What’s the main problem?

Unique Identification!
Implementing traceability - objectives

- To specify, develop, test and deploy a generic information infrastructure to ensure complete traceability along entire fork to farm food chains
- To enable validation and verification of the data in the traceability system by linking them to analytical methods and other traceability control mechanisms
- To draft and demonstrate standardised schemes for electronic data interchange
Typical activities per chain

1. Analyze current material flow and information flow
2. Use existing standards or draft ad-hoc standards, hearing and consensus
3. Specify changes required in chain
4. Implement re-engineered system in chain
5. Quantification of costs and benefits in chain
Detailed view of activities per chain

Kick-off meeting for this specific chain

First company/chain visit

Plan re-engineering

Consensus meeting

Effectuate re-engineering

Final company/chain visit

Evaluate cost/benefit and conclude

Drafting of ad-hoc standard

Draft ad-hoc standard

Final ad-hoc standard

Mapping verifiable parameters to objective methods

Dictionary of verifiable parameters to objective methods

Initial analysis of material and information flow

Draft plan for re-engineering

Final plan for re-engineering

Final plan for re-engineering

Final analysis of material and information flow

Final report with ‘Good Traceability Practice’ and cost/benefit analysis

Use of process mapping method

Use of cost/benefit method
Mineral water – Insalus, Spain

- 30 people
- 18,000 l/day
- 30,000,000 l/year
Honey – FMA, France

- Biggest producer in Europe, 14,000,000 kg/year
Chicken – Dafa Chia Tai, China

- 10,000 people
- 140,000 chickens/day

Material flow:

I – Reception, slaughter
   - Live chicken
   - Chicken carcasses

II – Cutting down
   - Chicken meat from leg

III – Processing, frying
   - Yakitori nuggets

IV – Insert sticks, freezing
   - Frozen Yakitori sticks in plastic bags

V – Packaging, shipment
Other chains analyzed

- Fish meal and fish oil production, Norway
- Salmon, cod and lamb production, Norway
- Soy bean production, Serbia
- Salmon, cod and herring production, Nordic countries
- Tuna processing, Spain
- Grain and soy bean production, Iowa
Recommendations from process mapping

- Overall, existing systems were fairly good.
- In many companies good traceability on ingredients received and on products produced, but no connection between them. Companies couldn’t identify exactly what ingredients and batches received was used to produce what products produced.
- No unique identification of trade units produced.
- Traceability not used as a profiling / branding / marketing tool.
Internal traceability - assessment

1. Documentation of raw materials and ingredients - **OK**

2. Documentation and unique labelling of finished products – **OK**, except lack of uniqueness

3. Documentation of transformations, that is which raw materials and ingredients were used to produce which finished products - **Varies**
Chain traceability - assessment

1. Documentation of what you do (internal traceability) - **OK**

2. Sending the information to the next link of the chain (on label, in accompanying documentation, electronically) - **Varies**

3. Taking care of the information that is sent to you from the previous link of the chain - **Fail**
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See you on the workshop Thursday!
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