

**Building capacities in animal health in the Caribbean: the veterinary epidemiology/para-epidemiology project (VEP)**

*Delgado, A.<sup>1</sup>, Favorjon, C.<sup>2</sup>, Lefrancois, T.<sup>2</sup>, Shaw, J.<sup>3</sup>, Gongora, V.<sup>4</sup>, Hackshaw, K.<sup>5</sup> and Pradel, J.<sup>2</sup>, <sup>1</sup>IICA, Costa Rica, <sup>2</sup>CIRADUMR CMAEE, Guadeloupe, <sup>3</sup>USDA-APHIS-IS, US Embassy, Dominican Republic, <sup>4</sup>Belize Poultry Association, Belize, <sup>5</sup>Vet Services, Chair CaribVET, St. Vincent & Grenadines; [amy.delgado@iica.int](mailto:amy.delgado@iica.int)*

Disease surveillance and control within the Caribbean has historically been difficult. The region is made up of over 31 countries, territories, and protectorates, with concomitant differences in language, culture, and historical experiences. Given the diversity of challenges the region faces in terms of disease introduction and spread, there is a need for longer-term, sustainable training in epidemiology, surveillance, and emergency response. The Veterinary Epidemiology/Para-epidemiology Project (VEP) was a four-year, capacity-building project conducted in 9 countries in the Caribbean region: Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Haiti, St. Lucia, St. Kitts and Nevis, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines. Project participants (10) received training in 7 key domains: epidemiologic methods, disease surveillance, diagnostic tests and sample handling, emergency preparedness and response, data management, communication and coordination, and management and leadership. Both didactic and hands-on trainings were emphasized, and all participants were required to complete an epidemiologic study in their respective countries. Project participants were mentored by experienced epidemiologists in the design and implementation of their studies. Lessons learned were identified which contributed to the success of the project overall. Coordination of the technical component of the project through the regional network for animal health, CaribVET, ensured that the project had both national and regional relevancy. Although costly, the VEP brought the participants together frequently and provided opportunities to build relationships, which strengthened cross-border communication and collaboration in the region overall.

**Improving cost-effectiveness of cross-border routine veterinary measures**

*Hop, G.E., Mourits, M.C.M., Oude Lansink, A.G.J.M. and Saatkamp, H.W., Wageningen University, Business Economics Group, Netherlands; [Gerald.Hop@wur.nl](mailto:Gerald.Hop@wur.nl)*

Cross-border trade in livestock is subject to additional, costly routine veterinary measures (RVM) compared to domestic trade, such as veterinary checks of live and slaughter animals, and export certificates. A short-distance transport just across the border requires many additional measures compared to a long-distance domestic animal transport, and the necessity of these additional measures is often questioned. In that respect, the key objective for veterinary policy makers is to improve the cost-effectiveness of these RVM, without compromising both the economic advantages of cross-border trade and veterinary risks. The aim of this study was to examine possibilities to lower the financial-economic impact of RVM, i.e. to improve their cost-effectiveness. RVM were analysed for the cross-border region of the Netherlands (NL) and Germany (GER) for cross-border trade in the pig, poultry and dairy sectors for the year 2010. Costs were calculated per region and stakeholder, and the impact on risk of contagious livestock diseases was considered. Total costs of RVM for the joint region NL-GER were €37.8 million/year; the additional cross-border measures contributed for 70% (€26.5 million/year). Of this €26.5 million, 40% resulted from trade in slaughter animals, i.e. mainly broilers (GER) and fattening pigs (NL). Costs for trade in live animals mainly resulted from trade in veal calves, laying hens (GER) and piglets (NL). Main costs were veterinary checks of animals (twice in case of slaughter animals), animal health tests and documentary controls. Although for different animal species, both NL and GER have several possibilities to improve the cost-effectiveness of RVM. Especially slaughter animals (dead-end hosts) encounter RVM that might be overdone in preventing contagious livestock diseases, e.g. veterinary checks on both sides of the border. It is therefore concluded that various possibilities exist to improve the cost-effectiveness of RVM which is beneficial for both countries.