



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
HEALTH & CONSUMER PROTECTION DIRECTORATE-GENERAL
Directorate F - Food and Veterinary Office
Director

DG(SANCO)/8148/2006 – MR Final

FINAL REPORT OF A MISSION
CARRIED OUT IN
THE UNITED KINGDOM
FROM 20 FEBRUARY TO 3 MARCH 2006
IN ORDER TO EVALUATE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
EU ANIMAL HEALTH REQUIREMENTS FOR INTRA-
COMMUNITY TRADE IN LIVE ANIMALS

Please note that factual errors in the draft report have been corrected. Clarifications provided by the Competent Authorities of the United Kingdom are given as footnotes, in bold, italic, type, to the relevant part of the report.



20/07/06 - 53718

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	4
2.	OBJECTIVES OF THE MISSION	4
3.	LEGAL BASIS FOR THE MISSION.....	5
4.	BACKGROUND.....	5
4.1.	Background to the series of missions	5
4.2.	Pattern of trade to and from the UK	5
4.3.	Animal health situation in the UK.....	6
5.	MAIN FINDINGS.....	7
5.1.	Legislation	7
5.2.	Competent Authority	8
5.3.	Holding registration, animal identification movement control	10
5.4.	Animal health requirements	12
5.5.	Specific supervision of operators and premises	14
5.6.	Veterinary checks applicable in Intra-Community trade.....	17
5.7.	Specific situation regarding ICT of sheep and goats for slaughter between NI and IE	21
5.8.	Supervision of Official Veterinarians.....	21
5.9.	Miscellaneous	22
6.	CONCLUSIONS	23
6.1.	Legislation	23
6.2.	Competent Authority	23
6.3.	Animal identification, holding registration and movement control	23
6.4.	Animal health requirements	23
6.5.	Approval and supervision of operators and premises.....	24
6.6.	Controls on intra-Community trade in live animals	24
6.7.	Special condition for ICT of sheep and goats for slaughter between NI and EI	24
6.8.	Supervision of Official Veterinarians.....	25
6.9.	Miscellaneous	25
7.	CLOSING MEETING.....	25
8.	RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COMPETENT AUTHORITIES OF UK	25
9.	ADDENDUM.....	26
	ANNEX	28

ABBREVIATIONS & SPECIAL TERMS USED IN THE REPORT

AC	Assembly Centre
AH	Animal Heath
AHDO	Animal Heath Divisional Office (Local Competent Authority in GB)
AVI	Authorised Veterinary Inspectors
CA	Competent Authorities
CCA	Central Competent Authorities
CPH	County Parish Holding
DARD	Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (regional CA for Northern Ireland)
DEFRA	Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (CCA)
DVM	Divisional Veterinary Manager
ELISA	Enzyme Linked Immuno Sorbent Assay
EU	European Union
FSA	Food Standards Agency
FVO	Food and Veterinary Office
GB	Great Britain (England, Scotland and Wales)
ICT	Intra-Community trade of live animals (bovine, ovine, caprine, and porcine species)
IE	Ireland (Republic of)
LCA	Local competent authority
LVI	Local veterinary inspector
MHS	Meat hygiene service
MS	Member State(s)
NI	Northern Ireland
OV	Official Veterinarian
RCVS	Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons
SEERAD	Scottish Executive Environment and Rural Affaire Department (regional CA for Scotland)
SVS	State Veterinary Service
TRACES	TRAdE Control and Expert System
TRMS	TRACES Risk Management System
TSS	Trading Standard Services
UK	United Kingdom
VO	Veterinary Officer

1. INTRODUCTION

The mission took place in the United Kingdom (UK) from 20 February to 3 March 2006. The mission team comprised two Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) inspectors. The mission was undertaken as part of the FVO's planned mission programme and forms part of a series of missions. The mission team was accompanied throughout the mission by a representative of the Central Competent Authority (CCA).

An opening meeting was held on 20 February 2006 with the CCA. At the meeting, the objectives of, and itinerary for the mission were confirmed by the inspection team, and additional information was requested for its satisfactory completion.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE MISSION

The objective of the mission was to evaluate the measures and control systems put in place to give effect to requirements of the European Union (EU), concerning intra-Community trade in live animals of the bovine, porcine, ovine and caprine species (ICT), in the framework of Council Directives 64/432/EEC, 91/68/EEC, and 90/425/EEC.

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

VISITS		COMMENTS
COMPETENT AUTHORITIES		
CENTRAL	1	
REGIONAL	1	DARD – Northern Ireland
LOCAL	6	
LIVE ANIMALS CONTROL SITES		
Animal holdings	4	3 sheep, 1 pig holding
Approved Assembly centres	2	1 for pigs, 1 for sheep
Approved dealers, dealer's premises	0	(1 sheep holding visited belonged to a dealer)
Transporters	2	
Staging point	0	Keeper not available
ESTABLISHMENTS		
Slaughterhouses	2	Sheep, pigs

3. LEGAL BASIS FOR THE MISSION

The mission was carried out under the general provisions of Community legislation, and in particular Article 45 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.

A list of the relevant EU legislation is attached to this report (see Annex).

4. BACKGROUND

4.1. Background to the series of missions

Council Directives 64/432/EEC and 91/68/EEC lay down the animal health (AH) requirements applicable to ICT.

In accordance with Council Directive 90/425/EEC the Member States (MS) have put in place control systems in order to ensure the implementation of veterinary and zootechnical checks applicable in ICT.

The considerable volume of ICT represents a risk of spreading animal diseases. Various FVO inspections have identified deficiencies in the control of aspects related to animal health requirements for ICT. These mission reports can be consulted on the following Internet website:

http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/inspections/index_en.html

However, the control systems in place related to veterinary checks for ICT of live animals have not been evaluated as such yet.

4.2. Pattern of trade to and from the UK

The CCA from the UK provided the following data regarding ICT in 2005:

export 2005	England	Scotland	Wales	Northern Ireland
bovine animals	-	-	-	-
Goats	103	-	1	5
Sheep for breeding (of which to Ireland (IE))	980 10%	2,176 2%	751 -	367 88%
Sheep for fattening (of which to IE)	14,405 0%	12,061 0%	11,131 0%	-
Sheep for slaughter (of which to IE)	-	-	-	272,189 100%
Pigs for breeding/production (of which to IE)	19,224	3,852	6	23 100%
Pigs for slaughter (of which to IE)	-	-	-	43,810 100%

Import 2005	England	Scotland	Wales	Northern I
bovine animals	5,236	1,316	556	27,169
Goats	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>
Sheep + Goats for breeding <i>(of which from IE)</i>	802 75%	202 16%	214 1%	564 86%
Sheep + Goats for fattening <i>(of which from IE)</i>	398 67%	28 0%	2 0%	-
Sheep + Goats for slaughter <i>(of which from IE)</i>	8,027 100%	-	-	94,505 100%
Pigs for breeding/production <i>(of which from IE)</i>	6,211 89%	344 94%	8 0%	67,985 100%
Pigs for slaughter <i>(of which from IE)</i>	60,795 100%	-	-	406,173 100%

Trade of live bovine animals from the UK to other MS has been prohibited for the last ten years (from Commission Decision 96/239/EC¹, and is still in force according to Commission Decision 2002/670/EC).

The trade pattern is very different between Northern Ireland (NI) and Great Britain (GB: England, Scotland and Wales). In NI, export of sheep and pigs for slaughter occurs on a relatively large scale, and exclusively to IE.

The trade from GB to other MS of sheep, goats and pigs is relatively limited.

4.3. Animal health situation in the UK

	GB	NI	Reference
Bovine brucellosis	Officially free	Not officially free	Commission Decision 2003/467/EC
Sheep and goats brucellosis: <i>Brucella melitensis</i>	Officially free	Officially free	Commission Decision 93/52/EEC
Aujeszky's disease	Free	No approved control programme	Commission Decision 2001/618
Anthrax	Last case reported: 2002	Last case reported: 1990	OIE
Foot and mouth disease	Last case reported: 2001	Last case reported: 2001	OIE
Rabies	Last reported case: 2002	Last reported case: 1923	OIE
Classical swine fever	Last reported case: 2000	Last reported case: 1958	OIE
Swine vesicular disease	Last reported case: 1982	Never reported	OIE

¹ Commission Decision 96/239/EC of 27 March 1996 on emergency measures to protect against bovine spongiform encephalopathy; OJ L 078 , 28/03/1996 p. 47.

Brucella ovis and *Brucella suis* infections, African swine fever, have never been reported in the UK.

5. MAIN FINDINGS

5.1. Legislation

The Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) is responsible for drafting the legislation in England. This legislation is then used as a framework by the regional authorities (Welsh Assembly Government in Wales, Scottish Executive Environment and Rural Affairs Department in Scotland, Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (DARD) in NI) who draft the legislation that will be used on their territory. However, the CCA has no responsibility in ensuring compliance of the regional legislation with EU legislation.

The main Community legislation in relation to AH requirements for ICT and animal welfare during transport is transposed into the regional legislation². All of the regional legislation has been consolidated during the last 12 months, except for Scotland, where the consolidated version is still under evaluation.

The CCA, while acknowledging that European Regulations were directly applicable and did not require transposing or implementing in UK legislation *per se*, implementing powers were required in domestic law to allow suitable application and enforcement of the European legislation (both Regulations and Decisions).

- The CCA stated for instance that no implementation act has been passed in relation to Commission Decision 2005/177/EC, with regard to the transit of live bovine animals through the UK, and consequently this Decision cannot be used³;
- Regional Regulations in England, Scotland and NI⁴ have set down the implementing measures for Council Regulation (EC) No 21/2004 (the adoption of the regulation in Wales is still pending). However, these regulations also incorrectly implemented the Regulation, as they leave the option for sheep and goats, born after 9 July 2005, to be sent to another MS without having been

² The animals and animal products (Import and Export) Regulations 2005: England (2005 No. 2002); Wales (2005 No. 1158 (W. 75)); Northern Ireland (2005 No. 78); The animals and animal products (Import and Export) (Scotland) Regulations 2000, as last amended by the animals and animal products (Import and Export) (Scotland) (2005 No. 278).

³ *In their response to the draft report the Authorities of the UK pointed out that this decision has since been superseded by Commission Regulation (EC) No 657/2006 [of 10 April 2006 amending Regulation (EC) No 999/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the United Kingdom and repealing Council Decision 98/256/EC and Decisions 98/351/EC and 1999/514/EC (OJ L116, 29/04/2006, p.9)], lifting the ban on the export of live bovines and beef and beef products from the UK from 2 May 2006.*

⁴ The Sheep and Goats (Records, Identification and Movement) (England) Order 2005 (2005, No. 3100); The sheep and goats (Identification and movement) order (Northern Ireland), 2005 (2005, No. 535); the sheep and goats (Identification and Traceability) (Scotland) Regulations 2006 (2006, no number, to coming into force on 20th March 2006).

identified according to Article 4(1) and 4, (2) (b) “*in any case before the animal leaves the holding on which it was born*”.

5.2. Competent Authority

In the UK, DEFRA⁵ is the Government Department designated as the interlocutor to the European Commission for animal health and welfare matters, acting as CCA. However, legislation, implementation, and control on these issues, including import and export, are devolved to the regional authorities, and DEFRA also acts as regional authority for England. The CCA explained that general co-ordination and specific technical meetings are organised with all regional authorities at regular intervals.

In GB, the State Veterinary Service (SVS)⁶ is a governmental executive agency responsible for veterinary controls in the fields of animal health and welfare and international trade (imports and exports). The SVS has been formally separated from DEFRA since 1 April 2005. The contract fixing the terms of delegations is still under negotiation.

- The draft of this memorandum was not available at the time of the mission, and it was not possible to evaluate the terms of delegation (including enforcement responsibilities) and system of control that DEFRA intends to put in place.

The SVS is present at local level through 24 Animal Health Divisional Offices (AHDOs) in GB. The AHDOs are under the responsibility of a Divisional Veterinary Manager (DVM), and employ technical staff (animal health officers and veterinary officers (VOs)) as well as administrative staff.

The CA in GB for food safety and standards controls is a different and independent government department, the Food Standards Agency (FSA). The Meat Hygiene Service (MHS) is an executive agency of the FSA, to which the application of the legislation in approved fresh meat premises was delegated. As the scope of responsibilities of the MHS includes application of animal health and welfare legislation in these premises, MHS and DEFRA work to some extent in collaboration.

- A single Service Agreement between DEFRA and the MHS is also being developed, but has not yet been finalised⁷;
- The MHS can use sub-contracting agencies which will then contract veterinarians to work as official veterinarians (OVs) in the fresh meat establishments.

⁵ www.defra.gov.uk

⁶ <http://www.svs.gov.uk>

⁷ *In their response to the draft report the Authorities of the UK stated that individual agreement for specific elements of animal health and welfare controls are in place.*

Animal health and welfare legislation, including import and export aspects, is directly enforced by DARD in Northern Ireland. DARD's veterinary service also enforces the meat hygiene legislation, which, nevertheless, remains under the responsibility of the FSA.

An extensive and detailed documentary support is available for the SVS, in order to help its officers in the implementation of their tasks. Implementation interpretation, documented procedures, guidance (SVS chapters), instructions, emergency notes and check-lists, are available through the intranet site of the agency, and are regularly updated. Similar sets of instructions are available in NI; the MHS is finalising "Notes for Guidance" for the OVs working in fresh meat premises. These notes instruct the OVs at licensed slaughterhouses to report to the DVM any apparent non-compliance with legislation concerning animal health or welfare.

In England and Wales, the enforcement activities regarding animal health and welfare have been delegated to local authorities through a Framework Agreement. Scottish local authorities carry out the same enforcement role as their counterparts in England and Wales under equivalent legislation. The Scottish Executive Environment and Rural Affairs Department has, however, decided that it is not necessary to have formal agreements with local authorities who are left to set their own priorities.

The local authorities are coordinated and receive guidance from a representative body, the Local Authority Coordinators of Regulatory Services. The enforcement services regarding animal health and welfare on holdings, transporters, dealers, assembly centres and slaughterhouses are performed by a department of the local authorities, the Trading Standard Services (TSS), which also provides enforcement services to a wide range of consumer protection aspects.

Under the Framework Agreement these services are performed at variable frequencies according to risk. Delivery of services is agreed annually between each Local Authority and each AHDO responsible for its territory in relation to the control.

A database has been developed under the Framework Agreement by DEFRA. Each local authority undertaking service delivery can record the enforcement activities, results and actions they undertake across a range of legislative controls. AMES is accessible by DEFRA, Welsh Assembly Government, SVS, LACORS and individual LAs.

- An internet-based database has been developed by DEFRA, in line with the framework agreement, where each Local Authority can record the results of their enforcement activities. However, one AHDO visited explained that, apart from deficiencies related to cattle identification, which are reported in the cattle identification database, no standardised system is in place for the Local Authorities to report their findings to the CA⁸;

⁸ *In their response to the draft report the Authorities of the UK stated that individual local authorities also record information on their own in house database systems which can produce reports upon request.*

- As mentioned in the FVO mission report DG(SANCO)/7770/2005⁹, DEFRA does not perform audit or inspections of the work performed on its behalf by the LAs.

In Northern Ireland, enforcement activities have not been delegated from DARD.

Other departments may inspect operators on aspects related to AH and welfare (SVS, rural payment agency). It was explained to the mission team that the cooperation between the different authorities supervising the holdings, establishments and other sites is organised at local level.

5.3. Holding registration, animal identification movement control

5.3.1. Holding registration

All holdings for cattle, sheep, goats and pigs are registered in GB, with a unique CPH (County/Parish/Holding) number. In Northern Ireland, a unique flock/herd number is allocated to each holding for the purposes of disease eradication and control programme. Information regarding these holdings are stored in databases (VETNET for pigs, CTS for cattle and AMLS2 for sheep and goats in GB; APHIS in NI) available for Local Competent Authorities (LCAs).

- All places visited where animals were held, kept or handled were identified with a CPH number, except the detention pens of the port inspection facilities in NI (see point 5.6.1.).

5.3.2. Animal identification

Although no consignments of animals ready to enter ICT were seen during the mission, the following was observed:

- The second individual means of identification of sheep for ICT can be attached to the animals after they have been moved from their holding of birth. This second means can be either a duplicate of the first one, or an “export” identification tag, with a different individual identification number. This procedure is valid for sheep of all ages¹⁰.
- The sheep holding visited in NI, which was adding the second means of individual identification to sheep bought in markets, was not recording cross-reference between both means of identification; the CA stated that although this cross-reference is requested in the notes for guidance, there is no legal requirement for it in NI¹¹.

⁹ http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fvo/ir_search_en.cfm

¹⁰ *In their response to the draft report the Authorities of the UK stated that they have introduced procedures in GB to ensure that animals whose holding of birth is not identifiable (i.e. which have lost their natal identification tag) are not authorised for intra-Community trade. In NI, animals are excluded from ICT if they have lost both their natal and any subsequent movement identification tag.*

¹¹ *In their response to the draft report the Authorities of the UK stated that the Sheep and Goats (Records, Identification and Movement) Order (NI) 2005 contains a provision requiring the*

- According to the declaration of the operator, the pigs received at the holding visited (fattening pigs) did not bear identification marks or temporary marks, enabling the identification of the holding from which they came. The movement documents did not mention any mark. However, pigs sent from this holding to other MS were individually identified, in accordance with the national legislation.

5.3.3. Movement control

Animals moved from one holding to another or to markets must be accompanied by an animal movement licence document completed by the keeper of the holding of origin. Movement from markets are accompanied by a movement licence issued by the CA (pigs), or by a movement document completed by the market operator (sheep and goats). All holdings are also required to have a holding register.

- At the pig holding visited, good records of national movements were kept. However, the record of destination of pigs sent to other MS was insufficient, as contradictory information related to the number and identification of pigs in a certificate could not be resolved;
- In one sheep holding, the owner had one holding register for two different holdings¹²; movements between these holdings were not recorded. In addition, this register was not of an approved model; for incoming sheep, identification of the holding of origin was not always present;
- In another sheep holding, information regarding the movements of sheep was kept partly in an approved register, partly in another record keeping book;
- A third sheep holding was using the same approved register, for both its activities as a holding and as an assembly centre¹³; the information of movement of sheep from the holding to the assembly centre was not complete.

No information regarding the replacement of ear-tags was observed in any of the registers checked during the mission.

The movement records in one holding in NI, which was regularly receiving sheep from a market, presented a number of shortcomings:

- The holdings of origin of sheep bought were not recorded in the register; the movement records were commercial documents, where the flock number of origin of each batch of sheep bought was added. No data concerning the means of transport and transporters was present. The CA explained that the movement

operators of assembly centres to keep a record of cross-references between the export tag numbers and the corresponding green natal tag numbers the sheep had on entry to the assembly centre.

¹² *In their response to the draft report the Authorities of the UK stated that they have requested clarification from the Commission, in order to know whether Regulation (EC) No 21/2004 requires one register per keeper, or one register per holding.*

¹³ *In their response to the draft report the Authorities of the UK stated that they would also question the obligation for separate registers to be held for the holding and the assembly centre when working from the same premises with the same CPH number.*

licence was not adapted to movement through markets, and that they were kept at the market, without indication of the holding(s) of destination¹⁴;

- One movement licence from the market to the holding was also present. This licence, issued by the CA, did not include any information regarding the holding of origin. The CA could not provide to the mission team with the identity of the holdings of origin of these sheep (information not recorded in APHIS database; market reconciliation report containing information of movement into the market, but no information of movement out of it).

The mission team did not visit areas where movement of sheep on and off common lands occur but, according to the CA, they represent an important feature in some areas in the UK. These common lands have been attributed a CPH number, and movements to and from these places must be recorded.

- A Field information note (FIN NO 2005/209) mentions that “there are no standstills applied to movement to or from common lands”. Although the CCA explained that this note was only referring to internal rules of standstill (i.e. prohibition of movements from a holding when ovine or caprine animals have been recently introduced), no such clarification was indicated in the letter. A representative of the CCA acknowledged that this note could be interpreted as including a waiver for the standstill as required for ICT.

5.3.4. Official controls

As explained in chapter 5.2., several organisations control the provision related to animal identification and movement controls. In addition, the OVAs certifying the animals entering ICT may also check movement records.

- One holding register only presented evidence of checks (stamp and signature of the control body); the deficiencies identified by the mission team were not detected.

5.4. Animal health requirements

5.4.1. Diseases absent from areas: controls in place

Aujeszky's disease

According to Commission Decision 2001/618/EC, the GB is recognised as free from Aujeszky's disease. A surveillance programme is in place, which includes a serum sampling of all culled boars at the slaughterhouses. In 2005, 7426 of these blood samples were tested for antibodies to Aujeszky's disease.

Aujeszky's disease is present in NI. A control programme is in place, but no information has been provided to the Commission, although this is required by Article 6 of Commission Decision 2001/618/EC.

¹⁴ *In their response to the draft report the Authorities of the UK explained that when animals are purchased from a market in NI, only details of the market should be recorded on movement documents, not of the holding of origin the animals left to go to the market.*

Movement of pigs from NI to GB are restricted, and subject to official certification and control checks. The ICT of pigs from NI was exclusively to IE in 2005, which has no approved programme for Aujeszky's disease either.

Brucella melitensis

A yearly monitoring programme is in place in the UK in order to maintain its officially brucellosis-free status (*B. melitensis*), in accordance with the requirements of Council Directive 91/68/EEC (Annex A, Chapter 1, II, 2. (i), second indent). This programme is run by DEFRA in GB, and DARD in NI, and is designed at the flock/herd level. Two different laboratories are used for these programmes. The national laboratory does not use the prescribed test, but a test which, according to its findings, gives better results (competitive ELISA test); however, this method has not been recognised in accordance with the procedure laid down in the above-mentioned Directive.

5.4.2. Holdings free from diseases

Anthrax:

The last official case in UK was reported in cattle in 2002.

According to one AHDO, private veterinarians may rule out themselves the suspicion of anthrax by microscope analysis of a blood sample, and therefore suspicion will only be notified when samples are sent to the reference laboratory for further testing. One such suspicion was reported in 2005. It was not possible to know the number of anthrax suspicions in sheep, which have been ruled out by veterinarians.

Scrapie

The protective measures implemented against transmissible spongiform encephalopathies in the UK have been recently reviewed by a FVO mission team (report DG(SANCO)/7697/2005¹⁵). In addition to the compulsory screening scheme, a voluntary monitoring programme is proposed to help holdings wishing to export sheep for breeding. Both schemes are managed by a central dedicated office, in collaboration with the LCAs. When scrapie is confirmed, the central office instructs the concerned LCA to serve restrictions on the flock.

5.4.3. Sources of information:

All diseases mentioned in Annex E (I) to Council Directive 64/432/EEC and Annex B (I) to Council Directive 91/68/EEC are compulsorily notifiable in the UK.

Restrictions on animal health grounds are recorded in the APHIS database in NI, together with holding and animal movement data. This database is available at the local offices, and bears a flagging system showing the holdings under restriction. The mission team could see it at work in one local office where the situation regarding brucellosis in the holdings of origin for pigs intended for ICT was checked.

¹⁵ http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fvo/ir_search_en.cfm

The VETNET database in operation in GB does not provide the same integrated and automatic approach. Information regarding the holdings (bovine, porcine, ovine, caprine), including their geographical location is present, and data regarding certain diseases may also be entered. Although VETNET design includes scrapie, information regarding this disease is not updated in this database. The scrapie schemes results are recorded in a different central and dedicated database; this latter database is not directly accessible by the LCAs, but the central unit sends information to the LCAs on request.

Movements of animals are recorded in other dedicated databases in GB. In Scotland, it was also observed that the AHDO do not have access to the movement database for sheep and goats.

When asked about their source of information regarding the disease status of the area, the VOs of different AHDOs mentioned that a notification system sending e-mails in case of the outbreak of notifiable diseases is in place. They also mentioned the DEFRA internet site, which, according to the CCA, is updated as and when the health status changes.

Regarding the declaration of absence of certain diseases for sheep and goats for reproduction mentioned in the certificate, a written declaration by owners for absence of clinical signs is always required.

5.5. Specific supervision of operators and premises

5.5.1. Assembly centres

The list of approved assembly centres (ACs) has been transmitted to the Commission and was last updated on 22/08/2005; it is available on the Commission website¹⁶. The ACs visited by the mission team were both listed.

Approval of Assembly Centres

The VOs in the LCAs are responsible for approval of ACs, and have the support of a detailed procedure and guidance for this task.

The mission team noted that:

- The procedure was followed and supporting documents were used in both ACs visited;
- In the case of the porcine AC, neither the CA nor the keeper of the AC could provide the mission team with the approval letter¹⁷;
- The isolation facilities were not of a suitable standard in either AC visited (no drainage, rough or cracked floor, walls not easy to clean and disinfect);

Operation and supervision of the assembly centres:

¹⁶ <http://forum.europa.eu.int/irc/sanco/vets/info/data/assembly/ass-eq.htm>

¹⁷ *In their response to the draft report the Authorities of the UK explained that, due to an administrative oversight, an approval letter was not issued to the keeper.*

Neither of the two ACs were operating when visited by the mission team. The guidance requires the operator to notify the dates of operation to the DVM, and both operators stated that they were under the control of an OV when operating; in the sheep holding, a check-list filled by the OV during the assembly was shown to the mission team.

The mission team noted that:

- In the sheep AC, supporting documentation related to the health status of the animals was requested at the time of entry of the animals, and a copy of the documentation was kept;
- In the pig AC, animals were admitted without proper guarantees that they were coming from eligible holdings; in particular, the status of the holdings of origin regarding brucellosis was verified at the LCA only during the validation of the export certificate.
- The record of movements at the pig AC was performed by storage of movement licence documents, and was deficient, with inconsistent information between documents (date of transport, place of origin, place of destination, transporter and lorry details) and dates of assemblies or movement records kept by the transporter.

Indications are given to the VOs for them to perform supervision inspections (at least once a year, when they are operating), but no report of this inspection is requested. In the pig AC, the operator mentioned that he had a visit from the enforcement branch of DARD a year ago. No inspection report was available at the AC or at the LCA, and according to the operator no follow-up was made.

5.5.2. Dealers

The detailed documented procedures on approval and supervision of dealers have not been used as no dealer has been approved in the UK. The premises of commercial operators are considered as holding of origin, and subject to the normal rules of residency and standstill. In NI, the CA decided to register dealers' premises as ACs.

The mission team visited one dealer in NI involved in ICT of slaughter sheep to IE. This operator requested to have part of his premises approved as an AC in June 2004.

- A first visit was performed by a VO in August 2004, who issued a number of requests for upgrading in order to approve the AC;
- Despite this lack of approval, certification of sheep assembled from different holdings of origin has regularly been taking place;
- No further follow-up of the approval request had been performed until after the mission team announced its intention to visit the holding.

5.5.3. Transporters

Transporters involved in transport of animals over 8 hours or involved in intra-community trade must apply for a specific authorisation to the SVS. Authorised transporters are registered in a computerised database.

Transporters may be checked by the TSS on the roads and at the ports.

The route plans undergo a tight control system. Each submission is analysed at the AHDO, which sends it to a centralised unit if the route is new, in order to assess its feasibility. Return of route plans are also scrutinised by the VOs, and recall letters issued in case of non-return, or plans returned with missing information.

The mission team noted the following:

- There is a lack of enforcement of the requirement for transporters to plan that a 24 hours stop should be made in an approved staging point:
 - Route plans for breeding pigs were approved although they indicated a 24 hours stop in a non-approved staging point.
 - A route plan returned was cleared by the VO in charge of the check, although the stop at the approved staging point was not validated by the official stamp of signature of the authorised veterinarian.
- The CCA agreed to allow the pigs for breeding not to be offloaded during their 24 hours stop, on the grounds that it is safer for their health status.

No evidence of checks of the records or registers was seen at any of the two transporters visited:

- One transporter who had 10 lorries operating international transport of live animals, mentioned that his register had never been checked; he kept one register for all vehicles, which contained all information requested in Article 12, 2. of Council Directive 64/432/EEC.
- The register shown by the other transporter was not satisfactory with regards to the same requirements, and presented contradictory information when compared with the accompanying movement documentation of the animals.

5.5.4. Staging points

The list of approved staging points, available on the Commission website¹⁸, has not been updated. The CA withdrew the approval of one of the staging points which was on the list on 04/08/2004¹⁹.

¹⁸ <http://forum.europa.eu.int/irc/sanco/vets/info/data/stagpt/stagpt.htm>

¹⁹ *In their response to the draft report the Authorities of the UK explained that they became aware that the premises referred to were for sale in January 2004 but were only able to conclusively confirm their unavailability following the enquiries when the CA tried to set up a visit to this staging point for this mission.*

During the mission, the mission team asked to add a visit to a staging point, but this visit could not be arranged as the operator was absent. Further clarification has been requested regarding the operation and supervision of this staging point, as route plans mentioning a stop of 24 hours in this staging point were neither signed nor stamped by the OV.

5.6. Veterinary checks applicable in Intra-Community trade

5.6.1. Checks on arrival at destination

Checks on animals for fattening –breeding:

Two different systems are applied in the UK for the determination of the post-import checks.

In GB, a Traces Risk Management System (TRMS) has been developed, to identify the consignments to be checked. For import of live animals, the system selects consignments according to a risk analysis. The global aim is to perform identity and documentary checks on 40% of the incoming consignments, and animal health tests on a further 10%.

The AHDOs must enter all TRACES notifications of arrival consignments into TRMS, which will identify the consignments to be subjected to checks. A VO must then perform a check within 72 hours of arrival, and record the outcome of the check in the system.

The risk analysis is set up in the software on a country basis. If the basic target of checks for biungulates is 25%. All sheep and goats imported from Greece, Italy, Spain and Portugal must be checked. All pigs from countries not free from Aujeszky's disease, and all cattle, sheep and goats from countries not free from brucellosis or enzootic bovine leucosis must also be checked.

- The risk analysis included criteria set up by the CA, not always supported by the European legal framework, and therefore not always non-discriminatory. Thus, sheep imported from Greece would be subject to a systematic check.

This system is very elaborate, but excludes checks on animals sent for slaughter. The CCA explained that there is no central instruction regarding the checks to be performed for these consignments, and it is left to the LCA to decide whether to check the effective arrival and slaughter of animals for which they receive a notification message.

A different system is in place in NI. DARD runs a portal inspection service, at points of entry of animals in NI, by sea or by air. Documentary and welfare checks are systematically performed, and installations are available to perform identity checks if deemed necessary. These checks are also performed on consignments arriving from GB.

The portal authorities use software which selects one in ten consignments intended for NI for a further documentary and identity check performed by the LCA at the

destination. They have the possibility to over-ride this automated system and select consignments for further checks based on level of risk.

The mission team visited one portal authority, and noted that, although animals could be offloaded at their facilities, and could also be retained for several days, the facilities had no holding number, and the stop at the premises was not recorded in the movement documents.

Checks of animals for slaughter

Consignments of animals for slaughter in NI arriving through the ports of entries are not released by the portal authorities if the slaughterhouse of destination has not sent an advance notification. A documentary check is performed on all consignments.

The operator of slaughterhouses in NI must also inform the LCA of consignments arriving by road from IE. At the sheep slaughterhouse visited, it was explained that most consignments were coming from across the border. The official notification from TRACES was often received when the sheep had already been slaughtered. The VO indicated that all consignments which were notified through TRACES had been slaughtered. However, a high percentage of consignments were not subject to TRACES notification from IE, as more than 400 consignments of sheep had been slaughtered over the last 12 months, for only around 150 TRACES notifications received.

In GB, the checks at slaughterhouses are codified in the note for guidance issued by the MHS for the OVs.

A number of shortcomings were noted regarding the supervision of the OVs in the slaughterhouses:

In the pig slaughterhouse, the OVs either did not identify shortcomings related to certificates, or did not take appropriate action (and did not report them to the SVS, as requested in the notes for guidance):

- Consignments of pigs from IE were accepted and slaughtered, although certificates were not completed as required by Article 7(2) of Commission Decision 2001/618/EC regarding Aujeszky's disease;
- No time of departure of the consignments was available, so that the OV could check that the travel time was less than 24 hours. An error related to the checks on the route plan was identified in the MHS operational manual, indicating that only journeys over 24 hours request a route plan, which is not in line with Article 5(2) (b) of Council Directive 91/628/EEC, nor with the legislation in force in England.

In the same slaughterhouse, the OV mentioned that she did not perform or supervise identity checks on the animals arriving from other MS; the operator performed an identity check after slaughter.

On two consignments in 2005, these identity checks revealed a different identification mark than the one recorded on the certificate. The OV did not take any restriction measure, nor did she report the case to the VO, as indicated in the notes for guidance.

In the sheep slaughterhouse in NI, the OV supervised the identity checks performed by the operator by checking 10% of the sheep; this check was documented.

The model of the certificates received from IE was incorrect, but the CA mentioned that DARD analysed the content of the certificate, and found it acceptable. However, all certificates indicated that the animals were passing through an AC, without specifying that it was an approved AC. According to the list available on the Commission website²⁰, there are no approved ACs in IE.

A number of certificates from IE for sheep for slaughter were incomplete (options not crossed). DARD stated that they would send the irregularities identified in the certificates directly to the CA of IE.

5.6.2. Checks at origin

Certification

A very detailed procedure is in place, with extensive supporting documentation, in order to ensure that all requirements subject to certification for live animals for ICT are complied with.

An operator wishing to export live animals sends an application in a specific format to the LCA, including details of the consignment, expected date and proposed route plan.

The LCA checks the status of the holding and area, enters the notification into TRACES and checks the proposed route plan. A disease clearance form is issued by a VO and sent together with pre-certificate and supporting notes for guidance to the OV responsible for the inspection.

The OV visits the holding within 24 hours and follows a check-list which details the checks to be performed on the identity of the animals and their condition. He then completes the certificates, signs and stamps it, and returns a copy of the completed documents, together with a specific form indicating whether amendments of the TRACES pre-notification are needed.

All returned health certificate copies and supporting documents must be scrutinised by the LCA to ensure that they have been duly completed, signed, stamped and dated appropriately. A percentage of the certificates (determined by the LCA) must be routinely audited.

The mission team noted the following positive elements regarding certification:

- The models of certificates checked were all correct and based on the TRACES format;

²⁰ <http://forum.europa.eu.int/irc/sanco/vets/info/data/assembly/ass-eq.htm>

- In all LCAs, a complete file was available for all certificates requested by the mission team;
- The check-list used by the OVs for certification of sheep/goats for fattening refers to detailed and strict rules regarding the identity checks.

However, weaknesses regarding the checks on residency and standstill have been identified:

- The pre-export procedures specify that it is the responsibility of the exporter to ensure that movement records and declaration related to the animals are available for inspection by the OV. The same procedures, which are very detailed on the animal health and welfare conditions, and on checks regarding animal identification, do not give details on the checks to be performed related to the residency and standstill of the animals.
- Although a format of a written declaration from the keeper, related to the residency and standstill requirements, and the possible introduction of biungulate animals from third countries, was transmitted by the LCA to the OV, this declaration is not mentioned in the check-list for the OV. The check list requests the OV to check movement and farm records, but only in order to verify compliance of the origin of the animals.

The control performed by the LCA on return of certificates did to identify a number of deficiencies in some certificates checked by the mission team, such as:

- a certificate with an incomplete date (the OV indicated only the month and year);
- incorrect certification (certifying that sheep for slaughter from NI to IE had met the residency and standstill requirements, when these sheep were sent by a dealer, with no supporting documentation);
- a certificate issued for 30 pigs, with a list of 31 identification marks;
- a same individual pig identification in two different certificates (INTRA.GB.2005.0002112 and INTRA.GB.2005.0002123).

The level of validation of certificates in TRACES varied from one LCA to another; with one LCA presenting a significant number of messages of 2005 had not been validated nor cancelled.

The CCA have decided to issue certificates in English exclusively, except for France, following complaints from this country. The Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons (RCVS) is evaluating the validity of OVs issuing certificates in a language that they do not understand. The current solution for certificates for France is that only the English version of the certificate is signed and stamped, whereas the French version contains the same information, but is only stamped.

TRACES is also used for national notification of trade of live animals, between NI and GB. No TRACES certificate is actually issued, as the requirements are different from those for ICT.

5.7. Specific situation regarding ICT of sheep and goats for slaughter between NI and IE

The UK and IE have decided not to respect the provisions of residency and standstill requirements as stated in Articles 4a(1)(b) and 4c(1) of Council Directive 91/68/EC, for trade of sheep and goats for slaughter between NI and IE.

Such a derogation was possible according to Article 5 (4) of Commission Decision 2003/483/EC²¹, which expired on 30/06/2004.

The Ministry for Agriculture and Food of IE contacted the Commissioner for Health and Consumer Protection on 29/06/2004, requesting the Commission to put forward a proposal to allow the extension of the derogation. The same letter also mentioned that both countries had the intention to continue with existing certification arrangements for cross-border trade in sheep for slaughter.

This trade is still subject to certification from either side of the border. Certificates from IE were seen, referring to (the expired) Commission Decision 2003/483/EC. The certificates from NI that the mission team examined had the part of the certificate related to residency and standstill crossed out.

Notes for guidance have been issued by the CA in NI related to the certification of these consignments, requesting the OV to draw up a supplementary certificate indicating that the “animals (are) in accordance with Commission Decision 2003/483/EC”. This supplementary certificate was not seen in the issued certificates checked by the mission team.

These notes for guidance also mention that a certificate is issued at the approved AC, on the basis of documents issued by the owner or operator of the AC, which is not in line with Article 9(5) of Council Directive 91/68/EEC.

In addition, in NI, conditions related to approval of ACs or dealers are not enforced, and sheep and goats are exported and certified from non approved dealers' premises or ACs, which are considered in the certificate as holdings of origin.

5.8. Supervision of Official Veterinarians

The OVs (Local Veterinary Inspectors (LVIs) in GB and authorised veterinary Inspectors (AVIs) in NI) performing the certification for export of live animals in the UK are private practitioners who must be members of the RCVS. They are appointed by the LCA, to carry out specific tasks on behalf of SVS or DARD, and receive instructions on their duties and obligations (guide to professional conduct in GB, AVI terms and conditions in NI).

The initial training of the OVs is under the responsibility of the LCA and focuses on procedures; then the OVs must undergo regular training, and receive information notes and instructions.

²¹ Commission 2003/483/EC Decision of 30 June 2003 establishing transitional measures for the control on the movement of animals of susceptible species with regard to foot-and-mouth disease. O.J. L 162, 01/07/2003, p.72

All OV practices must be visited by a VO at least every three years. The OVs in the panel for export of live animals must in addition be subject to monitoring visits, including during the export certification process.

If an OV performs his tasks unsatisfactorily, suitable re-training may be provided, and he may be suspended, either completely or for one of the tasks he has been appointed to.

The mission team found evidence of such actions, including re-training and suspension.

- One AHDO visited decided to suspend one OV from the panel of certification for sheep and goats, after repeated poor standard of completion of certificates, including non-stamped certificates due to the loss of the stamp. The AHDO decided, however, not to suspend the same OV from the panel of certification for export of live horses. The sanction is at the discretion of the AHDO.
- The LCAs visited which were asked about supervision of OVs, mentioned that they did not perform monitoring visits on the OVs responsible for export certification; their performance was assessed through compliance checks on the returned certificates.

Supervision OVs in Slaughterhouses

An initial training is given by the MHS to the newly appointed OVs in red meat plants. Additional training and supervision may be given by the subcontractors.

However, at one slaughterhouse visited, according to what a representative of the MHS explained, the MHS used to have a supervisory system of the OVs, but this system has not been in operation for the last three years. A new audit system is under development.

According to the representative of the SVS at the same slaughterhouse, the SVS has no direct supervision or training responsibility towards the OVs in the slaughterhouses.

5.9. Miscellaneous

The mission team noted that one transporter kept tetracycline soluble powder (antibiotic with withdrawal period) at his premises, to be added into the drinking water for pigs transported on long distances, on the request of the holding of origin. Council Directive 90/425/EEC does not require documents or certificates related to treatments of the animals, but the lack of control or records related to treatment of animals may lead to a non-respect of the provisions of Article 9 (a) (ii) of Council Directive 96/23/EEC²², on the observance of the withdrawal periods.

²² Council Directive 96/23/EC of 29 April 1996 on measures to monitor certain substances and residues thereof in live animals and animal products and repealing Directives 85/358/EEC and 86/469/EEC and Decisions 89/187/EEC and 91/664/EEC; OJ L 125, 23/5/1996, p. 10

The mission team noted on several occasions that, most of disinfectants encountered in slaughterhouses, ports, transporters, ACs, did not display any shelf life.

Both slaughterhouses had a site for cleaning and disinfection, but disinfectant was not readily available. One operator recognised the fact, the other one explained that the disinfectant was in a container with the washing agent, directly connected to the pressure washer. No written procedure was available for the operators who were using the facilities.

6. CONCLUSIONS

6.1. Legislation

The European legislation related to ICT of live animals has been transposed and updated into legislation applicable in each of the regions of the UK. However, the CCA does not check the correct transposition in all regional legislation.

Article 4, (1) and 4, (2)(b), of Council Regulation (EC) No 21/2004, regarding the rules of identification of sheep and goats for ICT, has been incorrectly implemented in the regional legislations applicable in the UK.

Delayed and incorrect implementation of provisions related to EU Decisions and Regulations have been noted.

6.2. Competent Authority

DEFRA, as CCA, has delegated the official controls and enforcement duties in fields related to the scope of the mission to various implementing and control bodies. As some terms of delegation were not available or finalised, it was not possible to evaluate their compliance with Article 4 of the Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, in particular regarding the organisation of coordination and cooperation.

6.3. Animal identification, holding registration and movement control

The number of deficiencies related to the identification of animals and records of movements identified during the mission, in particular in sheep, jeopardise the tracing of the animals and undermines the reliability of the checks related to residency and standstill at the holdings of origin.

The supervision of the implementation of requirements related to records of movements of animals was insufficient to detect most of the deficiencies observed during the mission.

6.4. Animal health requirements

The system in place for monitoring diseases provides sufficient supporting evidence for the certification related to disease situations, for porcine, ovine and caprine species.

6.5. Approval and supervision of operators and premises

The conditions of Article 4b (3) and (4) of Council Directive 91/68/EEC are not enforced in NI, where sheep sent for slaughter to IE may be sent and certified from an AC which is not approved.

Although the requirements for approval are detailed in the procedures in place, they were not completely met in both approved ACs visited.

The supervision of the AC is also codified in the procedures; it could not be evaluated on site, but the records regarding the origin of the animals in one AC were insufficient.

The level of supervision of the transporters (Article 5 of Council Directive 91/628/EEC) and of the staging points (Article 3 (3) and 6 of Regulation (EC) No 1255/97) do not give satisfactory evidence that the health status of the animals transported is not jeopardised during transport.

6.6. Controls on intra-Community trade in live animals

A detailed documented procedure is in place for the checks related to ICT of live animals, ensuring coherence and consistency of controls throughout the UK.

The checks at destination for animals for breeding and fattening give a good level of confidence in the respect of animal health conditions; the checks performed at slaughterhouses are not always organised or implemented to ensure an adequate level of security.

Despite individual shortcomings identified, the procedure applied throughout the UK gives a good degree of confidence in the quality of the certification. But the level of checks at origin is undermined by the problems identified in the checks performed with regard to identification and movement records. The supervision of elements related to residency and standstill of live animals entering ICT was a particular weak point.

The certificates were of a format following the harmonised model, but were not usually drawn in an official language of the country of destination.

6.7. Special condition for ICT of sheep and goats for slaughter between NI and EI

Despite the lack of legal basis, the CCA of the UK and IE have decided not to respect important provisions of Council Directive 91/68/EC (Article 4a(1)(b) and 4c(1)) regarding the movement control of sheep and goats, for their trade for slaughter between NI and IE.

A number of further provisions of the same Directive are not applied by the CA in NI (among which Article 4b(3) or Article 4b(4); Article 4c(3); Article 9(5)), which undermine further the traceability and animal health conditions of the animals subject to this trade.

Although no immediate health threat has been identified, in case of an animal

health crisis, the system as applied and enforced may prove ineffective for the prevention or control of a possible outbreak²³.

6.8. Supervision of Official Veterinarians

Documented procedures related to certification of live animals for intra-community trade are in place as requested by Article 8 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004. However, the procedures to supervise the OVs, and to verify the effectiveness of the official controls for the checks at origin and to take corrective action, were not always sufficiently applied.

The supervision of the OVs responsible for checks at destination in slaughterhouses, and the organisation of the cooperation between the different authorities were not sufficient to detect and amend the deficient checks.

6.9. Miscellaneous

Disinfection of vehicles used for the transport of live animals may be impaired by the lack of availability or indication on the validity of the disinfectant in some places.

7. CLOSING MEETING

A closing meeting was held on 3 March 2006 with representatives of the CCA and the CAs visited, during which the mission team presented the main findings and conclusions of the mission.

At this meeting, the CA did not express disagreement with the findings.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COMPETENT AUTHORITIES OF UK

- 8.1. To give assurance that the European Directives are consistently and correctly transposed in each of the regions of the UK, and that Decisions and Regulations are applied in a timely manner and in their entirety in all regions of the UK;
- 8.2. To finalise the terms of delegations with SVS and MHS so that the responsibilities and control systems are clearly defined;
- 8.3. To apply and enforce all current EU provisions for trade of ovine and caprine animals for slaughter between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. (including provisions of Council Directive 91/68/EC: Articles 4a(1)(b) and 4c(1) of for residency and standstill requirements; Article 4b(4) and 8a for approval of assembly centres; Article 4b(3) or Article 4b(4), Article 4c(3), and Article 9(5)) for conditions for movements through assembly centres;

²³ See Recital No 5 of: Council Directive 2003/50/EC of 11 June 2003 amending Directive 91/68/EEC as regards reinforcement of controls on movements of ovine and caprine animals Official Journal L 169, 08/07/2003 P. 0051

and provisions of Regulation (EC) No 21/2004: articles 4 (1) and 4 (2)(a) and 4(2)(b), for identification of animals);

- 8.4. To ensure that legal provisions of Article 4, 2., of Council Regulation (EC) No 21/2004, regarding the rules of identification of sheep and goats for intra-community trade are fully applicable in the UK; and to ensure that sheep or goats born after 9/07/2005 will not enter intra-community trade if they have not been identified before the animals leave the holding on which they were born in accordance with Article 4 (1) and 4. (2)(a) and (b);
- 8.5. To revise the procedures for, and audit the application of, official checks as defined in Article 3. (3) of Council Directive 90/425/EEC;
- 8.6. To ensure that the supervision of approved assembly centres, approved staging points and transporters provide adequate guarantees regarding the protection of the health status of the animals (Articles 11 and 12 of Council Directive 64/432/EEC; Articles 8a and 8c of Council directive 91/68/EEC; Article 5 (2) of Council Directive 91/628/EEC; Articles 3, 4, 5 and 6 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1255/97).;
- 8.7. To ensure that the procedures of supervision of OVs are applied consistently, in order to fulfil the conditions of article 8 (3) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004;
- 8.8. To ensure efficient and effective coordination and cooperation between the CAs involved in the official controls, in particular to guarantee that:
 - 8.8.1. the checks at destination in slaughterhouses satisfy the conditions required by Article 5, 1. (b) (ii) of Council Directive 90/425/EEC;
 - 8.8.2. the requirements of Council Directive 92/102/EEC (articles 4 and 5); Council regulation (EC) No 21/2004 (Articles 5 and 6); Council Directive 64/432/EEC (Articles 11 and 12) and Council Directive 91/68/EEC (Articles 8a and 8c) regarding the records of identification and registration of animals movements are properly enforced.
- 8.9. To issue certificates in at least one language understood by the certifying officer and one of the official languages of the country of destination, in accordance with Article 4 (2) of Council Directive 96/93/EC, article 5 (1) of Council Directive 64/432/EEC and Council Directive 91/68/EEC .

The CA of the UK should submit an action plan indicating the actions taken and planned in response to the recommendations of this report, within one month of receipt of the final version of this report.

9. ADDENDUM

Response of the CA of the UK to the draft mission report

The CA of the UK provided comments on the draft report by means of a letter dated 02 June 2006. Where appropriate, these comments have been incorporated into the final report. They also provided an initial reaction to certain conclusions

and recommendations in the report, by providing details of action already taken, or to be taken, to correct a number of deficiencies noted in the report.

The CCA provided in particular the following information: they acknowledged the concerns expressed by the FVO in respect of effective enforcement of the record keeping requirements in respect of sheep and goats, and that, in its response to FVO report DG (SANCO)7770/2005, the UK has set out its proposals for addressing these concerns in the short and medium term. In particular, in England and Wales, a new inspection regime will be put in place with effect from 1 January 2007.

ANNEX

The following is a list of EU legislation²⁴ relevant to this mission:

LEGISLATION RELATED TO OFFICIAL CONTROLS IN THE VETERINARY FIELD		
Council Directive 90/425/EEC	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	OJ L 224, 18/08/90, p. 29
Council Regulation (EC) No 882/2004	Regulation 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	OJ L 165, 30/04/2004, p. 1 Corrected and re-published in O. J. L 191, 28/05/2004
Commission Decision 98/139/EC	Commission Decision 98/139/EC of 4 February 1998 laying down certain detailed rules concerning on-the-spot checks carried out in the veterinary field by Commission experts in the Member States	OJ L 38, 12/02/1998 p. 10
LEGISLATION RELATING TO INTRA-COMMUNITY TRADE OF LIVE ANIMALS		
Council Directive 64/432/EEC	Council Directive 64/432/EEC of 26 June 1964 on animal health problems affecting intra-Community trade in bovine animals and swine	OJ L P 121, 29/07/1964, p. 1977
Council Directive 91/68/EEC	Council Directive 91/68/EEC of 28 January 1991 on animal health conditions governing intra-Community trade in ovine and caprine animals	OJ L 46, 19/02/91, p. 19
Commission Decision 2004/315/EC	Commission Decision 2004/315/EC of 26 March 2004 recognising the system of surveillance for bovine holdings implementing in Member States or regions of Member States under Directive 64/432/EEC	OJ L 100, 06/04/2004, p. 43
Council Directive 2004/68/EC	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 ungulate animals, amending Directive 90/426/EEC and 92/65/EEC and repealing Directive 72/462/EEC	OJ L 139, 30/04/2004, p. 320
LEGISLATION RELATED TO THE NOTIFICATION OF ANIMAL DISEASES		
Council Directive 82/894/EEC	Council Directive 82/894/EEC of 21 December 1982 on the notification of animal diseases within the Community	OJ L 378, 31/12/82, p. 58

²⁴ EU legislation quoted in the Annex refer to the last amended version.

LEGISLATION RELATED TO CERTAIN DISEASES IN MEMBER STATES OR CERTAIN AREAS OF THEM		
COMMISSION DECISION 93/52/EEC	Commission Decision 93/52/EEC of 21 December 1992 recording the compliance by certain Member States or regions with the requirements relating to brucellosis (<i>B. melitensis</i>) and according them the status of a Member State or region officially free of the disease.	OJ L 013 , 21/01/1993 p. 14
COMMISSION DECISION 2002/670/EC	Commission Decision 2002/670/EC of 20 August 2002 amending Council Decision 98/256/EC concerning emergency measures to protect against bovine spongiform encephalopathy	OJ L 228 , 24/08/2002, p. 22
COMMISSION DECISION 2001/618/EC	Commission Decision 2001/618/EC of 23 July 2001 on additional guarantees in intra-Community trade of pigs relating to Aujeszky's disease, criteria to provide information on this disease and repealing Decisions 93/24/EEC and 93/244/EEC	OJ L 215, 09/08/2001, p. 48
COMMISSION DECISION 2003/467/EC	Commission Decision 2003/467/EC of 23 June 2003 establishing the official tuberculosis, brucellosis, and enzootic-leucosis-free status of certain Member States as regards bovine herds	OJ L 156, 25/06/2003, p. 74
LEGISLATION RELATED TO FARM REGISTRATION, ANIMAL IDENTIFICATION AND MOVEMENT CONTROL		
Council Directive 92/102/EEC	Council Directive 92/102/EEC of 27 November 1992 on the identification and registration of animals	OJ L 355, 05/12/1992, p. 32
Commission Regulation (EC) No 494/98	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	OJ L 60, 28/02/1998 p. 78
Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000	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	OJ L 204, 11/08/2000, p. 1
Commission Decision 2000/678/EC	Commission Decision 2000/678/EC 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	OJ L 281, 07/11/2000, p.16
Commission Regulation (EC) 1082/2003	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	OJ L 156 , 25/06/2003 P. 9
Council Regulation (EC) No 21/2004	Council Regulation (EC) No 21/2004 establishing a system for identification and registration of ovine and caprine animals and amending Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 and Directives 92/102/EEC and 64/432/EEC	OJ L 5, 09/01/2004, p.8

Commission Regulation (EC) No 911/2004	Commission Regulation (EC) No 911/2004 of 29 April 2004 implementing Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 of the European Parliament and the Council as regards eartags, passports and holding registers	OJ L 163, 30/04/2004, p. 65
Commission Decision 2004/292/EC	Commission Decision 2004/292/EC of 30 March 2004 on the introduction of the Traces system and amending Decision 92/486/EEC	OJ L 94, 31/03/2004, p. 63
Commission Decision 2005/617/EC	Commission Decision 2005/617/EC of 17 August 2005 temporarily recognising the systems for identification and registration of ovine and caprine animals in Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Kingdom, according to Article 4(2)(d) of Council Regulation (EC) No 21/2004	OJ L 214, 19/08/2005, p. 63
LEGISLATION RELATED TO ANIMAL WELFARE		
Council Directive 91/628/EEC	Council Directive 91/628/EEC of 19 November 1991 on the protection of animals during transport and amending Directives 90/425/EEC and 91/496/EEC	OJ L 340, 11/12/91, p. 17
Council Regulation (EC) No 1255/97	Council Regulation (EC) No 1255/97 of 25 June 1997 concerning Community criteria for staging points and amending the route plan referred to in the Annex to directive 91/628/EEC	OJ L 174, 02/07/97, p. 1
Council Regulation (EC) No 411/98	Council Regulation (EC) No 411/98 of 16 February 1998 on additional animal protection standards applicable to road vehicles used for the carriage of livestock on journeys exceeding eight hours.	OJ L 52, 21/02/98, p. 8
LEGISLATION RELATING TO CERTIFICATION		
Council Directive 96/93/EC	Council Directive 96/93/EC of 17 December 1996 on the certification of animals and animal products	OJ L 13, 16/01/1997, p. 28
Commission Regulation (EC) No 599/2004	Commission Regulation (EC) No 599/2004 of 30 March 2004 concerning the adoption of a harmonised model certificate and inspection report linked to intra-Community trade in animals and products of animal origin	OJ L 94, 31/03/2004, p. 44