

17 mars 2008

TIMING	IFAP SPEAKERS	PROPOSED OUTLINES	GENERAL COMMENTS
IFAP PRESENTATIONSTO OIE			
10 mn	Peter Gaemelke	Farmers' concerns on Animal Welfare	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farmers supply consumers all over the world with animal products of high quality and with food products that meet global safety requirements at reasonable prices while ensuring animal welfare. All farmers that keep animals on their farms know it is essential to treat the animals well. • Farmers are responsible for treating their animals well, and at the same time they must try to meet society concerns without being forced to do so by regulations. Legislation is not the only solution to fulfil requirements on animal welfare. • Animal welfare must be safeguarded in the production of farm animals: in the breeding process; when designing housing, feeding and production systems; and during transportation and slaughtering • Animal welfare requirements are constantly evolving and differ from one country to another. Animal protection is a complex, multi-faceted public policy issue which includes important scientific, ethical, economic and political dimensions. • Animal welfare must be addressed in a scientifically credible manner. It is important that international minimum standards of animal welfare are based on scientific evidence on the physiological and behavioural needs of animals. At the same time the standards should take into account the effects that production methods have on the health status of the animals. • We need to address animal welfare at international level, because we are all depending on international trade and export opportunities. It should at least call for international standards of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Put emphasis on technical aspects rather than in policy aspects • Insist on the scientific basis of international standards • Animal welfare implies animal health: this is the first step • Going further international standards for animal health is going into supplementary welfare, this is only possible if consumers are ready to pay for it. • Make sure international standards are not used to exclude developing countries: standards should be applicable in these countries • Raise the level of public awareness on animal welfare, information is needed to show farmers are treating their animals well. Communication campaigns are necessary to show producers' efforts in respecting animals. Producers should also be opened to consumers in farms (transparency) • Education of farm workers and producers is essential on animal health and welfare standards • Animal welfare should be an

		<p>animal welfare in order to create equal trade conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An international agreement will contribute to solving the problems regarding trade and animal welfare. • Regulations on animal welfare in any one country must not become so excessively demanding that the production of farm animals moves from one country to another. • The OIE has paved the way for animal welfare at international level. Until animal welfare is covered by the WTO/SPS Agreement OIE is the best suited forum to reach a global recognition of animal welfare and to assist with guidelines and recommendations in bilateral trade negotiations. • IFAP supports the adoption of minimum standards for animal welfare that are harmonised internationally through the OIE. • IFAP is pleased that there is producer representation on the OIE Animal Welfare Group, and insists that farmers' organisations be consulted on the drawing up and application of all national and international strategies on animal welfare. • Best farming methods resulting from technological and scientific progress and management in a sustainable way, will provide a step closer to a global understanding for an international agreement, and that will ensure the best possible protection of our animals. 	<p>instrument for farmers to have more income.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WTO should refer to OIE standards • Investments in research are needed to define animal welfare characteristics
15 mn	Lourie Bosman	Food safety in Animal Production	
		<p>Reliable food safety systems and standards are essential for the confidence of consumers in the safety of farm products and for farmers to market their products.</p> <p>Farmers' highlights on Food safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harmonization of food safety standards at the international level to avoid unfair competition and divergences in interpretations of food safety norms. • Scientific evidence as a basis for common international threshold for food safety standards, not trade interests. • Agreement on a reasonable threshold between the different countries in the world in order to facilitate fair competition. <p>Food safety systems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotion of an integrated approach to food safety questions from 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask OIE if there is a statistic system worldwide: a rapid alert system exists in Europe, but what about the rest of the world? Is there a joint OIE WHO activity on this issue

the “farm to the fork”. Need for actions at all stages in the agrifood chain, with farmers responsible for food safety only to the extent that they can control it up to the farm gate.

- Establishment of national or regional food safety authorities independent from political interference, science-based and transparent in their operations. The management of food safety risks should remain in the hands of national governments.
- Governments’ support for the development of food safety programs and guidelines for good production practices, led by farmers’ organisations in partnership with other stakeholders of the chain.
- Establishment of national food safety standards based on international standards and guidelines established by governments, especially the Codex Alimentarius.
- Financial governmental support for program continuity and industry participation in food safety systems.

Precautionary Approach

- Consultation of all stakeholders - including farmers - on the various management options that may be envisaged once the results of the risk assessment are available, in order to make the risk management process transparent and valid.
- Obligation to consider the nature of risk management measures based on the precautionary approach as provisional and iterative, pending the results of additional scientific research which should be commissioned in order to perform a new risk assessment (see also: Article 5.7 of the SPS Agreement of the WTO)

Implementation of food safety systems on the farm

- Development of national or sectorial guides to good practices to achieve operational, effective domestic food safety system foreseeing in producer participation. Governmental support to make these initiatives sustainable is required.
- Possible complementation of regulatory work in the fight against spreading of zoonoses by voluntary schemes for animal disease prevention.
- Support of international thresholds as set in the Codex Alimentarius

to limit the residues of pesticides, veterinary medicine and other unwanted substances, and to minimise the problems with food-borne illnesses caused by micro-organisms or viruses.

Monitoring, Surveillance and Control Systems

- Full compensation of costs entailed by surveillance programs as well as the compensation for farmers affected by pre-emptive measures taken in the national interest in public health by national authorities.
- Stimulation of strong investment into these surveillance systems to ensure their strength and sustainability into the future.

Information to consumers

- Promotion through IFAP-member organisations, information and discussion on ways to constantly improve the sustainability of agricultural production systems, based on farmers' knowledge and experience, technological developments, and consumer concerns.
- Enhanced and improved communication between farmers and consumers regarding the costs of food safety schemes and better documentation of farmers' roles.

International Cooperation

- Conformation of the whole food chain to recognised international standards, such as those of the Codex Alimentarius or the World Organisation for Animal Health.
- A better harmonization internationally of disease surveillance systems, data reporting, and diagnostic methods for food safety.

Sanitary and phytosanitary measures (SPS)

- Support of WTO-SPS Agreement and efforts to improve its implementation to ensure transparent sanitary and phytosanitary measures and avoid using them as a form of protectionism from imports.
- Encouragement of further usage of international standards by WTO-members when SPS measures are fixed, by speeding up considerably the work of the international standard setting bodies.

Capacity Building

- Increase capacity-building efforts in the developing countries and

		<p>transition economies so that they are better able to ensure the safety of their animal production, in line with internationally-agreed standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase international development assistance for developing countries for the improvement of their technical and institutional capacity to cope with certification and traceability requirements, especially in export markets. 	
15 mn	Allan Burgess	Traceability	
		<p>Codex General Procedural Manual: Traceability /Product Tracing is the ability to follow the movement of a food through specified stages of production, processing and distribution.</p> <p>OIE General Principles: Animal identification and traceability are tools for addressing animal health and food safety issues. Animal traceability and traceability of products of animal origin should have the capability to be linked to achieve traceability throughout the animal production and food chain. Equivalent outcomes based on performance criteria rather than identical systems based on design criteria should be the basis for comparison of animal identification systems and animal traceability.</p> <p>Traceability and Livestock Identification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fundamental tool in managing animal health and food safety • Provides ability to trace products if required for recall or to take corrective action. • Also provides accountability for participants in the agri-food chain for risk communication one-step-forward and one-step-back • Also major benefits in managing animal health (see below) <p>Essential features</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farmers understand their role in the agri-food chain and support systems and tools that contribute to overall performance of the supply chain. • Important for farmers to be consulted and engaged during the introduction of traceability systems to ensure: cost – effective / feasible / compatible with other farm operations and systems / proportionate to risk and complexity / minimize duplication of effort 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OIE is responsible for elaborating standards but FOs should be involved and decide on the means and ways to attain the setting up of these standards • Producers need to understand the standards to respect them: involvement and communication are necessary. • Difficulty of setting up an identification system of animals (tags) in subsistence agriculture, which is the most common form of agriculture in developing countries. What should be done in this field? What support could be ensured? • The tags system is the choice of governments and producers: in some countries, if there is no tag on an animal, this one does not go in the track for transportation. Supermarkets in the future will all demand for animal identification at domestic level. • Traceability systems should be cost effective for farmers

and costs / confidentiality

- Governments need to provide coordination and support role for industry led initiatives
- Clear communications are required between all stakeholders in the agri-food chain

Illustrate with Australian experience with livestock identification

- Australian governments and the peak livestock industry bodies work in partnership through the joint company Australian Animal Health Council Ltd (AHA) for national animal health programs.
- AHA is strongly committed to the implementation of mandatory animal identification and traceability schemes within the livestock industries.
- To serve the national interest and deliver the available benefits of animal identification and traceability schemes must:
 - be national for each livestock species
 - use risk-based approach to deliver traceability and identification objectives
 - ensure timely delivery of required animal health information
 - have performance assessed against nationally agreed standards

Benefits for animal health status from improved identification and traceability:

- Improved biosecurity management and quality assurance
- Animal health management
- Disease surveillance and control
- Emergency disease response
- Laboratory information management
- Product differentiation and traceability.

Concrete example:

- Cattle tracing system introduced in 1996 to assist Bovine Brucellosis and TB Eradication Campaign based on:
 - a unique number allocated to each farm
 - tag identification number known as Property Identification Code (PIC)
 - all Australian jurisdictions introduced legislation to underpin PIC

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consequently application of a tail tag or transaction ear tag became mandatory for all cattle sales and transfer of ownership • Overtime the system enabled surveillance and monitoring of agricultural and veterinary chemicals in addition to disease surveillance and monitoring • National Vendor Declarations was introduced in 1996 which provided food safety integrity consignment note attesting fitness-for-purpose of a given consignment of cattle linked to the identification system • In 1996 SAFEMEAT Partnership introduced National Livestock Identification System for cattle with whole-of-life RF technology and supported by an electronic database managed by Meat and Livestock Australia • In 2003 Primary Industries Ministerial Council agreed to risk based approach for national system for livestock identification and traceability using a range of identification devices based on the complexity of animal movements. This incorporated the NLIS for cattle and provided herd and flock based mechanisms e.g. National Flock Identification for Sheep. • Implementation Advisory Committees and NLIS Standards Committees comprising representatives of governments and industries have been important bodies contributing to decision making. • Governments have played a leading role in providing assistance and funding support for implementation of the systems. <p>Australian Dairy Industry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome the benefits, opportunities and integrity that animal identification system provides • Also all dairy farms are licensed and have Food Safety Plans • Every dairy farm has their own audited QA program facilitated by the dairy processor and overseen by Regulatory Food safety Authority • In addition to animal identification QA covers traceability of farm inputs and record keeping. 	
10 mn	Raul	Integrating farmers in animal health programmes	

	Montemayor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical importance of strong farmer organizations, particularly in developing countries where animal raising is dispersed and small-scale; FOs can contribute to technology dissemination, standards compliance, disease monitoring, and disease outbreak control • Need for FOs to establish close links with agricultural R&D, quarantine, animal health, food standard and related public and private institutions at various levels, with focus on simple, affordable and realistic technologies and standards suited to farmers' situation and capacities • Highlight benefits of animal health and welfare to farmers with a focus on prevention instead of cures, and equal emphasis on promoting animal health as preventing animal disease • Educate farmers (share information) on consumer concerns and preferences with respect to livestock products • Market and government must provide incentives for adhering to food quality and safety standards; society must share in the cost of ensuring and maintaining animal welfare; a poor farmer leads to sickly animals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority is always given to the family before the animals, so if a farmer is in difficulty, he will prioritize his family health. • Concept of compensation for reporting diseases in developing countries should be studied, particularly for helping farmers to repopulate their farms which are the survival of their families. Envisage the possibility of an international fund (as it goes in the sense of the international community interests) and the possibility of receiving an income after the crisis to rebuild the farm activity. • An OIE system exists for specific diseases but this should be extended. • OIE should ask its delegates to consider FOs seriously as they are the owners of the animals and have valuable inputs to bring in the discussions • Trust is an important component of the relationship between FOs and governments • Education programs for farmers' families to build their capacities
10 mn	Catherine McLaughlin	Integrating farmers in animal health programmes	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consumers are increasingly making buying choices not only based on price but also on the integrity of the product. They are concerned about the welfare conditions, the health status and the providence of the food. They want to buy in to the altruistic lifestyle associated with supporting local farms. • Many livestock farmers, especially those supplying large multiple retailer food chains, will have to meet some form of farm assurance standard. These would often involve some element of a written farm health plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presentation has been modified to be more general and less GB oriented. • Mention the funds and compensation systems • Training and education programs • Use FOs as a key deliver of the services: FOs are the best placed to explain programs to producers but they need governments support to do so.

- | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A farm health plan is often a static document that meets a regulatory or compliance need. It may just be a medicine record sheet or a record of births and deaths. It would not necessarily assist the farmer in improving or developing the health status and welfare practices on his farm. • Livestock farmers and large animal vet practices have a symbiotic relationship where the viability of one depends on the viability of the other. Rural vets, and their large animal farmer clients, are an important component of the rural economy providing jobs, both directly and via ancillary support professions, and supplying need for rural housing, schooling, medical care and infrastructure. • In the UK, over a 10 year period, the livestock industry faced multiple disease problems such as BSE, Salmonella, Scrapie and the devastating Foot and Mouth Epidemic of 2001. Something had to change. In 2004, the Animal Health and Welfare Strategy for Great Britain was published. This strategy came about following recommendations from the Policy Commission report following the 2001 Foot and Mouth Disease Epidemic which said that we needed to reconnect consumers with food production in order to regain their trust and to develop a more strategic approach to animal health planning. The philosophy that disease prevention is better than cure, became an integral part of that strategic approach and farm health planning was recognised as being the best way to embrace that. • FHP has been defined as a proactive process where producers work with their advisers on improving the performance and productivity of their livestock taking account of the unique circumstances of the enterprise using a risk based approach to assessment and management of livestock disease and using the three elements of measurement, management and monitoring. A farm health plan (such as one demanded in a farm assurance scheme or retailer contract) is one component of farm health planning but is not a prerequisite to active or successful farm health planning. • For some farmers the challenge is actually changing the relationships and mind sets of the way that they work with, and | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consumers, producers and governments don't trust each other • Importance of the distribution of vets in the country and farms. How many vets are working in farms in one country? • Development of good examples from UK experiences |
|--|--|--|--|

view outsiders around their business. Research into farmer attitudes regarding sourcing advice consistently showed that vets were amongst the most trusted of 'advisers' on animal health issues so when we were planning ways to engage farmers in animal health programmes, the use of vets seemed the most obvious inclusion.

Getting cattle farmers engaged

In England in 2006, a group made up of Government and Industry representatives came together in partnership, to identify barriers and solutions to engagement in farm health planning. State Aid pump primed funding was made available and a tendering and application process was developed in March 2007. 60 tenders were submitted from a range of vets, farm advisers, breed societies and retailer supply groups with 27 successfully gaining approval and financial support. The tenders had to prove and develop four key principles throughout their bid to be successful:

1. Identify the impact of health on the performance of stock, using good record keeping to allow benchmarking and the identification of problem areas – a measurement principle;
2. Prioritise control measures for problem areas using cost/benefit calculations and the most effective management methods and to develop action plans for specific issues – the management principle;
3. Review health plans and records to assess whether measures have been effective and to revise plans as necessary; - monitoring - and finally to
4. Seek advice – back to prevention is better than cure

The future challenges

The funding was only ever available for a year and the biggest issue facing individual project groups over the next few months is the sustainability and self funding potential of the projects. Local government and business innovation grants are being applied for and it is hoped that cost benefit analysis could assist farmers, their vets and advisers in continuing with farm health planning in the face of increasing financial pressures and disease outbreaks such as

		bluetongue. Ultimately though the real aim is not to get more grants to continue the projects, but for industry to see the benefits of proactive health planning and increasingly embrace the practice.	
REACTIONS TO OIE PRESENTATIONS			
10 mn	Vuokko Puurula	Guidelines for production systems	
		<p>The guidelines are challenging to create because of the various ranges of production systems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Animal welfare is a complex issue and good tool is scientific listing of “ five freedoms” (freedom from hunger, thirst and malnourishment; freedom from pain, injury and disease; freedom from fear and distress; freedom to express normal patterns of behavior; freedom from discomfort) • Animal health is an essential part of welfare and that is a natural starting point in view of OIE and on point of view of farmers is an important economic issue (motivation) • IFAP encourages OIE to continue developing the guidelines on bases of animal perspective even though they are not yet widely used. • Guidelines must be built up of elements of science based and the farmers are willing to contribute should be partners in the process. • When discussing animal welfare we must emphasize that health IS one basic element of welfare and should not be ignored • Relevant science is encouraged to be followed (for example Welfare Quality project) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 5 Freedoms are a good starting point but there is a need for more valuable guidelines • What is discomfort definition? What is normal patterns of behavior definition? Could be very subjective: what are the OIE guidelines on that? • Difficulty to measure pains, stress, etc... • Dilemma: animal welfare is scientific for producers but certainly not for consumers! Need specific data for consumers in order to show the respect of animal welfare.
15 mn	Klaas Johan Osinga	Use of antimicrobials in agriculture	
		<p>The role of farmers in reducing antimicrobial resistance</p> <p>Over the last year, many debates have taken place over the use of antimicrobial agents in animal production. IFAP recognises consumers' growing concern about the treatment of healthy animals with antibiotics, and the need to protect both public and animal health &</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Show OIE is a real partner of IFAP to implement the collaboration • The participation of FOs in the scientific discussions on antimicrobials is essential as they are the end users of such products.

	<p>welfare. IFAP favours a sustainable animal production and therefore aims at developing clear messages on a prudent use of antimicrobial agents in animal production and what role farmers can play in minimising antimicrobial resistance. A prudent use of antimicrobial agents in animal production aims at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserving the possibility to treat microbial infections in man and animals also in the future • Preventing the occurrence and transmission of resistant bacteria from animals to humans through the food production chain • Avoiding dissemination of resistant genes in the environment <p>How to reach those aims</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention - Healthy animals by good husbandry <p>IFAP is of the opinion that prevention by good husbandry practices is by far the best option to focus on for sanitary and also economical reasons. In this area, IFAP believes that farmers are the essential actors in partnership with a team of experts (veterinarians, agriculture advisors,...) so as to raise their general competence. Thus, notwithstanding a prompt and appropriate use of medicines, farmers can contribute to avoid the general use of antimicrobials by applying good hygiene measures, using proper feed, providing animals with appropriate environment and ensure good global management of his farm.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate diagnosis and veterinary prescription <p>IFAP believes it is essential to ensure a prudent use of antimicrobial agents. This can be done by ensuring that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ an appropriate diagnosis is dispensed; ○ the use of antimicrobials is preferably on veterinary prescriptions; ○ any antimicrobial prescription has to be made, after diagnosis, either by a (para) veterinarian responsible for the treatment of a particular animal or by the vet in charge of following-up the specific production of the herd (for instance bovine milk production or fattening pig production); ○ the use of antimicrobial agents according to the provisions of 	<p>FOs will have a say on what the domestic authorities decide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk assessment: antimicrobials should not be only removed from the list but their risks should be assessed. • There is not always necessity of replacing a antimicrobial before removing it from the list: it depends of its utilization.
--	--	--

the prescription (administration of the product, respecting withdrawal periods);

- o the treatment should be recorded in order to evaluate the treatment's results, to adjust the treatment protocol.

In order to improve the application of these five essential points, IFAP thinks that training of farmers can play a significant role. Governments need to recognise that farmers can be trained and trusted to play a complementary role to that of the veterinarian's. This training could encompass a wide range of topics such as:

- o general awareness of symptoms,
- o food and feed safety,
- o proper administration of medicines.

Monitoring of the usage of antimicrobials and surveillance programmes on antimicrobial resistance

As a rule IFAP believes that public authorities should implement stern but practical and outcome-based regulations, to check regulation's application and repress illegal practices, to participate on financing practical and effective surveillance programmes on the use of antimicrobial and on antimicrobial resistance.

IFAP believes it necessary to encourage countries world-wide to have monitoring and surveillance programmes, using as much as possible current monitoring and data collection tools already in place. Governments should co-operate in order to avoid multiplication of systems and creating new constraints for the farmer (think of hygiene requirements). Regular and consistent reports would enable to better understand antimicrobial resistance and analyze trends over a long period of time.

Moreover, the way of monitoring should be harmonized so as to ensure uniform testing.

Involving all actors

For the veterinary **pharmaceutical industry**: to ensure responsible advertising, to have a clearer price policy (for antimicrobial agents, the practice of discount when you release big quantities is an issue).

- IFAP seeks to phase out the use of antimicrobials as growth promoters and reserve them for essential therapeutic purposes. Many IFAP members also wish to see a phasing out of the use of hormonal growth promoters.

For **distributors**: to limit antimicrobials delivery upon proof of prescription.

For **feed companies**: to aim at a responsible use of the antimicrobials in feed (where this is still allowed), with minimum dosages

For **veterinarians**: to adjust their prescriptions, to focus more on prevention and communicating this to farmers.

For **farmers**: to respect prescription, to record use of drugs and to consider more disease prevention within their activities.

For **authorities**: to ensure that the general legislation on the use, authorisation and putting on the market of veterinary medicines does not undermine the efforts conceived in the reduction of use of antimicrobials. Farmers should have the means to maintain high levels of animal welfare. IFAP is of the opinion that better regulation should involve reduction of the data burden and faster decision making procedures. It is important that while product safety is ensured, data requirements are streamlined as much as possible. Especially the position of minor species (fish, bees, small ruminants, etc) should be considered.

For the **OIE**: to stimulate better regulation. But this is solving only half the problem. Better (harmonised) interpretation, better and transparent decision making and communication with all stakeholders is equally important. The OIE should stimulate that the farmers' representation is heard at all political levels, before decisions are taken.

In the **WHO**, proportionality, transparency and communication should be important words. Veterinary medicines legislation seems often too closely tied to human medicines legislation to ever be truly proportionate to the risks and resources of the animal sector. As far as IFAP is concerned, a "full data list requirement for registration" interpretation from the human sector is a disproportionate measure for the animal sector. It brings little added safety to public and animal health, while adding to the costs. IFAP therefore calls for a proportionate risk assessment & risk management of antimicrobials. The WHO should ensure that farmers' organisations are heard before decisions are taken to remove antimicrobials from the veterinary list.

The need for global action

In the aim of controlling the use of antimicrobial agents, it is absolutely

		<p>necessary, parallel to targeted actions, to have a global view and approach when managing antimicrobials use and tackling antimicrobial resistance. Global, that is, at the geographical level.</p> <p>IFAP believes that it would be difficult to implement regulations in developed countries without first enforcing those existing as well as applying basic fundamental rules in other countries, but is willing to be proactive and contribute to a constructive dialogue world-wide.</p>	
10 mn	Per Olsen	Compartmentalisation	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The concept of compartmentalisation is a new and interesting tool usable in both veterinary and trade politics. The purpose of the concept seems right as it gives the farmers and the companies market access if they by other ways than geographical regionalisation can fulfil obligations to freedom of diseases. • As the concept is new and yet not applied in reality, it is very important to make sure that the criteria for defining and using the concept are thoroughly investigated during implementation. • The purpose of the concept is to limit the barriers to trade in relation to animal diseases. When such new rules are implemented it typically gives opportunities but at the same time it opens up for possibilities to introduce technical barriers to trade. Therefore, global acceptance of the concept is vital. • The guidelines of Compartmentalisation can be used in bilateral agreements but to avoid undesirable consequences on trade it has to be part of multilateral agreements. • Even though the idea of a compartment is to define a number of farms/holdings that can be accepted as disease free during an outbreak it is very important that the country/geographical region has a veterinary infrastructure that is generally approved to ensure satisfactory surveillance and monitoring and reporting to OIE. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IFAP is nervous about this concept, particularly in what concerns its impact on exportations • Need much more information from OIE • May be it could work in certain disease but not as a general tool
10 mn	Peter Gaemelke	Private standards	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farmers are working in a responsible way to feed a steadily increasing world population with high quality food products in sufficient quantity. They strive to use the best farming methods resulting from technological and scientific progress, and manage their farms in a sustainable manner. • The confidence of consumers in the safety of farm products is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Label is to give clear information to consumers, thus the development of private standards is bringing confusion • How private standards are defined? Does OIE recognize them?

		<p>absolutely essential</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Private Voluntary Standards (PVS) are not required by law but they often become mandatory if farmers wish to access markets. This goes for farmers in general and globally, both farmers in the developing countries and farmers in the EU. In Denmark, for instance, it is quite typically that farmers must comply with a series of PVSs.• Generally farmers do not share the notion by retailers on different degrees of safety in e.g. PVS and for farmers it is a precondition that all food products must be safe irrespective of origin. Farmers can and should compete on price, quality and their ability to meet the consumers' different demands. Farmers should not compete on food safety.• Even though the use of PVS can help developing countries improve their export performance by increasing consumer willingness to pay higher prices, IFAP recognises the special difficulties faced by farmers in developing countries in meeting even more stringent food safety and quality standards for their products in export markets and therefore calls for more international assistance to build their capacity to overcome these difficulties.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Large retailers will ask producers to supply them with private voluntary standards based on a minimum standards. It could be acceptable in a voluntary basis but would it be really voluntary?• FOs have a real concern about the responsibility in case of food safety problems: who will be responsible between farmers, companies, governments?• Private voluntary standards should be under government approval• Private voluntary standards could be a problem for competition between countries• They bring misinformation for consumers and producers
--	--	---	--