



Health data recording in Finland

Juho Kyntäjä, Agricultural Data Processing Centre Ltd.

History of health data recording in Finland

The need to have bulls tested for health traits was recognised in the 1970's

Health data recording started in 1982, after Norway, before Sweden and Denmark



Voluntary system

- 89 % of herds sent in data during 2011
- Total treatments equal to 55 % of cow number

Farmer owned

 Faba, NAV & Viking Genetics authorised to use it for breeding purposes



Health data in the advisory database

- Cow ID
- Treatment date
- Treatment code
 - 195 different codes for diagnoses and/or treatments
- Vet ID
- Preventive measures
- Hoof treatment
- Self-medication





Health data in the Naseva database

Naseva is a voluntary food safety register operated by the Finnish Association for Animal Disease Prevention

Established 2006

Nationally agreed food safety conditions

- Cow ID
- Treatment date
- Diagnosis
- Medication
- Withdrawal period
- Vet ID





How is the data collected?







The farmer summons the vet when he/she sees fit.

The farmer has the cow health cards ready for the vet.

The farmer may send the data to the advisory & Naseva databases.

The vet treats the animal.

The vet writes down treatment data on the cow health card.

The vet may send the data to the Naseva database.

Al technicians collect data from cow health cards

Al technicians send the data to the advisory database after the day's work



Data flow between the databases

All treatment data from Naseva is also transferred and converted to the advisory database

- Good points:
 - Once entered the data can be used anywhere
 - Medication bookkeeping and breeding & management purposes combined
- Problems:
 - Vets reluctant to enter data to Naseva
 - Farmers reluctant to enter data to Naseva
 - Naseva is almost solely used for cows right before slaughter
 - Some slaughteries accept data on paper





Data recording options

Korvann Laboun nom Efginfläkkärin ja omistajan merkinnät 489 Unftca Enginfläkkärin ja omistajan merkinnät
Indidicitati ja väroagiotata" India Indit
1 20 1.440 1.440 100 1.440 1.440 1.440 101 1.440 1.440 1.440 101 1.440 1.440 1.440 101 1.440 1.440 1.440 101 1.440 1.440 1.440 101 1.440 1.440 1.440 101 1.440 1.440 1.440 101 1.440 1.440 1.440 101 1.440 1.440 1.440 101 1.440 1.440 1.440 101 1.440 1.440 1.440 101 1.440 1.440 1.440 101 1.440 1.440 1.440 101 1.440 1.440 1.440 101 1.440 1.440 1.440 101 1.440 1.440 1.440 101 1.440 1.440 1.440 101 1.440 1.440 1.440 101 1.440 1.440 1.440 101 1.440 1.440 1.440 102 1.440 1.440 1.440 102 1.440 1.440 1.440
Poisto / 20 Syy

The farmer can have treatments reported:

- -By AI technician from the cow card
- -By himself through Ammu programme



Data recording from hoof trimming



- "Hoof Mobile"
- Software of Danish origin
- Hoof trimmers enter data on the spot
- Reports available after trimming session



Efficiency of data capture

In a voluntary system, efficiency of data capture is never perfect

Still, 83 % of all treatments are captured (Virtala 2012)

- Failure by veterinarian
 - Some farmers do not show cow cards to the vet
 - Some veterinarians reluctant to mark the cow cards (more in the past)
- Failure by AI technician
 - Culled cows
 - Cows that are not being inseminated
 - Some technicians reluctant to record data
- Delay
 - → Median 26 days, 95 % fractile 163 days (Virtala 2012)





Data collection methods vs. delay

Method	Treatments	%	Avg delay days
Veterinarian	37,724	12.6	38
Farmer /Naseva	54,075	18.1	64
Farmer/ Ammu	16,682	5.6	55
Advisor/ Ammu	13,839	4.6	98
Hoof trimmer/ sheet	2,391	0.8	232
Hoof trimmer	50,023	16.7	2
AI technician	124,066	41.5	84



Recognised problems

- Complexity
- Many parties involved
- Leads to:
 - Data loss
 - Errors
 - Delays
- Development of veterinary software to comply with the registers



Data use for breeding purposes

🔁 eUffice 👗 Prime 🔁 Systtesti 🛃 Br 🛃 M-um 🎆 EUdict 🏄 CRM 🤮 Str-Arkisto 🤤 Omat lahdot 😂 ProAspa 🚥 DLBK 💘 VG 😂

VR Asmo Ullimulli U	rut ET A 4	6365 C		Transla phenoty	<u>tion of b</u> pic valu	<u>reeding</u> es	valu	<u>ies to</u>	
Born: 18.10.2011, Sulkava				Sire: A Lillimulli A A A 44033 C					
Breeder: Tolvanen Asko				DCS. Lindars AAA 42519 C					
Color				PGS: Lindero AAA 43518 C					
Animal ID: 10683391				PGD:	Orakkel_I	50-120	4864	AAA	
Int ID: FIN00000046365				Dam: K.Elena 1300091AAA					
VG				MGS:	V.Record	AAA 427	24 C		
				MGD	Volga 129	0849AAA	4		
Trait Daught	ers Reliability				MGGS: N.O	Ooppium A	AA	41638 D	
Production				Breed p	roportion		ò		
Functional				· ·	•				
Health									
Conformation				EAV	CPP NI	E CAN			
Conformation				(65,6%)(14,8%) (12,:	5%)(7,0%))		
NTM: 24 (G)								30.04.2013	
			80	90	100	110	12	20	
Production	111								
Milk-kg	113								
Fat-%						_			
Fat-kg	107								
Prot%	112								
Persistency	112	non-ners						nersistant	
Fortility	114	non pero.					-	persistant	
Birth	110								
Calving	106								
Still birth sire									
Still birth mgs									
Calving ease (sire)									
Calving ease (mgs)									
NRR (male fertility)			_						
Growth	107		_	\vdash					
Cell count	108					-			
Milkability	96								
Leakage	50								
Other treatments	112								
Temperament	109								
Hoofhealth	109								
Longevity	119	bad						good	
Conformation			80	90	100	110	12	20	
Body	103	bad						good	

Breeding indeces

- udder health
- hoof health
- other treatments



Data use for breeding purposes, II



Genetic trend in mastitis treatments, Red cows



Data use for breeding purposes, III

Genetic trend in treatment of other diseases, Red cows





Reporting back to farmers



- Paper report once per year
- Treatments grouped into:
 - Fertility issues
 - Milk fever
 - Ketosis
 - Nutritional disorders
 - Udder diseases

Health data in advisory internet services

U-identification	<u>390 Urakka</u> F10000083631	89-9 H	orn erdbook nr	nimal 20	14.10.2005 1331947 A	
		K		animai 3:		
erd menu Basic	lata Annual yields	Testmilkings 305-day yields	Calvings Ins	emination	Treatment	
Treatment date	Treatment code	Treatment				
10.10.200	7 822	Preventive hoof treatment				<u></u>
20.09.200	8 768	Hoof torsion				
20.09.200	8 822	Preventive hoof treatment				
29.01.200	9 761	Sole haemorrhages				
29.01.200	9 822	Preventive hoof treatment				
08.06.200	9 822	Preventive hoof treatment				
16.09.200	9 763	White line rupture				
16.09.200	9 768	Hoof torsion				
16.09.200	9 822	Preventive hoof treatment				
19.06.201	0 821	Dry-off treatment				
21.12.201	0 12	Silent heat				
22.12.201	1 450	Other disease				
10.02.201	1 101	Cystic ovaries				
10.02.201	2 25	Cystic ovaries				





Health data in advisory internet services



1,18

Heifers culled, %
Deaths/ departures, % cowmean
Calf mortality
Cows/kennel
Eating space, cm/cow
Mastitis treatments in heifers, %
Mastitis treatment, 2+rd calving, %
Dry-off treatment, %
Milk fever treatment 1st & 2nd calv., %
Milk fever treatment 3+rd calving, %
Metritis treatment, %
Non-infectional fertility treatments, %
Abomasal treatments %
Ketosis treatment, %
Disorders in rumen and bowels, %
Grass tetany treatment, %
Contageous hoof diseases, %
Respiratory infections in calves, %
Calf scours treatments, %







Results

Breed	Fertility treat- ment	Milk Fever	Ketosis	Nutr. Disorder	Udder diseases	Hoof diseases	All treat- ments
Ayrshire	17.8	3.2	0.9	1.7	16.2	1.2	50.8
Holstein	20.4	4.6	1.7	2.3	20.9	1.7	63.0
Finncattle	13.7	4.1	2.3	1.7	16.3	1.1	47.8
Total	18.7	3.7	1.2	2.0	17.9	1.4	

- Results from 2011
- Percent of cows treated for each disease group



Conclusion

- Voluntary registration of treatments
- Since 1982
- Vet -> AI technician -> Database
- Breeding values
- Farm reports
- Management services
- Cooperation with the production chain information system
- Registration by hoof trimmers
- Future: registration by vets?



