| Regional (RECs) Strategies | 9 | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| GEP Blueprint to eradication | 11 | 5 | 2 | 3 |

Other Perceptions on PPR strategies

- ▶ The Global, Pan-African and sub-regional strategies serve a critical role of guidance for implementation of national strategies.
- ▶ Capacity strengthening of veterinary cadres required in some countries to effectively engage with the strategies.
- ▶ Linkages with regional strategies constrained by inadequate funding and frameworks to manage the eradication programme and stakeholders
- ▶ The regional and global strategies focus more on PPR infected countries and provide little guidance to historically free countries.
- ▶ The new PPR-GEP Blueprint to eradication needs to be widely disseminated to foster greater understanding, adoption and alignment of national PPR eradication activities.
- ▶ Gaps in knowledge may be due to frequent staff turnovers in the national Veterinary Services.
- ▶ Need to continuously raise awareness among the Members to ensure continuity in knowledge of the global and regional/sub-regional strategies



Status of National PPR Strategies

- ▶ National PPR strategies developed by all Members except 1 but only a few strategies costed until the eradication of PPR.
- ▶ The human and financial resources to implement the strategies are inadequate to achieve eradication in the majority of countries.
- ▶ Limited funding and lack of political goodwill affect the availability and use of emergency funds to effectively respond to outbreaks of PPR.

Challenges in implementing national PPR strategies

- Inadequate disbursement of funds by national governments for PPR activities (24 Members)
- Weak capacity of the national veterinary services for PPR surveillance, diagnosis and control (20 Members)
- Lack of public private partnership initiatives (13 Members)
- Lack of an enabling national policy framework (10 Members)
- Lack of an appropriate legal framework (9 members)
- Insecurity and armed conflict preventing access to some areas for PPR vaccinations (4 Members)
- PPR is not considered a priority by national stakeholders (3 Members)

Available tools to support implementation of national PPR strategies

- WOAHPVS Missions with PPR specific content (Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Cote d' Ivoire, Liberia, Nigeria, and Sierra Leone)
- The PPR Monitoring and Assessment Tool (PMAT) - recently revised.
- PPR Post Vaccination Evaluation (PVE) tool.
- Training on submission of dossiers for official recognition of free status by WOAHP
- Training on endorsement of PPR Official Control programmes by WOAHP
- Wildlife surveillance guidelines
- Contingency Plans (FAO template)
- WOAHPPR Vaccine Bank
- WOAHPPR Reference Laboratories network

Factors preventing effective use of the tools

The majority of the Members do not make use of the available tools to support implementation of national PPR strategies:

- inadequate knowledge of the procedures and process for engagement with the tool/strategy
- Lack of appropriately trained staff/ national expertise to implement the tool
- Lack of sufficient staff to dedicate to the tasks
- Lack of a PMAT version in French (or other languages except English)
- Low awareness among policy makers
- Insufficient funding and inadequate commitment from international organisations
- Lack of laboratory reagents to support the testing of samples for PVE
- No participation in inter-laboratory proficiency testing and regional laboratory network activities by some countries
- Some countries are still vaccinating and cannot apply for PPR freedom
- Countries with internal PPR vaccine production capabilities with quality certification obtained from AU-PANVAC
- One country has no PPR strategy or control programme

Implementation of PPR control programmes

- 25 Members implement structured PPR vaccination programmes designed by the Veterinary authorities
- 20 Members organise PPR vaccinations according to vaccination calendars
- Accredited private sector veterinarians participate in PPR vaccinations under supervision by the veterinary authorities in 21 countries
- Private veterinarians vaccinate for PPR on request by livestock owners in 19 countries
- Donor or Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) support PPR vaccination programmes in collaboration with the Veterinary Services in 17 countries
- Donor or NGO supported vaccination programmes are implemented directly with livestock owners in 19 countries
- 22 countries identified need for a practical PPR vaccination guide to facilitate the design and follow up implementation of PPR vaccination programmes
- 7 countries are not carrying out PPR vaccination campaigns

PRAPS Project in the Sahel region

- In the Sahel, Pastoralism is a key driver of growth providing livelihoods for more than 20 million people.
- In 2015, WOAHA launched the Regional Project to support Pastoralism in the Sahel (PRAPS) with funding from the World Bank.
- PRAPS animal health component aims to improve access to markets, the means of production and essential services in selected areas of six Sahelian Members (Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali, Mauritania, Niger and Senegal)
- More than 75% of the livestock sector is based on transhumant or nomadic pastoralism.
- PRAPS targets the control of PPR among other diseases to contribute to strengthening the resilience of the pastoral communities in the Sahel.

Application of PPR vaccinations

Varying applications of PPR vaccinations among the countries

- Targeting of the whole national population of sheep and goats (18 countries).
- Vaccinations only in selected areas of the country (14 Members)
- Vaccination of only certain categories of sheep and goats, (2 Members)
- Only ring vaccinations following outbreaks of PPR

PPR vaccinations do not appear to be systematically driven by a clear epidemiological understanding of the PPR situation for effective targeting of interventions

Factors constraining cessation of vaccinations

Cessation of vaccinations in countries vaccinating for more than 5 years constrained by:

- Continuous introduction of PPR from neighbouring countries (7 Members)
- Lack of a regional strategy for vaccination
- High numbers of sheep and goats but provision of insufficient doses of PPR vaccine by governments and donors.
- Delays in procurement and distribution of PPR vaccines
- No post vaccination evaluations carried out (3 Members)
- Vast territories, drought, insecurity, insufficient funds and cold chain facilities
- Insufficient political goodwill

Knowledge of WOAAH PPR Vaccine Bank and vaccine procurement practices and choices

- 22 Members aware of WOAAH PPR Vaccine Bank
- 7 Members work with local vaccine producers or pre-identified providers.
- 7 Members procure vaccines on an *ad-hoc* basis that is not based on a systematic vaccination programme.
- One indicated that the preferred vaccine choices are not included in the WOAAH Vaccine Bank.
- Sixteen Members highlighted the need for more information on WOAAH PPR Vaccine Bank.
- WOAAH information poster available at the exhibition

WOAH PPR status recognition and endorsement of PPR official control programmes

- ▶ 7 Members have WOAH PPR status recognition
- ▶ A number of Members that do not report PPR and do not vaccinate for PPR have not applied for WOAH PPR free status recognition.
- ▶ Members also implementing official control programmes for PPR but have not applied for WOAH endorsement of the programmes.

Factors preventing submission of applications for WOAAH PPR Status Recognition

Preparation of application underway in only one Member country

- ▶ Non-compliance with other WOAAH standards (no movement controls; nomadic and transhumant movements; lack of systems for border control and appropriate legislation)
- ▶ Inadequate knowledge of the PPR epidemiological situation in the country
- ▶ Active cases of PPR or serological detection in some areas/ neighbouring countries
- ▶ Lack of financial resources to pay for the application
- ▶ Lack of national expertise to compile dossiers for application
- ▶ Inadequate knowledge of procedures and process of application for PPR status recognition (3 Members)
- ▶ On-going vaccinations in high risk areas
- ▶ Displacement of workforce from posts and disruption of veterinary governance due to deep internal crisis

Factors preventing submission of applications for WOAH Endorsement of Official PPR Control Programmes

Seven Members in different stages of preparation of dossiers for submission

- Inadequate knowledge of the procedures and process for application in most countries.
- Lack of national expertise and/or trained staff to document in detail, the official control programme according to standards in the *Terrestrial Code*, and WOAH standard operating procedures and guidelines.
- Lack of an animal identification and traceability system and the irregular testing for PPR.

Impacts of animal movement control on the national PPR situation

- Internal movement of sheep and goats perceived to have a great impact on the national PPR situation by 31 Members but, 23 Members face challenges in the control of internal movements.
- Cross-border movements of sheep and goats perceived to have a great impact in 33 countries with 25 Members facing challenges in control of cross-border movements.

Need to strengthen enforcement of legal and regulatory frameworks for the control of both internal and cross-border movements of animals.

Need to enhance cooperation and coordination between Members in different regions for better control of cross-border animal movements.

Stakeholder engagement in PPR Activities

- Public and private sectors with varying combinations of other stakeholders (Vet. Associations, NGOs, Farmers'/pastoralists' organisations, other CSOs, VPPs and CAHWs) involved in PPR eradication in 26 countries.
- Public sector engagement alone in only two Members.
- No private sector involvement in 5 Members but other stakeholders involved
- Involvement of only the public and private sectors in one country.
- Engagement of all stakeholders in PPR control and eradication is critical to its eradication by 2030.
- Collaboration with community-focused service providers in other sectors could enhance delivery of PPR control and eradication interventions by leveraging on their ability to access sheep and goat farming communities.

Perceptions on PPR as a priority and its eradication by 2030

- Farmers in 28 Members consider eradication of PPR as a priority while those in 6 Members do not agree.
- The Veterinary Services in all the Members except one, agree that PPR eradication is a priority.
- The Governments in 31 out of the 34 respondent Members perceive PPR eradication as a priority but this is not reflected in the levels of national funding for PPR.
- 28 Members consider eradication of PPR by 2030 to be an achievable target while 6 disagree.

CONCLUSIONS

- ▶ **Sheep and goats considered to have positive socio-economic contributions in most Member Countries.**
- ▶ **Gaps in the knowledge of Global, Pan-African and sub-regional PPR strategies call for greater awareness to enhance ownership, alignment and harmonisation of national PPR interventions.**
- ▶ **All the Members except one have national PPR eradication strategies but some not yet officially adopted by the national competent authorities**
- ▶ **Implementation of PPR strategies constrained by inadequate funding and insufficient human resources**
- ▶ **Inadequate knowledge of existing tools, procedures and processes and lack of appropriately trained staff/national expertise constrain their use to support effective implementation of national PPR strategies and programmes**

CONCLUSIONS...

- Inadequate application of other WOAHA standards erodes confidence of some Members in their ability to meet requirements for submission of applications for WOAHA PPR status recognition and endorsement of official control programmes.
- Structured PPR programmes in most countries are hindered by inadequate funding for vaccine supplies and post-vaccination evaluation activities.
- Varying approaches to PPR vaccinations among countries call for improved regional harmonisation and coordination to enhance epidemiologically driven targeting, coverage and effectiveness of vaccinations.
- Need to strengthen veterinary services especially capacities to conduct surveillance, detect, eradicate and prevent the re-emergence of PPR.

CONCLUSIONS....

Adoption and use of WOAHPPR vaccine bank is hindered by inadequate information among Members and existing national vaccine procurement arrangements and choices.

- Uncontrolled internal and cross-border movements of sheep and goats have a great impact on national PPR situations and require strengthening of regional cooperation and enforcement of appropriate legal and regulatory frameworks
- Varying levels of engagement and involvement of stakeholders in PPR control and eradication include the private sector in the majority of Members.
- Need for collaboration with community focused service providers in other sectors to enhance the reach of PPR interventions to sheep and goat farming communities.
- Adoption and use of WOAHPPR vaccine bank is hindered by inadequate information among Members and existing national vaccine procurement arrangements and choices.
- Uncontrolled internal and cross-border movements of sheep and goats have a great impact on national PPR situations and require strengthening of regional cooperation and enforcement of appropriate legal and regulatory frameworks
- Varying levels of engagement and involvement of stakeholders in PPR control and eradication include the private sector in the majority of Members.
- Need for collaboration with community focused service providers in other sectors to enhance the reach of PPR interventions to sheep and goat farming communities.

PPR Eradication by 2030?

- ▶ Eradication of PPR by 2030 considered an achievable target.
- ▶ Inadequate human and financial resources to effectively implement national strategies and apply available tools, procedures and processes for verifiable PPR freedom.
- ▶ Need for concerted efforts by all stakeholders to bridge the gaps within the shortest time in order to achieve the 2030 PPR eradication target.



THANK YOU