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Problem Statement

- Importance of chain oriented management systems for food safety and consumer protection

- Development of many pig health management systems in pork production chains

- Major driving factors:
  - legislation
  - trade and marketing
  - economic efficiency
  - growing public interest

- Lack of harmonization
Objectives

- Comparison of the existing health management systems in pig production in Germany, the Netherlands and Denmark in order to identify similarities and differences
- Evaluation of the requirement for (cross-border) harmonization of these systems
- Development of a concept for harmonization
Procedures

- Identification of pig health management systems in the Netherlands, Germany and Denmark based on analysis of scientific literature and other publications

- Systematic documentation of content and design of the identified systems
Characterization criteria for pig health management systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational criteria</th>
<th>Content criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Coordinator/Initiator</td>
<td>• Collected data on farm activities and health related data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Restrictions in participation</td>
<td>• Monitoring of pathogens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participants</td>
<td>• Auditing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Considered farm level</td>
<td>• Certification/labeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information management</td>
<td>• Signaling to which party</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Procedures

- Identification of pig health management systems in the Netherlands, Germany and Denmark based on analysis of scientific literature and other publications

- Systematic documentation of content and design of the identified systems

- Expert interviews for more detailed information concerning design, future developments and harmonization aspects
Expert interviews

- 11 experts questioned via telephone from 17.01.-05.02.2013
- Duration: average 20 min
- Open questions
- All experts have to do with pig health management system(s), have direct contact to farmers and are involved in development/management of such systems
- Representatives from producer organizations (2), livestock traders (1), slaughter companies (1), associations/ service federations of the farmers (3), veterinary official pig health services (3) and research institutions (1)
- Partly veterinarian (5) and agricultural (6) experts
- 1 from the Netherlands, 1 from Denmark, 9 from Germany
Main driving factors of identified pig health management systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main driving factors</th>
<th>Pig health management systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of the pig health status on farm level</td>
<td>• „Gesunde Tiere – gesunde Lebensmittel“ (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• „Veredlungsland Sachsen 2020“ (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplification of the trade/ trade advantage</td>
<td>• Biggen Pas (NL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PigMatch (NL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ZNVG (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EGF (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• BayPHV (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• EVH-Select Screening (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Westfalenpass (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• TiGA-Standard (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Erzeugergemeinschaft Südostbayern (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguard of international meat exports</td>
<td>• SPF-System (DK)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results from comparison of identified pig health management systems

1. Organizational and content criteria not comparable
2. Monitoring practices not comparable
3. Different initiators and driving factors
4. Partly restricted in participation to a special region or to customers of a company
5. Data exchange in practice not possible
6. Common basic not given
Results from expert interviews

1. Clear and homogeneous definition not given
2. Different elements considered as important
3. Concentration on farm level indicators
4. Data included into monitoring supported by checklists
5. Access to production-related and veterinarian advice
5. Improvement of information transfer
6. Chain oriented/interplant aspects not in focus
7. Communication to consumers not in focus
8. Harmonization with opportunities and barriers
Discussion and conclusions I

1. Full harmonization not favored by all stakeholders
2. Consideration of chain oriented/interplant aspects to meet demands of different stakeholders and to increase acceptance
3. Improvement of advice through combination of all health-/production-related data available on farm and in chain
4. Improvement of data protection
5. A common (European) solution

- can be created as common basic standard, as a completely harmonized system or something in between.
- should at least be based on basic modules including harmonized checklists, laboratory tests and analysis of the results.
- should have a common data base or interaction between existing data bases.
- should be flexible according to addition of company-specific features.
- should involve the existing pig health management systems.
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