

23<sup>rd</sup> Annual IFAMA World Forum and Symposium  
June 16-20, 2013 Atlanta, Georgia

---

## Harmonization of pig health management systems - The case of Germany, Denmark and the Netherlands

---

Anja Czekala<sup>ab</sup>, Verena Schütz<sup>ab</sup>, Brigitte Petersen<sup>c</sup>, Jacques H. Trienekens<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>University of Wageningen,  
the Netherlands

<sup>b</sup>Deutscher  
Raiffeisenverband e.V.,  
Germany

<sup>c</sup>University of Bonn,  
Germany



---

# 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

Organizational criteria	Content criteria
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Coordinator/Initiator</li><li>• Restrictions in participation</li><li>• Participants</li><li>• Considered farm level</li><li>• Information management</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Collected data on farm activities and health related data</li><li>• Monitoring of pathogens</li><li>• Auditing</li><li>• Certification/labeling</li><li>• Signaling to which party</li></ul>

---

# 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

Main driving factors	Pig health management systems
Improvement of the pig health status on farm level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• „Gesunde Tiere – gesunde Lebensmittel“ (D)</li> <li>• „Veredlungsland Sachsen 2020“ (D)</li> </ul>
Simplification of the trade/ trade advantage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biggen Pas (NL)</li> <li>• PigMatch (NL)</li> <li>• ZNVG (D)</li> <li>• EGF (D)</li> <li>• BayPHV (D)</li> <li>• EVH-Select Screening (D)</li> <li>• Westfalenpass (D)</li> <li>• TiGA-Standard (D)</li> <li>• Erzeugergemeinschaft Südostbayern (D)</li> </ul>
Safeguard of international meat exports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SPF-System (DK)</li> </ul>



---

# 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

---

# Discussion and conclusions II

---

## 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 moduls 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.

## Acknowledgement



**The research leading to these results  
has received funding from the  
European Community's Seventh  
Framework Programme FP7/2007-2013  
under grant agreement n°228821.**