EUROPEAN COMMISSION
HEALTH AND CONSUMERS DIRECTORATE-GENERAL

Directorate F - Food and Veterinary Office

Ares(2014)4004811

DG(SANCO) 2014-7050 - MR FINAL

FINAL REPORT OF AN AUDIT

CARRIED OUT IN

SPAIN

FROM 18 TO 25 MARCH 2014

IN ORDER TO EVALUATE THE ANIMAL HEALTH CONTROL SYSTEM IN PLACE FOR BODIES, INSTITUTES OR CENTRES APPROVED IN ACCORDANCE WITH ANNEX C OF COUNCIL DIRECTIVE 92/65/EEC

In response to information provided by the Competent Authority, any factual error noted in the draft report has been corrected; any clarification appears in the form of a footnote.

Executive Summary

The report describes the outcome of an audit carried out by the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) in Spain from 18 to 25 March 2014. The objective of the audit was to evaluate the effectiveness of the animal health controls in place in relation to bodies, institutes or centres in accordance with Annex C to Council Directive 92/65/EEC.

Overall, the report concludes that:

The significant revision of the list of approved bodies, institutes and centres (ABICs) performed shortly before the present audit and the deficiencies found in the official controls in this area were indications of the insufficient attention given previously by the competent authorities to this sector.

In general the official controls were insufficient to guarantee compliance of ABICs with relevant requirements. This was mainly due to the incomplete transposition of the relevant Directive and the unclear applicability of some Spanish legal acts for approvals and official controls, and to insufficient procedures or instructions.

Nevertheless, the standards of animal health surveillance in the ABICs visited were in general sufficient, even if not always adapted to the evolution of risks. The controls of health standard for animals coming from non-approved sources was generally insufficient, introducing an unnecessary risk for the biosecurity of these establishments.

The measures applied in case of suspicion or confirmation of notifiable disease were effective but insufficiently documented, and they were not accompanied by the required administrative measures, such as suspension of the approval. The consequences of this were limited, as the authorities had in general a stricter control of movements of animals from ABICs than required by EU legislation. Traceability of animals was in general ensured. There were problems with certification for Intra-Union Trade from or to establishments considered ABICs but which were actually not approved as such.

As Spain has not imported ungulates under the EU conditions for imports into ABICs, and has not developed procedures to do so, this area was not covered by the audit. The control of compliance with national health conditions established for imported animals (for which no EU conditions are in place) was insufficient when they are imported through border inspection posts situated in other Member States.

No immediate health risk was identified.

Recommendations are made to the competent authorities of Spain to address the shortcomings described in the report.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations and definitions used in this report

Abbreviation	Explanation
ABIC	Approved body, institute or centre: *establishment where animal species are kept or bred, either for the display of animals and education of the public, or for conservation of the species, or for basic or applied scientific research or breeding of such animals for such research, and approved according to Directive 92/65/EEC*
BIP	Border inspection post
CA	Competent Authority
CCA	Central Competent Authority
EU	European Union
FVO	Food and Veterinary Office
IUT	Intra-Union trade
MS(s)	Member State(s)
OIE	*World Organisation for Animal Health*
OV	Official veterinarian
RCA	Regional Competent Authority
TRACES	TRAde Control Expert System, a trans-European network for veterinary health notification and certification.

1 Introduction

This audit took place in Spain from 18 to 25 March 2014, as part of the planned audit programme of the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO). The audit comprised 3 FVO auditors.

The FVO audit team was accompanied by a representative from the Central competent authority (CCA), the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment (*Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente*).

2 Objectives

The objective of the audit was to evaluate the effectiveness of the animal health controls in place in relation to bodies, institutes or centres approved in accordance with Annex C to Council Directive 92/65/EEC and in particular:

- The assurances given by the official controls regarding the compliance of approved bodies, institutes and centres with applicable requirements;
- The standards of animal health surveillance and control measures applied in these establishments in relation to the objectives of applicable legislation;
- The conditions for movements of animals to and from these establishments, and their traceability;
- The specific arrangements in place for the introduction of animals from third countries to approved bodies, institutes or centres.

The scope focused on bodies, institutes and centres keeping animals susceptible to the diseases listed in annex A to Directive 92/65/EEC, including arrangements in place when such establishments keep also ungulates of species referred to in Directives 64/432/EEC, 91/68/EEC and 2009/156/EC. The evaluation of the system for introduction from third countries focused on animals for which harmonised rules are in place (in line with Directives 92/65/EEC, 2004/68/EC, or 2009/156/EC).

The organisation of the competent authorities, their operational criteria and performance in this sector was assessed according to the standards laid down in Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.

In view of this objective, the following sites were visited:

Visits	Number	Comments
Central Competent Authority	1	
Regional and local Competent Authorities	3	Madrid, Catalonia and Andalusia
Approved bodies, institutes and centres	5	4 zoos and 1 research centre

3 Legal Basis

The audit was carried out under the general provisions of EU legislation and, in particular Article 45 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules.

A full list of the EU legal instruments referred to in this report is provided in Annex I. EU legal acts quoted in this report refer, where applicable, to the latest amended version

4 Background

The intra-Union trade of a number of animal species covered by Council Directive 92/65/EEC must be subject to production of a health certificate delivered by the competent authority (CA). Article 13 of this Directive foresees that trade in most of these animals, to and from approved bodies, institutes or centres (ABICs), shall be subject to production of a transport document, completed by the veterinarian responsible for the ABIC of origin.

Article 2 of Directive 92/65/EEC defines ABICs as establishments where animal species are kept or bred, either for the display of animals and education of the public, or for conservation of the species, or for basic or applied scientific research or breeding of such animals for such research. Conditions for approval and official supervision of these ABICs are detailed in Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC, aiming at ensuring them a high standard of biosecurity.

Specific conditions for the import of ungulates from third countries, intended for an ABIC, have been introduced in September 2013 (Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 780/2013[1] amending Commission Regulation (EU) No 206/2010). These conditions authorise imports from an extended number of third countries.

This is the first series of audits from the European Commission on this topic, decided on the ground that animals traded to and from ABICs can be carriers of animal diseases which, transmitted via direct or indirect contact, can have serious consequences for livestock farming or humans (zoonoses).

Spain had 150 ABICs listed until March 2014, when the list was reviewed and the number of ABICs reduced to 42.

5 Findings And Conclusions

5.1 Legislation and competent authorities

Legal requirements

Articles 4 to 8 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004; Article 291 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

Findings

5.1.1 Legislation

Council Directive 92/65/EC was transposed into Spanish legislation by Royal Decree 1881/1994 of

1 Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 780/2013 of 14 August 2013 amending Commission Regulation (EU) No 206/2010 laying down lists of third countries, territories or parts thereof authorised for the introduction into the European Union of certain animals and fresh meat and the veterinary certification requirements OJ L 219, 15.8.2013, p.1

16 September 1994. The diseases which are notifiable at national level, or in accordance with EU rules (transposition of Directive 82/894/EEC) are listed in Royal Decree 617/2007.

The FVO team noted that:

- The substantial changes introduced by Commission Regulation 1282/2002[2] to Directive 92/65/EEC have not been taken into account by the CA, which considered that the legal basis for approval and supervision of ABICs was the original Royal Decree. This meant that the list of diseases considered for the scope of approval and supervisions of ABICs was much shorter and more restrictive. However, it also implied that official supervision was to be performed twice a year instead of once a year (as required in EU law), and that annual sampling and testing of a representative proportion of animals in ABIC for diseases listed was also required.
- The requirement for ABICs to have approved procedures for animals coming from non approved sources (point 1 (b) of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC) was not transposed into Spanish legislation. This requirement is also missing in the Spanish version of the EU Directive.
- The audit team received contradicting information from the CCA on the applicability of a number of transpositions of EU pieces of legislation applying to zoo animals or ABICs. Both Royal Decree 617/2007 and Order AAA/570/2013 (establishing specific measures in relation to bluetongue, in line with Regulation (EC) No 1266/2007) referred in their definitions to article 3 of National Law 8/2003. The CCA stated that this reference made zoo animals included in the scope for the notification of animal diseases, but same reference made them excluded for the bluetongue movement restriction measures. An official position was requested by the FVO audit team, but not received. Irrespective of the fact that the CCA indicated that zoo animals are included in the scope of Royal Decree 617/2007, the list of diseases (Annex I) includes many diseases referred as diseases of domestic species, making it unclear whether outbreaks of such diseases in non-domestic species would be notifiable[3].

5.1.2 Designation of competent authorities, operational criteria

The CCA in charge of ABIC is the sub-directorate for animal health and hygiene, and traceability. Each of the 17 regions is responsible for its own organisation. Coordination between the CCA and Regional CAs (RCAs) is organised through monthly meetings of heads of service of the animal health services, and for the scope of this audit, additional meetings of the heads of service meeting in a national committee of identification and registration, which occur at least every quarter.

The FVO team noted that:

- The approval and official supervision of ABICs had not been covered by any audit.
- The CCA stated that another CA at central level was in charge of licensing zoos (in line with

2 Commission Regulation (EC) No 1282/2002 of 15 July 2002 amending Annexes to Council Directive 92/65/EEC laying down animal health requirements governing trade in and imports into the Community of animals, semen, ova and embryos not subject to animal health requirements laid down in specific Community rules referred to in Annex A(1) to Directive 90/425/EEC - OJ L 187, 16/07/2002, p. 3–12

3 In their response to the draft report the Competent Authority noted that the Royal Decree 617/2007 has been repealed by Royal Decree 526/2014 of 20 June 2014, which no longer refers to domestic species.

Council Directive 99/22/EC[4]) and it was not clear on the respective responsibilities for approvals of such establishments. A coordination meeting of the national committee for identification and registration agreed in 2013 on the way to register zoos approved as ABICs;

- A RCA had identified possible synergies with official controls of various ABICs (zoos and research institutes or centres) performed by the CA in charge of animal welfare or environmental matters (checks on movement registers, on preventive and curative veterinary care), and was planning to increase its coordination with this latter CA;

- In another region, the CA in charge of animal health was in charge of the checks at destination when such destination were ABICs, while the CA in charge of environmental matters was in charge of checks of exotic animals arriving at other destinations. This separation of tasks explained delay in identifying primates which arrived from other Member States (MSs) to an individual, in breach of Article 5 of Directive 92/65/EEC.

- Training on official controls of ABICs was organised by the CA in Andalusia through a cascade training, from an official veterinarian (OV) who participated in a "Better Training for Safer Food" session.

5.1.3 Organisation, implementation and verification of official controls and procedures

- Andalusia and Madrid had developed instructions and check-lists for the approval and official supervision of ABICs respectively. Procedures and check-lists were also provided from two other regions not visited (Galicia and Navarra). No such elements were developed in Catalonia, where official controls within the scope of the present were not organised, which is not in line with point 2(a) of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC). No information was provided from the other seven RCAs in charge of listed ABICs.

- In some cases, the check-lists and instructions are developped according to the requirements of Directive 92/65/EEC; in other cases (e.g. some check-list for inspections) to Royal Decree 1881/1997 (with a more limited list of diseases).

Conclusions

The lack of complete transposition of the current requirements of Directive 92/65/EEC and the unclear applicability of some legal acts to ABICs and/or exotic animals represent an impediment to their correct application.

Deficiencies in coordination of official controls on certain ABICs have been identified at various levels of the CA, which led to insufficient official controls on compliance of the operators, and improvements have been planned or implemented.

The absence of instructions and information for staff in one of the three regions visited was linked to absence of official controls. The lack of information on the organisation of seven other regions with listed ABICs raises doubts on the effectiveness of their official controls.

4 Council Directive 1999/22/EC of 29 March 1999 relating to the keeping of wild animals in zoos. *OJ L 94, 09/04/1999, p. 24–26*

5.2 Approval of bodies, institutes and centres

Legal requirements

Article 13 of Directive 92/65/EEC; Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC.

Findings

5.2.1 Listing of approved bodies, institutes and centres

Whereas the RCAs are in charge of the approvals of the ABIC, the CCA is in charge of relations with other MSs and to make the list of ABICs public. This is done through a dedicated page in the CCA website[5], in line with Article 13(2)(d) of Directive 92/65/EEC Most ABICs are listed without their approval number, which is not in line with Article 13(2)(d) of Directive 92/65/EEC.

The FVO team noted that:

- The most drastic change on the newly published list of ABICs originated from Catalonia, where from 82 ABICs prior to March 2014, four remained on the list.

- A procedure for transmission of updates was agreed in 2013. All ABICs would be integrated into the national holding database, and a special field was put in place for the RCA to indicate whether the holding is an ABIC or not. The CCA intended to review the database on a weekly basis to spot any possible update in order to amend accordingly the published list.

- The procedure agreed does not foresee the attribution of an approval number specific to the ABIC, their holding registration number will be used instead. This is not in line with Article 13(2)(d) of Directive 92/65/EEC.

5.2.2 Procedures and conditions for approval

The system for assessing the conditions for approvals is developed at regional level.

The FVO team noted that:

Procedures:

- A formal approval system was in place in Andalusia, which included a commitment letter from the operator and the veterinarian, and the presentation of a disease surveillance plan. In Madrid and in Andalusia, a formal approval was issued to the operator ("*resolución*") by the RCA, following a review of documents and an inspections of the official services, in line with Article 13(2)(a) of Directive 92/65/EEC. No system was in place in Catalonia.

- In Andalusia, the approval is granted on the basis of the requirements contained in Directive 92/65/EEC. However, since not all the conditions for approval in the Directive are transposed in Spain, there could be legal uncertainty on the enforceable requirements. The approval documents attributed a specific approval number to the ABICs, but these approval numbers were not recorded at national level or used for certification purposes. In Madrid, the approval document referred to Royal Decree 1881/1994, but did not approve them

5 http://www.magrama.gob.es/es/ganaderia/temas/comercio-exterior-ganadero/comercio-intracomunitario/

specifically as ABIC: instead, it authorised them to "perform intra-union trade", and indicated to them that they had a (holding) registration number. No approval document had been issued to the listed ABICs in Catalonia.

- The RCA of Catalonia indicated that the extended list of ABICs until March 2014 came from a misunderstanding of the type of establishments that needed to be approved under Directive 92/65/EEC, and was not related to requests from such establishments to be involved in Intra-Union trade (IUT) with other ABICs. No official notification of the removal of their listing was sent to the 78 ABICs.
- The veterinarians of the ABIC were specifically authorised by the RCA in Andalusia and in Madrid, and signed a commitment declaration. In Catalonia, the veterinarians of the four ABICs still on the list had been issued a letter of approval, referring to Directive 92/65/EEC, but the approvals were not linked to any specific ABIC, making this approval insufficient to comply with the requirement of Point 1(g) of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC.
- Both Andalusia and Madrid used check-list as a support to the official visit. In Madrid, the checks on animal health controls were focused on the diseases listed in the Royal Decree (and not the full list of Directive 92/65/EEC). In Catalonia, no inspection to check the compliance of conditions for ABICs was performed prior to listing, no submission of supporting documents was requested, which is not in line with Article 13 (2)(a) of Directive 92/65/EEC.

- The approval process in Andalusia or Madrid did not include a check on the presence or a review of the records for three years prior to approval. The approval process did not either require the development of procedures to be approved for animals coming from non-approved sources (point 1(b) of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC).

Infrastructures:

- Except in one case (research centre), ABICs visited were clearly demarcated, as required by Point 1(a) of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC. All had premises for post-mortem examination.
- Quarantine facilities, required by Point 1(b) of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC, were present in all ABICs. The facilities visited were in fair or poor conditions. In most cases, quarantine facilities were also used for the isolation of sick animals. In one ABIC, suitable quarantine facilities were present: the operator explained that they had been upgraded following the insistent request of the CA following the official supervision visits, thus showing the added value of the repeated inspections.

Animal registers:

- A regional Regulation in Catalonia requires to keep registers in paper form (with numbered pages) at research institutes be kept on paper, or, if in electronic format, the register needs to be approved, and able to extract information allowing for easy inspection; print-out of the electronic register must be performed prior to the inspection.
- All ABICs visited had registers of the animals they kept, their origin and destination. Most animals were identified individually (when practical), in line with requirement of point 1(d) (i) of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC.
- The registers kept by the research centre visited were incompletely filled and not specific to the operations of the centre. It was impossible to get a full and accurate picture of the animals and species which were moved into or from this ABIC.

- All zoos visited were part of a European zoos association, which had developed an electronic database where data on movements and mortality are recorded, allowing an easy check on the elements required by Points 1(d)(ii) and (v) of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC. The electronic registers for clinical observations, laboratory analyses and necropsy (records required by point 1(d)(iii), (iv) and (v) of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC), from the same association, was too complicated to allow the extraction of an overview of the events over a period. A veterinarian of an ABIC (zoo) explained that the system was unreliable or too cumbersome, and kept information also in a separate database. In another ABIC (zoo), paper copies were kept until 2009. A fast review of them allowed the FVO audit team to identify and review positive virological tests for relevant diseases. It was impractical to perform a similar investigation for the more recent years.

Conclusions

The lack of formal approval, or incomplete standards used in the approval of establishments publicly listed as ABICs in Spain by the CCA, and the sudden decrease in numbers when the list was reviewed before the audit, indicates the unreliability of the system to ensure that the listed ABICs complied with the requirements.

The use of a holding registration number instead of a specific approval number means that the number associated to the ABIC will remain in use even when the approval is withdrawn or suspended.

The assurances given by CAs on compliance of the ABICs when approving them, were affected by the absence of checks on the animal health history of the establishment. The incomplete registers of one ABIC made it unfit for approval, as it could not demonstrate that it complied with the required biosecurity standards.

The compliance with requirements for registers in the other ABICs were facilitated to some extent by their inclusion in a European industry network which developed a comprehensive system. However, this system of registers was designed for different purpose and the models/formats used made it difficult for the official veterinarian to audit the activity of the approved veterinarian, and therefore to decide on the compliance on this aspect. A good practice was noticed in one region with specific additional requirements on the format of registers, facilitating their official inspection to confirm the health status of the establishment.

The official controls were insufficient to identify the deficiencies of the organisational aspects of quarantines, and in most cases to enforce adequate infrastructures of quarantine facilities, affecting the biosecurity standard of the ABICs.

5.3 Disease surveillance and control measures

Legal requirements

Annex A, and C to Directive 92/65/EEC; Decision 2007/598/EC; Chapter 5.9 of the 2013 OIE Code.

Findings

5.3.1 Disease surveillance and prevention

On the basis of the requirement of Royal Decree 1881/1994, the CCA wrote a note two weeks prior

to the FVO audit, indicating that the sampling and testing to be performed on a representative proportion of animals of the susceptible species for the diseases under consideration should only be done in case of clinical suspicion.

At national level, a programme for vaccination of susceptible birds kept in zoos was issued in 2006 and 2007, approved by Commission Decision 2007/598/EC. Vaccination against bluetongue in non-domestic susceptible species is authorised under national legislation.

No specific national guidelines or instructions have been issued for the surveillance or control of other diseases listed in Annex A to Directive 92/65/EEC in approved bodies, but national surveillance and control programmes are in place for a number of these diseases; these programmes are published on the CA website[6] .

The FVO team noted that:

- The scope and frequency of updates of disease surveillance plans developed by the ABICs visited, varied. In most ABICs, the surveillance plans adequately referred to the diseases listed in the current Annex A of Directive 92/65/EEC, rather than the more restrictive list of Royal Decree 1881/1994. None of the surveillance plans presented evidence of revision on an annual basis, contrary to the requirement in Point 1(g)(ii) of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC.
- Whereas histopathology and bacteriological analyses were quite common in ABICs following necropsy (as required by Points 1(d)(iii) and (v) of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC), analyses were seldom required for viral diseases.
- Some active surveillance was performed on exotic species in some ABICs visited on some diseases from Annex A to Directive 92/65/EEC, namely: avian influenza and Newcastle disease, African and classical swine fever, bluetongue, brucellosis and tuberculosis, psittacosis, and also on rabies and foot-and-mouth disease.
- Vaccination against avian influenza had been carried out in some ABICs, under official supervision, with an inactivated vaccine provided by the CA and records of vaccinated animals were available in the ABICs visited, in line with Decision 2007/598/EC.
- Vaccination against bluetongue had been performed in the past by some ABICs, using the inactivated vaccines registered in the country, in line with point (1)(g)(ii) of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC. Such vaccinations were adequately recorded.
- Only one ABIC visited indicated that they imported a non-registered vaccine from a third country. This was done with the authorisation and under the control of the CA. Medicinal products used in all ABICs visited were either registered veterinary products registered in the EU, or products used in human medicine.

5.3.2 Disease surveillance and control of bovine, ovine, caprine, porcine animals and equidae

Royal Decree 1881/1994 excludes bovine, porcine, ovine and caprine animals, as well as equidae and bivalve molluscs from its scope. The other exclusions are made on the intended use (poultry and aquaculture animals). National disease control programmes in these species are also applied in these animals when kept in ABICs, in line with requirements of Directives 64/432/EEC and 92/65/EEC. Under national legislation, vaccination against serotype 4 and 1 of bluetongue is compulsory for bovine and ovine animals in areas situated in the south and centre-west of the country, and authorised elsewhere.

6 http://rasve.mapa.es/Publica/Programas/Normativa.asp

The FVO team noted that:

- The CCA stated that they excluded domestic bovine animals kept in zoos from the national programme of tuberculosis, using the derogation of Chapter I of Annex A to Directive 64/432/EEC for animals taking part in cultural events. As such animals are not excluded from Chapter II of the same Annex, the bovine animals in zoos are included in the national brucellosis control programme.
- Evidence of domestic bovine animals in zoos tested for tuberculosis was nonetheless presented in various ABICs. This was done either on the decision of the RCA (on public health ground – twice a year), or on the initiative of the ABIC.
- ABICs were given an official classification for tuberculosis and brucellosis (according to the standards of Annex A to Directive 64/432/EEC, and of Directive 91/68/EEC) into the national database, in order to permit movements of the animals to other holdings.

5.3.3 Quarantine operations

The FVO team noted that:

- Procedures for quarantine were more or less developed and detailed according to the ABIC visited, but no specific procedures for animals coming from non-approved sources were developed, contrary to the requirement of point 1(b) of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC. The need for derogation and possible instructions from the CA and the official controls (required as per point 3 of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC) were not considered.
- As foreseen by the derogation laid down in point 3 of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC, primates from non-approved sources were introduced into ABICs. These included illegally imported animals seized at the border. One such ABIC had inadequate quarantine facilities, while the other one upgraded its quarantine facilities recently.
- In one ABIC visited, an imported primate was kept in quarantine facilities that did not meet several requirements of Article 5.9.3. of the OIE code to provide adequate confinement and biosecurity (although the standard is required by point 3 of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC). This had been identified by the CA, which gave an exceptional permission, but required that upgrade be performed in the future.
- Record of observations made during quarantine (required by point 1(d)(vi) of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC was usually performed on individual registers. Several ABICs used the quarantine facilities also for isolation of sick animals. One ABIC did not register the use of quarantine facilities when used for isolation for animals. Another ABIC kept quarantined animals and animals from the ABIC at the same time in the quarantine facilities; the use of quarantine facilities for this last category was not recorded.

5.3.4 Official visits to ABICs

The FVO team noted that:

- The RCA of Madrid performed documented official inspections at the frequency required by Royal Decree 1881/1994, and following its scope, thus complying with the frequency, but not the scope of official inspections required by point 2 of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC. In Andalusia, the ABIC evaluated by the FVO team had not been visited since its approval (May 2011), until a week before the FVO audit. The ABICs in Catalonia were not subject to

official inspections for the scope of 92/65/EEC.

- In all ABICs, additional visits were performed by animal health officers, on an *ad-hoc* basis (national surveillance programmes, specific problem reported by the veterinarian of the ABIC,...). The RCA in Catalonia indicated that inspections of registers were performed by the CA in charge of environmental matters, which was also reviewing to a certain extent the presence of a veterinary programme. However, this second CA acknowledged that it focused more on the presence of the registers than on their reliability or accuracy.
- In Madrid, in line with the requirement of Royal Decree 1881/1994, the CA requested the ABICs to take serological samples from animals which were sedated for manipulation or other purpose. These samples were frozen, and taken by the OV at the time of the inspection to be sent for analyses of some diseases relevant to the species. Although bringing some health information, the selection of animals or diseases to be tested was not based on risk.
- No CA developed minimum standards for surveillance and control of diseases in ABICs, or required increased surveillance over the years in relation to the evolution of the disease situation in the country (point 1(g)(ii) of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC): no specific standard was set for bluetongue surveillance, or for avian influenza (two diseases for which at some stage vaccination campaigns were carried out in ABICs). In Andalusia, one ABIC undertook to perform some sampling and testing for some diseases of the Annex A to Directive 92/65/EEC for its approval , while another one had planned none: both plans were approved.
- The national surveillance programmes included active surveillance for a number of diseases of the Annex A to Directive 92/65/EEC (African horse sickness, Rift Valley fever...). The choice of the holdings to be included in the programme is left to the RCAs. No ABIC had been selected.
- Official controls of quarantine included checks of records, and possible visits of premises or inspection of animals. Log-book of activities for quarantine were either absent or insufficiently kept to allow a check on the absence of simultaneous use of quarantine for other purposes, and therefore to be used as a tool for official control over quarantine (required in point 3 of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC). Whereas at a couple of ABICs the OVs made remarks on the inadequate quarantine infrastructures, no remark was made on the insufficient quarantine registers.

5.3.5 Action in case of suspicion or confirmation of a notifiable disease

A case of Tuberculosis due to *T. m. bovis* was identified in August 2013 in an ABIC (post-mortem on a primate), and a case (post-mortem) of bluetongue was identified in an ungulate in 2008 in another ABIC.

The FVO team noted that:

- In both instances the ABICs informed the CA of the suspicions/confirmation, as foreseen by point 1(g)(iii) of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC. The ABIC informed the CA of the suspicion of tuberculosis. The CA performed an inspection, and received and accepted a proposed action plan from the ABIC in both cases.
- For the tuberculosis case, an epidemiological enquiry was performed, but not documented, and therefore the scope and depth of this enquiry could not be reviewed.
- For the bluetongue case, the CA performed an evaluation of the recent movements (30 days) from the ABIC prior to the case, in order to identify possible receiving holdings.

- The veterinarian of the zoo published a result of his observations of bluetongue following this first case. He showed that 8 clinical cases (including 6 fatalities) were identified in ungulates (among which one case in a camel). These occurrences were not considered as cases by the CA. The veterinarian also identified the presence of virus in asymptomatic antelopes.
- In neither case, the approval was suspended (one of the ABICs had no formal approval), contrary to the requirement of point 6(b) of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC. The RCAs indicated that in both cases they considered but dismissed the option of suspending the approval (in the tuberculosis case, on the ground that Annex A to the Royal Decree restricted its scope to ruminants; in the bluetongue case, on the ground that it was a disease already regulated by Regulation (EC) No 1266/2007); no documentation of this evaluation was available.
- As the approvals of the ABICs were not suspended or withdrawn, the Commission was not informed of the cases in the ABICs. The CA stated that the bluetongue case was reported in the animal disease notification system database (in line with Article 4 of Directive 82/894/EEC, but this database does not record the identification of the outbreaks, or type of establishment.

Conclusions

Animal health surveillance was effective in all ABICs visited, but its standard varied, some of them adequately took into account increased risks of specific diseases (avian influenza, bluetongue). For these two diseases, the standard for application and control of vaccination was in line with EU animal health requirements. Compliance with health standards for animals of domestic species kept in ABICs was assured for diseases for which a national control programme is in place, except for tuberculosis. Local requirements or own-checks also brought these animals under control for this disease.

The absence of standards for surveillance and control of diseases in ABICs (for non-domestic animals) or their assessment in relation to the disease situation of the country undermine the efficiency of the controls on the activities of the approved veterinarians. The risk assessment performed by the CA which led to introduction of active surveillance for some diseases listed in Annex A to Directive 92/65/EEC was not translated into the surveillance of such diseases in ABICs, even when these diseases are vector-borne. The effectiveness of the official controls was also affected at various levels in the regions visited by their incorrect frequency or insufficient scope.

The absence of authorised procedures for introduction from non-approved sources represented a significant weakness: confronted with urgent need, the CAs authorised quarantine in premises unsuitable for such use, creating a risk of exposure for the ABIC and its personnel.

The official actions in case of suspicion or confirmation of cases of diseases of Annex A to the Directive lacked transparency towards the Commission an other Member States, and were insufficiently documented to allow an evaluation of the adequacy of the risk analysis (and investigations) performed, and measures applied.

5.4 MOVEMENT OF ANIMALS

Legal requirements

Commission Regulation (EC) No 1266/2007; Articles 5 and 13 and Chapter III of Directive 92/65/EEC; Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC; Directive 96/93/EC; Article 4 (2) and 9 of Directive 90/425/EEC; Article 3a of Regulation (EC) No 206/2010; Commission Decision 97/794/EC; Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000; Regulation (EC) No 21/2004; Regulation (EC) No 504/2008; Article 8 of Directive 91/496/EEC; Article 4 of Commission Regulation (EC) No 282/2004.

Findings

5.4.1 Identification of animals and movement registers

The FVO team noted that:

- All ABICs visited kept registers with the relevant details, including individual identification of the animal when practical. These registers were scrupulously kept updates in the ABICs linked to the European association of zoos.

- Individual identification was generally performed either with a microchip, a photograph, and/or a ring for birds. Domestic bovine animals were identified according to Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000, and domestic ovine animals were identified in accordance with regulaltion (EC) No 21/2004. Equidae were not identified in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 504/2008: zebras had either no microchip or no passport but were at least identified by one of the two elements, or by a picture.

5.4.2 National movements

According to Article 50 of the Spanish National Law 8/2003, movements of non-domestic animals from any holding must be accompanied by a health certificate of origin, signed by official or approved veterinarian. The holding of origin is identified in the certificate.

Spain has been regionalised for bluetongue. Two infected zones are considered, one infected with BTV1 and 4, the other one with BTV1 only, and movement rules for ruminants are applied as per national legislation.

The FVO team noted that:

- The health certificates of origin were available in the ABICs visited, allowing the veterinarian at reception to confirm the status of the holding of origin (in order to apply provisions of point 1(g)(iv) of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC) ;
- The national rules for movement of animals other than bovine and ovine animals, from the BTV1-4 zone to the BTV1 zone, differ from the provisions of Annex III to Regulation (EC) No 1266/2007: animals may move on the basis of a satisfactory clinical inspection. Such rules would create a risk of introducing BTV4 into the BTV1 region. The possibility of adopting alternate health guarantees is foreseen under Article 8(1)(b) of the Regulation, following a risk assessment, and the Commission and other Member States must be immediately informed. The audit team requested but did not receive the mentioned risk assessment. The CCA indicated that they made a presentation related to this topic to the Commission during a session of the Standing Committee on the food Chain and Animal

Health, but it does not appear on the history of presentations performed at this Committee[7].

- Nevertheless, the CCA indicated that a non-written instruction had been given that susceptible animals from ABICs and zoos should only be moved from the BTV1-4 to the BTV1 zone after testing the animals for the presence of the virus. Evidence of such testing was presented in Andalusia.
- In accordance with point 4 of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC, animals (including primates) from ABICs were also allowed to move to a place other than an ABIC. Specific requirements were set only for domestic species.
- Domestic animals in ABICs could be sold to dealers, or holdings for breeding and production (no case was seen where they were sent directly to slaughter). These movements were done on the basis of the classification of the ABIC of origin for brucellosis and tuberculosis, and, when required, on testing of animals for the diseases required.

5.4.3 Intra-Union trade

The organisation of certification for IUT is under the responsibility of the RCAs. In Andalusia all movements from ABICs are certified by the OV, following inspection. In Madrid, movements from ABICs are also certified by the OV, but on the basis of a pre-certificate and clinical check performed by the veterinarian of the ABIC. In Catalonia, veterinarians from ABICs were authorised to sign the animal health movement documents. In this case, they were required to inform the RCA in advance, who notified the movement in TRACES for all species.

The controls of IUT at destination can be defined at national level within the framework of national surveillance plans (e.g. policy of non-discriminatory sampling of incoming pigs for African and classical swine fever, swine vesicular disease), or decided by the RCAs. In Andalusia, systematic checks were to be performed on arriving animals. In Madrid, all TRACES notifications were checked in the office; a list of all IUT notifications was prepared by the OV for revision during the bi-annual inspections of the ABIC.

The FVO team noted that:

- The RCA in Andalusia has developed a general procedure with a check-list for the OV certifying livestock for IUT. It was used also for certification of movements from ABICs.
- In all regions, some IUT certificates were issued from places certified as being an approved body, despite the fact that they were not listed or approved as ABIC. The FVO team did not identify any IUT certificate from such places to another ABIC (movements which would have had consequences on the maintenance of the animal health status of the ABIC of destination).
- The CA in Andalusia had recently performed a check on the holdings incorrectly listed in TRACES as being ABICs in their region, changed their status in the database, and issued an instruction that only ABICs approved in accordance with Directive 92/65/EEC should be considered as approved bodies for the IUT certification. No procedure had been developed in other regions on the conditions to be respected to avail of the certificate from ABICs (part 3 of Annex E to Directive 92/65/EEC), or the checks to be done before certifying that animals are leaving from an ABIC.
- No procedure was in place to ensure that primates subject to IUT are only sent to ABICs (as required by Article 5 of Directive 92/65/EEC), or to verify the standard of the holding of

7 http://ec.europa.eu/food/committees/regulatory/scfcah/animal_health/index_en.htm

destination for other species. However in cases of doubt the RCAs contacted the CCA, which investigated with the MSs of destination, either the status of the holding of destination, or the possible animal health requirements of the CA of destination when the animals were not destined for an ABIC. Numerous email exchanges on these topics were presented to the FVO team.

- In some other cases (e.g. For MSs which have not published any list of ABIC), the CA was relying on the absence of reaction from the MSs of destination to validate the ABIC status of the place of destination for primates.
- In Catalonia, the IUT certificates were issued by the CA on the basis of a pre-certificate issued by the veterinarian of the ABIC, who performed the clinical inspection of the animal. The dates of the pre-certificate (and examination of the animal) and of the certificate (certifying that the animal had been examined on the day the certificate was issued) were not necessarily the same ones, and a difference of up to 5 days could be observed between both documents. This was also the case to a much lesser extent in Madrid (few certificates with a difference of one to 2 days from the pre-certificate).
- A veterinarian of an ABIC regularly sending primates to other MSs was allowed to sign the IUT certificates (which is not in line with Article 5 of Directive 92/65/EEC). The certificates were then sent to the RCA, which notified the movements into TRACES. The RCA had a deadline to notify movements into TRACES on the day after their occurrence (not in line with Article 4(2) of Directive 90/425/EEC).
- The RCA in Madrid identified that another MS had notified a movement of a primate to a destination in their region, which was not an ABIC, and reported it into TRACES. However, four previous similar notifications (to the same operator, from two MS) had remained undetected. The certifying CAs of the MSs of origin were not contacted. The operator of destination was under formal investigation, as the animals could not be retrieved.
- An ABIC in Catalonia was indicated as place of destination for porcine animals from another MS. The operator indicated that these animals never actually entered into the ABIC, as they remained in the transport vehicle before being redirected to another region in Spain. Apart from creating uncertainties about the movements of animals inside the centre (recorded in the ABIC movement register), such movements, if done as stated, were in breach of animal welfare rules for transport (Chapter V, point 1.4(b) of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005)[8], as the animals had already been transported for 24 hours, of which the CA should have been aware as they issued a national movement certificate.

5.4.4 Importations

Depending on the species, ABICs wishing to import live animals must submit a request to the sub-directorate of border controls, which will issue an import licence (system introduced in August 2013). Conditions for import of some species (e.g. Primates) for which uniform animal health conditions have not been established at the European level are defined by the CA on a case-by-case basis, and transmitted to the operator. For some other species (e.g. rodents), a standard national model certificate has been established at national level and is available on the CA website[9]. The risk

8Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 of 22 December 2004 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations and amending Directives 64/432/EEC and 93/119/EC and Regulation (EC) No 1255/97 - OJ L 3, 05/01/2005

9http://cexgan.mapa.es/Modulos05/Publico/DocumentosCertificadosImportacion.aspx

analysis and definition of animal health requirements is the responsibility of the sub-directorate of border controls.

All documentary, identity and physical checks to be performed on live animals to be imported from third countries into Spain, are performed at border inspection posts (BIPs). No agreement has been put in place with other MSs in order to avail of the possible postponement of checks to ABICs when animals are imported through another MS (possibility foreseen by Article 8(A)(1)(b)(ii)) of Directive 91/496/EC, nor is there any derogation for checks at BIPs for any category of animals going to ABICs (including dangerous or specific pathogen free animals).

The FVO team noted that:

- No procedures have been developed yet for the implementation of the import conditions for ungulates according to Regulation (EU) No 206/2010 as amended by Regulation (EU) No 780/2013; no such request for import has been submitted.
- The CA indicated that a number of imports of animals for which uniform animal health conditions have not been established at the European level are performed through BIPs from other MSs, which have never requested Spain to communicate the national animal health requirements. The import licence system requires the identification of the BIP of entry, and the CA is contemplating the possibility to send the health requirements to the CA of the BIP indicated.
- An example of contact with a BIP with another MS was presented, requiring reinforced checks for turtles from a foreign country, regarding the national requirements for salmonella, to which they did not receive any reply.

Conclusions

The system of national certification of movements allows ABICs of destination to have a guarantee regarding the holding of origin, and therefore protect their health status. The management of the risk linked to national movements of susceptible non-domestic species from BTV1/BTV4 region to the BTV1 region was adequate, but the assurances in that respect were insufficient (absence of written instructions in order to apply EU standard instead of national rules).

Despite some shortcomings in the operation of certification and notification (in particular with the certification of trade for primates issued by the veterinarian of the ABIC and not by an OV), the systems for certification of IUT in the regions visited ensured that the CA were aware of all movements, and notification of the movements through TRACES was done. This system mitigates the risk of the extended list of ABICs, which could have unduly used their status to send animals to other MS without any official control. The extended correspondence with MSs of destination in case of doubt is another positive factor, promoting a correct application of the requirements.

The absence of systematic checks on the approved status of holding of origin and the holding of destination (are they ABICs) created a number of incorrect certification, with a risk of loss of traceability, as Spain experienced with primates sent from other Ms.

The absence of procedures to implement the newly introduced rules for import of ungulates into ABICs did not create problems, but could contribute to incorrect decisions in case the CA is confronted with an urgent request.

The system for the control of the health requirements for imports of live animals not subject to harmonised conditions is operational for import directly to Spain, and would guarantee the correct health status of arriving animals. The system currently does not ensure that the conditions required by Spain will be effectively controlled if the animals are introduced through a BIP in another MS.

6 Overall Conclusions

The significant revision of the list of ABICs performed shortly before the present audit and the deficiencies found in the official controls in this area were indications of the insufficient attention given by the CA to this sector.

In general the official controls were insufficient to guarantee compliance of ABICs with applicable requirements. This was mainly due to the unclear legal framework for approvals and official controls, and to insufficient procedures or instructions.

Nevertheless, the standards of animal health surveillance in the ABICs visited were in general sufficient, even if not necessarily adapted to the evolution of risks. The controls of animal health standard for animals coming from non-approved sources was generally insufficient, introducing an unnecessary risk for the biosecurity of these establishments.

The measures applied in case of suspicion or confirmation of notifiable disease were effective but insufficiently documented, and they were not accompanied by the required administrative measures, such as suspension of the approval. The consequences of this were limited, as the CA had in general a stricter control of movements of animals from ABICs than required by EU legislation. Traceability of animals was in general ensured. There were problems with certification for Intra-Union Trade from or to ABICs which were actually not approved as such.

As Spain hasn't imported ungulates under the EU conditions for imports into ABICs, and has not developed procedures to do so, this area was not covered by the audit. The control of compliance with national health conditions established for imported animals (for which no uniform EU conditions are in place) was insufficient when they are imported through border inspection posts situated in other Member States.

7 Closing Meeting

A closing meeting was held on 25 March 2014 with the CCA and the RCAs. At this meeting, the FVO audit team presented the findings and preliminary conclusions of the audit.

The representatives of the CCA acknowledged the findings and conclusions, and clarified some specific points.

8 Recommendations

The CA of Spain are invited to submit an action plan describing the actions taken or planned in response to the recommendations of the report, and setting out a timetable for their completion,within 25 working days of receipt of the report.

N°.	Recommendation
1.	To ensure that the current requirements of Directive 92/65/EEC are transposed and clarify the national legal framework applicable to ABICs and animals kept therein, in particular in relation to:the conditions governing their approval;the diseases subject to compulsory notification, including the species to which it applies; the movement of

N°.	Recommendation
	ruminants other than bovine and ovine animals from one restricted zone for bluetongue to another.(Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC, Directive 82/894/EEC, Regulation (EC) No 1266/2007)
2.	To ensure efficient and effective coordination with other competent authorities in charge of official controls of ABICs, so that gaps in official controls, or uncertainties on respective responsibilities, are avoided.(articles 4(3) and 4(5) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004)
3.	In order to ensure the effective functioning of the official controls, to ensure that procedures, including information and instructions for staff performing official controls, are developed across the whole relevant territory, with the adequate scope, in particular for: approval of ABICs (which includes review of previous records and assessment and approval of appropriate disease surveillance and control measures);animals coming from non approved sources; adequate quarantine, including primates; Article 8(1) and Annex II, Chapter II, point 11 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004
4.	To ensure that ABICs are approved and attributed an approval number, so that approvals and approval numbers can be withdrawn in accordance with point 6 of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC, and to ensure that the list of ABICs and their approval numbers available to the other Member States and the public is kept updated.Article 13 (2) of Directive 92/65/EEC
5.	To ensure that the registers contain all the information required in point 1(d) of Annex C of Directive 92/65/EEC in a manner which enables the official veterinarian to verify that the relevant requirements of the Directive are fulfilled and to comply with points 2(a) and 2(c) of that Annex.[Annex C, point 1(d), 2(a) and 2(c) of Council Directive 92/65/EEC]
6.	To ensure that in case of suspicion of a disease listed in Annex A or B to Directive 92/65/EEC, the approval of the ABIC is suspended, and that the Commission is informed of suspension, withdrawal or restoration of approvals. To ensure that official controls and investigations following suspicion or confirmation are documented. Point 6 of Annex C to Directive 92/65/EEC; Article 9 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004
7.	To ensure the integrity of certification and in particular that the model certificate contained in part 3 of Annex E to Directive 96/25/EEC is used only for animals from duly approved ABICs, and to this end ensure that the information in TRACES as regards the status of ABICs is accurate and up to date. [Article 4(1)(b) of Directive 96/93/EEC]
8.	To ensure that the general and particular principles of certification and notification are respected, in particular: that the certificate is issued on the actual date of examination

N°.	Recommendation
	of the animals (point II.2 of part 3 of Annex E to Directive 92/65/EEC);that the Member State of destination is informed of the issuing of the certificate through TRACES on the day the certificate was issued (article 4(2) of Directive 90/425/EEC; that intra-union trade of primates is accompanied by a veterinary certificate completed by the official veterinarian in charge of the ABIC (article 5 of Directive 92/65/EEC).
9.	To complete a procedure aiming at ensuring adequate checks on animals subject to national animal health conditions, imported from third countries through border inspection posts in another Member State. Article 4 of Directive 91/496/EEC

The competent authority's response to the recommendations can be found at:

http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/rep_details_en.cfm?rep_inspection_ref=2014-7050

Annex 1 - Legal References

Legal Reference	Official Journal	Title
Dir. 64/432/EEC	OJ 121, 29.7.1964, p. 1977-2012	Council Directive 64/432/EEC of 26 June 1964 on animal health problems affecting intra-Community trade in bovine animals and swine
Dir. 82/894/EEC	OJ L 378, 31.12.1982, p. 58-62	Council Directive 82/894/EEC of 21 December 1982 on the notification of animal diseases within the Community
Dir. 90/425/EEC	OJ L 224, 18.8.1990, p. 29-41	Council Directive 90/425/EEC of 26 June 1990 concerning veterinary and zootechnical checks applicable in intra- Community trade in certain live animals and products with a view to the completion of the internal market
Dir. 91/68/EEC	OJ L 46, 19.2.1991, p. 19-36	Council Directive 91/68/EEC of 28 January 1991 on animal health conditions governing intra-Community trade in ovine and caprine animals
Dir. 91/496/EEC	OJ L 268, 24.9.1991, p. 56-68	Council Directive 91/496/EEC of 15 July 1991 laying down the principles governing the organization of veterinary checks on animals entering the Community from third countries and amending Directives 89/662/EEC, 90/425/EEC and 90/675/EEC
Dir. 92/35/EEC	OJ L 157, 10.6.1992, p. 19-27	Council Directive 92/35/EEC of 29 April 1992 laying down control rules and measures to combat African horse sickness
Dir. 92/65/EEC	OJ L 268, 14.9.1992, p. 54-72	Council Directive 92/65/EEC of 13 July 1992 laying down animal health requirements governing trade in and imports into the Community of animals, semen, ova and embryos not subject to animal health requirements laid down in specific Community rules referred to in Annex A (I) to Directive 90/425/EEC
Dir. 92/66/EEC	OJ L 260, 5.9.1992, p. 1-20	Council Directive 92/66/EEC of 14 July 1992 introducing Community measures for the control of Newcastle disease

Legal Reference	Official Journal	Title
Dir. 92/119/EEC	OJ L 62, 15.3.1993, p. 69-85	Council Directive 92/119/EEC of 17 December 1992 introducing general Community measures for the control of certain animal diseases and specific measures relating to swine vesicular disease
Dir. 96/93/EC	OJ L 13, 16.1.1997, p. 28-30	Council Directive 96/93/EC of 17 December 1996 on the certification of animals and animal products
Dir. 2000/75/EC	OJ L 327, 22.12.2000, p. 74-83	Council Directive 2000/75/EC of 20 November 2000 laying down specific provisions for the control and eradication of bluetongue
Dir. 2003/85/EC	OJ L 306, 22.11.2003, p. 1-87	Council Directive 2003/85/EC of 29 September 2003 on Community measures for the control of foot-and-mouth disease repealing Directive 85/511/EEC and Decisions 89/531/EEC and 91/665/EEC and amending Directive 92/46/EEC
Dir. 2004/68/EC	OJ L 139, 30.4.2004, p. 321-360. Corrected and re-published in OJ L 226, 25.6.2004, p. 128.	Council Directive 2004/68/EC of 26 April 2004 laying down animal health rules for the importation into and transit through the Community of certain live ungulate animals, amending Directives 90/426/EEC and 92/65/EEC and repealing Directive 72/462/EEC
Dir. 2005/94/EC	OJ L 10, 14.1.2006, p. 16-65	Council Directive 2005/94/EC of 20 December 2005 on Community measures for the control of avian influenza and repealing Directive 92/40/EEC
Dir. 2009/156/EC	OJ L 192, 23.7.2010, p. 1-24	Council Directive 2009/156/EC of 30 November 2009 on animal health conditions governing the movement and importation from third countries of equidae
Reg. 1760/2000	OJ L 204, 11.8.2000, p. 1-10	Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 July 2000 establishing a system for the identification and registration of bovine animals and regarding the labelling of beef and beef products and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 820/97

Legal Reference	Official Journal	Title
Reg. 21/2004	OJ L 5, 9.1.2004, p. 8-17	Council Regulation (EC) No 21/2004 of 17 December 2003 establishing a system for the identification and registration of ovine and caprine animals and amending Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 and Directives 92/102/EEC and 64/432/EEC
Reg. 282/2004	OJ L 49, 19.2.2004, p. 11-24	Commission Regulation (EC) No 282/2004 of 18 February 2004 introducing a document for the declaration of, and veterinary checks on, animals from third countries entering the Community
Reg. 882/2004	OJ L 165, 30.4.2004, p. 1, Corrected and re-published in OJ L 191, 28.5.2004, p. 1	Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules
Reg. 1266/2007	OJ L 283, 27.10.2007, p. 37-52	Commission Regulation (EC) No 1266/2007 of 26 October 2007 on implementing rules for Council Directive 2000/75/EC as regards the control, monitoring, surveillance and restrictions on movements of certain animals of susceptible species in relation to bluetongue
Reg. 504/2008	OJ L 149, 7.6.2008, p. 3-32	Commission Regulation (EC) No 504/2008 of 6 June 2008 implementing Council Directives 90/426/EEC and 90/427/EEC as regards methods for the identification of equidae
Reg. 206/2010	OJ L 73, 20.3.2010, p. 1–121	Commission Regulation (EU) No 206/2010 of 12 March 2010 laying down lists of third countries, territories or parts thereof authorised for the introduction into the European Union of certain animals and fresh meat and the veterinary certification requirements
Reg. 1069/2009	OJ L 300, 14.11.2009, p. 1-33	Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 laying down health rules as regards animal by-products and derived products not intended for human consumption and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 (Animal by-products Regulation)

Legal Reference	Official Journal	Title
Dec. 97/794/EC	OJ L 323, 26.11.1997, p. 31-36	97/794/EC: Commission Decision of 12 November 1997 laying down certain detailed rules for the application of Council Directive 91/496/EEC as regards veterinary checks on live animals to be imported from third countries
Dec. 2007/598/EC	OJ L 230, 1.9.2007, p. 20-26	2007/598/EC: Commission Decision of 28 August 2007 concerning measures to prevent the spread of highly pathogenic avian influenza to other captive birds kept in zoos and approved bodies, institutes or centres in the Member States