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**

This report describes the outcome of an audit carried out by the Directorate-General for Health and Food Safety in Poland from 14 to 22 November 2017 in order to evaluate the control system of documentary checks at the Union borders. The main objective of the audit was to evaluate the official controls related to the documentary checks and, where relevant, the audit also evaluated the organisation of the import control system. Particular attention was paid to whether the documentary checks were implemented in compliance with the applicable requirements and whether the implementation was effective and suitable in ensuring that only compliant consignments could enter the European Union (EU). Additionally, the audit team assessed the compliance of facilities, equipment and hygienic conditions of some of the sites visited.

Appropriate coordination is established between different competent authorities and the Customs ensuring that only eligible consignments are accepted. All relevant consignments are presented for official controls, which in the case of live animals and products of animal origin is supported by the use of Trade Control and Expert System (TRACES).

Overall documentary checks were performed correctly, thus providing assurances that animal health and public health requirements for imported goods are observed. Actions taken when non-compliant goods are detected during documentary checks were appropriate and, with few exceptions concerning products of non-animal origin, were in line with Union rules. There is a well-functioning system in place allowing the competent authorities to verify the effectiveness of official controls on imported goods.

With regard to the lack of sampling of products of non-animal origin from Japan, the failure to implement this legislative requirement could lead to the importation of products which do not comply with the EU health requirements.

The report contains recommendations addressed to the competent authority in order to rectify the shortcomings identified.
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ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS USED IN THIS REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIP</td>
<td>Border Inspection Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSES</td>
<td>Border Sanitary and Epidemiological Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CED</td>
<td>Common entry document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVED</td>
<td>Common veterinary entry document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVO</td>
<td>Chief Veterinary Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>Chief Sanitary Inspectorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPE</td>
<td>Designated Point of Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPI</td>
<td>Designated Point of Import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVI</td>
<td>General Veterinary Inspectorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLWeWeb</td>
<td>Border Official Veterinarian Web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSES</td>
<td>Poviat Sanitary and Epidemiological Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSI</td>
<td>State Sanitary Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKK</td>
<td>Control Coordination System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRACES</td>
<td>Trade Control and Expert System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSES</td>
<td>Voivodship Sanitary and Epidemiological Station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 INTRODUCTION

The audit was carried out in Poland from 14 to 22 November 2017 as part of the published Directorate-General for Health and Food Safety work programme for 2017. The audit team comprised two auditors. The audit team was accompanied where relevant by representatives of the central competent authority, the General Veterinary Inspectorate (GVI) under the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development and the Chief Sanitary Inspectorate (CSI) under the Ministry of Health, responsible for the controls covered by the scope of the audit.

An opening meeting was held on 14 November 2017 between the audit team and the representatives of GVI and CSI. The audit team confirmed the objectives and scope of the audit as well as the itinerary, and information required for the successful completion of the audit was provided by the both competent authorities.

2 OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

The main objective of the audit was to evaluate the conduct of official controls related to documentary checks and, where relevant, the audit also evaluated the organisation of the import control system. Particular attention was paid to whether documentary checks were implemented in compliance with applicable requirements and whether the implementation was effective and suitable in ensuring that only compliant consignments could enter the European Union (EU). Additionally, the audit team assessed the compliance of facilities, equipment and hygienic conditions of the sites visited.

The scope of the audit covered:

- the organisation and implementation of documentary checks and related controls on products of animal origin, non-animal origin and live animals, in particular,
  - the roles and responsibilities, training and competence of staff, and communication and cooperation between competent authorities responsible for documentary checks,
  - the action taken in the event of non-compliances being identified during documentary checks,
  - the use of the Trade Control and Expert System (TRACES),
  - the verification of compliance activities and related documentation;
- border inspection posts (BIPs), designated points of entry (DPEs) and/or designated points of import (DPIs);
- consignments arriving at the EU borders during 2015-2017 either as imports or for transit/transhipment.

The scope excluded controls on non-commercial consignments of live animals and goods.
The itinerary of the audit included the following visits and meetings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISITS</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENT AUTHORITIES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Opening and closing meeting with the central competent authorities, GVI and CSI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIPs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Warsaw, Szczecin, Gdansk, Korosczyn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPEs/DPIs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Warsaw, Szczecin, Gdansk/Gdynia, Korosczyn.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

Full legal references are provided in Annex 1. Legal acts quoted in this report refer, where applicable, to the last amended version.

4 **BACKGROUND**

General rules on official controls on feed and food, both of animal and non-animal origin, are laid down in Chapter V of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004. Specific requirements for veterinary checks of feed and food of animal origin are set out in Council Directive 97/78/EC, and for live animals in Council Directive 91/496/EEC. Moreover, Union legislation lays down specific and special conditions for import controls on feed and food for which there may be an increased risk to human health, animal health or to the environment.

Export certificates issued by non-EU countries provide assurances on the safety of feed, food and health of live animals being imported into or transited through the EU. The model certificates are harmonised for most commodities and live animals exported to the EU. Some consignments, however, need to be accompanied by other documents (for example, declarations by operators, laboratory reports etc.).

The Country Profile for Poland provides an overview of how the control systems are organised in the country, based on information supplied by the competent authorities, and is available at the following website:

http://ec.europa.eu/food/audits-analysis/country_profiles/details.cfm?co_id=PL.
5 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 ORGANISATION OF THE COMPETENT AUTHORITIES AND OF OFFICIAL CONTROLS

Legal requirements

- Article 4(3), article 8(1) and article 24 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004
- Article 5(f) of Directive 91/496/EEC
- Article 5 and article 8(2) of Commission Regulation (EC) No 669/2009
- Article 8 of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 884/2014

Findings

5.1.1 Roles and responsibilities

1. The competent authorities responsible for implementing the relevant EU legislation are clearly designated. GVI, SSI and Customs (under Ministry of Finance) are the three competent authorities involved in import control within the scope of the audit. GVI is responsible for the checks on live animals, products of animal origin and feed of animal and non-animal origin. SSI is responsible for the checks on food of non-animal origin and Customs are responsible for customs control.

2. Staff of DPEs are part of Border Sanitary and Epidemiological Stations (BSES). They carry out import controls at the border and are under direct administration of the Chief Sanitary Inspector who is the head of SSI. Staff of Poviat Sanitary and Epidemiological Stations (PSES) are responsible for the controls at DPIs located inland and they are under administration of the Voivodship Sanitary and Epidemiological Stations (VSES). If an operator appeals the DPE decision following the required import checks, this is followed by the VSES. BIPs are under direct administration of the GVI.

3. Evidence of training events related to import controls covered within the scope of this audit, organised at national (central and local) level, was provided to the audit team. In addition, staff of both competent authorities have participated in Better Training for Safer Food training sessions.

5.1.2 Communication and cooperation between competent authorities

4. Both GVI and SSI have procedures in place to ensure efficient and effective coordination and cooperation between the central and local authorities in relation to the implementation of import controls, in line with Article 4(3) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.

5. Cooperation agreements, in which the competencies and responsibilities of each competent authority are clearly described, are in place between the GVI and SSI and Customs at central level and in certain cases at local level, in line with the requirements laid down in Article 24 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004. These agreements are supported by a national legal framework.
6. In line with Article 8(1) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, both GVI and SSI have developed their own procedures and instructions which support the implementation of official controls. The audit team noted that in three BIPs and one DPE visited there were local written instructions which supported the implementation of controls.

7. The GVI has developed a BIP manual which at the time of the audit was being updated. The first two parts of the BIP manual that comprise general principles for import control and detailed requirements for specific categories of products and live animals were already done and the third part comprising instructions, guidelines, written information and clarifications for the BIP staff was being finalised at the time of the audit.

8. Evidence was available that the relevant central competent authority informs the BIPs/DPEs by email of any amendments to relevant instructions, EU and national legislation. The latest versions of the model health certificates and lists of authorised signatures from non-EU countries were available in the BIPs visited.

9. The import of non-harmonised live animal species for which there are no animal health requirements laid down in EU legislation are allowed only with the authorisation of the Chief Veterinary Officer (CVO) as established in national legislation. This is in compliance with the requirements of Article 5(f) of Directive 91/496/EEC.

10. In accordance with the requirements of Article 5 of Commission Regulation (EC) No 669/2009 and Article 8 of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 884/2014, the competent authorities have designated the DPEs/DPIs for food and feed of non-animal origin and maintain up-to-date lists of the DPEs/DPIs which are made publicly available on the webpage of the SSI and respectively GVI.

11. Customs have a system for identification of goods within the scope of the audit based on the Combined Nomenclature (CN) code. This is supported by an Information Technology (IT) tool the Integrated Customs Tariff Information System.

12. The exchange of the information between the BIPs and DPEs visited with the Customs concerning the results of the controls carried out by the BIPs/DPEs staff is ensured using various IT tools managed by the airports, port and road operators.

13. The audit team noted that there is a mechanism which ensures that the consignments subject to import controls relevant to the scope of this audit cannot be cleared by Customs until all checks of the consignments under the scope of the audit are completed by the competent authorities. The audit team noted in the BIPs visited that Customs have access to TRACES to verify whether veterinary checks have been finalised.

14. In order to coordinate all of the controls performed at Szczecin river port and Gdansk and Gdynia sea ports, Customs has been using an IT system called Control Coordination System (SKK) since January 2015. According to Polish national provisions all the import controls have to be carried out by the relevant enforcement authorities within 24
hours from the moment when all the required documents and the consignment are physically presented for the controls, unless non-compliances are identified or sampling is required.

15. An IT tool called GLWeWeb (Border Official Veterinarian Web) is used by GVI in all BIPs except BIP Warsaw to record all information concerning pre-notification and all controls performed for each consignment. In addition to other activities it is used as a tool for performance of verification activities (e.g. audits and supervision). In BIP Warsaw an alternative IT tool called Granica is used to record all information concerning pre-notification and the controls performed for each consignment.

16. The competent authority declared that onward transportation of consignments of products of non-animal origin, as specified in Article 8(2) of Commission Regulation (EC) No 669/2009, is allowed but it has not been used so far.

Conclusions on the organisation of competent authorities and of official controls

17. The competent authorities are appropriately designated and the evident coordination and cooperation and transfer of information between the authorities at different levels and between the competent authorities and Customs contributes to the effective implementation of import controls.

5.2 IMPLEMENTATION OF DOCUMENTARY CHECKS

Legal requirements

Article 3(1) (a), 4(1) and 5(f) of Directive 91/496/EEC
Article 2 of Commission Decision 97/794/EC
Article 2(1) and article 6 of Commission Regulation (EC) No 136/2004
Article 1(1), article 3(3) and article 4(3) of Directive 97/78/EC
Article 17(1) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004
Article 7(2) and Article 9(3) Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 884/2014
Article 10(1) (b) of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 2016/6
Commission Implementing Decision 2011/884/EU

5.2.1 Documentary checks on live animals

18. In general, documentary checks are carried out as required by Article 4(1) of Directive 91/496/EEC and Article 2 of Commission Decision 97/794/EC.

19. The audit team noted that with a few exceptions, the competent authority at the airport and the road BIP visited had received timely prior notification of the physical arrival of live animals in the form of part I of the common veterinary entry documents for animals
from the person responsible for the load, mainly through TRACES. This is in line with the requirements of Article 1(1) of Commission Regulation (EC) No 282/2004.

20. The BIP staff met informed the audit team that they organised annual training sessions with all the non-compliant operators in relation to Article 3(1)(a) of Directive 91/496/EEC.

21. The audit team checked in total 16 files related to import of live animals and noted that the documentary check have been performed correctly with only some minor errors regarding registration in TRACES (see finding 44).

22. The audit team noted that several consignments of live animals for which there are no harmonised animal health requirements laid down in EU legislation have been imported based on a written authorization of the CVO. This is in compliance with the requirements of Article 5(f) of Directive 91/496/EEC (see finding 9).

5.2.2 Documentary checks on products of animal origin

23. In all BIPs visited the competent authority had access to manifests from ports and airport operators either via an IT tool or by email. This is in line with the requirements of Article 6 of Commission Regulation (EC) No 136/2004. All manifests were checked by BIP staff in the BIPs visited. With the exception of the airport BIP the results of manifest check were documented by the BIP staff. A detailed local procedure had been developed in one port BIP visited for the verification of the manifests and the summary of the checks performed was well documented.

24. The audit team noted that with a few exceptions, the competent authority in BIPs visited received timely prior notification of the physical arrival of products of animal origin in the form of part I of the common veterinary entry documents (CVED) from the person responsible for the load, mainly through TRACES. This is in line with the requirements of Article 3(3) of Directive 97/78/EC and Article 2(1) of Commission Regulation (EC) No 136/2004. The competent authority in one port BIP declared that consignments of feed of non-animal origin are pre-notified by email.


26. The documentary checks witnessed by the audit team were carried out using all available information (manifests, bills of lading, invoices, the list of signatures of authorised inspectors in non-EU countries, models of certificates, etc.) in line with the requirements of Article 4(3) of Directive 97/78/EC and Article 1(1) of Commission Regulation (EC) No 136/2004.

27. The audit team checked in total 39 files related to import of products of animal origin and noted that the documentary checks have been implemented correctly except for some minor mistakes and errors in the registration in TRACES (see finding 44).
28. In one port BIP visited the audit team checked the files related to the importation of wild fish, originating from non-EU countries which are under safeguard measures. In all cases the information concerning the origin of fish as mentioned in the health certificate had been verified by the BIP staff against the information from the catch certificate.

29. In one airport BIP a consignment of wild stock fish been correctly rejected by the competent authority due to a failure of the physical check. However, in box I.12 of part I of CVED the importer described the fish products as farmed fish although in the health certificate the commodity was described as wild fish. This aspect was not identified by the competent authority during documentary check.

30. The audit team noted that in some cases the competent authority had correctly accepted the replacement of the health certificates issued by the competent authority of the non-EU country of origin in accordance with the instructions adopted by the central level. The competent authorities at the visited BIPs kept detailed records on the cases when the replacement of the health certificates has been required.

5.2.3 Documentary checks on products of non-animal origin

Findings

31. The competent authority at the DPEs/DPIs visited received timely prior notification (except for some isolated cases) of the physical arrival of food of non-animal origin (part I of the common entry document (CED) by email and letters from the food business operators or their representatives. This is in line with the provisions of Article 17(1) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, Article 6 of Commission Regulation (EC) No 669/2009 and Article 7(2) Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 884/2014.

32. The audit team noted that a number of consignments subject to safeguard measures had not been notified prior to their arrival at the DPE/DPI Gdansk. In addition, the competent authority stated that about 70 % of consignments they receive in Gdansk are not pre-notified in a timely manner. This is not in compliance with Article 17(1) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, Article 6 of Commission Regulation (EC) No 669/2009 and Article 7(2) Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 884/2014. The audit team noted that no enforcement measures had been taken by competent authority to address these operators' non-compliance.

33. The audit team checked a total of 33 files related to import of products of non-animal origin and noted that the documentary checks had been performed correctly using all available information with the following four exceptions:

---

1 In its response to the draft report, the competent authority stated that during the checks, it informed the operators which, under current EU legislation, were supposed to pre-notify consignments at the required time. The operators informed the competent authority that in some cases they were not able to prepare the common entry documents (CED) in advance because the requisite documents whose numbers they needed to enter in box I.10 of the CED were not available. It was not until the operators had received the full set of documents that they were able to fill out the CED as required.
• In one airport DPE one consignment of hazelnuts falling under provisions of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 884/2014 had been imported without the number of the health certificate issued by the non-EU country having been entered in box I.10 of part I of the CED.

• In one port DPE one consignment of liquid spices falling under provisions of Commission Implementing Decision 2011/884/EU had been imported although the analytical report the date of issue was not specified.

• In one port DPE several consignments of nuts falling under provisions of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 884/2014 had been imported without having reference to the health certificate number and lot number in the analytical report issued by the non-EU country official laboratory.

• In one port DPE several consignments of peanuts from Argentina had been correctly rejected by the DPE staff as the consignments had been presented for the controls with an expired health certificate. This is in line with the provisions of the Article 9(3) of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 884/2014. However, following of an appeal of the importer, the VSES decided to sample these consignments and to accept new health certificates issued by the competent authority of the non-EU country of origin after the arrival of consignments at the DPE and finally to allow importation into EU. This is contrary to the provisions of Article 9(3) of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 884/2014.

34. The audit team noted that none of the consignments imported from Japan in last three years in the visited DPEs and falling under provisions of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 2016/6 had been sampled as required by the Article 10(1)(b) of said Regulation.

**Conclusion on the implementation of documentary checks**

35. There are adequate mechanisms in place to ensure that consignments are presented for official controls and with few exceptions (in DPEs), the implementation of documentary checks was carried out correctly in the BIPs and DPEs visited, being performed using all available information.

36. The lack of sampling of products of non-animal origin from Japan as required by EU legislation could lead to the import of products which do not comply with the EU health requirements.

---

2 After the audit and in advance of the production of the draft report of the audit, the competent authority provided additional information on 28 November 2017 indicating that it had already taken some measures to rectify the deficiencies described in the fourth bullet point of finding 33 and finding 34.
5.3 ACTION TAKEN IN CASE OF NON-COMPLIENCES RELATED TO DOCUMENTARY CHECKS

Legal requirements

Article 54 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004

Findings

37. When non-compliances are identified during documentary checks the decision on further action is taken by the BIP/DPE staff. In a number of cases assessed by the audit team, BIP and DPE staff had taken appropriate action in light of non-compliances detected in the documentary check. Depending on the significance of the non-compliances, the action can vary from asking the importers to provide the missing information or to correct the information (for example, a replacement certificate), to sending the consignment for re-dispatch to the non-EU country of origin or destruction or to apply a special treatment to the products to bring the food into line with the requirements of Union law.

38. As regards the re-dispatched or destroyed consignments assessed by the audit team, the respective proof of such actions was provided.

39. However, in some cases of imported food of non-animal origin the competent authority did not take the appropriate actions, which is contrary to the requirements of Article 54 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 (see finding 33).

40. The audit team noted that the visited BIPs/DPEs had adopted a local procedure whereby in the event that some accompanying documents are missing they send a letter to the importer to provide the relevant documents within 7 to 14 days. If the importer does not provide these within 14 days, the competent authority can decide to reject the respective consignment, as per its national rules.

41. The audit team noted that in the event of a non-compliant consignment, BSES registers all of the administrative steps performed in a file log in chronological order which facilitates the follow-up of the individual noncompliant case.

Conclusions on the action taken in case of non-compliances related to documentary checks

42. On the whole, actions taken when non-compliant goods are detected during documentary check, are appropriate and, with few exceptions, are in line with Union rules.

5.4 THE USE OF TRADE CONTROL AND EXPERT SYSTEM

Legal requirements

Article 3(2) of Commission Decision 2004/292/EC
Findings

43. The audit team noted that all consignments of live animals, products animal origin, including feed, were recorded in TRACES as required by Article 3(2) of Commission Decision 2004/292/EC.

44. However, the audit team noted that out of the 55 files assessed the following errors in the documentation in TRACES have been identified:

- In one case a consignment of horses had been wrongly declared by the person responsible for the load in box 27 of part I of the CVED as an import consignment instead of a re-entry.

- In another case of re-import of meat products, the competent authority had indicated wrongly in box 33 of part II of CVED that the product is channelled under Article 8 procedure of Directive 97/78/EC instead of Article 15 (that refers to re-import of EU products).

- In a few cases of rejections due to failure of the identity check, the competent authority had incorrectly indicated in box 36 of part II of the CVED that the product was rejected due to other cases instead of the correct option 'mismatch with documents'.

- In one case of rejection the competent authority had incorrectly indicated the physical check as satisfactory in box 28 of part II of the CVED while the laboratory check was indicated as unsatisfactory in box 29 of part II of the CVED.

Conclusion on the use of TRACES

45. Notwithstanding the mistakes identified by the audit team in some of the documents registered in TRACES, the system was mostly correctly used for recording controls on imports of live animals and products of animal origin.

5.5 VERIFICATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF IMPORT CONTROLS

Legal requirements

Articles 4(6) and Article 8(3) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004

Findings

46. Both GVI and CSI confirmed that there were no changes concerning the structure of audit departments and the organisation of the audit activities since the last audit (DG (SANTE) 2016-8825 on evaluation of the system put in place to implement Article 4(6) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004).
47. The audit division of GVI carries out annual audits in 20% of the BIPs. The audit reports for the period 2015-2017 were provided to the audit team before the audit and it was seen that deficiencies had been identified and recommendations issued.

48. The GVI has a supervisory role allowing it to verify the proper conduct of official controls carried out by the BIPs. The GVI's activities in this respect are based on an annual control plan, taking into account results of previous controls. A dedicated checklist has been developed by the GVI to be used, including for the recording of findings. Supervision reports were available and recommendations had been issued. This is in line with the requirements of Article 8(3) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004. The audit team noted that the follow-up of recommendations is assessed by the GVI in successive supervision visits.

49. In general, supervision at local level is performed with a frequency decided by the head of the BIP (varying between one supervisory visit monthly to one annually). With one exception, the results of this activity were documented in all of the visited BIPs.

50. Both central and local level supervision of BIPs is supported by the use of the GLWeWeb application (see finding 15).

51. The Department for Food and Nutrition Safety of CSI audits VSES, PSES and BSES. VSES also carries out audits of PSES and BSES. Several audit reports were made available to the audit team and in some cases recommendations had been issued. Supervision of BSES and PSES (either by CSI or VSES) included verification that the frequency of checks as required by EU legislation on safeguard measures was respected. The examples of supervision examined by the audit team were not specifically focused on documentary checks and, with the exception of one visited port DPE/DPI, no supervision had been carried out since 2016 in the other DPE/DPI visited.

**Conclusion on the verification of effectiveness of import controls**

52. There is a well-functioning system in place allowing the competent authorities to verify the effectiveness of official controls on imported goods.

---

### 5.6 Compliance of the Facilities, Equipment and Hygiene at BIPS/DPEs

**Legal requirements**

- Annex II to Directive 97/78/EC
- Annex to Commission Decision 2001/812/EC
- Article 8 of Commission Implementing Regulation (EC) No 884/2014
Findings


54. The Koroszczyn road DPE/DPI has appropriate premises and facilities for carrying out routine analyses and taking samples, in line with the requirements of Article 4 of Commission Regulation (EC) No 669/2009 and Article 8 of Commission Implementing Regulation (EC) No 884/2014.

55. However the audit team noted the following non-compliance in this facility - there was no documented evidence of cleaning and disinfection of the premises in which consignments were sampled. The competent authority informed the audit team that cleaning and disinfection is carried out by the administrator of the facility and that it (the competent authority) verifies the hygiene status of the premises before arrival of the consignment. If necessary, cleaning and disinfection would be requested to be performed, though this situation has never arisen.

Conclusion on the compliance of the facilities, equipment and hygiene at BIPs/DPEs

56. Both the airport BIP and the DPE/DPI facilities visited are suitable for undertaking the necessary checks. Nevertheless, the absence of documentary evidence demonstrating that cleaning and disinfection has been carried out could lead to a situation where the validity of laboratory results is compromised.

6 Overall Conclusions

Appropriate coordination is established between different competent authorities and the Customs ensuring that only eligible consignments are accepted. All relevant consignments are presented for official controls, which in the case of live animals and products of animal origin is supported by the use of Trade Control and Expert System (TRACES).

Overall documentary checks were performed correctly, thus providing assurances that animal health and public health requirements for imported goods are observed. Actions taken when non-compliant goods are detected during documentary checks were appropriate and, with few exceptions concerning products of non-animal origin, were in line with Union rules. There is a well-functioning system in place allowing the competent authorities to verify the effectiveness of official controls on imported goods.

With regard to the lack of sampling of products of non-animal origin from Japan, the failure to implement this legislative requirement could lead to the importation of products which do not comply with the EU health requirements.
7 CLOSING MEETING

A closing meeting was held on 22 November 2017 with the representatives from GVI, SSI and Customs. At this meeting, the main findings and preliminary conclusions of the audit were presented by the audit team. The central competent authorities did not express disagreement with the findings and conclusions presented.

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.  | To ensure that documentary checks for products of non-animal origin are carried out in line with Articles 5 and 9(3) of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 884/2014 and to take adequate action when non-conformities are found, in compliance with Article 54 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.  

Recommendation based on conclusions: 35 and 42  
Associated findings: 33 and 39 |
| 2.  | To ensure that products of non-animal origin are sampled and tested as required by Article 10(1)(b) of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/6.  

Recommendation based on conclusion: 36  
Associated finding: 34 |

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