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• European Forum of Farm Animal Breeders [www.effab.info]
  – Farmers’ cooperatives and companies
  – Cattle, pigs, poultry, farmed fish

  • Research (lobby) and partnering research
  • FABRE Technology Platform [www.fabretp.org]
  • New technologies
  • Code of Good Practice
  • IP issues, and Patent Watch
  • Genetic diversity and ABS

  – Industry EADGENE [www.eadgene.org]
• European Animal Disease Genomics Network of Excellence for Animal Health and Food Safety
• Aims to coordinate a genomics approach to the unravelling of the host-pathogen interactions in domestic livestock

Genomics needs phenotypic data, such as field health data
– Request from the industry (breeders)

– International comparability of data on animal health

• Availability
• Standardisation
  – Practical situation
  – Stimulating and hampering issues
    » How to work with / overcome these
Set up Project

• Phase 1 - Pilot study (EADGENE)

• Phase 2 - Stakeholder (EADGENE)
  - Working groups (EADGENE)
  - More country diagrams

• Phase 3 : You...?
1. Overview & map of animal health recording, establish data trail, data comparability
   - cattle, pigs and poultry
   - UK, DK, NL, FR but with a breeder’s perspective

2. Differences & Similarities
   - between countries
   - between species

3. At a practical level!
TRACES (cattle) in every diagram (not specifically outlined)
Spain (Pilot projects): Basque Country

- Regional Health Government Agencies
- Labs
- Movements/Registrations
- Vets private
- Other diseases: Limp, diarrhoea...
- Local Official Gov. vets/inspectors – Disease monitoring
- Disease surveillance
  - Notifiable diseases
  - Specific programs

Abattoirs

Cattle
- Recording for breeding/management
- Dairy 50%
- Cattle 25%

Farms
- Management software 1%

RASVE

Discussion

Conclusions

Results

Material and methods

Introduction
Phase 2

- Identify opportunities sharing + systems development

- Stakeholder interactions
  - Two workshops
    - May 2009 Brussels
      - Working Groups Cattle, Pigs, Poultry
    - October 2009 Paris
      - Plan future development data comparability (Phase 3)
Advantages for stakeholders (1)

- Prevalence information, facilitating timely and adequate reaction to changes
- Tool for benchmarking

- Breeders/farmers
  - Comparable EU data on to assess breeding developments at slaughterhouse and other levels

- Animal Health Industry
  - Input for R&D, product innovation and product registration
  - Improved positioning of products, optimizing efficiency of use
Advantages for stakeholders (2)

• Processing Industry
  – Enhanced knowledge of relation animal nutrition – animal health
  – Pre-harvest selection for specific processing
  – Pre-harvest selection to optimise abattoir logistics/utilisation capacity

• Research Institutions
  – International, comparable AH data for R&D
  – Easier to find and arrange the use of AH data
Advantages for stakeholders (3)

- EU + Member States Administrative Bodies
  - Availability AH data non-notifiable diseases across countries
  - Better international surveillance disease development
    - across countries
    - over time
  - Knowledge on AH data gathering & management from other countries
• Participants per country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Diaz</td>
<td>Clara</td>
<td>INIA Depto de Mejora Genética Animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Ferreira</td>
<td>António</td>
<td>ABLN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Manca</td>
<td>Gracia</td>
<td>Instituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale delle Venezie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Selosse</td>
<td>Coralie</td>
<td>FNGDSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Van der Linde</td>
<td>René</td>
<td>CRV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Klopcik</td>
<td>Marija</td>
<td>University of Ljubljana - Biotechnical Faculty - Dpt Animal Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Stoop</td>
<td>Sigrid</td>
<td>Animal Health Care Flanders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholders and Added Value

- Farmers
  Identify source of economic losses

- Veterinarians
  Coordinated actions in prevention of diseases

- Advisory services
- Breeding organisations
- Recording organisations
  Health status of farms
  Share knowledge – Common vocabulary

- Research
  Genomics → EADGENE Network
Driving Idea

- Facilitate the implementation of several but harmonised:
  
  **Recording systems**
  **Architecture of data**

- Define a **general framework for all diseases** (e.g. Mastitis, lameness, bovine hypodermosis, BHV1, paratbc, pneumonia, diarrhoe calves)

- **Win / Win situation**
  Returns of information for all stakeholders
Key Issues

- Stakeholder’s implication
- Standardised diagnosis and codification
- Guide for best recording practices

- Needs from the sponsors:
  Share knowledge
  Identify and share best practices
General overview of a possible project

- Project management
  - Analysis of current situation and opportunity
  - Development of Standards: Best practices
  - Synthesises: Recommendations Further steps

- Stakeholders integration and dissemination

- Needs from research, sponsors of existing projects
- Farmers, Vet, Recording organisations, Breeding organisations, Research
Canada
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC)

- National Animal Health Project
- 8 key diseases
  - milk fever, left displaced abomasum, cystic ovarian disease, clinical mastitis, retained placenta, metritis, ketosis, lameness
- Improve management / economy farm level
- Improve production selection indices
- AI centres, breeds associations, veterinarians...
Way Forward (Phase 3) ...........

Working Group in international organisation ..... 

- Broad stakeholder commitment
- Knowledgeable in recording & data architecture
- Bottom up- practical
  - farmers’ and breeders’ reality
Questions?

- More information:

  Erik Rehben
  Institut d’Élevage
  Erik.Rehben@inst-elevage.asso.fr