



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY

Directorate F - Health and food audits and analysis

DG(SANTE) 2015-7572 - MR

FINAL REPORT OF AN AUDIT
CARRIED OUT IN
SWEDEN
FROM 16 NOVEMBER 2015 TO 20 NOVEMBER 2015
IN ORDER TO
EVALUATE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF IDENTIFICATION AND REGISTRATION
SYSTEMS FOR BOVINES, SMALL RUMINANTS AND PORCINES

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 objective of the audit was to evaluate the suitability of national arrangements in achieving effective traceability of animals to support animal health controls. In particular, to evaluate to what extent the identification and registration systems provide effective support to:

- Outbreaks of highly contagious animal diseases;
- Surveillance, control and eradication programs for less contagious animal diseases; and
- Intra-Union (and export) certification of live animals;

In addition, the audit evaluated whether the current animal identification and registration systems provide for effective and reliable backwards traceability from slaughter to birth and whether the use of various derogations impacted on traceability in different animal health control scenarios.

Overall, the report concludes that :

The animal identification and registration system and related databases in place provides the functions expected. They have the capability to provide support in controlling outbreaks of contagious animal disease. This includes the ability to trace animals (cattle individually and pigs by batch) back to holding of birth. There is evidence of improving trends for the notification of events with especially timely reporting of movement events for cattle.

Access to the databases is restricted, precluding their use for veterinary certification purposes in certain instances.

Competent Authorities make use of the derogation to apply their national systems for movements to a proportion of pigs in their territories. This means that in certain circumstances, pigs can be moved between holdings with no physical identification. These national systems can be relied on to maintain batch traceability of the pigs and to identify the holding from which they came and their holding of birth.

No recommendations were issued to Competent Authorities.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Objectives and scope	1
3	Legal Basis	2
4	Background	2
5	Findings and Conclusions	3
5.1	Quality of data	3
5.2	User interfaces	7
5.3	Review / continuous improvement	10
6	Overall Conclusions	12
7	Closing Meeting	12
8	Recommendations	12

ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS USED IN THIS REPORT

Abbreviation	Explanation
CDB	Central Database for Bovines
EU	European Union
SBA	Swedish Board of Agriculture

1 INTRODUCTION

The audit took place in Sweden from 16 to 20 November 2015. The audit team comprised two auditors from the Food and Veterinary Office (DG HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY) and two interpreters. The audit team was accompanied throughout the audit by representatives of the Central Competent Authority.

This was the second (and final) pilot audit carried out to help prepare for the forthcoming series of audits on animal identification, registration and traceability programmed for 2016.

2 OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

The objective of the audit was to evaluate the suitability of national arrangements in achieving the key objective of traceability to support animal health controls. In particular, the audit aims at evaluating to what extent the identification and registration systems provide effective support to controls in:

- Outbreaks of highly contagious animal diseases;
- Monitoring, control and eradication programs for less contagious animal diseases; and
- Intra-Union (and export) certification of live animals;

In addition to these objectives, the audit aimed to evaluate whether the current animal identification and registration systems provide for fully effective and reliable backwards traceability from slaughter to birth.

And finally, the audit evaluated the use of various derogations and their impact on achieving traceability in different animal health control scenarios.

The audit aimed to identify best practices in ensuring effective traceability systems for further dissemination. Best practices in the following areas were of particular interest:

- Implementation of the basic requirements;
- Integration and/or interoperability with other databases;
- Performance indicators and/or quality schemes for the databases;
- Any performance testing or simulation exercises on traceability;
- User interfaces e.g. use of mobile technology; and
- Access to the data for various stakeholders.

The scope of the audit included:

- All of the main components of official identification and registration systems;
- Data from year 2012 onwards;
- Bovine, ovine, caprine and porcine species;
- Traceability from import/birth until export/death;
- Quality controls on the data; and
- Official controls on holdings.

The main audit criteria are listed in the Annex. Legal acts quoted in this report refer, where applicable, to the last amended version. Any implementing legislation or derogations falling under those main audit criteria were also applicable to this audit.

3 LEGAL BASIS

The audit was carried out under the general provisions of 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.

4 BACKGROUND

The basic objectives for Union rules on identification of animals are the localisation and tracing of animals for veterinary purposes, which is of crucial importance for the control of infectious diseases. In the field of animal health, the systems for animal identification and registration serve as basic tools for disease surveillance, control and eradication. Additionally, they support certification for intra-Union trade or export and import of live animals. These systems are used in the public health sector for issues related to food hygiene, zoonoses and residues.

A new Animal Health Law (adopted at European Union (EU) level) will, together with consequential delegating and implementing acts, provide an opportunity to review the legal requirements for the animal identification and registration systems.

In order to contribute to the future review of the rules on animal identification and registration DG HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY has initiated a project on animal identification and registration. This project will critically evaluate the suitability of current EU requirements and the added value of current certification arrangements for intra-Union trade.

5 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The effective functioning of identification and registration systems depends on three main factors: the quality of data in the system, the capability of the system to provide users with relevant information from that pool of data and the Competent Authority's ability to monitor, review and improve the system. Therefore, the findings and conclusions of this audit have been organised under these three main headings.

5.1 QUALITY OF DATA

Legal requirements

Legislation sets:

- the maximum time limits for notifications of (various events for) both bovines and small ruminants – porcine movements (or other events) need not be notified to a database;
- the minimum data requirements for all species, and
- requirements for the Competent Authority to carry out a minimum level of official controls on bovine and small ruminant holdings (farms, slaughterhouses, markets, assembly centres etc.) to verify compliance with identification and registration requirements. These controls include, amongst other things, a reality check on the data entered into the database. For porcine species, there is no such requirement at EU level.

Findings

1. There are five databases used for identification, registration and movement of cattle, small ruminants and pigs which are interoperational. The databases comprise: (i) Plats - holding database, (ii) CDB - central database for bovines (iii) Forflytning - database for sheep, goats and pigs, (iv) SLAKT - for information on slaughtered animals and (v) BEST - used for ordering ear tags for cattle and sheep.
2. An extensive list of plausibility checks has been implemented to detect and prevent implausible data being recorded. There is no routine review of this list, rather, it is updated on an ad hoc basis when required – last update was in 2011.
3. 90% of cattle farmers (less so other species) use electronic notification to register events with Competent Authority. For cattle, there is timely update of database with events (e.g. figures provided for 2015 show around 95% notification of births and 91% notifications of on movements within seven days). For other species, figures are lower but show improving trends (e.g. notifications of on movements of sheep within seven days is 66% for 2015 - an increase of 10% from previous year). Any manual reporting of cattle movements is done using a document which is directly scanned into database with no further keying of data thus reducing error. Competent Authority use text alerts (six and fifteen days after movement event) to remind farmers of their obligation to report movements. Movements of cattle and sheep on and off holdings and movements of pigs onto holdings must be reported. In cases of continued non-compliance, this is followed by series of letters, issued at intervals of six weeks for up to eighteen months.
4. Holdings are defined to include animal housing plus contiguous land or, in the absence of animal housing, contiguous parcels of land. One farmer can have multiple holding numbers. Movement of animals between holdings in the same ownership within a municipality or neighbouring municipalities does not need to be notified to the Swedish

Board of Agriculture (SBA). Such movements must be recorded in holding registers. Geographical coordinates are allocated by SBA based on maps submitted by person applying for holding number. Holding number is a six digit number and the same holding number is used for all bovines, small ruminants or pigs kept on the holding.

5. Common grazing is rare in Sweden but where it exists, land must be registered as a holding with a keeper. The DG HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY team verified movements of cattle to / from an area of common grazing in CDB. CDB records demonstrated that farmers who are not registered as keeper of common grazing notify SBA of movements to /from common grazing.
6. From January 2016, rendering plants will have to notify SBA of the arrival of dead cattle. This was actioned following a DG HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY audit on contingency planning in 2013 (DG(SANCO)/2013 – 6780).
7. SBA databases are integrated with several external databases including :
 - a commercial organisation providing milk / beef recording services where input of identification / movement data to this system is automatically shared with SBA and vice-versa.
 - Swedish tax agency which allows SBA to obtain keeper and address details.
 - land registry for accessing the most up to date maps.
 - Laboratory information management system (LIMS).
8. Planning official controls on compliance with animal identification and registration requirements for cattle, small ruminants and pigs is performed annually and the percentage of holdings checked for cattle and small ruminants currently meets the requirements of Article(2)(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1082/2003 and Article 2 of Regulation (EC) 1505/2006. Although the requirement to carry out these controls for pigs is not an EU legislative requirement, the Competent Authority carried checked 3.5% of pig holdings in 2014. SBA confirmed they carry out a risk analysis of each bovine and ovine/caprine holding based on the requirements of Article 2(4) to Regulation (EC) No 1082/2003 and Article 3 to Regulation (EC) No 21/2004. For pig holdings, selection is based on risk factors such as poor reporting of movements with a target of inspecting 3% holdings per annum. SBA determines the number of controls for each county.
9. County Administrative Boards receive risk analysis from SBA and have final decision in selecting holdings for on farm controls. Each County Administrative Board can add their own risk factors to determine final selection based on e.g. local knowledge. Documented procedures are in place for performing these controls. SBA confirmed the same staff from County Administrative Board perform the official control whether it is performed under animal identification legislation or cross compliance legislation. In both cases, the same identification, registration and movement checks are carried out.

10. The DG HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY Team visited two farms and reviewed the 2015 results for on farm controls. For the cattle farm, inspector had a pre-printed list of all cattle expected to be on farm. Each animal's ear tag was individually read and checked off. The records showed that there was one non-compliance for late notification of birth.
11. The DG HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY Team found that herd register details of cattle movement to a slaughterhouse used a number which identified the company name (which in this case operated two separate slaughterhouses) rather than a unique holding number for the slaughterhouse. This meant the slaughterhouse was not identifiable in the herd register. This had not been detected during official control.
12. During the on farm control to a pig holding, the inspector had a pre-printed list of pig movements off the holding. A selection of these was checked against movements recorded on the farmers electronic herd register.
13. The DG HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY audit team observed that a transporter number rather than a destination holding number was regularly being recorded in electronic register. Additionally, there were instances when supplier number was used as consignee on commercial movement documents rather than holding number which, in certain circumstances, may delay tracing of pigs e.g. when pigs are not physically identified with supplier number, there is no requirement for farmer to notify SBA of supplier number details and these would have to be obtained from a third party.
14. Data provided by Competent Authorities for 2014 confirmed that around a quarter of official controls on compliance with animal identification and registration requirements for cattle, small ruminants and pigs resulted in financial penalties through cross compliance.
15. Cattle eartags are marked with Competent Authority logo plus identification code. The identification code on the ear tag is made up of country code (SE), six digit holding number and a five digit unique identifier number, the fifth digit of which is a check digit. Electronic identification codes, when used, are configured in the same way. This restricts the number of unique identification numbers on a holding to 9999. Consequently, Competent Authority has introduced a procedure to reuse bovine identification numbers three years after death. A specific plausibility check is in place to ensure three year interval is respected. The DG HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY audit team confirmed that when an ear tag is reused this way, all details relating to animals which have been allocated the number are kept on central database for bovines. Details of dead animal in this case are highlighted and can be differentiated from live animal details.
16. A system for ordering "reserve" tags is in place which allows keepers to have a supply of bovine ear tags with only the Competent Authority logo and individual holding number pre-printed – if an animal loses a tag, the unique animal identifier number is written on this "reserve" tag prior to application. There is no time limit for this "reserve"

tag to be replaced with a tag bearing a non-removable inscription. Competent Authority confirmed that up to 10% of annual tag requirements for a holding could be ordered as "reserve" tags. This is contrary to the requirements of regulation (EC) No 911/2004 article 2(e) requiring bovine ear tags to carry only non-removable inscriptions.

17. Article 4d to Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 requires Competent Authority permission for the removal, modification or replacement of bovine ear tags. This is not possible when using "reserve" tags.
18. The Competent Authority's internet page does not include details of "reserve" tags as a means of identification contrary to the requirements of Article(4)(6) to Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000.
19. Sweden apply the derogation for sheep identification, as foreseen in Article 9(3) of Regulation (EC) No 21/2004, meaning electronic identification is not obligatory. Consequently, the majority of sheep are identified by a single ear tag containing the holding number of birth.
20. The Competent Authority has approved movement documents for sheep as required by Annex C to Regulation (EC) No 21/2004. However, the sheep database has no data field reserved for Competent Authority to enter animal health information contrary to the requirements of Annex D(1)(g) to Regulation (EC) No 21/2004.
21. Pigs are identified by either tattoo or eartag (less common) using either holding number or supplier number.
22. The supplier number is a unique number allocated by abattoirs to their producers. In order to identify pigs with this number, farmers must notify SBA who in turn correlate supplier number with their holding number in database. However, Competent Authority confirmed that it was not possible to search database using supplier number and this may delay the tracing of pigs. In these circumstances, Competent Authority indicated contact may have to be made with abattoir to get name and address of producer.
23. Additionally, the derogation to apply national systems for movement of pigs, as foreseen in Article 5(2) to Council Directive 2008/71/EC, is applied in Sweden. This means that producers of fattening pigs are allowed to receive animals from up to three contracted holdings without ear tags or tattoos. There must be a written contract between breeder and fattening holdings which must be registered with SBA. Prior to transport to an abattoir, these pigs are tattooed with supplier number of the fattening holding. 2015 data, provided to the DG HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY team, show just under 6% of slaughter pigs are produced using this national system for movement.
24. In the abattoir visited, there was good application of holding / supplier number tattoos which could be clearly read in chills. In the majority of cases, it was not possible to read tattoos on live animals in lairage.

25. Animal health restrictions imposed centrally by the Competent Authority are communicated to all counties. The Competent Authority commented that their high health status means few restrictions are issued. Animal health restrictions imposed at county level are notified by County Administrative Boards to e.g. official veterinarians and private veterinary practitioners within the same county by e-mail.

Conclusions

26. Traceability may be impaired if "reserve" tags are used to identify cattle over a prolonged period of time. Significant numbers of cattle can be identified with these tags without Competent Authority knowledge and permission and there is no time limit for their replacement with tags bearing a non-removable inscription.
27. Compliance with legal requirements regarding checks on animal identification and registration contributes to the quality of information held in the database.
28. The use of a derogation to apply national systems for movement of pigs in Sweden has been implemented in a structured manner which does not affect their traceability.
29. Overall, the integration of databases, evidence of improving trends for the notification of events and an extensive list of plausibility checks does provide assurance that data quality is good and can support the traceability of cattle, small ruminants and pigs.

5.2 USER INTERFACES

User interfaces provide the various user-groups with relevant information from the database. The needs of users vary depending on the user-group and the use-case-scenario. For the purposes of this audit, two use-case-scenarios were used to evaluate the services provided by the databases: disease outbreaks and certification for intra-Union trade (as described in the objectives of this audit).

The suitability of user interfaces in achieving animal health traceability was evaluated using the following criteria:

- Access to relevant data and functionalities;
- Fitness for purpose; and
- Usability.

Legal requirements

Access: Article 3 of Regulation (EC) 1760/2000 and of Regulation (EC) 21/2004 are identical in this respect. They both require that: *"The Member States and the Commission shall take the measures necessary to ensure access to these data for all parties concerned, including consumer organisations having an interest which are recognised by the Member*

State, provided that the data confidentiality and protection prescribed by national law are ensured."

Fitness for purpose: there are two very basic legislative requirements on the functionalities of the databases – both of these are under point C (3) to Article 14 of Council Directive 64/432/EEC. It says: *"The database must be able to supply the following particulars at any time:*

- *the identification number of all animals of the bovine species present on a holding, or in the case of groups of animals of the porcine species, the registration number of the holding of origin or herd of origin and the number of the health certificate where applicable; and*
- *a list of all changes of holding for each animal of the bovine species starting from the holding of birth, or the holding of importation in the case of animals imported from third countries; and for groups of pigs the registration number of the last holding or last herd and for imported animals from third countries the holding of importation."*

Usability: legislation does not prescribe criteria to evaluate usability. It is up to the Member States to decide the level of support and efficiency provided by the databases for each user group.

Findings

Stakeholders' access to data

30. Farmers can access database via internet and complete standard tasks (e.g. notification of births, movements and order tags). Internet usage is highest for cattle at 90% with small ruminants and pigs at 74%.
31. National farmers associations met were content with the systems offered as were the farmers visited during the audit.
32. Slaughterhouses have the possibility to access CDB, for example for TSE sampling purposes. Slaughterhouses have the option to notify data on slaughtered animals (cattle, small ruminants pigs, equidae and game) via SLAKT. Currently 62% of slaughterhouses submit data via internet with the remainder being submitted manually (mostly by small slaughterhouses and game establishments).
33. The National Veterinary Institute do not have direct access to databases but receive daily data transfer from SBA databases. This includes all information from CDB, Plats, Forflytning and SLAKT.
34. Officials have varying degrees of access to databases. Competent Authority confirmed that district veterinarians responsible for delivering official controls and clinical services to farmers and official controls in assembly centres, cannot access animal databases.
35. In the assembly centre visited, district veterinarians issued intra trade certificates. These attested to, inter alia, the animals not remaining more than six days in the assembly

centre, being resident on holding of origin for the previous 30 days or since birth and no animals imported from a third country to holding of origin unless they were isolated.

36. The district veterinarians interviewed were unaware that no herd register fulfilling the requirements of Article 4 to Directive 2008/71/EC was available on site. Access to these documents would be necessary to verify residency period in assembly centre.
37. The district veterinarians confirmed they had not verified residency requirements on holding of origin prior to certification or that no animals had been imported from a third country into the holding of origin. No pre-certification was available to attest to these requirements. This is not in accordance with the requirements of Article 3(2) to Directive 96/93/EC.
38. Competent Authority further confirmed that National Food Agency (NFA) veterinarians cannot access an official website for official veterinarians but do have access to the NFA official website. The SBA provides announcements on restricted herds to NFA by e-mail notification.

Fitness for purpose

39. Since 2006, there have been a small number of disease outbreaks in Sweden and the Authorities have organised regular simulation exercises for highly contagious animal diseases. The Competent Authority confirmed that databases were used in both scenarios and their overall impression was that databases had performed at least satisfactorily.
40. Competent Authorities are at an advanced stage of developing a tool to allow the real time capture of data from epidemiological investigations for direct uploading to databases.
41. Competent Authorities have developed an application (STUDS) which uses information in the databases for the management of disease outbreaks. The DG HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY audit team reviewed, real time, the capability of the application for disease outbreak purposes. This provided the functions expected and included the listing of basic owner information, establishing restriction zones, listing holdings within the zones, tracing of animal movements in and out of holding within specified timeframes and mapping functions.
42. The movement data is used by the National Veterinary Institute to analyse the network of movements of animals and identify holdings with many movements or other movement patterns. This application has been used in selecting premises for simulation exercises.

Usability

43. National farmers associations and farmers met during audit were satisfied with the systems offered.

Conclusions

44. Databases have the capability to provide support in controlling outbreaks of highly contagious animal disease and the monitoring, control and eradication of less contagious animal diseases. Stakeholders met were satisfied with the current databases and acknowledged their importance for traceability.
45. The capability of the databases is not always used for certification purposes. In certain instances, veterinary certification may be provided without the certifying officer having personal knowledge or ascertaining the necessary data required prior to certification. In such instances, the certification process does not add value and does not contribute to the control of disease in the EU.

5.3 REVIEW / CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Compliance with minimum legal requirements requires significant investments but doesn't guarantee efficient and effective functionalities for the various services provided. In order to bring the systems up to a level where users get real benefits and return for investment, more than minimum compliance is needed. Review and continuous improvement are the mechanisms, which ensure that users receive a good quality of service, and the system continues to deliver efficiently and effectively what is expected from it.

Four elements of monitoring and review were assessed:

- Monitoring of control results for:
 - Food business operator's compliance levels, types of non-compliance and trends;
 - Verifying effectiveness of controls and further development;
- Analysis of existing data for various purposes; and
- Internal and external audits or other evaluations.

Legal requirements

Monitoring of control results: Commission Decision 2008/654/EC provides guidance on the annual report for the single integrated multiannual control plan. Point 9.2.2 of the Annex to this Decision suggests that control data should be analysed, patterns and trends identified and root causes for non-compliance described, as appropriate.

Article 4.2 of Regulation (EC) 882/2004 has a generic requirement: *"The Competent Authorities shall ensure the effectiveness and appropriateness official controls on live animals..."* Article 8.3 of the same Regulation requires Competent Authorities to *"have procedures in place to verify the effectiveness of official controls that they carry out..."* Monitoring of control results is one way of addressing the latter requirement – other means do exist but those fall outside the scope of this pilot audit.

There is no explicit legal requirement in the specific identification and registration systems legislation to monitor, review and improve the systems. Equally, analysis of existing data for

various purposes is not a legal requirement – this audit attempted to harvest good/best practice in this area, if possible.

Internal and external audits or other evaluations: Article 4.6 of Regulation (EC) 882/2004 requires that Competent Authorities *"...carry out internal audits or have external audits carried out, and shall take appropriate measures in the light of their results..."*

Findings

Monitoring of trends and patterns in non-compliance

46. The Competent Authority compiles annual control reports on identification and registration of bovines and small ruminants and transmits them to the Commission. Reports include details on the number of holdings and number of animals inspected and frequencies of non-compliances. This fulfils the requirements of article 5 to Regulation (EC) No 1082/2003 and article 7 to Regulation (EC) No 1505/2006.

Data analysis

47. Competent Authorities are striving to improve the quality of data. If they have notification of an "off" movement but no notification of the "on" movement they will send a text reminder to keeper of destination on day six and fifteen followed by written reminders at six weekly intervals. Competent Authorities have recognised that persistent late notifiers exist and, from 2016, they plan to introduce a system of fines as a deterrent and to change behaviours.

Audits or other evaluations

48. The European Commission approved the Swedish bovine database as fully operational in 1999 (Decision 1999/693/EC).

49. SBA confirmed that each year, they audit five counties to ensure correct implementation of on-farm controls by County Administrative Boards. One report, reviewed by the DG HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY audit team, highlighted that County Administrative Boards try to perform as many controls unannounced as possible but this was not always possible due to long journey times. The Competent Authority confirmed that, in certain circumstances, controls are never announced e.g. where local intelligence is used.

50. The Central Competent Authority confirmed they had not systematically evaluated the performance of databases during disease outbreaks / simulation exercises.

Conclusion

51. There is some review of the identification and registration system by Competent Authorities to improve the quality of data captured but this is limited to audits performed by County Administrative Boards. There is significant potential to further analyse available data to identify patterns and trends and establish the reasons for non-compliances.

6 OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

The animal identification and registration system and related databases in place provides the functions expected. They have the capability to provide support in controlling outbreaks of contagious animal disease. This includes the ability to trace animals (cattle individually and pigs by batch) back to holding of birth. There is evidence of improving trends for the notification of events with especially timely reporting of movement events for cattle.

Access to the databases is restricted, precluding their use for veterinary certification purposes in certain instances.

Competent Authorities make use of the derogation to apply their national systems for movements to a proportion of pigs in their territories. This means that in certain circumstances, pigs can be moved between holdings with no physical identification. These national systems can be relied on to maintain batch traceability of the pigs and to identify the holding from which they came and their holding of birth.

7 CLOSING MEETING

A closing meeting was held on 20th November 2015 with the central competent authority. At this meeting the DG HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY audit team presented the findings and preliminary conclusions of the audit. The Competent Authority did not express any disagreement with the preliminary conclusions at the closing meeting.

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

No recommendations were issued to Competent Authority.

ANNEX 1 – LEGAL REFERENCES

Legal Reference	Official Journal	Title
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. 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
Reg. 911/2004	OJ L 163, 30.4.2004, p. 65-70	Commission Regulation (EC) No 911/2004 of 29 April 2004 implementing Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards eartags, passports and holding registers
Reg. 1082/2003	OJ L 156, 25.6.2003, p. 9-12	Commission Regulation (EC) No 1082/2003 of 23 June 2003 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the minimum level of controls to be carried out in the framework of the system for the identification and registration of bovine animals
Reg. 494/98	OJ L 60, 28.2.1998, p. 78-79	Commission Regulation (EC) No 494/98 of 27 February 1998 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 820/97 as regards the application of minimum administrative sanctions in the framework of the system for the identification and registration of bovine animals
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

Dec. 2006/968/EC	OJ L 401, 30.12.2006, p. 41-45	2006/968/EC: Commission Decision of 15 December 2006 implementing Council Regulation (EC) No 21/2004 as regards guidelines and procedures for the electronic identification of ovine and caprine animals
Reg. 1505/2006	OJ L 280, 12.10.2006, p. 3-6	Commission Regulation (EC) No 1505/2006 of 11 October 2006 implementing Council Regulation (EC) No 21/2004 as regards the minimum level of checks to be carried out in relation to the identification and registration of ovine and caprine animals
Dir. 2008/71/EC	OJ L 213, 8.8.2008, p. 31-36	Council Directive 2008/71/EC of 15 July 2008 on the identification and registration of pigs (Codified version)
Dec. 2000/678/EC	OJ L 281, 7.11.2000, p. 16-17	2000/678/EC: Commission Decision of 23 October 2000 laying down detailed rules for registration of holdings in national databases for porcine animals as foreseen by Council Directive 64/432/EEC