

---

---

## Recommendations and conclusions

*A. Speedy*

*Senior Officer, Feed and Animal Nutrition, AGAP, FAO,  
Via delle Terme di Caracalla, Rome, Italy  
E-mail: Andrew.Speedy@fao.org*

---

- Develop project proposals for the preparation of animal identification and recording legislation in consultation with LEG.
- Develop project proposals for translation and interpretation of livestock standards including I&R and movement controls.

---

---

### Follow-up

---

---

The FAO/ICAR seminar was held in conjunction with the 35<sup>th</sup> International Committee for Animal Recording (ICAR) and INTERBULL Meeting in Kuopio, Finland, one day in advance of the main programme. Forty persons attended the seminar out of 350 registered for the main meeting. The seminar was introduced by J. Juga (President of ICAR) and the Reporting Officer (RO) gave a welcome address on behalf of FAO. R. Pauw (Germany) described the work of the ICAR Sub-Committee on animal identification. The RO presented a paper on veterinary surveillance and livestock development issues in Eastern Europe, co-authored with J. Domenech and R. Bambauer. He stressed that the priority objective of I&R was animal health, particularly surveillance and control of bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE), foot and mouth disease (FMD) and classical swine fever (CSF) in the Region, and the need for an international standard through OIE and its implementation by FAO with national authorities. Further papers were presented by K-U. Sprenger (European Commission, DG Sanco) on EU legislation, and D. Chaisemartin (OIE) on OIE activities and standards relating to I&R and traceability.

---

---

### Issues and outcome

---

---

R. Maijala reported on the Finnish system of veterinary surveillance and traceability of live animals with Internet based entry and diminishing paper systems. A model of the impact of a CSF outbreak was described using the geographic data available from the system.

F. Schmitt (Germany) described Planning experiences of animal I&R and livestock development in Central and Eastern European countries and V. Kondratenko gave a paper on Experiences from animal I&R project implementation in FYR Macedonia.

The RO chaired the afternoon session in which state of the art country reports were given by O. Hvostova (Belarus), S. Volkov (Ukraine), R. Ciobanu (Moldova) and N. Vlasov (Russian Federation). Mr Milan Zjalic provided summary translation between English and Russian which was necessary to enable discussion. Professor Nicolai Vlasov, Deputy Chief of Administration of Veterinary Supervision, Federal Service for Veterinary and Phytosanitary Supervision, also greatly assisted with facilitating understanding and discussion.

Besides the global issues emphasized by the RO, Mr Kondratenko noted the importance of local issues including brucellosis and tuberculosis. Most of the systems described attempted to comply with EU requirements, indeed many were based upon EU projects and funding support. Most claimed to be successful and database systems were well developed. Only the Russian representative noted that there was no national system of identification and tracing in the country, despite a mandatory legislative system. One of the problems was small farms. The RO suspected that presentations were affected by the presence of the EC representative and the desire to show EU compliance. It was clear that there was not 100% I&R in any of the countries and technical assistance might still be required.

A harmonized system and regional collaboration was desirable but this had not yet been achieved. The Russian representative noted that some countries had agreed but others refused regional cooperation. There was also variation in the transparency of the systems from personal data protection (Macedonia) to an open system (Ukraine).

There was some discussion on farmer incentives to comply. It was evident that most relied on penalties for non-compliance rather than positive incentives. Subsidies would be an incentive but were generally being phased out. The sustainability of the systems after the end of EU project funding must be called into question.

There was also a discussion of transitional arrangements with relaxed regulations for small farms and auto-consumption. However, there was general resistance to a two-tier system. Transitional arrangements must be short term. Moldova had established a pilot project with 30 000 cattle and hired a database server in Romania. This had been successful.

The seminar participants made the following recommendations at the conclusion of the meeting:

1. The competent authority responsible for animal I&R and movement control should be the veterinary authority (not always the case in the EU).
2. The system should be outcome driven, leaving individual countries to design the system depending on disease status.
3. When discussing an I&R system, a multi-purpose system should be considered. This would save cost and motivate different users, for veterinary surveillance and control, herd book, performance recording and beef quality schemes.
4. The system should allow for expansion and for different modules.

5. Planning was very important. Administration needs should not be underestimated. More time should be allowed for procurement, contracts and implementation.
6. Countries should make provision for transitional arrangements when embarking on national I&R systems. A step by step approach was suggested. This might start with a register of livestock holdings followed by transitional arrangements and then a full animal recording system. It was recommended that animal identification should be coupled with the development of a database. One species should be undertaken at a time.
7. Movement reporting could (in some cases) be undertaken by markets and slaughter houses, removing the onus from the (small) farmer.
8. Legislation needs to be drafted for each country and cannot be copied verbatim. Although pilot projects may be carried out, there needs to be a clear legal basis and a nationwide approach.
9. There was a need for translation and, more particularly, interpretation of legislation, particularly EU legislation.
10. FAO's assistance in drafting I&R legislation was requested. FAO should also be responsible for the interpretation of such legislation from one country to another.

The RO was once again impressed by the priority need of translation and interpretation of legislation, standards and guidelines as the most critical factor in the implementation of such standards in developing and emerging countries, including those of Eastern Europe.