

### Farm risk categorisation & Pre-harvest strategies



Meemken, D.<sup>1</sup>; Li, T.-T.<sup>1</sup>; Langkabel, N.<sup>1</sup>; Langforth, S.<sup>1</sup>; Isbrandt, R.<sup>1</sup>; Rodrigues da Costa, D.<sup>2</sup>; Pessoa, J.<sup>3</sup>; Nesbakken, T.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Freie Universität Berlin, Institute of Food Hygiene and Food Safety
<sup>2</sup>Scotland's Rural College, Centre for Epidemiology and Planetary Health
<sup>3</sup>Ghent University, Veterinary Epidemiology Unit
<sup>4</sup>Norwegian University of Life Sciences, Department of Production Animal Clinical Sciences
**RIBMINS** 21-Jun-2022 WG2 | Diana Meemken

#### **Key components of RB-MSAS**

WG2

(RB-MSAS: Risk-Based Meat Safety Assurance System)



according to Blagojevic et al., 2021



#### WG2 Elements of Food Chain Information (FCI) Reg. (EC) No 853/2004



#### Results of our online survey in Europe: **Degree of implementation**

WG2



#### Results of our online survey in Europe: Usefulness of FCI

WG2

**Does FCI help you in decision-making regarding food safety?** 



#### Results of our online survey in Europe: Status quo

WG2

#### Which information do you currently receive as part of FCI?



\* treatments with a withdrawal period > 0 days in the relevant period

#### Results of our online survey in Europe: Suggested improvements

#### Which additional information do you suggest?

WG2



#### Definition: WG2 Harmonised Epidemiological Indicators (HEIs)

#### Harmonised Epidemiological Indicators (HEIs) according to EFSA, 2011, 2012, 2013

Prevalence or incidence of the hazard at a certain stage of the food chain that correlates to a human health risk caused by the hazard & & <u>& Indirect measure of the hazard (such as au</u>dits on farms or transports)



### WG2 7 proposed HEIs for Salmonella (EFSA, 2011)



## WG2 Monitoring and Surveillance Systems (MOSSs)

#### For which pathogen do you have a MOSS in place?



Foodborne biological hazards participants tested for in pigs

#### Conclusions: WG2 Harmonised Epidemiological Indicators (HEIs)

- HEIs are useful as part of the risk-based meat safety assurance system (RB-MSAS)
  - HEIs enable risk categorisation of farms and abattoirs
- HEIs for pigs that are equivalent to testing regulated by law were mostly implemented
  - e.g. Reg (EU) No 2073/2005: Process Hygiene Criteria (*Salmonella* testing before chilling)
- additional HEIs for pigs are underutilised and not implemented properly in Europe
  - HEIs at farm level are rarely applied
- main implemented consequences: raising awareness, farm categorisation, feedback to farmers
- more training is needed in HEIs application



## WG2 **Pre-harvest strategies** risk pre-harvest pre-harvest categorisation strategies meat safety of farms





## WG2 Results of the systematic literature review PubMed® & Web of Science on June 7<sup>th</sup> 2020

Pathogen	records identified	records after duplicates' removal	records retained after abstract screening	records retained after full text screening
Clostridium botulinum	3	3	0	0
Clostridioides difficile	8	7	0	0
Clostridium perfringens	43	33	9	5
Campylobacter spp.	156	115	3	2
Hepatitis virus type E	101	77	0	0
Listeria monocytogenes	12	11	0	0
MRSA	194	139	9	1
Mycobacterium avium	27	23	3	1
Salmonella spp.	785	555	57	43
Sarcocystis spp.	9	7	0	0
Taenia solium	12	12	0	0
Toxoplasma gondii	101	77	2	0
Trichinella spiralis	63	50	2	0
VTEC	5	5	1	0
Yersinia enterocolitica	87	66	1	0
TOTAL	1606	1180	87	52

#### WG2 Results of the Systematic Literature Review Pre-harvest strategies: Salmonella

- 43 out of the 52 analysed publications dealt with Salmonella
- 76% (65/86) of the trials assessed reported **positive** results.
  - in-feed and/or water treatments, and vaccination were the most tested interventions and were, overall, successful (72% and 87%)



• only 1 out of the 8 trials tested the efficacy of **antimicrobials** had positive results



## WG2 Discussion of Salmonella results

#### missing of effective interventions due to applied eligibility criteria

e.g. control group mandatory



#### most successful pre-harvest measures





## WG2 Results of the systematic literature review **Overall results**

 high herd health coupled with good management and biosecurity were effective to control or prevent most foodborne pathogens in pork at the pre-harvest level



- some foodborne pathogens appear to be best controlled at post-harvest level as risk of disease does not correlate with the occurrence in raw meat
  - Campylobacter spp., Clostridium perfringens

## **VG2** Discussion of selected results

#### Yersinia enterocolitica

- second most important hazard in pork
- SPF-programs seem to work although not included in our study

#### Toxoplasma gondii

- particularly important in outdoor pigs (not included in this study)
- control of cat population and pest control are helpful measure

#### Hepatitis E

- new research in recent years, no papers meeting criteria defined
- vaccination trails show promising results







### WG2 References // outputs



Maria Rodrigues da Costa <sup>1</sup>, Joana Pessoa <sup>2,3,4</sup>, Diana Meemken <sup>5,\*</sup> and Truls Nesbakken <sup>6</sup>





#### Conclusions

#### Farm categorisation:

effective tools are available like FCI, HEIs, diagnostics, but ...

#### need for ...

- precise definitions of requested information
- will of consistent implementation
- monetary incentives for farmers

#### However,

 risk categorisation might fail as "exceptions confirm rules"

#### **Farm interventions:**

effective interventions are proven like C&D, SPF, vaccines, biosecurity, but ...

#### need for ...

- monetary incentives for farmers
- strict legal requirements
- innovation supporting legislation

#### However,

 some pathogens need to be (additionally) controlled at harvest/post harvest stages

# Thank you for the attention. Please join us at **RIBMINS**



Funded by the 2020 Framework Programme of the European Union

www.cost.eu

