



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
HEALTH AND CONSUMERS DIRECTORATE-GENERAL
Directorate F - Food and Veterinary Office

DG(SANCO) 2012-6430 - MR FINAL

FINAL REPORT OF AN AUDIT

CARRIED OUT IN

GREECE

FROM 04 TO 13 SEPTEMBER 2012

IN ORDER TO EVALUATE THE SALMONELLA NATIONAL CONTROL PROGRAMMES IN
PARTICULAR POULTRY POPULATIONS (BREEDERS, LAYING HENS, BROILERS AND
TURKEYS)

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 Food and Veterinary Office in Greece, from 4 to 13 September 2012.

The objective of the audit was to evaluate the actions taken by the Greek competent authorities in order to control Salmonella, in particular concerning the implementation of the Salmonella National Control Programmes for various poultry populations.

This report concludes that in general the SNCP programmes are correctly implemented and cover all relevant poultry populations concerned. Official controls are implemented including regular and documented checks ensuring that food business operators implement these programmes. Only minor deficiencies were noted.

The report addresses to the Greek competent authorities a number of recommendations aimed at rectifying identified shortcomings and enhancing the control system in place.

Table of Contents

1	<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1
2	<u>OBJECTIVES</u>	1
3	<u>LEGAL BASIS</u>	2
4	<u>BACKGROUND</u>	2
5	<u>FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS</u>	2
	5.1 <u>COMPETENT AUTHORITY</u>	2
	5.2 <u>CONTROLS AT FARM LEVEL</u>	4
	5.3 <u>SNCP FOR BREEDING HENS</u>	5
	5.4 <u>SNCP FOR LAYING HENS</u>	7
	5.5 <u>SNCP FOR BROILERS</u>	8
	5.6 <u>SNCP FOR TURKEY</u>	8
	5.7 <u>RAPID ALERT SYSTEM FOR FOOD AND FEED FOLLOW UP</u>	9
	5.8 <u>LABORATORIES</u>	9
6	<u>OVERALL CONCLUSIONS</u>	11
7	<u>CLOSING MEETING</u>	11
8	<u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	11
	<u>ANNEX 1 - LEGAL REFERENCES</u>	13

ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS USED IN THIS REPORT

Abbreviation	Explanation
CA	Competent Authority
CCA	Central Competent Authority
EU	European Union
FBO	Food businesses operator
FVO	Food and Veterinary Office
NRL	National Reference Laboratory
S/E	<i>Salmonella enteritidis</i>
SNCP	<i>Salmonella</i> National Control Programme
S/T	<i>Salmonella typhimurium</i>

1 INTRODUCTION

The audit took place in Greece from 4 to 13 September 2012 and was undertaken as part of the Food and Veterinary Office's (FVO) planned audit programme.

The audit team comprised one inspector from the FVO and one national expert from a Member State.

2 OBJECTIVES

The objective of the audit was to evaluate the actions taken by the competent authority (CA) in order to control *Salmonella*, in particular concerning the implementation of the *Salmonella* National Control Programmes (SNCP) for breeders, laying hens, broilers and turkeys.

In order to achieve this objective the audit team evaluated the organisation of the CA and its capacity for implementing the relevant EU requirements.

In pursuit of this objective, the audit team proceeded as follows:

- an opening meeting was held on 4 September 2012 with the Central CA (CCA). At this meeting the audit team confirmed the objective of, and itinerary for the audit, and requested additional information required for the satisfactory completion of the audit;
- the following sites were visited:

COMPETENT AUTHORITY VISITS		
CCA	1	Department of Zoonosis
Regional Veterinary Units	3	Ioannina, Chalkidiki and Chalkida
District Veterinary Station	1	
LABORATORY VISITS		
National Reference Laboratory (NRL)	1	
Official laboratory	1	
Private laboratory	1	
PRIMARY PRODUCTION		
Breeding hen farms	3	
Hatcheries	1	
Laying hen farms	2	
Broiler farms	2	
Turkey farms	1	

- representatives from the CA accompanied the team during the whole audit.

3 LEGAL BASIS

The audit was carried out in agreement with the Greek Authorities and 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 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;

- Article 17 of Regulation (EC) No 2160/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 November 2003 on the control of *Salmonella* and other specified food-borne zoonotic agents.

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

4 BACKGROUND

A previous audit evaluating the implementation of SNCPs for breeders and layers in Greece took place in 2009 (ref. DG (SANCO) 8067/2009) and the report was published on the Health and Consumer Directorate – General's Internet website:-

http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/rep_details_en.cfm?rep_id=2391#.

In Greece there are 360 breeding flocks located in 12 regions, 670 laying flocks in 35 regions, 7,887 broiler flocks in 31 regions, 3 breeding and 59 fattening turkey flocks in 15 regions.

In 2010 and 2011 the number of the specific *Salmonella* serotypes found in flocks of breeders and layers declined from 7 to 2 and from 10 to 3 respectively whereas for broiler flocks this number increased from 2 to 12. No specific *Salmonella* serotypes were identified in turkey flocks.

5 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 COMPETENT AUTHORITY

Legal basis

Article 3.1 of Regulation (EC) No 2160/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council requires Member States to designate a CA or CAs for the purpose of the regulation and notify the Commission thereof.

Audit findings

The Department of Zoonosis, Animal Health Directorate of the Directorate General of Veterinary Services, Ministry of Rural Development and Food is responsible for the coordination and supervision of the SNCPs, the designation of the authorities implementing this specific programme, the collection and evaluation of data and results received and notifying these results to the European Commission. Implementation of the *Salmonella* programme is done by the Regional Veterinary Departments. This level is responsible for collecting and transport of the samples to the official laboratories, for the evaluation how the *Salmonella* programmes are being implemented by the food business operators (FBOs), and for collecting and sending the data to the CCA.

A more detailed description of the CA can be found in the country profile for Greece on the following website: http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/controlsystems_en.cfm?co_id=GR

Concerning own-check sampling, each regional unit is responsible for organising the collection of information and the forms used are different. However for layers, from 2012, the information is sent by FBOs to regional units on the basis of an instruction issued by the central level and by using a

harmonised form. For breeders, broilers and turkeys the information can be sent to the regional units either by FBOs or laboratories or slaughterhouses depending on the region. The number of own-check samples is verified by the regional units during official controls at the holdings.

The reports are sent every six months from regional units to the central level separately for every poultry population by using a standard form. Each report includes the number of official samples and the date of official and own-check sampling. In breeding flocks, because of the large number of checks, there is the option of not recording all of them. According to the manual for breeding hens, the dates of the own-checks carried out in each flock are recorded in the own-checks column of the report's form for breeding hens, so that 'total' shows the sum of all own-checks in that specific period. Where all the dates for own-checks are not being recorded, it is necessary to include at least the sampling dates of defined production stages. These are day-old chicks, four-week-old birds, two weeks before moving to the laying phase or laying unit, the first sampling in the production phase and the last sampling prior to depopulation. For the above cases where own-checks have not been carried out, the word "No" is recorded in the form against the production stage concerned.

At the final meeting, the audit team was informed that the verification on the implementation of SNCPs is done only at regional level¹. The audit team verified the data sent to the central level with the number of samples taken on the farms and found some minor differences.

Training

The audit team was informed that there are annual meetings between central and regional level where specific topics on the implementation of SNCPs are discussed. The minutes from these meetings were presented to the audit team.

Several training sessions had been organised by the Department of Zoonosis with the participation of all the stakeholders of the SNCPs including staff from regional level, laboratories and poultry farmers.

On the website of the Ministry of Agriculture there are publicly available guidelines on various aspects of the SNCPs. They include:

- Template for sampling report
- Sampling protocols
- Requirements for the transport of samples
- Template for checklist for official controls on the farm

On the same website there is a video demonstrating how *Salmonella* sampling should be done.

During the audit it was found that veterinarians involved in the SNCPs were properly trained as regards required sampling frequency and sampling protocol or they were under supervision of more experienced officials.

Internal audits

Internal auditing by the central level of the regional levels is being carried out since 2010. This involves documentary checks, and attention is also paid to the implementation of the SNCPs. To date, this internal audit had been carried out in four regions. The audit team reviewed the result of

¹ In its response to the draft report the CA stated that in addition to verification of implementation at regional level checks on the implementation of SNCPs is carried out at central level both by the Department of Zoonosis on a sample basis, verifying and evaluating the data from the regional units, and by the Inspections and Checks Directorate (within the Veterinary Directorate- General) which is responsible for carrying out checks in the regional units.

these controls in one region visited and found that SNCPs had been covered and recommendations related to inadequate biosecurity measures in one poultry farm had been issued.

Epidemiological survey

There is on-going cooperation at the central and regional level between veterinary and public health services concerning *Salmonella* outbreaks in the populace. The formal agreement of cooperation between the above mentioned services is at draft stage.

The data received by the audit team from the CA for the years 2007 to 2011 shows the number of human outbreaks where the source was *Salmonella enteritidis* (S/E) or *Salmonella typhimurium* (S/T). The follow-up investigation done by authorities of these cases revealed that only in a few instances was poultry the source. In 2009 and 2010 the decrease in human *Salmonella* cases was remarkable. The number of human *Salmonella* cases increased again in 2011 to the same level as in 2009.

Conclusions

The CA responsible for official controls within the scope of this audit is clearly designated.

There are procedures in place to collect the data as regards SNCPs implementation and in general the verification of this data by the CA is adequate.

Staff involved in the implementation of SNCPs had received training or had access to the information in the area concerned.

There are internal audits carried out which cover among others the implementation of SNCPs.

5.2 CONTROLS AT FARM LEVEL

Legal basis

Article 3 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires Member States to carry out regularly, on a risk basis and with appropriate frequency, controls on feed or food businesses.

Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 852/2004.

Chapter I of Annex II to Council Directive 2009/158/EC requires at least one inspection per year per holding by an official veterinarian in order to be approved by the CA for the purposes of intra-EU trade in poultry or hatching eggs.

Audit findings

Poultry farms are registered in a central database maintained and updated by the Department of Zoonosis and the information stored in this database was found appropriate. The audit team consulted it at central level and in the three regions visited. The registration system is house-based. An electronic database has also been created for layers but, at the time of this audit, has not yet been used for the SNCP.

The frequency of official controls at poultry farms had been determined by the national decisions for the implementation of SNCPs in the relevant poultry populations. According to these, official controls should take place whenever official sampling occurs. The CA informed the audit team that official controls are also carried out at the holdings where official sampling is not required due to the small size of the flocks. A standard checklist is used for verifying biosecurity conditions and implementation of *Salmonella* own-checks. Official controls are carried out by officials from the regional level.

In all regions visited the frequency of controls was as defined and well documented. In general in the farms visited an adequate follow-up was performed when needed, to ensure that deficiencies found had been corrected (they were mainly related to biosecurity).

However in one case during routine inspection a deadline for the correction of deficiencies identified was not set and the same recommendations were repeated in a subsequent report without any specific action being taken. Also in one case the inspector failed to note an inadequate frequency of sampling.

Farms visited had generally adequate biosecurity measures in place. Records of treatment, mortality, pest control, sampling, etc. on flocks were kept. The information about practices and biosecurity measures in relation to the protection of flocks from *Salmonella* infection was available to poultry farmers and included in the national legislation and SNCPs. However in the farms visited not all the requirements were followed e.g. the presence of vegetation in close proximity to the poultry houses, inadequate biosecurity measures for entering the poultry houses (the changing of boots/shoes or protective clothing done in incorrect place, hand washing not done, clothes not always changed).

Water control

Under the SNCPs if an own well is used as the source of water its potability must be ensured. During the farm visits the audit team found that water is regularly analysed by the FBOs.

Feed control

In Greece, production of feed should meet the requirements of Regulation (EC) No 183/2005. All feedstuff must be certified as *Salmonella* free before it is fed to poultry. If the farmer does not get a certificate from the feed producer he must test feed samples for *Salmonella* himself. There is also an obligation for farmers producing own feedstuff to collect and test feed samples for *Salmonella*. As there is no national legislation or guidelines regulating feed sampling, the producer or farmer decides on feed sampling frequency, size and type of samples. There is no official surveillance programme for *Salmonella* in domestic feedstuffs.

The audit team was informed that in Greece the broiler and broiler breeding holdings belong mostly to big companies with their own feed mills. The own-check testing is done for the production batches and in some cases also environmental samples and raw material are tested.

Cleaning and disinfection

Under the SNCPs after every production cycle a break of 15 days for broilers and 21 days for breeding and laying flocks is required for cleaning and disinfection. The audit team was informed that environmental samples are to be taken after cleaning and disinfection. The number of samples is decided by the person performing the sampling. Restocking of the houses is allowed only if satisfactory results are obtained.

The audit team noted in the farms visited that this rule had been respected and for one case when the waiting time was shorter than required, a penalty was imposed on the farmer.

Conclusions

Poultry farms are appropriately registered, under regular and well documented official supervision and biosecurity conditions were mostly satisfactory. However some deficiencies were noted in the performance of the official controls as deficiencies had not been detected or reported (e.g. inadequate *Salmonella* sampling frequency and breaches in biosecurity rules).

5.3 SNCP FOR BREEDING HENS

Legal basis

Regulation (EC) No 2160/2003 outlines how targets shall be established for the reduction of the prevalence of zoonosis, including *Salmonella*. The target for breeding hens has been fixed by Regulation (EC) No 200/2010. To achieve the targets, Member States have to implement a SNCP in breeding hens, including detailed sampling rules both for the FBO and for the official services. However, for those Member States whose SNCPs in breeding hens were approved in line with Regulation (EC) No 1003/2005, the provisions contained in the Annex of this earlier Regulation are still applicable.

Audit findings

Vaccination

SNCP for breeders states that birds can be vaccinated by using vaccine which has been approved by the Greek National Organisation for Medicine. In the farms visited the birds were vaccinated only during the rearing period.

General information

In the regions visited the SNCP for breeders had been implemented.

Under the SNCP for breeders, a flock is suspected under the following circumstances:

- when the presence of *Salmonella* spp. is detected during own-check or official sampling
- when *Salmonella* infection is suspected
- when S/T or S/E are identified at the hatchery.

When a flock is under suspicion, the eggs produced are kept and hatched separately from other eggs.

A flock is *Salmonella* positive when after serotyping S/T or S/E is confirmed. In such instances, birds and eggs are either destroyed by incineration or food derived from these products shall be heat treated (poultry meat and egg products).

The audit team was informed that when samples are taken on the farms there is no routine confirmatory sampling to exclude false positive or false negative results.

Under the Greek scheme samples for *Salmonella* testing are taken at the hatchery (all own-check samples and the official samples which are not taken on the farms). In one hatchery visited the sampling frequency for own-check sampling was every two weeks with samples taken from 1 m² of five randomly selected basket liners. The official sampling at this hatchery was carried out every 16 weeks for each breeding flock.

However in cases where the breeding hens holding does not have its own hatchery and eggs are hatched in a hatchery owned by another FBO, the check on the flock may be carried out either at the hatchery or at the breeding holding. In cases where the hatchery does the testing, the results are transmitted to the breeding holding which supplied the eggs.

During a visit to one breeder holding, the audit team saw evidence that the frequency of own-check sampling at the hatchery (owned by another FBO) where the eggs from this particular holding were incubated was in line with EU legislation.

The audit team reviewed one case which had tested positive for S/T at the hatchery under own-

check samples tested at a private laboratory. A positive result was found only for one flock out of three from this particular holding. The infected eggs were separated and restrictions on the flock were imposed. The result of official confirmatory sampling from the positive flock (three faeces together 300g) was negative and the trade restrictions were lifted. However one additional sampling was missing as point 2.2.2.2, Annex of Regulation (EC) No 200/2010 stipulates that "*after confirmatory sampling antimicrobial testing shall be carried out or new bacteriological testing for the presence of the relevant Salmonella serotypes if the source of infection is not confirmed*". In this case the CA did not find the source of *Salmonella* infection.

The audit team visited three broiler breeding holdings. In the farms visited, official sampling was done in accordance with EU legislation as regards frequency and sampling protocol. The own-check sampling was done in general correctly except the cases where one sampling was found missing in two holdings during a rearing phase.

The audit team reviewed also a case when S/T was identified in breeders following official sampling. After *Salmonella* spp. was identified the eggs at the hatchery from this specific flock were isolated. Restrictive measures such as slaughtering of birds and destroying the hatched eggs were imposed after S/T was isolated. The audit team visited this farm and noted that biosecurity measures were adequate. However at the time of sampling the situation was different and the official veterinarian had issued recommendations with a deadline for their implementation. Because of inadequate biosecurity conditions on the farm and non-respect of the time delay for the introduction of a new flock no compensation was granted to the farmer and a penalty was imposed.

Conclusions

The SNCP for breeders has been implemented in all regions visited in general in line with EU legislation. Some minor deficiencies were noted (sampling frequency for own-checks). Follow-up in the case of official positive *Salmonella* test results was in general satisfactory.

5.4 SNCP FOR LAYING HENS

Legal basis

Both Regulation (EC) No 2160/2003 and Regulation (EU) No 517/2011 lay down rules for the SNCP in laying hen populations of the Member States.

Audit Findings

Vaccination

In 2008 the prevalence of specific *Salmonella* strains in Greece was 25% and vaccination remains compulsory although in 2011 the prevalence was only 0.67%. The vaccine used must be from the list of approved vaccines. In the farms visited the flocks had been vaccinated twice during the rearing period.

General information

The SNCP for laying hens stipulates that, "*routine official sampling should be done in one flock per year per holding comprising at least 1,000 bird and should comprise three times 150g of faeces or three pairs of boot swabs*". In the two farms visited the audit team found that official sampling follows the sampling scheme as regards frequency and composition of the samples.

The protocol of the sampling scheme for own-check samples had been in general correctly

implemented. However in both holdings visited sampling at the age of 22-26 weeks was not carried out.

The audit team was informed that confirmatory sampling is not done on a routine basis but only if there is any reason to suspect false positive or false negative results.

The audit team reviewed the files of a small farm with two houses where S/E had been identified in one of the houses following official sampling. The official sampling for the second house showed negative result. Restrictive measures for the affected flock were applied - the birds were to be disposed of through incineration and eggs were sold as class B (to be heat treated). As not all the measures imposed by the CA were respected by the farmer (no evidence that all birds had been disposed of) compensation was not given and a penalty was imposed.

Conclusions

The SNCP for layers has been implemented with a sampling frequency in general respected except that the sampling at the age of 22-26 weeks was not carried out in all flocks.

The measures applied after *Salmonella* positive results are in line with EU legislation.

5.5 SNCP FOR BROILERS

Legal basis

Regulation (EC) No 2160/2003, Regulation (EC) No 646/2007 and Regulation (EC) No 200/2012 set rules for the SNCP in the broiler population of Member States.

Audit Findings

Implementation of the SNCP for broilers began on 13 March 2009.

According to the SNCP, official samples are taken in at least one flock of 10% of holdings with more than 5,000 broilers per year. The CA explained that the selection of holdings is risk based and the requirements for this selection are provided in national legislation. In the regions visited the frequency and sampling protocol (two pairs of boot swabs) were in line with EU legislation.

In two broiler farms visited only own-check sampling was done. The sampling protocol and the sampling frequency were in line with EU legislation. The information on *Salmonella* test results was included in the food chain information in the cases studied.

Conclusions

The SNCP for broilers is being implemented. The information about *Salmonella* test results is included in the information accompanying the flock to the slaughterhouse.

5.6 SNCP FOR TURKEY

Legal basis

Both Regulation (EC) No 2160/2003 and Regulation (EC) No 584/2008 set rules for the *Salmonella*

testing of turkeys.

Audit Findings

The audit team was informed that turkey production is only seasonal and mostly in the period leading up to Christmas.

The implementation of the programme started in 2010 but does not cover all flocks.

The audit team visited one turkey fattening farm where production started in 2012. The *Salmonella* test for the previous flock was in line with EU rules. Environmental samples were taken to check the effectiveness of cleaning and disinfection between flocks and tested for *Salmonella* spp., *E. coli* and *Staphylococcus aureus*.

According to the information received from the CA no specific *Salmonella* strains were detected in 2010 and 2011.

Conclusions

The SNCP for turkey is being implemented however not all flocks are covered by the programme.

5.7 RAPID ALERT SYSTEM FOR FOOD AND FEED FOLLOW UP

Legal basis

Article 50 of the Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 lays down the scope and procedures of RASFF, which are intended to provide the CAs with an effective tool for exchange of information on measures taken to ensure food safety.

Audit findings

Between 2010 and the date of the audit there were no RASFF notifications linked to poultry meat, poultry meat products or eggs.

5.8 LABORATORIES

Legal basis

Article 33 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 lays down the responsibilities and tasks of NRLs designated by the Member States.

Article 12 (2) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires CAs to only designate official laboratories that meet certain quality standards.

Additionally, Article 12 of Regulation (EC) No 2160/2003 lays down requirements for laboratories participating in control programmes, including the need to apply quality assurance systems and to participate in collaborative testing.

The relevant regulations for the different poultry populations lay down rules for the detection method (Annex D of ISO 6579) to be used in the context of SNCPs.

Audit findings

Official laboratories

Halkida Veterinary Laboratory is NRL for *Salmonella* and is accredited by Hellenic Accreditation System S.A. to ISO 17025.

This laboratory isolates *Salmonella* spp. in official samples and serotypes *Salmonella* spp. strains isolated from official and own-check samples. The reference methods used are in the scope of accreditation. At the moment the serotyping method for five specific *Salmonella* is accredited, but accreditation for all serotyping methods is in progress. At the moment the suspected strains of monophasic *typhimurium* are sent to the Public Health Laboratory for confirmation, but the NRL is developing its own method. From February 2012 tests for antimicrobial resistance are also in the scope of its accreditation.

The NRL participates in proficiency tests for *Salmonella* isolation and typing since 2010 with satisfactory results. Since 2011 poultry faeces were used as matrix and the frequency of proficiency tests was twice per year (EU Reference Laboratory for *Salmonella* and Veterinary Laboratory Agencies).

There is one official laboratory designated for *Salmonella* detection in official sampling. This laboratory is accredited to ISO 17025 by Hellenic Accreditation System S.A and the EN/ISO method used is in the scope of its accreditation. Proficiency tests have been organised every year by the NRL since 2009 with satisfactory results.

According to the internal laboratory procedures the information on a positive result is to be sent to the person in charge of sampling and to the Department of Zoonosis. The audit team saw the evidence that this procedure was followed.

A workshop was organised in 2009 by the NRL for the staff from official and private laboratories involved in *Salmonella* testing. Since then there have been no official training sessions. However, the audit team saw evidence that laboratory staff from private and official laboratories have participated individually in all day sessions to update their knowledge.

The audit team was informed that official routine samples for breeders taken on the farm are always faecal and comprise two sub-samples of 150g. The audit team noted while reviewing the test records that these two sub-samples are pooled into one sample with one result. This is not in line with point 2.2.2.1 (a), Annex of Regulation (EC) No 200/2010 which stipulates that "*faeces may be pooled for analysis up to a minimum of two pools*". The CA explained that there is an inconsistency in the EU legislation, namely in point 3.1.4. (a), Annex of Regulation (EC) No 200/2010 where it is stated that "*the faeces samples shall be pooled and thoroughly mixed*".

Private laboratory

In a 2012 Greek official circular there are conditions to be met by private laboratories to be included in the list of laboratories designated for *Salmonella* testing. Among others it is stated that a laboratory must be accredited and the method applied should be an ISO method.

The list of designated laboratories was established in 2010 and currently there are 24 laboratories designated by the CA for *Salmonella* testing with 19 accredited to ISO 17025 and five in the last stage of accreditation.

The audit team visited a private laboratory belonging to an establishment producing food products and performing *Salmonella* testing for own-check sampling.

The laboratory is accredited to ISO 17025 by Hellenic Accreditation System S.A. The first accreditation was granted in 2011 and is valid until 2015. The accreditation body visits the

laboratory every year.

The method used for *Salmonella* isolation is the correct one and is within the scope of accreditation. There are proficiency tests organised every year for this particular method since 2009 with satisfactory results. The first one using a faecal matrix was in 2010.

The audit team was informed that if *Salmonella* is isolated the strain is sent for serotyping to the NRL. The information about *Salmonella* positive results should be forwarded to the FBO and the regional CA.

In this laboratory there are procedures for the rejection of inadequate samples. The audit team saw evidence how a sample transported in an incorrect way was rejected.

The laboratory staff responsible for *Salmonella* sampling is trained on how the samples should be taken.

Conclusions

The laboratories involved in the SNCP are accredited or seeking accreditation and they use the reference method for *Salmonella* testing. They participate regularly in proficiency tests with satisfactory results. However, in the official laboratory, the number of sub-samples tested was not in line with EU requirements.

6 OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

In general the SNCP programmes are correctly implemented and cover all relevant poultry populations concerned. Official controls are implemented including regular and documented checks ensuring that food business operators implement these programmes. Only minor deficiencies were noted.

7 CLOSING MEETING

During the closing meeting held in Athens on 13 September 2012, the audit team presented the findings and preliminary conclusions of the audit to the CA.

The CCA representatives stated that they would take whatever actions were necessary in order to address the deficiencies found.

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

N°.	Recommendation
1.	The CCA should ensure that official controls at farms level are effective enough to detect deficiencies in the implementation of the SNCP and in biosecurity conditions in

N°.	Recommendation
	order to fulfil the requirements of Articles 4.2(a) and 9 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.
2.	The CCA should ensure that the number of sub-samples tested in adult breeding flocks is in line with the requirements of point 2.2.2.1(a), Annex of Regulation (EC) No 200/2010.
3.	The CA should ensure that the frequency of own-check sampling for laying hen flocks is implemented in line with the requirements of point 2.1, Annex of Regulation (EC) No 517/2011 especially at the age of 22-26 weeks.
4.	The CA should ensure that the SNCP for turkey flocks is implemented in all flocks of fattening and breeding turkey covered by the scope of Annex II, B of Regulation (EC) No 2160/2003.

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

http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/rep_details_en.cfm?rep_inspection_ref=2012-6430

ANNEX 1 - LEGAL REFERENCES

Legal Reference	Official Journal	Title
Dir. 2009/158/EC	OJ L 343, 22.12.2009, p. 74-113	Council Directive 2009/158/EC of 30 November 2009 on animal health conditions governing intra-Community trade in, and imports from third countries of, poultry and hatching eggs
Reg. 178/2002	OJ L 31, 1.2.2002, p. 1-24	Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2002 laying down the general principles and requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Safety Authority and laying down procedures in matters of food safety
Reg. 2160/2003	OJ L 325, 12.12.2003, p. 1-15	Regulation (EC) No 2160/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 November 2003 on the control of salmonella and other specified food-borne zoonotic agents
Reg. 852/2004	OJ L 139, 30.4.2004, p. 1, Corrected and re-published in OJ L 226, 25.6.2004, p. 3	Regulation (EC) No 852/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the hygiene of foodstuffs
Reg. 183/2005	OJ L 35, 8.2.2005, p. 1-22	Regulation (EC) No 183/2005 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 January 2005 laying down requirements for feed hygiene
Reg. 646/2007	OJ L 151, 13.6.2007, p. 21-25	Commission Regulation (EC) No 646/2007 of 12 June 2007 implementing Regulation (EC) No 2160/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards a Community target for the reduction of the prevalence of Salmonella enteritidis and Salmonella typhimurium in broilers and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1091/2005
Reg. 584/2008	OJ L 162, 21.6.2008, p. 3-8	Commission Regulation (EC) No 584/2008 of 20 June 2008 implementing Regulation (EC) No 2160/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards a Community target for the reduction of the prevalence of Salmonella enteritidis and Salmonella typhimurium in turkeys

Legal Reference	Official Journal	Title
Reg. 200/2010	OJ L 61, 11.3.2010, p. 1-9	Commission Regulation (EU) No 200/2010 of 10 March 2010 implementing Regulation (EC) No 2160/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards a Union target for the reduction of the prevalence of Salmonella serotypes in adult breeding flocks of Gallus gallus
Reg. 517/2011	OJ L 138, 26.5.2011, p. 45-51	Commission Regulation (EU) No 517/2011 of 25 May 2011 implementing Regulation (EC) No 2160/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards a Union target for the reduction of the prevalence of certain Salmonella serotypes in laying hens of Gallus gallus and amending Regulation (EC) No 2160/2003 and Commission Regulation (EU) No 200/2010
Reg. 200/2012	OJ L 71, 9.3.2012, p. 31-36	Commission Regulation (EU) No 200/2012 of 8 March 2012 concerning a Union target for the reduction of Salmonella enteritidis and Salmonella typhimurium in flocks of broilers, as provided for in Regulation (EC) No 2160/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council