

Nr	Author of suggestion	MS	Relevant regulation	Problem description	Solution	Responsible DG
1	Bavarian State Government	DE	COMMISSION REGULATION (EC) No 1828/2006 of 8 December 2006 setting out rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006 laying down general provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund and the Cohesion Fund and of Regulation (EC) No 1080/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the European Regional Development Fund	The system for the proper allocation of EU funds from the European Regional Development Funds has been altered for the programming period 2007-2013 in the sense that verifications must take place on a mathematical-statistical random sampling basis (Article 17 in conjunction with Annex IV of Regulation 1828/2006). Compared to the previous system, this innovation will at least double the number of cases to be checked.	This means an unnecessary increase in the administrative burden, since the old arrangement for the period 2000-2006 (cf. Chapter IV of Regulation (EC) No 438/2001) already ensured proper verification. Despite resistance from the Member States, the Commission has so far refused to change the new verification system.	REGIO
2	Machanek (company)	DE	Regulation (EC) No 854/2004	We are a small family catering business from Berlin (3 employees) which caters for kindergartens and now needs an authorisation. The authorisation encompasses documents which fill more than one file and can't be completed by small businesses like us without professional help. We don't understand why we need this authorisation, since we cook only for about 250 children, and other bigger caterers such as kitchens in hospitals can make use of a 1/3 rule and thus do not need an authorisation. There is no fair competition. The biggest problem are changes in the building that we have to do for the EU-authorisation, e.g. altering the loading platform in a way that the delivery van can load (packed and welded) foodstuffs without external influences.  Where is the logic in this, when the truck has delivered to a non-EU-customer without these strict requirements? In addition, we have to pay for microbiological examinations for products delivered to us (such as milk). With these excessive requirements a lot of small caterers will have to close down. We cannot find details on the necessary alterations, a phone call to Brussels has not helped. Since we are subject to the regulation on meat-processing, we have to comply with requirements going beyond normal kitchens.	less stringent provisions for small caterers	SANCO
3	Landrat Müller / Landkreis Paderborn (regional authority)	DE	Regulation (EC) No 21/2004	Regulation (EC) No 21/2004 requires identification and registration of individual sheep and goat from 1 January 2010. The measures foreseen are not appropriate, they serve neither consumer protection nor epidemic crisis management or animal protection. In addition, the introduction of electronic identification of individual animals and the connected documentation obligations lead to high costs for the keepers. There are still a lot of unclear and practical problems with this kind of identification; its use is not yet mature enough.	We ask for a change of the legal provisions concerning individual animal recording and electronic identification and the reintroduction of the stock identification.	SANCO
4	Creamery Gropper (company)	DE	Regulation (EC) No 853/2004, annex II, section I, part B	Due to extensions of production capacities we need a new EU authorisation according to the EU hygiene package in force since 1 January 2006. This entails a new authorisation number (DE BY 77723 EG instead of DE BY 723 EG). What sounds like a minor detail leads to enormous costs for our business. We have to change more than 200 packages and pay for the changes in layout, text, advertising agencies.	We would like to continue using the old identification number.	SANCO
5	Merz, Fleischer-Juniorenverband (butcher association)	DE	Regulation (EC) No 853/2004, annex II, section III, no. 5; HACCP	Easing information requirements on the food chain would be a great relief for companies. At the moment information on the food chain must be available 24 hours before the arrival of the animals. This leads to difficulties in the butcheries, since the exact number of animals delivered to be slaughtered is seldom known to butcheries 24 hours before arrival. There will be additional bureaucracy via the introduction of chain information for cows and sheep. The 24 hour rule should be slackened. In the current proposal exemptions from the 24 hour rule require prior authorisation by the authorities. This prior authorisation should be deleted. Furthermore, annex II, section III, no. 5 requires butchers to collect information and notify the veterinary concerning information on health concerns. In the future all available information has to be forwarded to the veterinary, even if they are not related to health concerns. HACCP: The HACCP-system is in principle an appropriate approach for risk-oriented supervision.	facilitate 24-hour rule, information for veterinaries only in cases of health concerns; simplification of HACCP requirements for small companies	SANCO

Nr	Author of suggestion	MS	Relevant regulation	Problem description	Solution	Responsible DG
				However, we ask for simplifications for small companies. We don't understand why small businesses have to fulfill the same requirements as large meat processing factories.		
6	Söder (Bavarian Minister for Health and Environment)	DE	Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009	A proposal for a regulation on the protection of animals at the time of killing foresees a limit on the validity of certificates of competence for slaughter operations. The renewal would lead to costs for the butchers even if they have been in business for a long time. Furthermore, we oppose the obligation for the competent authorities to get an accreditation from a national reference body.	no limit to the validity of certificates of competence for slaughter operations	SANCO
7	Hartmann (company)	DE	Regulation (EC) No 853/200	Our company breeds turkey (hens) and also directly sells them. We face very strict provisions on food hygiene including extensive documentation obligations. Documentation and samples in relation to plant protection, water protection and animal protection likewise require extensive efforts. In particular concerning food hygiene the requirements are out of proportion. As a small business we have to comply with provisions made for large meat-processing businesses. An example: If you cut off feet you are required to use one knife for skin, a second one for the joints. This is reasonable for cows, but not for poultry since the feet are clean, as they have been scalded before; in addition, there is no meat at the poultry feet. This is just a small example, but there are many more.  Necessary examinations to prove cleaning of facilities and meat, examinations of the drinking water, extensive (and repetitive) training for personnel, documentation on control of temperatures or cooling facilities, waste disposal etc. A detailed risk- and management plan (HACCP) has to be developed which entails issues such as notification of a cooling technician when the temperatures are to high within the cooling facilities. We perceive this as an incapacitation. The people working in the companies for years know what to do in these cases.	avoid exaggerated control provisions; provide a lighter regime for small enterprises; put more emphasis on individual and personal responsibility	SANCO
8	Bavarian State Government	DE		Contracting Authorities are obliged to publish their invitations to tender and contracts awarded in the Official Journal of the EU. They also have to draw up an annual statistical report, several pages long, for the European Commission on the contracts awarded, involving all government departments, municipal authorities and other contracting authorities.	The administrative burdens involved is superfluous, as all European invitations to tender and notices about contracts awarded must in any case be recorded in a database at the EU Publications Office. The contract awarded statistics should therefore be abolished as soon as possible. If there are pressing reasons why more data are needed than appear in the notices, they could be obtained simply by adjusting the model of notices.	MARKT
9	Ministry of Economic Affairs, Labour and Transport, Lower Saxony	DE	Regulation (EC) 2150/2002 of the European Parliament of the Council of 25 November on Waste Statistics	The survey on waste places a further bureaucratic burden on companies because its only purpose is the gathering of statistics on waste which has been generated; it does not contribute to the processing or disposal of waste. The Regulation requires businesses to provide a detailed record of waste produced in 48 waste categories for all economic sectors. Under the provision of the Environmental Statistics Act which have been in force hitherto, it has not been necessary for statistics to be gathered from waste producers in order that this requirement be met. This means that, since 2006, 20.000 companies across Germany have been required to provide information every 4 years on the type of quantity of waste they produce. The companies are selected according to the number of staff the employ. In lower Saxony alone, the survey now extends to an additional 1.319 manufacturing companies with more than 500 employees who are compulsorily insured. Exceptions are not permitted, nor may companies be exempted from the survey.	A careful check should be carried out to determine whether this primary survey on the production of waste can be excluded from the EU Waste Statistics Regulation.	ESTAT/ENV

Nr	Author of suggestion	MS Relevant regulation	Problem description	Solution	Responsible DG
10	Central Chamber of Commerce	FI Council Regulation (EC) No 322/97 of 17 February 1997 on Community Statistics.	The data collection from companies is regulated in Finland by the Statistics Act, which complies with the Council Regulation 322/97/EC. According to the Act all the entrepreneurs are obligated to give information to four different officials, including Statistics Centre of Finland; the Finnish Customs; Press and Information Unit of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry; and the National Research and Development Centre for Welfare and Health. According to the section 14 of the Statistics Act, entrepreneurs and employers are obligated to give information to the Statistics Centre of Finland on the following issues: the field of business, location, ownership, financial situation, company assets, personnel and other resources. Altogether there are almost 60 different classes of information gathered. Statistics Centre of Finland obtains almost 95 percent of the data for statistics from administrative sources and only the remaining five percent is based on direct data collections.	The Central Chamber of Commerce of Finland admits the importance of collecting data and having statistics of high quality. But, the actual purpose of collecting data must have adequate and relevant reasons. In our opinion the automation of the data collection is extremely important and should be improved in all the Member States.	ESTAT
11	Airbrush Geckler (company)		When a customer comes from another MS, it has to deliver its Tax ID number. This to make sure no VAT is calculated. The supplier has to review the tax ID number and get a written confirmation from a national tax authority. The information is however not online available, so that the moment of checking the tax ID number is dependant on the moment the national tax authority is available. When competition is getting closer and closer such disruptions can be fatal.	For SME it is important that they can react to customers as quickly as possible.	TAXUD
12	Becker ktedo (company)	DE Directive 2006/42/EC	The new machine directive causes a lot of questions. The intention of clarifying labelling of products led to the implementation of rules which cause additional costs for administrative and technical issues. We would welcome proper measures to examine formulations in official documents on plausibility and implementability. We have questions on the following text in Annex II, 1.A.2.: name and address of the person authorised to compile the technical file, who must be established in the Community. What technical file is meant (those that need to be added or the documentation on CE-marking)? What address (professional or private)? Who can authorise?  Annex II, 1.A.3.:description and identification of the machinery, including generic denomination, function, model, type, serial number and commercial name. Why is the indication of where the serial number can be found not sufficient/what if there is no serial number? We see a contradiction with the provisions in Annex I, 1.7.3. and 1.7.4.2. The description of the machine is part of the manual. Why is there a need for an additional description in the EC conformity declaration? There is a danger of different names that need to be provided which will confuse users.	We ask for clarification.	ENTR
13	Englert (company)	DE Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008	Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008 is a bureaucratic monster. It is complex and very hard to find relevant provisions. In pdf-format there are 1355 pages, but no directory or chapter references on individual pages. Try to find the end of table 3.1 for yourself!	We suggest mandatory directories for pieces of legislation exceeding a certain number of pages as well as chapter references on individual pages.	SecGen