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Abstract

Romanian husbandry is better and better every year. In this context, the most representative results are in pig production, where the quality of carcasses is comparative to that of the other E.U. member states with high performances in this field. The methods of classification we have used were acknowledged by the Commission of Classification of Swine, Bovine, and Sheep Carcasses in Romania, i.e. optic probe (the apparatuses Fat-o-meat’er and OptiGrade-Pro), as well as the ZP (Zwei Punkte) method. Most Romanian pork carcasses (over 99.0%) range among E and U high-quality classes. This is more than satisfactory from the point of view of the qualitative evolution of pork in Romania. The results obtained by the Romanian pig breeders were remarkable in 2009, i.e. superior compared to those of the previous years. The implementation of the EUROP system for pork carcass classification in Romania has largely generated expected results.
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1. Introduction

Implementing the quality classification system for pork carcasses in Romania has generated a substantial improvement of the quality of swine numbers and, implicitly, reaching specific international standards [1, 2].

A major objective of classification of pork carcasses is represented by the increase of carcass quality up to the qualitative level of carcasses in other E.U. member states. The year 2009 brought about some changes from the point of view of both pork carcass in general and their distribution within them [3].

2. Materials and methods

Data presented have been centralised on the ground of both reports by classification agencies and reports by independent classifiers activating in swine slaughtering sector in Romania.

In 2009, in Romania, they classified over 2.8 million pork carcasses, which represents a substantial increase of the animal numbers being classified compared to the previous years. We have analysed the entire swine numbers at national levels between January 1, 2009, and December 31, 2009, reported to the European Commission [4].

The averages of the percentage of lean meat in a carcass as well as of warm weight have been calculated as pondered averages.

The methods of classification we have used were acknowledged by the Commission of Classification of Swine, Bovine, and Sheep Carcasses in Romania, i.e. optic probe (the apparatuses Fat-o-meat’er and OptiGrade-Pro), as well as the ZP (Zwei Punkte) method (Table 2).

3. Results and discussion

Most Romanian pork carcasses (over 99.0%) range among E and U high-quality classes. This is more than satisfactory from the point of view of the qualitative evolution of pork in Romania.
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Table 1. Classification of pork carcasses from the point of view of quality in 2009[5]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Carcasses (number)</th>
<th>Share of the total (%)</th>
<th>Lean meat (%)</th>
<th>Warm weight (2%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2,587,593</td>
<td>90.69</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>240,690</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>21,269</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>84.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>3,056</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,853,362</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. The number of carcasses classified in 2009 depending on the method and on the classification apparatus[6]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Carcasses (number)</th>
<th>Total carcasses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optic probe</td>
<td>Fat-o-meat’er</td>
<td>1,150,616</td>
<td>40.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OptiGrade-Pro</td>
<td>OptiGrade-Pro</td>
<td>1,276,590</td>
<td>44.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>426,156</td>
<td>14.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,853,362</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If, between 2000 and 2004, Romania was confronted with an almost critical situation from the point of view of pork quality and of pork carcass quality, today our country ranges among top E.U. member states producing high-quality pork carcasses. In 2009 the number of pork carcasses classified as E compared with the number of pork carcasses classified as U was over 10 times higher (10.75). Similarly, the number of pork carcasses classified as U is over 10 times higher than that of the carcasses classified as R (11.3) (Figure 1).

![Figure 1 Distribution of pork carcasses in 2009 per quality classes](image)

Analysing the number of carcasses classified as O we can see that they represent 7 times less than those classified as R (6.96). The number of carcasses classified as P (inferior class) is insignificant, i.e. 4 times smaller than that of the previous class O (4.05).

Totalling the carcasses classified in the two low-quality classes, i.e. O and P, we can see that of the total number of over 2,800,000 carcasses classified at national level in Romania in 2008, less than 4,000 were classified in low-quality classes, i.e. carcasses difficult to sell.

4. Conclusions

The results obtained by the Romanian pig breeders were remarkable in 2009, i.e. superior compared to those of the previous years.

However, if from the point of view of pork carcass quality Romania has made huge progress, we need to take into account the aspect of intrinsic meat quality which, because of the diminution of fat levels, might also loose some of its taste quality – the feature that made Romanian pork well-known.
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