



**Standing Group of Experts on African swine fever
in the Baltic and Eastern Europe region**
under the GF-TADs umbrella

Second meeting (SGE2)

Final Report

<i>Location</i>	Tallinn, Estonia
<i>Date</i>	11-12 February 2015
<i>Present</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Countries: BY, EE, LT, LV, PL, RF, UA• Organisations: European Commission (EC) ; FAO ; OIE• Experts: S. Bellini (IZSLER¹); K. Gruzdev (FGBI ARRIAH²)
<i>Objectives</i>	To review the principles and discuss the implementation of biosecurity in different pig production systems as means to control ASF
<i>Next meeting (SGE3)</i>	April 2015, Russia (exact date and location to be confirmed)

The Second meeting of the **Standing Group of Experts on African swine fever in the Baltic and Eastern Europe region** (SGE2) took place in Tallinn, Estonia, on 11-12 February 2015. The SGE Secretariat expresses its deep gratitude to the Veterinary Services of Estonia for hosting the meeting and contributing to its organisation.

All seven countries part of the initiative attended the meeting, while four of them were represented by their OIE Delegate/CVO. Dr B. Van Goethem, in his capacity as President of the GF-TADS for Europe Steering Committee, chaired the meeting. The list of participants is available in [annex 1](#).

Following the decision made during the SGE1 in Minsk, the SGE2 was dedicated to biosecurity measures in the different pig production systems. Special attention was paid to small holders / so-called “backyards” systems, which is mostly where ASF maintains, largely due to lack of biosecurity (as well as to at-risk practices such as swill feeding with possible ASF contaminated food waste). The percentage of ASF outbreaks occurring in backyards represents 68,2% and 63,2% respectively in the affected EU Member States³ and in Russia.

Two internationally renowned experts on ASF and biosecurity, Dr S. Bellini and Prof K. Gruzdev, made detailed technical presentations on biosecurity measures in pig production systems, reviewing both the basic principles of biosecurity and the practical implementation in backyards as well as in commercial farms, taking examples from different regions of Europe.

Countries were then invited to report on any change in wild boar control strategy following the SGE1 conclusions and to present in detail their biosecurity measures in place at national level (see [annex 2](#); a template had been provided in advance of the meeting to assist and harmonise country reporting). Overall,

¹ IZSLER: Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale della Lombardia e dell'Emilia Romagna (www.izsler.it)

² FGBI ARRIAH : Federal Governmental Budgetary Institution – Federal Center for Animal Health (www.ariah.ru)

³ Excluding Italy (Sardinia)

all countries seem to have fairly good biosecurity measures in place, as extensive experience has been gained from earlier animal health crises, notably HPAI, FMD and ASF; biosecurity is better understood by farmers nowadays, although communication remains a key aspect to engage them to implement biosecurity measures in a timely and appropriate manner.

During his presentation, the representative of Belarus invited the other countries to pay a visit to his country to gain a good appreciation on the measures put in place at national level to prevent ASF, including in the backyard production systems and wildlife. In response to this invitation and to get a comprehensive overview of the ASF situation across the sub-region (in particular with regard to wild boar and backyard systems), the chairman proposed that technical missions be deployed as soon as possible in all seven affected countries. During the ensuing discussions, it was collectively agreed to involve the experts already engaged in the SGE initiative (see *SGE2 Conclusions below*) to carry out these missions. It was further agreed that these missions would not be inspections/audits but rather missions to understand in depth field aspects and collate best practises. They will be organised using the EU CVET⁴ instrument and will be financed by the EC; however, it was proposed that they be organised within the framework of the GF-TADs for Europe mechanism, including exclusive reporting to the SGE. Terms of Reference for the experts as well as a calendar of missions will be elaborated shortly after the meeting, bearing in mind that missions would take 2 days in the smaller countries (EE, LT, LV) and 3 to 4 days in the bigger ones (BY, PL, RU, UA). The ultimate expected outcomes of the missions are clear recommendations on ASF management at sub-regional level; they will be reported in the SGE3 and SGE4.

Finally, FAO made a presentation advocating to collect, standardise, arrange and make accessible all relevant epidemiological information that could help to reduce risks of ASF and plan interventions, and timely inform all stakeholders on the regional scale. A mapping exercise of “backyard” production systems is currently taking place in Ukraine and Belarus and results will be made available soon.

➤ Summary of the key technical points presented and discussed during the SGE2

❖ Definitions:

– **Biosecurity** (FAO/OIE/World Bank, 2008 – Good Practices for Biosecurity in the Pig Sector⁵)

“The implementation of measures that reduce the risk (1) of the introduction and (2) spread of disease agents; it requires the adoption of a set of attitudes and behaviours by people to reduce risk in all activities involving domestic, captive/exotic and wild animals and their products”.

Basic principles of biosecurity at the farm level include segregation, cleaning and disinfection.

– **Biosecurity plan** (OIE Terrestrial Animal Health Code⁶)

Means a plan that identifies potential pathways for the introduction and spread of disease in a zone or compartment, and describes the measures which are being or will be applied to mitigate the disease risks, if applicable, in accordance with the recommendations in the Terrestrial Code.

❖ Possible risks of introduction of the ASF virus in a pig holding include contaminated pigs, feed, water, means of transport, equipment, genetic material, carcasses, manure, wildlife, farm workers, veterinarians and different other people

• **Supporting facts / advices provided by the experts:**

- Contact with infected pigs during transportation, shipping and movement as well as swill feeding with contaminated food are the main sources of ASF transmission (EFSA Scientific Opinion on African swine fever⁷);
- Contact with ASFV infected wild boar as the source of contamination for domestic pigs is suggested only in 4% of the outbreaks (EFSA), and therefore it can be considered as a limited risk factor; current

⁴ CVET: Community Veterinary Emergency Team

⁵ <http://www.fao.org/docrep/012/i1435e/i1435e00.htm>

⁶ <http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=169&L=0&htmfile=glossaire.htm>

⁷ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/3628.htm>

available evidence does not allow concluding whether wild boar can serve as a maintenance host or only as a spill over host;

- There is no scientific evidence that rodents, birds and insects play a role in the transmission of ASF (their control should however be part of the biosecurity plan as they may transmit other diseases);
- Soft ticks of the *Ornithodoros* genus, especially *O. moubata* and *O. erraticus*, have been shown to be both reservoirs and transmission vectors of ASF virus in Africa; in Europe, their geographical distribution is unclear and so is their epidemiological role in ASF transmission and spread; further epidemiological studies are needed;
- Bedding material provided to pigs can also spread some pathogens; while this has never been demonstrated for ASF virus, it may be necessary to check the provenance and manipulation of the beddings as part of the biosecurity plan (for example in the Italian ASF contingency plan, it is required that bedding from the outbreak be soaked with an approved disinfectant for at least 42 days before being re-used; an alternative is to destroy it).

❖ The level of risk of the farm is determined by several factors (see Table below); however, the type of production and management system in place, the area and the situation are amongst the most relevant factors to be evaluated when addressing a biosecurity protocol

• **Supporting facts / advices provided by the experts:**

- Backyard pig production is the most important risk factor for ASF ('epidemiological reservoir'); however, the occurrence of ASF in the backyard sector is often underestimated;
- Pig population density strongly affects swine disease (possibly including ASF) spreading pathways:
 - Sparsely Populated Livestock Areas (SPLAs) do not allow the spread of the disease (low risk area, local potential risk < 1); 'secure distance' superior to 500 m usually exists among commercial farms;
 - Densely Populated Livestock Areas (DPLAs) allow the spread of the disease (high risk area, local potential spread > 1); the high density of backyards is a risk factor but it is difficult to address it;
- The prevalence/incidence of ASF in at-risk areas is an important factor to take into account and some experts suggest to adapt the level of biosecurity measures accordingly (the higher the risk, the more stringent the measures); this implies to have a well-functioning surveillance system in place:
 - In feral pigs and wild boar (extent of the infection, follow the trend); it is particularly important to raise awareness of hunters and other individuals who may come into contact with wildlife in order to provide early information on sick or dead wild boar;
 - In domestic pigs (all holdings: commercial and backyards)
- As a result, to address the farm biosecurity protocol, it is necessary to know:

The holdings	The area	The situation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Size (?) • Type of production • Management • Infrastructure/limits • Health Status 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location • Animal density • Health Status 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peace time • Emergency

❖ Strengthening the biosecurity throughout the pig production and marketing chain is a priority to minimize the risk of ASF introduction and spread

• **Supporting facts / advices provided by the experts:**

- Each production system requires a specific set of biosecurity measures; some of these measures are applicable across all production systems:

Main biosecurity measures to minimise ASF introduction and spread, applicable or not according to the pig production system	Production systems		
	Large scale Commercial farms	Small scale commercial farms	backyards
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Segregation 			
– Controlling the entrance of pigs: from outside farms, markets or villages;	Yes	Yes	Yes

– implementing quarantine for newly purchased animals;	Yes	Yes	Yes/no
– limiting the number of sources of replacement stocks;	Yes	Yes	Yes
– fencing a farm area and controlling access for people, as well as wildlife, birds, bats, rodents, cats and dogs;	Yes	Yes/no	No
– maintaining adequate distances between farms;	Yes	Yes	No
– providing footwear and clothing to be worn only on the farm;	Yes	Yes	Yes
– using an all-in-all-out management system.	Yes	Yes/no	No
– excluding wild boar and rodents	Yes	Yes/no	No
– manure management	Yes	Yes	No
• Cleaning and Disinfection			
– buildings on the premises, but also vehicles, equipment, clothing and footwear	Yes	Yes	Yes
– Disinfectants	Yes	Yes	Yes

- The quality of the whole biosecurity system in place is only as good as the weakest link (no weak link allowed); the biosecurity measures / plan must be regularly and systematically assessed;
- The weakest link is usually the human factor; this is why the provision of regular trainings to all farm workers as well as to service providers (artificial insemination centers; brokers and transporters; etc) is a critical control point; whenever possible, the number of suppliers should be minimised;
- Live-animal markets are clear mixing points and a potential source of disease spread; biosecurity measures should therefore be stringent in those places, with regular controls by the Veterinary Services;
- The concept of compartmentalisation - based upon maintaining strict biosecurity throughout the whole production chain - is highly applicable to ASF; it should be further implemented for pig holdings; Russia is encouraging a progressive pathway towards compartmentalisation (the pig holdings are sorted out in categories I to IV, IV being highly biosecured farms, akin to a compartment);
- The social and economic impacts of required biosecurity measures must be carefully assessed, and appropriate accompaniment measures must be in place, in particular for backyards and small commercial farms;
- Veterinary Services (or competent authorities) must have the authority and capacity to control the biosecurity measures put in place in any premises (including farms), when mandatory; for the control of the cleaning and disinfection of vehicles, they should make documentary and visuals controls and if unsatisfactory, the vehicle should not be allowed to proceed further .

❖ Effective biosecurity measures in “backyard” production systems are crucial to avoid the two-ways transmission

• **Supporting facts / advices provided by the experts:**

- Strict implementation of the biosecurity measures in backyard production system are possible;
- Some specific measures – especially physical protection measures - are however difficult to implement in backyards, notably:
 - fencing a farm area and controlling access for people, as well as wildlife, birds, bats, rodents, cats and dogs;
 - maintaining adequate distances between backyards;
 - using an all-in-all-out management system.
- Swill feeding (kitchen wastes in particular) of backyard pigs must be forbidden and strictly enforced;
- Particular emphasis should be put on minimizing contact between domestic pigs and wild boars; it seems very likely that the backyard sector serves as the major source of virus from which ASF spills to wild boars. Several studies suggest that ASFV tends to disappear in wild boar populations when the interaction with infected domestic or free range pigs is limited;
- A list of measures to minimise the risk of ASF introduction into a pig holding, including in backyards, is suggested as part of the SGE2 meeting below.

➤ Conclusions / outcomes of SGE1

The Standing Group concludes:

- It is essential to ensure transparency and full compliance with reporting to OIE. The Standing Group reiterates that trust and cooperation can only be built when full access to the relevant information is provided;
- Biosecurity is of crucial importance to prevent the entry and spread of ASF in pig holdings, both in the commercial and so called backyard pig sectors. There are minimum biosecurity measures that need to be and can easily be implemented even by smallholder pig owners, such as restricting access to visitors, preventing contact between domestic pigs and wild boar, using separate shoes and clothes when entering the pig house, and having disinfectants ready on site. Precondition to achieve this is for the Veterinary Services to provide basic information to pig holders by way of appropriate communication campaigns;
- Backyard holdings with low bio-security in place are currently playing an important role in the spread of ASF. Given the economic relevance of these holdings in certain areas, the control and biosecurity measures to be applied in such production systems need to be carefully evaluated ([see below](#));
- There are different ways/strategies to strengthen and promote biosecurity measures, including positive stimulus for compliant holdings, that should be applied taking into account the different levels of risks of each type of holding, area/zone and in peace/emergency/endemic situation. Failure to comply may entail enforcement measures including administrative sanctions or other actions.

The Standing Group recommends:

- Setting an expert team composed primarily of experts that have participated in previous meetings in Minsk and Tallinn and other well renowned experts with experience in ASF in the region (Drs S. Bellini, K. Depner, K. Gruzdev, V. Guberti, S. Khomenko);
- With the purpose of carrying out a series of field visits to all seven participating countries;
- Aiming at gathering information and identifying best practices focusing on wild boar and backyard management, biosecurity, etc.;
- With the following order of visits LT, BY, PL, RF, LV, UA, EE;
- Starting in March and due to end by end of May;
- The expert group will exclusively report to the next meetings of this GF-TADs Standing Group that should take place in April in Russia (SGE3) and in June in Poland (SGE4).

Measures to minimise the risk of ASF introduction into a pig holding, including in backyards

- No swill feeding;
- Pigs should be introduced from trusted and certified sources;
- Visitors should be discouraged to enter the pig holdings, specially the commercial ones;
- Personnel should be well trained/informed and contacts with other pigs or wild boar forbidden,
- Perimeter fencing preventing contact with feral pigs (double fences) should be installed on a pig holding in outdoor farms;
- Carcasses, discarded parts from slaughtered pigs and food waste should be disposed of in an appropriate manner;
- No part of any feral pig, whether shot or found dead should be brought into a pig holding;
- Sharing of equipment and tools between the holdings should be avoided;
- Appropriate means for cleaning and disinfection have to be placed at the entrance of the holdings. Effective disinfectants shall be available in the holding;

- Vehicles and equipment should be properly cleaned and disinfected before entering into contact with pigs and leaving the holdings; however in general they should not enter the holding;
- Appropriate hygiene measures have to be applied by all persons entering into contact with pigs (domestic and/or feral).

→ In the light of these conclusions, countries may rethink their biosecurity measures implemented at national level.

➤ Additional information / resources presented during the SGE2

- All SGE2 presentations are available on the GF-TADs Standing Group of Experts on ASF webpage: http://web.oie.int/RR-Europe/eng/Regprog/en_GF_TADS%20-%20Standing%20Group%20ASF.htm
- A specific GF-TADs ASF e-depository is available at: http://web.oie.int/RR-Europe/eng/Regprog/en_ASF_depository.htm
- Good practices for biosecurity in the pig sector - Issues and options in developing and transition countries (FAO Animal Production and Health Paper No. 169): <http://www.fao.org/docrep/012/i1435e/i1435e00.htm>
- OIE international standards and guidelines on:
 - African swine fever [Chapter 15.1.](#)
 - Disposal of dead animals [Chapter 4.12.](#)
 - General recommendations on disinfection and disinsection [Chapter 4.13.](#)
 - Zoning and compartmentalisation [Chapter 4.3.](#)
 - Application of compartmentalisation [Chapter 4.4.](#)
 - Checklist on the Practical Application of Compartmentalisation http://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/Our_scientific_expertise/docs/pdf/A_CMP_Checklist.pdf

➤ Next Meetings of the SGE

The next meeting (SGE3) is proposed to be organised on **29-30 April 2015 in Vladimir, Russia** (to be confirmed). The agenda, invitation letters and logistical details will be sent in due time by the Secretariat. In line with SGE2 discussions, the SGE3 will focus on **depopulation/stamping out procedures as a prevention and control measure**; practical aspects related to carcass disposal and disinfection of holdings, as well as animal welfare during the killing of pigs for ASF control purposes will also be addressed. International experts on ASF and stamping out procedures will be invited to support country discussions.

For the SGE3, and as agreed at the kick-off meeting in Bern in September 2014, it is required that the CVO / OIE Delegate – or their Deputy with clear decision-making authority - attend the meeting in person, as it is important for the Standing Group to be able to reach immediate decisions whenever needed, and notably when an important agenda item emerges from the discussions at the meeting.

Annex 1 – detailed list of participants of the SGE2

No	Country / organisations	First and Last names	Position	Email address
▪ SGE Members				
1	BY - Belarus	Yuri Pivovarchik	Deputy CVO	fnn5@tut.by
2	EE - Estonia	Ago Pärtel	Director General of the Food and Veterinary Service of Estonia, Chief Veterinary Officer and OIE Delegate of Estonia	ago.partel@vet.agri.ee
3		Ainike Nõmmisto	Head of Animal Health Office, Animal Health, Welfare and Feedingstuffs Department, Veterinary and Food Board	ainike.nommisto@vet.agri.ee
4		Pille Tammemägi	Deputy Head of Food Safety Department, Ministry of Agriculture	pille.tammemagi@agri.ee
5	LT - Lithuania	Jonas Milius	Chief Veterinary Officer of Lithuania, OIE Delegate of Lithuania	jmilius@vet.lt
6		Marius Masiulis	Head of the Emergency Department at the State Food and veterinary service of Lithuania	mmasiulis@vet.lt
7	LV - Latvia	Edvins Olsevskis	Deputy-Director of the Food and Veterinary Service of Latvia	Edvins.Olsevskis@pvd.gov.lv
8		Sanita Vanaga	Deputy head of Animal health and veterinary drug division, Minister of Agriculture of Latvia	sanita.vanaga@zm.gov.lv
9		Maija Irbe	xxxHead of Animal Holding Surveillance Division of the Food and Veterinary Service of Latvia	Maija.Irbe@pvd.gov.lv
10	PL - Poland	Krzysztof Jażdżewski	Deputy Chief Veterinary Officer of Poland, OIE Delegate of Poland	wet@wetgiw.gov.pl
11		Krzysztof Smietanka	xxx	ksmiet@piwet.pulawy.pl
12		Iwona Markowska-Daniel	Director of the pig diseases laboratory	iwonamd@piwet.pulawy.pl
13	Russia	Nikita Lebedev	Head of the Department for WTO and International Organizations at Rosselkhoznadzor	lebn@yandex.ru
14		Vladimir Shevkoplyas	Head of the Rosselkhoznadzor Directorate for Domestic Veterinary Surveillance	shevkoplyasvn@gmail.com
15	UA - Ukraine	Vitalii Bashinskiy	Acting Chief Veterinary Officer of Ukraine	svv@vet.gov.ua
16	European Commission	Bernard Van Goethem	Chairman of GF-TADs Europe Regional Steering Committee, Director for Veterinary and International affairs at the European Commission	Bernard.Van-Goethem@ec.europa.eu
17		Francisco Riviriego-Gordejo	Head of Sector Disease Control, Animal Health Unit	Francisco.REVIRIEGO-GORDEJO@ec.europa.eu
18		Moritz Klemm	Veterinary Officer, Relations with the OIE, Animal Health Unit	Moritz.klemm@ec.europa.eu
19	FAO	Daniel Beltran-Alcrudo	Animal Health Officer (Disease Ecology) FAO EMPRES Infectious Diseases Group	Daniel.beltranalcrudo@fao.org
20	OIE	Kazimieras Lukauskas	Head of OIE Regional Office in Moscow	k.lukauskas@oie.int
21		Nadège Leboucq	Head of OIE Regional Office in Brussels; Secretariat of the GF-TADs for Europe and of the SGE	n.leboucq@oie.int
▪ Experts				
22		Silvia Bellini	IZSLER, Italy	silvia.bellini@izsler.it
23		Konstantine Gruzdev	Expert at Russian Scientific-Research Institute of Animal Protection	gruzdev@arriah.ru

№	Country / organisations	First and Last names	Position	Email address
▪ Interpreters				
24		Natalia Murina (RU/EN)		natalia.murina@gmail.com
25		Ekaterina Shutova (RU/EN)		ekaterina.shutova@gmail.com

Annex 2 – Summary of country presentations

	Belarus	Estonia	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Russia	Ukraine
General Biosecurity	- A biosecurity plan is available for 2015	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Since October 2014 SFVS started the categorization of all pig holdings located in the Annex (Part I, II and III area) to the Commission Implementing Decision 2014/709/EU according to their biosecurity level, the number of pigs kept and the risk of spreading the disease: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Category I</u> - Commercial pig farms; - <u>Category II</u> - Non-commercial pig farms (pigs kept only for own consumption); - Requirements on biosecurity measures for pig keeping places" (Order of the Director of the State Food and Veterinary Service No B1-384 of 11 July 2011) – contains internal and external biosecurity measures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Categorization of holdings in the infected area (according to the risk of ASF transmission, lowest for A, highest for C) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Category A: commercial farms (regardless of the number of pigs kept); also includes farms where sows or boars used for reproduction are kept; - Category B: non-commercial farms - (regardless of the number of pigs kept) - Category C: all holdings in which pigs, wild boars or hybrid of wild boar and domestic pig are kept permanently or temporarily on open pens. - <u>Under development</u>, the categorisation of pig holding depending on the level of biosecurity (4 categories of pigs holdings under discussion) 	-	-

	Belarus	Estonia	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Russia	Ukraine
Biosecurity in large scale commercial farms	<p>Stringent measures are put in place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disinfection barriers - Changing clothes and shoes - Movement control of products - Feed from licensed providers only - Training of farm personnel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Controls over movements of people and vehicles - Restricted access for unauthorised persons - Restricted access for any person travelling abroad for 48 hours after return - Initial separation for new animals introduced into the herd - Separation for disease suspect animals - Regular disinfection on surfaces and equipment and management system for feed, bedding - Regular disinsection and deratisation - Restricted access for any domestic animals or wildlife. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Obligation to elaborate biosecurity plan, adapted to farm activities/management – close or open cycle, etc. - Food and Veterinary Service ensures regular controls in order to check the status of implementation of biosecurity plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The owner is obliged <u>fully implement</u> Requirements regarding biosecurity measures applicable in the pig holdings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the workers, visitors and other persons who can access the keeping location or room for pigs; - the vehicles that can access the pig holding; - the feed and water used for pigs feeding and watering; - tools, equipment and other things potentially infected with the pathogens of contagious diseases which can access the keeping room for pigs; - wild, derelict and abandoned animals; - dead pigs, the containers intended for the storage of pigs carcasses, the vehicles of the company that is engaged in the activity of animal by-products processing; - rodents and other pests and etc. 	<p>In all farms in the infected area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - double fence (at least 1.5 m high) on foundation or with a curb, where pigs are kept in the open system - implementation of the rodents monitoring and eradication programme; - conducting periodical disinsection procedures; - Registering means of transport for pigs that enter the area of the farm and entries of people to premises where pigs are kept; - protection of the building where pigs are kept against household animals; - implementation of a plan of biosecurity measures taking account the profile of the farm; - keeping pigs in farms in closed premises except for pigs kept in the open system; - ensuring that persons in contact with pigs on a farm do not keep own pigs and are not additionally dealing with handling pigs in other farms; - prohibition for outsiders to enter the buildings, in which pigs are kept; - mandatory protective clothing and footwear in buildings, in which pigs are kept. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Farmers (including in State owned farms) are requested to put stringent biosecurity measures in place; they are notably requested to record all their activities (log books)

	Belarus	Estonia	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Russia	Ukraine
Biosecurity in small backyards production systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No free ranging pigs allowed in Belarus - The total number of pigs in backyard systems is approx. 380 000 - Stringent biosecurity measures are mandatory in backyard production systems, with regular official controls - Farmers sign an agreement to indicate that they will comply with all requirements needed for the prevention of ASF, including biosecurity measures - A lot of awareness raising is made for backyard production systems - Disinfectant is also provided for free to farm owners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ban on outdoor farming of pigs (VFB DG Decree from 25.07.14) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In general, it is prohibited to keep pigs outdoors - exception is set for the wild boar (farmed game) kept in fenced territories and exotic pig species (Mangalica pigs); these farms must comply with specific additional requirement such as double fence - No biosecurity plan, but obligation to implement biosecurity requirements as set by the legislation (specific Annex) - Policy on preventive emptying of low biosecurity holdings – was in place July 23, 2014 – January 9, 2015; as a result, in 2014 - <i>5923 pigs were slaughtered in 1633 holdings; compensations were paid to animal owners</i> - Planned inspections in 2015 – all farms twice in Part II and Part III, and once in Part I and free areas (depending on capacity FVS) - Poster on biosecurity prepared for pig farmers 	<p><u>No. of backyard farms in Lithuania : more than 40 thousand ; Pigs kept only for own consumption;</u> Minimum biosecurity requirements (exemptions from national rules):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No swill feeding, - No contact between the pigs and susceptible animals (indoor keeping) and no part of any feral pig (hunted or dead wild boar/meat/by-products), - The owner should change clothes on entering the stable and leaving the stable, having disinfection at the entrance of holding, - No unauthorised persons in the pig holding, - Home slaughtering under veterinary supervision. 	<p>No free ranging holdings in the infected and at risk area. For the entire infected area a biosecurity programme is being developed in order to eliminate holdings with poor biosecurity (regardless of category):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The owner of pigs has 3 months to report a termination of the production to Vet. Inspection. Full compensation and yearly recompense for 3 years are prepared. (Implementation – first quarter 2015) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Difficult to implement; - Incentive measures to raise sheep instead of pigs (conversion)

	Belarus	Estonia	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Russia	Ukraine
Official control of biosecurity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Farms are randomly controlled by local inspectors; in case of non compliance, farmers are fined and are given a deadline to comply; if still no compliance, pigs are seized 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - August 2014 – 100% inspection of pig holdings (920 holdings with 38000 pigs. 2400 pigs in holdings with less than 10 pigs) - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in 2015 each commercial farm will be inspected twice (entire country) - Specific controls are planned also in all small pig farms located in 10km radius around commercial farms (entire country) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Control of the pig keeping places in 2015: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>In the entire country</u> – enhanced passive surveillance (combined with active in accordance with national animal disease control programme); - <u>In Part I, II and III of the Decision 2014/709/EU:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to check biosecurity and census of pigs minimum 2/year; - to perform clinical investigation and in case of suspicion – to examine and to take blood samples (in case of death – organ samples) for ASF testing; - If during inspection non compliances are found, the owner receives a fine and has 14 days' time frame to present the plan with the information and deadlines to resolve discrepancies. If after the agreed and approved dates the discrepancies will be not resolved, the owner will be obliged to slaughter the pigs kept. - Official controls are also carried in the buffer zone and the extended buffer zone. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimum 2 controls per year to verify the absence of free –ranging farms in affected and at risk areas - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Veterinary inspectors were delegated the right to do on-site inspections; increased number of inspections at farm level; local vets are also monitoring backyards on a weekly basis - The respect of the ban of swill feeding is controlled - Compensation schemes exist in case of culling of animals for ASF control purposes

	Belarus	Estonia	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Russia	Ukraine
Biosecurity in live pig markets	-	- No live pig markets	-	-	- In infected zone the live markets operations are forbidden. - In other part of Poland movement holding – market – holding - pigs are accompanied by health certificates due to AD program.	-	-
Swill feeding	- Swill feeding is prohibited – feed is bought from licensed facilities	- Swill feeding is prohibited	-	- No swill feeding	- Swill feeding is forbidden in animals by law, - Periodic controls by official veterinarians - Collaboration with Sanitary Inspection controlling restaurants, canteenes etc. - Information dissemination.	-	- Swill feeding is prohibited (by a criminal law)
Waste management	-	- All fallen livestock reported, collected and rendered by state owned rendering plant. - December 2014 - locked containers in clusters for dead and hunted positive WB collected and rendered by state. - January 2014 – disposable rendering unit.	- Purchase of a mobile incinerator	-	- Carcasses are disposed according to Reg. 1069/2009. - Dead pigs are rendered in rendering plants. - Wild boar: if found dead, they are buried; if shot off they are rendered / incinerating plants.	-	-

	Belarus	Estonia	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Russia	Ukraine
Control at borders	-	- Continuing collaboration with Tax and Customs Board for 100% controls of personal luggage at land border -	-	-	- The control of means of transport for live animals – Vet Service and Customs Service - The control of the ban of introduction to EU the food in travellers luggage.	-	- Border control in place
Others	- Implementation of strict biosecurity measures for hunters (only authorised and informed hunters can access the hunting areas)	- Awareness campaigns, meetings with farmers and hunters - Veterinary and Food Board <u>can refuse the application for compensation</u> if the applicant has not fulfilled imposed restrictions (Par 57 Law on Animal Health) -	- No compensation schemes in place <u>at the moment</u> linked to biosecurity aspects	- Creation of a Buffer zone approx.10 km from the border with BY (2013); in this zone, option to: - strengthen biosecurity measures, or - early slaughter pigs kept (for own consumption) (clinical examination + test for ASF) with the compensation from Government and with agreement not to keep pigs for one year	- biosecurity requirements put in place for hunters: - persons participating in hunts cannot perform activities related to handling of pigs, unless 72 hours have passed from the end of such hunt; - any person having contact with wild boar, when in a holding must apply proper (change of clothing and shoes and disinfecting hands and shoes); - it is prohibited to bring in to a holding any part of wild boar or any materials that could have been contaminated with ASFV. - Compensation schemes are not linked to biosecurity implemented in the holdings	-	- Buffer zones along the border with Belarus in place since 2011 (= no pig raising 20km along the border); farmers in these zones sign an agreement not to raise pigs; - Lots of ToT formations conducted - lots of awareness programmes, involving the citizens; very efficient way