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1. Executive Summary

The Feather Board Command Centre (FBCC) with the support of the Ontario Livestock and Poultry Council (OLPC), the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food (OMAF), the Animal Health Lab at the University of Guelph, and the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) held a Poultry Foreign Animal Disease Workshop on Thursday, June 13, 2013 in Guelph. Invitations were extended to a broad cross-section of poultry industry stakeholders including producers, veterinarians, feed and service suppliers, processors, and government; 90 individuals participating in the day. A copy of the agenda is included in section 2 and the list of attendees is presented in section 3.

The objective of the workshop was to improve the preparedness of the poultry industry for a foreign animal disease (FAD) outbreak and to familiarize stakeholders with the Incident Command System (ICS) which would be used during an emergency response.

The morning program consisted of a number of speakers and presentations. The topics were focused on government response in the event of a FAD in Ontario and what is expected/needed from the poultry industry. Copies of the presentations are included in section 4.

The afternoon session focused around a tabletop disease exercise. Our scenario used “Coughing-Poultry-Disease”, a fictitious disease with characteristics like Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza.

Each table was assigned a role to play within the Incident Command System structure, e.g. Command, Information, Liaison, Finance, Operations, Planning, and Logistics. Each table had participants with a mixture of backgrounds and experience with most, but not all, sitting at a table which represented their actual roles if deployed in an ICS framework. The role playing was designed to stimulate conversation among stakeholders regarding the necessary assets, vulnerabilities and response resources including personnel, skill sets, equipment and supplies.

The general objectives of the simulation were:
1. Increase awareness of how a foreign animal disease outbreak could unfold.
2. Understand the response activities needed for an animal disease emergency within the ICS structure.
3. Determine personnel and stakeholder groups’ roles and responsibilities when assisting and supporting an animal disease response.
4. Identify critical areas that may be impacted by an animal disease emergency.

Bryan Boyle then facilitated an interactive session to identify the perceived strengths, weaknesses and possible actions around FAD response in the sector. His complete report is contained in section 5. Listed on pages 39 to 42 of this report are suggested action items identified by participants. These are organized within the six key areas identified by attendees in order of priority assigned by the group: training and education; stakeholder engagement; communication; legislation and protocols; financial resources; and an “other” category.

The ratings and comments on the feedback sheets submitted by attendees were very good. Ninety percent of the respondents rated the day good to excellent regarding raising their awareness of emergency management within the context of a foreign animal disease. In response to the question regarding whether they heard or learned something at the workshop that they would consider implementing in their business or association activities, 60% replied in the affirmative. The only
complaints were the room was crowded and it was difficult to hear speakers from the floor. See section 6 of this report for the complete feedback sheet summary.

As noted above, there were several actionable items and areas identified for potential follow-up. Participants were encouraged to collaborate on the items which fall within their particular mandate.
2. Workshop Agenda

Poultry Foreign Animal Disease Workshop  
Holiday Inn  
Oakwood Ballroom A  
601 Scottsdale Drive, Street, Guelph  

Thursday, June 13, 2013  
9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Agenda
Chair: Gordon Coukell, OLPC

9:00 a.m.  Welcome – Ingrid de Visser, Chair, Feather Board Command Centre

9:05 a.m.  Opening Remarks – Dr. Greg Douglas, Chief Veterinarian for Ontario

9:15 a.m.  “Principles of Disease Spread and Control and Emergency Response”  
Dr. Bruce McNab, Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food

10:00 a.m.  “National Principles for Foreign Animal Disease Planning, Preparedness and Response” - Dr. Alan Barton, Sr. Veterinarian, Disease Control, CFIA

10:30 a.m.  Break

10:45 a.m.  “CFIA Outbreak Response and Movement Control”  
Dr. Robyn Budgeon, DVM, Canadian Food Inspection Agency

11:15 a.m.  “Lessons Learned from 2004 AI Outbreak in B.C.”  
Dr. Alan Barton, Sr. Veterinarian, Disease Control, CFIA

11:45 p.m.  Introduction to ICS and Foreign Animal Disease Scenario – Bruce McNab

12:00 noon  Lunch

12:45 p.m.  Tabletop Simulation  
– Bruce McNab and Susan Fitzgerald, Ontario Livestock and Poultry Council

2:15 p.m.  Break

2:30 p.m.  FAD Response Preparedness – strengths, weaknesses and next steps  
- Bryan Boyle, Bryan Boyle & Associates

3:45 p.m.  Wrap-up and Feedback Sheets

4:00 p.m.  Adjourn
3. List of Attendees
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4. Morning Presentations

Principles of Disease Spread and Control and Emergency Response Dr. Bruce McNab, OMAFRA

Minimizing Need for Cull and $
Poultry Foreign Animal Disease Workshop Summary

Summary of Factors Influencing R (new cases / existing case)

- duration
- contact
- transmission
- susceptible
- new per- infection frequency proportion
- existing

Get as low as possible by:
- removing infectious
- forestalling transmission
- “cleanliness”
- resistance

See / Distribute video by McInnes at Ontario Livestock and Poultry Council
http://www.cifas하도록/ohcf/ohcfason.htm

And OE paper by McInnes, Dube and Alves

“Hubs” Can Have Great Influence
E.g. sales-yard or dealer

With H: R = 1.8
Without H: R = 0.6

(understanding “networks” is important)

Schematic Representation of Movement, Networks, Flow & Traceability

Good Flow Design & Extensive Knowledge vs. Poor Flow Design & Limited Knowledge

1) Network analysis of premises & movements helps anticipate & improve design.
2) Timely movement data within known networks, facilitates more precise responses

4 Scenarios with Different Prevention, Detection, Response

1) 5 new cases, poor detection & response
Aware of 1, but 62 more (some spreading)

2) 2 new cases, reasonable detection & response
Aware of 15, but 26 more (some spreading)

3) 1.2 new cases, poor detection & response
Aware of 1, but 11 more (some spreading)

4) 0.2 new cases, reasonable detection & response
Aware of 7, but 1 more (or no spreading)
Some Key Points

- Disease spread and control are inherently exponential
  - therefore little things matter
- Spread is often via movement networks
  - (i.e., movements, tracing, and understanding networks are important)
- Available tools are Prevention, Detection & Response
  - response is ‘just’ more aggressive prevention and detection
- “Rags (Disease Agents)” only respect biologically sound actions
  - they do not care about inconvenience, economic harm or the law

Some Key Points

- Disease spread and control are inherently exponential
  - therefore little things matter
- Spread is often via movement networks
  - (i.e., movements, tracing, and understanding networks are important)
- Available tools are Prevention, Detection & Response
  - response is ‘just’ more aggressive prevention and detection
- “Rags (Disease Agents)” only respect biologically sound actions
  - they do not care about inconvenience, economic harm or the law

Ask not what “authorities” can do for you,
Do now what only you can do for industry and society

Some Key Points
National Principles for Foreign Animal Disease Planning, Preparedness and Response, Dr. Alan Barton
Emergency Management - Plans

- CFIA Emergency Response Plan
- Functional Plans
- Hazard Specific Plans
- Procedures

Basic Plan

Basic plan - CFIA Emergency Response Plan

- Describes the foundations of emergency management in the CFIA.
- Forms the basis for the establishment of all other Agency emergency plans.
- Describes Agency operational framework, response process, and the response structure.

Functional Plans

- Functional plans are organized around a common task or function.
- Outline the common functions which relate to animal disease control.
- Emphasize responsibilities, tasks and operational actions that pertain to that common function.
- Programs and Operations are responsible for developing and updating functional plans.

Hazard Specific Plans

- Provide additional detailed information applicable to the response to a particular hazard.
- Intended to be used in conjunction with the respective functional plan.
- Programs are responsible for developing and updating hazard-specific plans.
Procedures

Emergency Procedures
- Provide the detailed instructions on how to perform a particular task as outlined in the basic plan, functional plan or hazard-specific plan.
- Examples include carcass disposal, emergency contracting of personnel, emergency operation centre (EOC) procedures.
- All branches in the Agency have a responsibility to develop emergency procedures related to their areas of accountability.

Animal Health Functional Plan
- Emergency preparedness.
- Structure and plan for animal disease response.
- Responsibilities, tasks and operational actions that pertain to specific functions.
- Programs and Operations are responsible for developing / updating the AHFP.

AHFP
EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS
- Check lists for Field, Region, Area, National.
- Importance of individual 48/72 hour plans.
- Importance of links between Fed/Prov abattoir and the respective CFIA Animal Health District Office.
- Structure and plan for animal disease response.
- Responsibilities, tasks and operational actions that pertain to specific functions.

AHFP
RESPONSE STRUCTURE
- Roles and responsibilities.
- Detail of functions.
- Use of colour coding.
- ERT structure diagrams.
AERT – Area Emergency Response Team

Disease Investigation Activity Flow

AHFP
Phases of Animal Health Disease Response:
1. Reporting Suspicion (clinical, surveillance, postmortem, laboratory, producer self identification)
2. Prompt Investigation, Rapid Response
3. Early Decision to activate emergency teams and movement controls
4. Rapid confirmation (laboratory)
5. Integrated, coordinated response Action
6. Resolution leading to Demobilization, Recovery

APPENDICES

What’s New?
Operations Emergency Planning and Preparedness (OEPP)
- To identify national strategies and tactical case plans required to improve effectiveness
- To establish national deployment strategy and a national human resource strategy
- Will manage Canadian Veterinary Reserve, Storied piles
- Develop and deliver emergency management training
What's New?

- Specialized Emergency Response Force (SRF)
- Standardization of functional plans
- Development of Case Plans
- Procedural development

Partnerships

Liaison Officer – The CFIA identifies personnel to serve as Liaison Officer early in the initial activation. The role of the Liaison Officer is to receive representatives from stakeholders at all levels and to keep all external organizations informed so as to achieve mutual cooperation and understanding. The poultry industry is a very important stakeholder and partner in response to an FAD affecting that industry. Representatives may be invited to be embedded in an EOC.

Partnerships

Some characteristics of an effective industry representative to an EOC:
- Must be well aware of local/provincial practices and industry groups
- Must be able to disseminate information quickly
- Willing to represent all industry groups
- It must be acknowledged that there is a relationship of respect and trust. Breaches of that trust could result in exclusion of an industry representative
- A Representative and an alternate should be designated

Role of the Industry Representative

Depending on the specific situation, expectations of the industry may be to:
- Provide the CFIA with the location and contact information of its own EOC that may serve as a link to the CFIA EOC
- Keep industry groups informed, including members and non-members.
- Provide the CFIA with a list of industry groups / associations that may be contacted by the emergency responders.
- Provide a list of services suppliers to the industry who operate in the area.
Role of the Industry Representative (cont’d)
- Provide information pertaining to CFIA’s designation of zone boundaries.
- Inform the CFIA about the economic impacts of eradication decisions.
- Ensure the collaboration of industry groups in eradication measures.
- Obtain from the industry groups, information based on the needs determined by the CFIA.
- Provide information on general industry practices such as product movement.

Examples of Other Partnerships
- Provinces
- Municipalities
- Other affected industries
- Other Federal Departments
- LMG
- International

Chicken Lifestyle

Kaput
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CFIA Outbreak Response and Movement Control, Dr. Robyn Budgeon, CFIA

Outbreak of Coughing Poultry Disease

What does the CFIA do?

- Our job is to control the outbreak and stop the spread of the disease.

Why?

- Consistent with CFIA mission statement: Dedicated to safeguarding food, animals and plants, which enhances the health and well-being of Canada's people, environment and economy.

How?

- The regulatory authority invested in the Agency by the health of animals and allows us to carry out disease control activities.

How do we stop the disease spread?

- Eradication activities
- Cleaning and disinfection of infected premises
- Surveillance activities
- Movement restrictions

Movement Restrictions - what does this mean?

- Initially when dealing with a high risk suspect or "presumptive case" CFIA would place a Declaration of Infected Premises on all premises within 3 km of the index premises.
- All movement on or off the these premises is dictated by a licence issued by a CFIA inspector.
  - Movement restrictions of all movement controls
  - Ability to control movement of everything except for people

Movement Restrictions - what next?

- Once disease is confirmed, the Minister of Agriculture will declare a
  
  **Primary Control Zone**

- This means global movement restrictions in parts of Canada which have requirements in place.

June 2013
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Declaration of a Primary Control Zone
What does this mean?

It means the Minister of Agriculture believes:

(1) that a disease exists in an area, and the Minister may, by order, declare the area to be a primary control zone, and (2) shall describe the zone and identify the disease.

(2) The Minister may, by order, designate any animal or thing that is capable of being affected or contaminated by the disease.

(3) No person shall remove from, move within or take into the primary control zone a designated animal or thing except in accordance with a permit issued by the Minister.

Risk of disease spread decreases as one moves out from infected zone

- Infected Zone
- Restricted Zone
- Security Zone
- Primary Control Zone

Movement Restrictions and Zones
How are they related?

- The restrictions imposed in these zones relate to the risk of moving the commodity with respect to risk of spreading the disease.
- Movement restrictions decrease with distance from infected premises.

Permits? Schmermits!!!
What do you mean?
How do we continue to do our business?

- What is this permit system and how does it work?

  - Basically where are you, what do you want to move and where do you want to move it?
  - Many variables in deciding on type of permit which will be needed
    - Risk of spread (live birds vs feed from a feed mill)
    - Risk of location of origin (proximity to infected premises)
    - Risk of location of destination (is going to the Free Zone or just moving within the infected zone?)
Lessons Learned from 2004 AI Outbreak in B.C., Dr. Alan Barton

Purpose

To highlight some of the lessons learned in response to notifiable avian influenza (NAI) outbreaks in:
- BC 2004
- BC 2005
- SK 2007
- BC 2009
- MB 2010

Background

- Each response to NAI has taught us that we can improve our response.
- Current CFIA policy is that we hold a “lessons learned” session after each event and capture the areas of activity that we need to work on.
- These points are captured in an After Incident Report and are forwarded to the business lines (Animal Health) to be acted upon.

Destruction

- The logistical advantages of whole barn gassing are obvious.
- Contract with service provider
- Design of gas delivery system
- Gas sensing devices and servicing
- Distribution of manifolds around the country

Regulatory Changes

- Name change from HPAI
- DRAP legislation
- Changes in compensation

Training

- On farm to simulate real life
- With stakeholders
- To validate procedures
- In use of the Incident Command System
- Premises Investigation Questionnaire
- To increase familiarity in handling and sampling
Surge Capacity
- Network Laboratories
- Special Emergency Response Force
- Use of Canadian Veterinary Reserve
- International Animal Health Reserve

Other Examples
- Disposal
- Personal Protective Equipment
- Biosecurity Standards
- Surveillance
- Cleaning and Disinfection

Questions for me?

Questions for Discussion

What you see as the most important points that we need to address?
Introduction to ICS and Foreign Animal Disease Scenario, Dr. Bruce McNab

**Objective and Outline**

- Get everyone thinking about how we will apply ICS across organizations in an animal disease emergency: industry, CFIA, OMAF, Other Ministries, Municipalities...
- Quick high-level review ICS (IMS) to get people on the same page
- Assign Tables to Main Boxes of ICS Org Chart
- Assign Read-Outs to Individual Tables for discussion
- Repeat as work through a simple FAD scenario
- Next steps for improvement

**How Will We Work Together Across Organizations?**

- CPIA
- OMAF
- EMO
- Municipality

**OMAF Example**

- Incident Command System (ICS) in an Animal Disease Emergency

**Incident Command (Management) System**

- Command
- Information
- Liaison
- Operations
- Planning
- Logistics
- Finance
Exercise Format

- Different tables represent different ICS groups (don’t move)
  1) Command Table
  2) Information Table
  3) Liaison Table
  4) Finance Table
  5) Logistics Table
  6) 5 & 10 Operations Table
  7 & 11) Planning Tables
  8) Session Organizers Table

- At least a few people at each table with experience in that group, but the rest are deliberately mixed to force you to think from another person’s point of view
- Facilitator will assign tasks/questions to specific tables that everyone hears, to actively engage people

The Foreign Animal Disease

"Coughing-Poultry Disease"
Characteristics of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza
- Specifically an H5N1
- Highly contagious among poultry
- Not a serious zoonosis
- Not cause sig. disease in people
- Detection triggers closure of export borders
- "Stamping Out Policy"
  i.e. affected and exposed animals are destroyed
- Quarantines and movement restrictions
- Zones of control

BREAK FOR LUNCH !!!

Poultry FAD Simulated Scenario
To Practice ICS
Poultry FAD Workshop
June 10 & 21, 2013
Dundey, OH

For Today’s Exercise - To Get You Thinking

The Foreign Animal Disease

"Coughing-Poultry Disease"
Characteristics of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza
- Specifically an H5N1
- Highly contagious among poultry
- Not a serious zoonosis
- Not cause sig. disease in people
- Detection triggers closure of export borders
- "Stamping Out Policy"
  i.e. affected and exposed animals are destroyed
- Quarantines and movement restrictions
- Zones of control

Phase 1: Things Start to Happen

- For the past 3 weeks the eastern USA has been dealing with "Coughing Poultry Disease" H5N1
- Yesterday another layer submitted to NAD from a single chicken flock in Kentucky with a mild respiratory disease similar to the known H5N1 virus. The human notified NAD yesterday of a possible mild notifiable disease in a field flock. The NAD team was deployed immediately to assess the situation.
- The FAD / FPC Diagnostic team was deployed to the farm to collect environmental samples and to coordinate a response plan for the farm. The Farming Management Team was contacted to coordinate a response plan for the farm. The Farming Management Team was contacted to coordinate a response plan for the farm.
- Many farms in the region have experienced similar respiratory problems in chicken flocks, which was confirmed by the H5N1 testing results. The result was confirmed by the H5N1 testing results.
- The FAD / FPC Diagnostic team was deployed to the farm to collect environmental samples and to coordinate a response plan for the farm. The Farming Management Team was contacted to coordinate a response plan for the farm. The Farming Management Team was contacted to coordinate a response plan for the farm.
- Many farms in the region have experienced similar respiratory problems in chicken flocks, which was confirmed by the H5N1 testing results. The result was confirmed by the H5N1 testing results.
- The FAD / FPC Diagnostic team was deployed to the farm to collect environmental samples and to coordinate a response plan for the farm. The Farming Management Team was contacted to coordinate a response plan for the farm. The Farming Management Team was contacted to coordinate a response plan for the farm.
- Many farms in the region have experienced similar respiratory problems in chicken flocks, which was confirmed by the H5N1 testing results. The result was confirmed by the H5N1 testing results.
- The FAD / FPC Diagnostic team was deployed to the farm to collect environmental samples and to coordinate a response plan for the farm. The Farming Management Team was contacted to coordinate a response plan for the farm. The Farming Management Team was contacted to coordinate a response plan for the farm.
Phase 4: Day 35

CFIA Stakeholder Briefing - Day 35

- Now 26 days have passed since the last positive was found
- As depicted on the following updated maps, the premises counts are now at:
  - Positive: 6 premises, isolated, C.A.O. - 11
  - Total - 11
  - Negative within 1 km premises, destroyed, disposed - 9
  - Premises destroyed for various reasons - 9
  - Additional sampled and tested negative - 56
  - Total - 87
- Zones posted for today as per map, note how they have not changed because no new positives have been found.
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Executive Summary

A broad range of stakeholders in the poultry sector in Ontario met at the Holiday Inn in Guelph on June 13, 2013 for a Poultry Foreign Animal Disease Workshop sponsored by Ontario Livestock and Poultry Council, the Feather Board Command Centre, Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Canadian Food Inspection Agency and the Animal Health Lab. The workshop featured four informative presentations relating to the topic and a foreign animal disease scenario exercise. Bryan Boyle facilitated a highly interactive session designed to engage the participants to identify strengths and weaknesses in the poultry sector's Foreign Animal Disease (FAD) response preparedness and identify prioritized actions to build on the strengths and reduce or eliminate the weaknesses or gaps.

When asked to identify the positive features or advantages of FAD emergency preparedness for the poultry sector in Ontario that provided opportunities on which they could build, many merits emerged in areas such as strong collaboration, a proactive and prepared sector, Incident Command System adoption, the Feather Board Command Centre, structure and governance as well as technical systems and resources. The participants also identified some current negative features that could pose potential problems or challenges. Challenges of coordination and the impact of small flocks in the case of an outbreak emerged as the major concerns. Engagement of other stakeholders, available resources, and protocols were also areas of common concern.

The participants noted the significance of their actions when they identified the consequences of inaction. The overriding theme was the broad impact on agriculture in Ontario characterized by response limitations, financial impacts and the effects on people and animals. Based on their desire to be proactive, the participants identified and prioritized their key target areas of potential action. There was an obvious proactive trend in the three highest priorities for action, namely, training and education, stakeholder engagement and communication. At slightly lower, yet significant, priority levels were legislation and protocol, financial resources and research.

Through a facilitated discussion, participants identified recommended actions to move toward strong and effective FAD emergency preparedness for the poultry sector in Ontario. These actions were designed to be specific, measureable, achievable, realistic and timely. The complete details of all these initiatives are included in the main report of the workshop. An example in each of the areas of focus includes:

Training and Education - Increase cross-training among different emergency preparedness organizations i.e. Canadian Food Inspection Agency, Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Feather Board Command Centre.

Stakeholder Engagement - Initiate or promote more producer education i.e. newsletters, annual general meetings, conferences, Poultry Industry Council initiatives. Include small flocks in this initiative.
Communication - Create a series of YouTube vignettes to illustrate biosecurity to ensure safe food production by December 2013.

Legislation and Protocols - Assure that a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Feather Board Command Centre (FBCC) and Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) is signed by the end of 2013.

Financial Resources - Investigate and implement an insurance program for the impact of foreign animal disease within 12 months.

Research - Commission research over the next five years in Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food (OMAF)-University of Guelph (U of G) agreement to support FAD preparedness.

The event was a productive one, where the participants were very engaged. Through their valued input, participants took an important step in their continued quest for strong and effective FAD emergency preparedness for the poultry sector in Ontario.
Purpose of the Session

To identify strengths and weaknesses in the poultry sector’s Foreign Animal Disease (FAD) response preparedness and identify prioritized actions to build on the strengths and reduce or eliminate the weaknesses or gaps.

What?...Observations

Participants outlined the current positive features or advantages that pop out at them when they think about FAD emergency preparedness in the Ontario poultry sector...opportunities on which they can build.

(Items denoted by x # indicate this point was noted by multiple individuals or groups)

Collaboration
- Well-established collaboration (x2)
- Collaboration on common issues
- Working together, good communication
- We are all talking together
- We all have the same goals, to protect the poultry industry
- Strength of relationships established already
- Interconnected with all organizations
- Integrated with producers and industry
- All stakeholders see their role in this process
- Improved collaboration between industry and government
- Open communication between industry and government
- Engaged government and industry
- Better understanding of roles and chain of command across government and industry
- Avoiding duplication of resources

Proactive and Prepared
- Poultry industry is proactive (x2)
- Industry engaged and prepared
- Poultry industry is a leader in response abilities (x2)
- Working proactively on the solution before encountering problems (x2)
Already have a response structure in place
FADER (Foreign Animal Disease Emergency Response) plan in place
Awareness of the issue
Advance planning i.e. simulations
Raises confidence in the plan and starts to focus on gaps
Being prepared helps make efficient use of resources
Takes away complacency
Expanded awareness
Raises the awareness of producers and what they have to consider
Industry has many protocols available now
Progressive

Incident Command System (ICS)
- All sectors adopted Incident Command System (ICS) (x2)
- Everyone using ICS, on the same page
- Standardized ICS

Feather Board Command Centre (FBCC)
- FBCC is coordinated industry voice (x3)
- Coordination between Feather Boards through Feather Board Command Centre (FBCC)
- FBCC Board and Advisory Committee
- FBCC preferred to individual poultry organization initiatives

Structure and Governance
- A clear structure and governance (x2)
- Feather Boards working together with good standardized structure
- Industry is well organized

Technical Systems and Resources
- Determination, focus, finances and ability to prevent and control incidents
- Premises identification of all poultry farms
- Traceability
- Emergency response trailers and Agricultural Response Materials Management Inc. (ARMMI)
- Written emergency plans that have been exercised
- Continuous improvement and training (x2)
- Exercises with federal, provincial and industry staff
- Value in having simulations
- Evaluation of other jurisdiction’s experiences with FAD's
- Ontario may assist through the Animal Health Act
- World-class lab in Guelph
- Very qualified CFIA personnel
- New CFIA compensation regulation
- Global Positioning System (GPS) and Geographic Information System (GIS)
- Information sharing, i.e. maps
They also identified the current negative features...things that could pose potential problems or challenges in the case of a FAD emergency affecting poultry.

Coordination
- Too many chiefs (x3)
- Resolve competing interests
- Will there be a power struggle if it happens?
- Politics
- When is there unified command?
- No unified command, how to integrate responders from each stakeholder group
- Different mandates and philosophies for different groups
- Stress of working together
- Duplication
- Responsibility overlap
- No clear goals

Impact of Small Flocks
- Still missing information on location and number of small flocks
- We need to know site ID now
- Backyard flocks
- No small flock plan
- Non-quota farms

Other Stakeholders
- No common premise identification across the province
- Many stakeholders, many unknowns
- Weak links with other commodities

Available Resources
- Lack of industry resources, personnel, equipment (x3)
- Resources including staff and finances
- Lack of resource information
- Large economic impact all across Ontario and beyond

Protocols
- No real-time outbreak experience in Ontario, but that's okay too (x2)
- Privacy and information sharing (x2)
- Dealing with privacy and confidentiality issues (x2)
- Media relations can be challenging in consistency and follow-up (x2)
- Too many false alarms
- Lack of compartmentalization to allow export
- Training and staff turnover
- No signed MOU’s
- Time constraints with permitting
- Limited knowledge and understanding of permits
• Government red tape
  • The lab in Winnipeg, is that an issue?

**Sector Realities**

• Geographic concentration of poultry industry (x2)
• Will we become complacent?
• Non-tariff trade barriers
• Reluctance to self-declare because of negative publicity and stigma

**What? ...Reflections**

**Participants identified the consequences of continuing along the current path and strategies without taking innovative or proactive approaches to FAD emergency preparedness within the poultry sector.**

**Economic Impact**

• Economic impact in trade, jobs, tourism, supply management
• Economic devastation
• Risk destruction of the industry
• Market losses
• Lose market share and consumer confidence
• Lost exports (x3)
• Loss of export potential, GP and GGP flocks
• Hell in a hand basket
• Everyone loses along the whole value chain from farmers to consumers

**Uncoordinated Response**

• Lack of preparedness
• Potential chaotic response (x2)
• Inefficient response
• Early response is essential
• Delayed response to sort out jurisdictional issues
• Three levels of agencies doing the same thing, duplication
• Maintaining momentum and improvements
• 2010 model versus 2004 response
• Resources don’t get allocated to emergencies complacence
• Miscommunication
• Cry wolf
• No better prepared
• CFIA will dominate
• We will not improve unified command and trust
• Uncoordinated effort means faster spread of disease and greater economic loss
Loss of Confidence and Support
- Loss of consumer confidence (x6)
- Loss of government support and confidence
- Loss of support from stakeholders in industry (x2)
- Loss of producer support (x2)
- Loss of membership engagement and trust
- Public inquiry if we don’t deal with issues correctly
- Threat to lose supply management
- Lose ability to self-regulate

Sector Realities
- Lost opportunities
- Still confused
- Lack of knowledge relating to small flocks will affect our stamping out ability
- Prolong the disease if small flocks are not addressed
- Potential human health issues
- Public health issues
- Never get to resolution
- If no practice, won’t identify limitations
- More political interference
- Need continual improvement of understanding of permitting
- Run out of resources
- Constant planning required to match the response with current technology

Now What? ...Actions

Several potential “Key Areas of Focus” for the future of FAD emergency preparedness within the poultry sector were suggested, confirmed and prioritized by participants.

Prioritizing...
Each participant was given 100 “poultry points” to allocate to these areas of focus that they identified or confirmed. On the ballot beside each number they indicated the number of points that they would give each area of focus (must be between 0 & 40 in multiples of five)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Key Area of Focus</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Training and Education</td>
<td>1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Stakeholder Engagement</td>
<td>1445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>1375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Legislation and Protocols</td>
<td>1305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>Financial Resources</td>
<td>1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>Other (Research, etc.)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely) steps will help move toward a strong and effective FAD emergency preparedness for poultry in Ontario?

These were designed to build on their strengths, reduce or eliminate their challenges and avoid the consequences of inaction.

**A. Training and Education**

A.1 Add or expand outbreak response and biosecurity to Ontario Farm Food Safety Program. (OFFSP)

A.2 Increase cross-training among different emergency preparedness organizations, i.e. Canadian Food Inspection Agency, Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Feather Board Command Centre.

A.3 Engage non-quota poultry producers in foreign animal disease (FAD) preparedness. (x2)

A.4 Educate producers on foreign animal disease response including what to do and what to expect.

A.5 Develop a web-based learning module by June 2014.

A.6 Practice unified command by December 31, 2013.

A.7 Develop hands-on educational program for poultry service personnel for heightened biosecurity by December 31, 2013.

**B. Stakeholder Engagement**

B.1 Act as a role model for the non-poultry industry addressing foreign animal disease.

B.2 Increase awareness of non-commercial flocks utilizing brokers and dealers by spring of 2014. (x3)

B.3 Feather Board Command Centre should initiate educational workshops for farmers relating to permitting.

B.4 Consider an Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food (OMAF) led disease simulation.

B.5 Engage other livestock commodities in foreign animal disease issues.

B.6 Initiate a full-scale field exercise involving all stakeholders.

B.7 Identify and clarify the stakeholders immediately. (x2)

B.8 Initiate or promote more producer education, i.e. newsletters, annual general meetings, conferences, Poultry Industry Council initiatives. Include small flocks in this initiative. (x2)
B.9 Create a clear foreign animal disease response plan indicating who supports who.

B.10 Encourage the Poultry Industry Council (PIC) to sponsor foreign animal disease (FAD) information sessions for Ontario Agri-Business Association (OABA) clients by December 2013.

B.11 Develop protocol to ensure database is kept current immediately.

B.12 Ensure regular communications on FAD emergency preparedness are provided to stakeholders on a quarterly basis.

**C. Communications**

C.1 Review emergency communication tree yearly.

C.2 Ensure that Feather Board Command Centre (FBCC) is acting as the voice of the industry on FAD immediately.

C.3 Develop a key message approval protocol by August 1, 2013. Agree to a unified message and a process to get there.

C.4 Create a series of YouTube vignettes to illustrate biosecurity to ensure safe food production by December 2013.

C.5 Encourage Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) to improve their website by December 31, 2013.

C.6 Establish a single point of media contact protocol for outbreaks by December 30, 2013.

C.7 Develop communication agreements among industry partners by the end of June 2014.

C.8 Ensure communication to farmers and industry is tested and enhanced immediately.

C.9 Engage a public relations firm to provide media training for spokespeople.

C.10 Identify a protocol for small flock communication.

C.11 Develop a standard messaging ahead of time that can be updated with specifics at the time of a crisis.

**D. Legislation and Protocols**

D.1 Assure that a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Feather Board Command Centre (FBCC) and Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) is signed by the end of 2013. (x3)

D.2 Complete information sharing agreements by December 2014. (x2)
D.3 Develop protocol for who is in command by December 2014. (x2)

D.4 Establish defined responsibilities and clear protocols re: foreign animal disease (FAD) by September 1, 2013.

D.5 Design protocols that are disease specific and provide more assistance to the producer.

D.6 Command needs more operating guidelines that can be communicated.

D.7 Firm up the protocols with Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) for issuing permits by March 2014. (x2)

D.8 Encourage consistent premise identification across commodities by January 1, 2014.

D.9 Formalize a protocol with Québec's counterpart to FBCC - Equipe québecoise de contrôle des maladies avicoles. (ESEQMA)

D.10 Enhance farmers understanding of information shared and privacy concerns.

D.11 Harmonize various Feather Board regulations and policies on emergency response.

D.12 Provide the Federal Minister with the authority to be able to implement a 10 km movement restriction immediately after confirmation of foreign animal disease.

D.13 Develop a strategic plan for the Feather Board Command Centre by January 1, 2014.

E. Financial Resources

E.1 Investigate and implement an insurance program for the impact of foreign animal disease within 12 months. (x4)

E.2 Determine what financial resources are available to conduct training exercises or drills and 2014.

E.3 Increase producer license fees for use in foreign animal disease (FAD) preparedness.

E.4 Establish a pay scale for cleaning and disinfecting.

E.5 Complete a resource inventory and adjust accordingly.

E.6 Investigate other government financial programs that could aid in foreign animal disease (FAD) preparedness. Feather Board Command Centre would take the lead to complete by December 31, 2013.
F. Other (Research etc.)

F.1 Commission research over the next five years in Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food (OMAF)-University of Guelph (U of G) agreement to support FAD preparedness: (1) model return on investment of biosecurity at producer and industry level; (2) model the impact of various industry level approaches – i.e nothing, status quo level, advance preparedness; and, (3) model the impact of using various level of network hubs or compartments in Ontario.

F.2 Complete a FADER review by 2014. Consider introducing the concept of unified or more integrated command, communications and liaison among industry, province and Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA).

F.3 Augment the role of Ontario Livestock and Poultry Council (OLPC) and National Farmed Animal Health and Welfare Council (NFAHWC) to improve industry integration with preparedness provincially and nationally by 2015 using Growing Forward 2 funding.

The event was a productive one, where the participants were very engaged. Through their valued input, participants took an important step in their continued quest for strong and effective FAD emergency preparedness for the poultry sector in Ontario.
Poultry Foreign Animal Disease Workshop

Thursday, June 13, 2013

Feedback Sheet Summary

Sixty-two completed feedback sheets were returned from the 90 attendees representing a 69% response rate. Not all respondents answered every question.

1. “Principals of Disease Spread and Control and Emergency Response” – Dr. Bruce McNab

   Poor - 0  Fair - 0  Good - 14  Very Good - 33  Excellent - 15

2. “National Principals for Foreign Animal Disease Planning, Preparedness and Response” – Dr. Alan Barton

   Poor - 0  Fair - 9  Good - 27  Very Good - 23  Excellent - 3

   • Too general

3. “CFIA Outbreak Response and Movement Control” – Dr. Robyn Budgeon

   Poor - 1  Fair - 2  Good - 18  Very Good - 33  Excellent - 8

   • Not enough time to respond to question
   • Please give examples of a permit, since we will be using them

4. “Lessons Learned from 2004 AI Outbreak in B.C.” – Dr. Alan Barton

   Poor - 0  Fair - 7  Good - 28  Very Good - 25  Excellent - 2

5. Tabletop Simulation – Dr. Bruce McNab and Susan Fitzgerald

   Poor - 0  Fair - 4  Good - 18  Very Good - 28  Excellent - 13

   • Good session for after lunch
   • Hard to hear - speakers should have been mic’d and people at tables should have kept quiet
Poultry Foreign Animal Disease Workshop Summary

- We have a FBCC manual, why didn’t we use it? Get familiar with it. Why guess at things we should already know?

6. **FAD Response Preparedness – strengths, weaknesses and next steps** – Bryan Boyle

   Very Poor - 1    Fair - 1    Good - 15    Very Good - 31    Excellent – 11

   - Interactive for everyone - good job
   - What are you going to do with this question? ½ hour too long. Way too much after a long day after the simulation

7. How beneficial did you find the overall session in raising your awareness of emergency management within the context of a foreign animal disease?

   Poor - 0    Fair - 3    Good - 17    Very Good - 33    Excellent - 6

8. Is there something you heard or learned at the workshop, either from the presentations or in discussion with other attendees, that you would consider implementing in your business or association activities?

   Yes - 20    No - 13

   - All very good information
   - Company ICS
   - ICS structure for company FAD plan, use of video from McNab, OLPC to train employees
   - ICS
   - Use portions of slides and also video for employee training
   - Permitting
   - Considerations have expanded on resources, especially veterinary gap. Upfront planning details
   - Reinforcement of the need to follow our biosecurity protocols and SOP’s
   - Create a permit plan outlining procedures
   - Update SOP and emergency procedures; communicate issues with staff
   - Reinforcement of the importance of biosecurity
   - More awareness about permits, especially with small flock growers
   - Educating industry about permits and process to get them
   - List of common/ available resources from all partners so that we could work together to provide supplies, equipment, staff etc.
   - Many elements can be added to existing plan
   - Movement permits
   - List of maps showing “potentially” available resources (equipment rental, trailers, sales barns, etc.)

10. What additional information, if any, would you have found valuable in this workshop?

   - More time for each table to draw each stage of the table top simulation: was too rushed
   - Presentations from industry would have been a valuable input to the attendees and a contrast to the Government presenters
   - Room was too big for hearing speakers (re couldn’t hear a thing being said): need microphones that could move around to the various tables and those doing speaking
   - Networking
   - Would like to see simulations that focuses on first seven days of outbreak

June 2013
A round table introduction: who is everyone?
Perhaps there could have been more interaction with non CFIA staffers!
Identifying “gaps” between CFIA programs/procedures and industry. Dr Barton - understanding more of the procedures within CFIA. Understand they are developing
Specific Permits: how to more effectively manage resources, would be valuable discussion
Unorganized, IC system command needs to be in control and telling general staff what to do, not general staff telling command what to do. Seemed unorganized and chaotic
Hazard specific plan and disease responses
More time
Listening to others - it all comes together when you hear the entire group (big picture)
Proved a portable microphone - difficult to hear speakers in the audience
Electronic copy of presentations for future reference (colour coded maps, diagrams, etc.)
More specifics in simulation rather than such a broad overview
The set up in the room was too crowded for most sessions. Difficult to watch presenters with round table set up and full tables
Good, practical information