EUROPEAN COMMISSION
HEALTH AND CONSUMERS DIRECTORATE-GENERAL

Directorate F - Food and Veterinary Office

DG(SANCO) 2013-6865 - MR FINAL

FINAL REPORT OF AN AUDIT

CARRIED OUT IN

CHILE

FROM 18 FEBRUARY TO 01 MARCH 2013

IN ORDER TO EVALUATE THE SYSTEM OF CONTROLS OVER THE PRODUCTION OF FRESH BEEF, OVINE AND PORCINE MEAT, MEAT PRODUCTS AND CASINGS DESTINED FOR EXPORT TO THE EU, AS WELL AS CERTIFICATION PROCEDURES

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

Executive Summary

The report describes the outcome of an audit carried out by the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) in Chile from 18 February to 1 March 2013. The objectives of the audit were to evaluate the official controls in place for the export of fresh beef, ovine and porcine meat, meat products and casings destined for export to the European Union (EU) and certification procedures as well as the follow-up actions taken by the Chilean Central Competent Authority (CCA) in response to the recommendations of the previous FVO report (ref. DG(SANCO)/2011-6124.

The structure of the Competent Authority (CA), its powers and authority of enforcement have not changed since 2011. Some new legislation and instructions have been issued, in addition to the detailed and documented control procedures already in place; however, the regional and local CAs systematically failed to use appropriate enforcement powers in relation to the relevant deficiencies noted in the supervision of EU eligible (PABCO – Planteles Animales Bajo Control Oficial – Animal Holdings Under Official Control)) holdings. The PABCO system, intended to guarantee that holdings for porcine and ovine animals, their meat and their products fulfils the sanitary requirements and the good husbandry practices required. The PABCO A system (specifically designed for bovine holdings and animals) as well as the bovine central database (SIPEC), however, confirmed the weaknesses detected during the previous audit.

During the audit, significant deficiencies were identified in the PABCO A system, which was found not to be a reliable tool to ensure that only EU eligible animals are kept in eligible holdings and slaughtered for the EU market:

- *the SIPEC database is not updated, or consulted during official supervision on PABCO A holdings. Many bovine animals identified in 2008 and 2010 were never registered in the SIPEC database;*
- *the supervision carried out by the authorised veterinarians on PABCO A holdings was not effective in detecting the deficiencies noted by the FVO audit team: no physical verification is carried out of the animal identification process, reading of ear-tags is not carried out, no examinations take place to confirm that ear-tags are present or whether the animals are registered in the database, no verification is carried out on whether the animal numbers notified as being present on a holding match with those actually located in that holding and loaded in the holding register;*
- *the supervision carried out by the CA over the performance of the authorised veterinarians is also not effective in verifying the appropriateness and efficacy of their activities;*
- *the controls on the purchase, the use and the remaining stock of official ear-tags is not carried out by the CAs or the authorised veterinarians;*
- *EU eligible animals can be moved without being accompanied by the movement document required by the national legislation. Thus, the movement is not registered in the SIPEC database and the animals could be physically located in an unknown holding.*

The CAs met during the audit stated that, in case of discrepancies or doubts regarding data originating from the SIPEC, data provided by holding registers are considered as reliable to support information to assess the EU eligibility of animals. However, deficiencies were also noted in such documentation. The list of establishments producing food for export to the EU was not updated since the last audit in 2011, and several discrepancies were noted among activities no longer carried out or establishments having ceased activities, but still remaining on the list. This questions the capacity of the CA to keep under constant review the approvals. The food establishments visited were found to be in principle in line with the relevant EU rules, but a number of deficiencies including three major non conformities found by the FVO audit team were not identified by the CAs despite frequent documented visits or/and numerous veterinary staff.

Most of the findings noted above have already been mentioned in the 2011 audit report.

A number of recommendations have been made to the CA with a view to addressing the deficiencies identified during this audit.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations and definitions used in this report

Abbreviation	Explanation
ABP	Animal By-Product
CA(s)	Competent Authority(ies)
CCA(s)	Central Competent Authority(ies)
DG(SANCO)	Health & Consumers Directorate General
DPP	*Division de Proteccion Pecuaria* (Division of Livestock Protection), the branch of SAG responsible for official controls in establishments and holdings
EU	European Union
FBO(s)	Food Business Operator(s)
FMA	*Formulario de Movimento Animal* – Movement Document
FVO	Food and Veterinary Office
HACCP	Hazard Analysis of Critical Control Points
Hygiene Package	Regulations (EC) No 852/2004, No 853/2004 and No 854/2004
LEEPP	*Listado de Establecimientos Exportadores de Productos Pecuarios*
MVA	*Medico Veterinario Autorizado* (authorised veterinarian)
MVO	*Medico veterinario Oficial* (official veterinarian)
PABCO	*Planteles de Animales Bajo Certificación Oficial* (Animal Premises Under Official Certification)
PABCO A	*Planteles de Animales Bajo Certification Oficial Nivel A* (Animal Premises Under Official Certification for bovine animals)
RUP	*Rol Unico Pecuario* – RUP number
SAG	*Servicio Agricola y Ganadero* (Agriculture and Livestock Service) – The CCA
SEREMI	*Secretarrías Regionales Ministeriales de Salud*
SH	Slaughterhouse
SIPEC	Chilean Bovine Central Database

1 Introduction

The audit took place in Chile from 18 February to 1 March 2013 as part of the planned audit programme of the FVO. The audit team comprised three auditors from the FVO and one National Expert from a Member State.

The FVO audit team was accompanied by representatives from the CCA, the Agriculture and Livestock Service (*Servicio Agricola y Ganadero - SAG*), in particular its Livestock Protection Division (*Division de Proteccion Pecuaria - DPP)*.

The opening meeting was held on 18 February 2013 with the CCA in Santiago. At this meeting the FVO audit team confirmed the objectives of, and itinerary for the audit, and additional information required for the satisfactory completion of the audit was requested.

2 Objectives

The objectives of the audit were to follow-up actions taken by the Chilean CCA in response to the recommendations of the previous FVO report (ref. DG(SANCO)/2011-6124 and to evaluate the official controls related to production and storage of food of animal origin in Chile and imports to the EU with regard to:

- CA organisation and operation;
- official controls over food business operators' (FBO) compliance with general and specific rules on the hygiene of food of animal origin; and
- the correct implementation of the chain of certification,

In particular, controls over fresh beef, ovine and porcine meat, meat products and casings in the framework of Regulations (EC) No 178/2002, No 852/2004, No 853/2004, No 854/2004 and No 882/2004 were subject to this evaluation. In pursuit of these objectives, the audit itinerary included the following:

COMPETENT AUTHORITIES			Comments
Competent Authorities	Central		
	Regional		
	Local		
FOOD PRODUCTION / PROCESSING / DISTRIBUTION – ACTIVITIES			
Slaughterhouses		6	2 ovine, 1 bovine and 3 porcine slaughterhouses
Cutting premises		7	6 combined with the slaughterhouses visited, 1 standing alone
Casing establishments		2	
Meat products establishments		1	One establishment producing cured hams
Cold stores		7	6 combined with the slaughterhouses visited, 1 standing alone

COMPETENT AUTHORITIES		Comments
Laboratories	3	Laboratories, located in slaughterhouses, for examination of *Trichinella spp.*
Animal holdings	5	2 ovine, 2 bovine and 1 pig holdings

3 Legal Basis

The audit was carried out under the general provisions of provisions of:

- the Agreement on Sanitary and Phytosanitary measures applicable to trade in animals and animal products, plants, plant products and other goods and animal welfare – hereafter Agreement - (Annex IV of the Association Agreement between the European Union and its Member States of the one part and the Republic of Chile of the other part). The Association Agreement was approved by the Community with Council Decision 2005/269/EC in February 2005.

- EU legislation and, in particular Article 46 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules.

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

4 Background

The previous audit concerning the safety of food of animal origin in Chile was carried out from 14 to 24 February 2011, the results of which are described in report DG(SANCO)/2011-6124 – MR Final. This report is accessible at: http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/index_en.cfm

The action plan received from the Chilean authorities in response to the report's recommendations provided satisfactory guarantees in relation to 5 out of 6 recommendations and an unsatisfactory response to Recommendation No 1.

Details of the recommendations and of the CCA's response are given in the relevant sections of this report.

According to data provided by the CCA, in 2012 Chile has exported 624 tonnes of beef, 2 000 tonnes of sheep meat, 3 970 tonnes of pork and 3 345 tonnes of casings to the EU.

5 Findings And Conclusions

5.1 Legislation and Competent Authorities

5.1.1 Legal basis

Article 46.1 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 stipulates that official controls by Commission experts in third countries shall verify compliance or equivalence of third country legislation and

systems with EU feed and food law, and EU animal health legislation. These controls shall have particular regard to points (a) to (e) and (g) of the aforementioned Article.

Point 1.2 of the Appendix VII to the Agreement outlines that verification should be designed to check the effectiveness of the auditee.

Art. 8(1) of the Agreement stipulates that for the products of animal origin the import conditions of importing Party shall be applicable to the total territory of the exporting Party.

Article 5 of the Agreement defines the responsible authorities as follows:

1.The CAs of the Parties are the authorities competent for the implementation of the measures referred to in this Agreement, as provided for in Appendix II, namely the Ministry of Agriculture through the SAG.

2.The Parties shall, in accordance with Article 12, inform each other of any significant changes in the structure, organisation and division of competency of their CAs.

Point 4(d) of Part B of Appendix V to the Agreement outlines that the verification concerns the structure and organisation of the CA as well as the powers available regarding the implementation of importing Party's rules.

5.1.2 Findings

5.1.2.1 Legislation

Observations:

The relevant national laws, regulations and administrative provisions considered by the CCA to provide guarantees equivalent to the EU legislation have been described in detail in the previous reports.

Since the last FVO audit in 2011, several provisions have been issued and published in order to address some of the recommendations of the 2011 report. They are listed in the relevant sections of this report.

The differences between the Chilean legislation and the requirements of the EU legislation governing fresh meat identified during the previous audit concerning the "National Pathogen Reduction Programme" microbiological carcass testing (not covering all the same organisms and the same procedure as included in Regulation (EC) No 2073/2005) are still ongoing. The process for seeking recognition of equivalence with EU requirements has not yet been finalised.

5.1.2.2 Competent Authorities

5.1.2.2.1 Organisation of Competent Authorities

Observations:

The organisation of the CA remains as described in the previous report, except for the fact that two new administrative regions (and thus, two new regional offices of SAG) have been created.

5.1.2.2.2 Competent Authorities powers, independence and authority for enforcement

Observations:

There is a system in place to allow the implementation and enforcement of the requirements in regard to the production and certification of meat to the EU. Nevertheless the FVO audit team noted that the Regional and local CAs were not making appropriate use of their powers and authority for enforcement, especially in the field of traceability of live animals (see 5.2.2).

5.1.2.2.3 Supervision

Observations:

The CCA (DPP) carries out audits of the regions on an annual basis. They include the evaluation of the performance at two levels: the Regional staff (regional supervisor or other regional staff appointed) and the local team working in the establishments with a permanent veterinary presence (official veterinarians and auxiliaries) in the slaughterhouses (SHs). In general at least one export establishment is included in the audit. Ten regions (out of fifteen) were audited in 2012, the procedures for inspection and approval of establishments for export were checked in nine of them; in three regions certification procedures and approval of livestock holdings were also audited. However, this did not prevent the deficiencies mentioned in points 5.2.2 and 5.4.2 from occurring.

In the 2013 audit programme there is a plan to audit twelve regions, ten are for inspection and approval of establishments for export, three for certification procedures and four for approval of livestock holdings.

The regional level, through the regional supervisors, regularly checks the performance of the team permanently present in the SHs; evidence was seen of such activities, related to compliance with residue monitoring programmes, check on compliance of Hazard Analysis Critical Control Points (HACCP)-based programmes, hygiene requirements, animal welfare, etc. with the national legislation and instructions. In some cases the General Export and EU check-lists were used in joint inspections with the local team to assess the general compliance of the establishments with the national and EU requirements.

The local CA on the spot is primarily involved in carrying out a complete annual overview of the approved plants based on a General Export check-list and, but not always, on the EU check-list (see 5.4.2). In addition, daily based supervision, in general well documented, is performed to ensure that the requirements of the hygiene package are implemented at establishment level during EU production.

The FVO audit team identified different situations where the official authority in charge of an establishment was performing the general reviews in a purely mechanical way, thus making the reliability of these general reviews questionable (see 5.5.2.8). In other cases the specific check-lists for reviewing the EU eligibility of the establishments had not been used on an annual basis.

5.1.2.2.4 Training of staff in performance of official controls

Observations:

The CCA informed the FVO audit team that training programmes are in place covering different topics including those relating to EU approval. Training courses for official veterinarians at regional level in the first half of 2011 were also held with the aim of improving traceability monitoring and the use of veterinary medicine in the PABCO programme. Nevertheless this did not prevent the deficiencies mentioned in points 5.2.2, 5.4.2 and 5.5.2.4 from occurring.

5.1.2.2.5 Resources

Observations:

Only the SAG official staff (official veterinarians (MVOs) and official auxiliaries) are involved in official controls of establishments and certification. No staff shortages were noticed by the FVO audit team at establishments level.

Authorised veterinarians (MVAs) carry out controls on holdings under the "*Programma de Planteles Animales bajo Certification Official* (PABCO)" , with the exception of the Magallanes Region, where the SAG is solely involved (see also point 5.2.2). With regard to PABCO A system (specifically designed for bovine animals), one Regional CA stated that there was insufficient official staff to carry out supervision of MVAs and to feed the SIPEC database; this region arranged tenders for such services with private companies on an annual basis (see 5.2.2). The FVO audit team did not notice any shortage of staff at the level of services involved in animal traceability for ovine animals.

In one pig holding visited one of the two MVAs in charge of the official supervision was the son of the owner; the CAs stated that in Chile only one similar case exists. The CCA stated that no conflict of interest was considered, as currently there is no policy for dealing with it.

5.1.2.2.6 Organisation of control systems

Observations:

The SAG staff at different levels register, supervise and monitor the establishments approved to export to the EU and the certification of their products.

5.1.2.2.7 Documented control procedures

Observations:

An extensive set of control procedures is in place, and also proper documented instructions, check-lists and manuals of procedures could be seen in the different regions visited. Nevertheless as already mentioned, this did not prevent the occurrence of deficiencies.

5.1.2.2.8 Official controls on imports

The FVO audit team was informed that appropriate legislation/instructions/procedures are in place including border controls. The implementation of these legislation/instructions/procedures was not evaluated during the current audit.

5.1.3 Conclusions

The legislation in place, the structure of the CA, its powers and authority for enforcement are satisfactory. Trained staff resources are available and detailed control procedures are in place. Nevertheless these control procedures are sometimes mechanically implemented without taking into account the current reality in the establishments evaluated.

As already identified in the previous audit in 2011, in several cases the regional and local CAs failed to use their powers of enforcement appropriately against animal holdings when non-compliances had been detected.

5.2 HOLDING REGISTRATION, ANIMAL IDENTIFICATION

5.2.1 Legal Requirements

The veterinary certification requirements for the introduction into the EU of fresh meat are laid down in Regulation (EU) No 206/2010. Point II.2 of the model certificates, in Part 2 of Annex II to the Regulation, sets out the animal health requirements to be met, including the requirement for the CA to have systems in place for holding registration and animal identification and movement controls for bovine animals.

5.2.2 Findings

In response to Recommendation No 1 of the previous report (*To improve the PABCO A system and its official controls to guarantee that all bovine animals slaughtered for the EU fulfil the requirements laid down in Regulation (EU) No 206/2010*) the CCA stated that the derogation permitting the non-identification of male calves originating from dairy holdings was abolished. In addition, the bovine database has improved (purchase of ear-tags could be validated within the system) and Resolution N° 5895 was published on 13 October 2012 to improve the Official Programme for Animal Traceability. The CCA response was assessed by the FVO as satisfactory, with verification needed on-the-sport during the following FVO audit to Chile.

As already noted in the previous reports, specific legislation is put in place to guarantee that animals fulfil the specific requirements for export to the EU. The PABCO system guarantees that the holdings for bovine, porcine and ovine animals, their meat and their products fulfil the sanitary requirements and the good husbandry practices required by the countries of destination. A specific system called PABCO A has been designed for bovine animals. This separate system should ensure that animals are kept in holdings which are not authorised to use growth promoters prohibited by EU legislation.

The national instructions require that all EU eligible animals have to be kept on the PABCO holdings for their entire lives; such PABCO holdings are regularly inspected by authorised veterinarians, who are supervised by the official veterinarians. The documentation accompanying the animals, the status of the holdings and the ear-tags must be checked in the slaughterhouses and this information should be cross-checked with the information kept in the SIPEC database.

Some legal provisions have been issued or amended since the last FVO audit. In particular:

- *Resolution N° 5895* of 13 October 2012 (amending *Resolution N° 3423/2008*) prescribes that all movements of animals should be accompanied by a movement document (FMA – *Formulario de Movimento Animal*), that animal tagging must be supervised by MVAs and that the animal identification ear-tag number must be entered into the SIPEC within 15 working days of being applied to the animal;

- *Law for the prevention of livestock rustling* of 18 June 2012: makes it compulsory for each movement of farmed animals to be issued with a FMA in order to improve the traceability of livestock and foresees fines for non-compliances;

- modification of the *Instruction for PABCO dairy holdings* in September 2011: the derogation from the ear-tagging of male animals coming from PABCO dairy holdings (irrespective of their age of slaughter) is no longer granted;

- *Resolution N° 4577* of 3 August 2012 (amending *Resolutions N° 3366* and *3685* of 1999) establishes specific requirements for the programmes of pre-requisites and HACCP for the implementation of quality assurance. It stipulates, in particular, that the FBO is obliged to implement a traceability system and the CA is obliged to verify it.

Porcine holdings

The porcine holding visited by the FVO audit team had a satisfactory documented system for recording medical treatments and animal movements.

Ovine holdings

In one region visited, where ovine production is predominant, one PABCO number could cover two or more holdings with different geographical locations and with different holding's unique registration number (*Rol Unico Pecuario* - *RUP* number), belonging to the same owner. New instructions have been issued in 2012 by the CCA, requiring a PABCO number to be clearly linked to well identified holdings (thus with well identified RUP numbers), with the aim of improving the traceability of animals through a better control of animal movements; the Regional CA met stated that a process of updating is on-going, but so far only 20-30% of the holdings concerned have been properly identified in the SIPEC database. The same CA stated that 1 PABCO number in the region can still include up to 13 different holdings and RUPs.

One of the two ovine holdings visited by the FVO audit team had satisfactory documentation kept on site. In the other one, however, the single PABCO number included three different RUPs and holdings (one located 80 km from the holding center): the movements of EU eligible ovine animals between such holdings were not accompanied by FMAs and consequently were not registered in SIPEC.

Bovine holdings

Significant shortcomings (with the exception of holding registration) were noted in relation to the management of the PABCO A system for bovine animals:

Holding registration

In the region visited, where beef production is the predominant activity, each EU eligible holding had received a PABCO number, linked with their unique RUP number, according to the 2012 instructions from the CCA.

Animal identification

According to the CCA instructions, an animal will be legally identified as long as it bears only one ear-tag; it is not compulsory to replace one lost ear-tag. In one holding visited 43% of the animals had lost one of the two elements of their identification. The farmer may put a new set of ear-tags on an animal that has lost both ear-tags without having to demonstrate that the animal was EU eligible and previously present on his holding. According to *Resolution N° 5895*, the replacement of ear-tags should now be performed under the supervision of the MVAs, with the new ear-tag number being entered into the SIPEC database within 15 working days together with the link to the previous ear-tag number. However this was not the case in the two bovine holdings visited, where a sheet establishing a link between a lost ear-tag and a new one was only very recently established (not one of the six re-identified animals was entered into the SIPEC database at the time of the visit).

Animals identified with official ear-tags were still not entered into the SIPEC database; this relevant backlog exists concerning animals identified since 2008. As a consequence, these animals are unknown in the SIPEC database, while registered in the holding register; the CAs stated, however, that those animals are not traceable and thus not EU eligible. In one bovine holding visited, 19 out of 28 adult bovine animals checked by the FVO audit team were unknown in the SIPEC. However, the same CAs stated, later on, that in case of discrepancies between data supplied by the SIPEC database and the animals physically brought to the slaughterhouse, the data of the holding registers prevail.

The management of ear-tags before being applied to bovine animals do not ensure their full traceability, and no verification is carried out in relation to the buying, the using and the remaining stock of ear-tags. The records in the SIPEC database of all ear-tags allocated to a given holding was one of the commitments made by the CCA following the FVO audit in 2011: however, this could not be demonstrated at either CCA or at regional CA levels.

Movement controls

Significant delays of up to several weeks occur between the departure of the animals from the holding, the notification of this off movement (that should be < 5 days) and the registration of the movements in the SIPEC database. There are no sanctions for not respecting the deadlines.

A limited amount of FMAs (less than 20%) is entered into the SIPEC database in electronic form by the farmers, and made immediately available.

In both bovine holdings visited movements of EU eligible bovine animals were carried out between different holdings belonging to the same owners without any FMA, resulting in animals whose

current location is unknown and could possibly be at a non-PABCO holding. The movement of bovine animals without FMAs is not in compliance with the requirements of *Law 20.596* and *Resolution N° 5895***,** however, no evidence of any sanction imposed on non-compliant farmers could be presented to the FVO audit team in the region visited.

Important differences (up to 20% of the stock, 176 animals, in one case) were noted at the holdings visited between the number of animals that, according to data provided by the SIPEC database, should be present at the holding and those physically present at the time of the audit.

Animal database

The SIPEC database has only a few verification tools built in to validate the data introduced, leading to numerous weaknesses and deficiencies which further reduces its efficiency; in particular, the SIPEC database does not ensure controls on ear-tags allocated to a given holding, and does not flag delayed notifications. Some improvements are planned in the future.

A significant backlog, of up to five years exists concerning registration within the SIPEC database of previously identified animals. The CA of the region visited stated that a shortage of staff does not allow the SAG offices to enter the relevant amount of data notified by farmers: in that region 18 000 blank movement notification forms were distributed to farmers only in December 2012. As a result, the introduction of data into the SIPEC database has been delegated to private companies and a tender is organised every year. The procedure takes a couple of months during which time data is not entered into the SIPEC.

The same regional CA met stated that the SIPEC is currently not reliable and it does not ensure traceability of bovine animals, and that holdings' records are used to support the EU eligibility of bovine animals, instead.

Official controls at holding level

The PABCO holdings are checked every three or six months, depending on the species, by MVAs. In turn, MVAs are regularly supervised by the SAG officials: the CAs met stated that the minimum level of supervision is one supervisory visit per year and per animal species for which the MVA is authorised to carry out official tasks. In the Magellanes region only SAG officials are in charge of supervision of the PABCO holdings.

The performance of MVAs was checked by the FVO audit team during their visits to the holdings, and significant deficiencies were noted:

- no proper controls were carried out to ensure that the number of animals would match those notified in the database and those listed in the farm registers;

- no control activities were carried out to ensure that the number of animals present between two consecutive censuses would match with the movements in-out occurring during the same period (due to movements, births and deaths). Differences of up to 20% of the animals deemed to be present at the holding were identified between the two consecutive census and movement notifications;

- no single physical verification was carried out on the ear-tagging process. In particular, no reading of ear-tags that are on the the animals is carried out. There is also no examination of

a certain number of animals to see if ear-tags are present;

- no verification is made on the stock of ear-tags allocated to the holdings, or on the conditions of their use and registration;

- no verification is carried out to check that all movements of animals are accompanied by the FMAs, as required by the national legislation.

The system of verification of the performance of authorised veterinarians by the SAG officials did not detect the relevant and obvious deficiencies noted by the FVO audit team. The SAG officials used the same check-lists used by the MVAs, without inquiring about how to evaluate the efficiency and efficacy of their controls.

The regional CAs met were reluctant to apply any kind of sanctions foreseen by the national legislation to farmers and MVAs when non-compliances were detected.

Controls on EU eligibility of animals at slaughterhouse level

When checked at the SH, the database does not ensure traceability of all animals brought to the premises; in this case the FBO operating the SH contacts the CA's office, who in turn asks the farmer for clarification. This means that the whole system of bovine traceability relies on the registers kept by farmers.

In a bovine SH visited, all bovine carcasses coming from animals originating from PABCO farms were preliminarily approved as EU eligible. The CA declared that their real eligibility was checked afterwards. Two carcasses declared and health marked as EU eligible, located among other carcasses that were not EU-eligible, were verified later, at the FVO audit team's request, and were found not to be EU eligible. No written procedures could be provided to prove that such verifications took place on a regular basis and that they were supervised by the CA.

Records of medical veterinary treatments

Mass treatments were not linked to identified bovine animals and “off label” treatments with phenylbutazone to cattle had, according to the register seen in one holding, no withdrawal periods. The National Residues Monitoring Plan includes testing for phenylbutazone since 2003; however, it is unclear how the measures in place are able to prevent the presence of such residues in fresh meat and products exported to the EU, since MVAs do not identify treatments with phenylbutazone as a risk factor for targeting sampling.

5.2.3 Conclusions

The PABCO system is intended by the CCA to provide the guarantees that animals slaughtered for EU export fulfils the EU requirements. However, as already identified in the previous audit in 2011, this system is currently unable to ensure that only EU eligible bovine animals are slaughtered for the EU market. The weak supervision on PABCO holdings and the relevant shortcomings identified by the FVO audit team at holding and slaughterhouse levels make this system unreliable for ensuring traceability of bovine animals and their certification as EU eligible animals.

Only a few shortcomings were found in relation to traceability of ovine animals, and none concerning porcine animals.

Evidence of treatments of cattle with phenylbutazone was collected during the audit; although the National Residues Monitoring Plan includes testing for phenylbutazone, treatment of EU eligible bovine animals does not seem to be considered a risk factor for targeting sampling.

5.3 Laboratory services

5.3.1 Legal Requirements

The veterinary certification requirements for the introduction into the EU of fresh meat are laid down in Regulation (EU) No 206/2010. Point II.1 of the model certificates, in Part 2 of Annex II to the Regulation, sets out the public health requirements to be met. These include the requirement to satisfy the relevant microbiological criteria set out in Regulation (EC) No 2073/2005, the special guarantees concerning Salmonella for consignments to Finland and Sweden, and the specific rules on official controls for Trichinella set out in Regulation (EC) No 2075/2005.

5.3.2 Findings

5.3.2.1 Laboratories testing microbiological criteria for foodstuffs

As already mentioned at point 5.1.2.1, the "National Pathogen Reduction Programme" for microbiological carcass testing does not cover all the same organisms and the same procedure as included in Regulation (EC) No 2073/2005; however, when checked by the FVO audit team in the establishments visited, the national procedure was followed and no deficiencies were noted.

Although the CCA, following the FVO audit in 2011, had informed all FBOs of the need to have all results of testing of potable water in line with the requirements of Council Directive 98/83/EC, in one establishment visited the methods used for testing potable water could not demonstrate the absence of *E. coli* and *Enterococci* in 100 ml of potable water but rather the probability that the numbers of *E. coli* and *Enteroccci* were below 1,8 and 2 per 100 ml respectively.

A different approach was noted for water testing in two establishments both using municipal water. In one establishment, water was tested according to national parameters (official Chilean norm Agua potable NCH 409/1). The microbiological parameters checked were tested for *Enterococci*, Total Coliforms, *E. coli* and Clostridium Perfringens. In another establishment also Colony count 37C and 22C, Pseudomonas Aeruginosa and Coliforms were regularly checked and compliance with the requirements of Council Directive 98/93/EC was clearly indicated in the procedures. The methods used were not those indicated in Annex III to the Council Directive 98/93/EC but the CA stated that validation of methods is done by the National Institute for Standardisation.

5.3.2.2 Laboratories for Trichinella testing

In response to Recommendation No 6 of the previous report (*To ensure the procedure used for Trichina testing is in line with the requirements of Commission Regulation (EC) No 2075/2005)* the CCA stated that the regional and local CAs were informed by fax about EU requirements which were not covered by Chilean legislation, in order that they could be immediately implemented.

The procedures for the testing of pig meat for *Trichinella* were checked in the pig SHs visited, and no major shortcomings were detected. In one SH the storage temperature of the pepsine was not in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations.

All in-house laboratories but one visited, participated with satisfactory results, in the evaluation of their expertise which was carried out by experts from the Ministry of Health, who provided *Trichinella* positive samples. One in-house laboratory did not participate in any performance test, nor had it a procedure to deal with possible suspicions.

5.3.3 Conclusions

A few deviations from EU requirements for the testing of potable water was noted. Not all laboratories authorised to perform testing for *Trichinella* were assessed for their competence.

5.4 LISTING OF ESTABLISHMENTS

5.4.1 Legal requirements

Article 12 of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 requires that products of animal origin may be imported into the EU only if they have been dispatched from, and obtained or prepared in, establishments that appear on lists drawn up, kept up-to-date and communicated to the Commission.

5.4.2 Findings

In response to Recommendation No 1 of the previous report (*To confirm the action taken or intended to be taken concerning the two establishments which did not fulfil EU requirements, as contained in the Hygiene package)* the CCA delisted the two establishments from the EU Export list and notified such delistings to the Commission services.

In response to Recommendation No 2 of the previous report (*To review all other establishments currently listed for EU approval to confirm their compliance with the requirements of the Hygiene package as required by Article 12 of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004*) the CCA stated that, with a deadline of June 2011, all regional and local CAs were required to review the EU approved establishments and to notify the CCA about their compliance with the requirements of the Hygiene package, as required by Article 12 of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004.

A comprehensive approval procedure is laid down in the Regulation on the administration of sanitary registration and enrolment for food establishments for export; each establishment is first approved by the SEREMI (Secretarías Regionales Ministeriales de Salud), then listed in the general Export list (*Listado de Establecimientos Exportadores de Productos Pecuarios – LEEPP*) by the SAG, and then further specifically approved for export to the EU.

There is a legal obligation to fill in the LEEPP check-list annually; however, the same obligation did not exist until very recently for the EU check-list. *DPP Instruction* No. 120 of 15 February 2013 requires the verification of compliance with EU requirements in EU listed establishments' reports

by the specific EU check-list (once a year for exporting establishments, every four months for establishments that had no export to the EU for at least one year).

In addition, in the framework of the internal audit programme of the CCA, Regional CAs are audited: ten Regional CAs (out of fifteen) were audited in 2012. The procedures for inspection and approval of establishments for export were checked in nine of them. At least one export establishment was included in each audit, but this did not prevent the deficiencies noted in the listing of establishments seen by the FVO audit team from occurring.

During the preparation of the audit, the FVO audit team (and the CCA) identified significant changes in the EU approved establishments which were not reflected in the list of premises authorised for export to the EU: one plant destroyed by a fire in 2010 was still listed, several others plants were not operating or exporting for more than two years (and should have been delisted according to the national instructions), while activities which were stopped in other establishments were still mentioned on the list. The CCA only notified the Commission services three days before the start of the FVO audit. At the opening meeting, the CCA also stated that the list of EU approved establishments is now updated and reflects entirely the current status of all listed premises.

In establishments visited where the approval procedure was checked by the FVO audit team, the different steps were followed and the LEEPP and EU check-lists were used. In the cold store and the visited cutting plant approved for export to the EU (but in the process of being delisted at the FBO's request), however, the check-list specifically designed for evaluating EU compliance has not been used in the last four years. In the same establishment neither the CAs nor the FBO had the *Resolution* approving the plant for export to the EU (this was later provided by the CCA headquarters). The cutting activities ceased in 2010, but this was not noted in the local CA reports until July 2011. The local CA stated that there is no obligation for the FBOs running the establishments to inform the CA about ceased activities.

In one casing establishment visited the approval document did not mention the processing of horse intestines, although horse intestines were processed and the FBO had requested such approval since 2009.

5.4.3 Conclusions

The system in place to approve establishments for EU export is acceptable but its implementation shows weaknesses and questions the ability of the CAs to keep under constant review the approval of establishments listed for export to the EU. Some of these weaknesses were already identified during the previous audit in 2011.

5.5 Official controls at establishment level

5.5.1 Legal requirements

Article 12 of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 lays down that the CA of a third country of origin has to guarantee that establishments placed on the list of establishments from which imports of specified products of animal origin to the EU are permitted, together with any establishments handling raw material of animal origin used in the manufacture of the products of animal origin concerned, complies with relevant EU requirements, in particular those of Regulation (EC) No 853/2004, or with requirements that were determined to be equivalent. It also lays down that an official

inspection service supervises the establishments and has real powers to stop the establishments from exporting to the EU in the event that the establishments fail to meet the relevant requirements.

5.5.2 Findings

In response to Recommendation No 4 of the previous report *(To improve the official controls carried out at establishment level to better detect deficiencies in relation to the general and specific hygiene requirements contained in the Hygiene package)* the CCA stated that training courses for local official inspections teams would have been held in the second half of 2011, and that greater emphasis would have been placed on the application of hygiene requirements of the Hygiene package, as part of the CCA's inspection activities at the regional and local levels.

5.5.2.1 Ante-mortem inspection

In all SHs but two visited, the ante-mortem inspection was generally carried out as required and well documented. In one pig SH visited, some incomplete data could not explain what happened to detained animals. In the bovine SH visited the ear-tags were not cross-checked with the FMA, but only with the killing list prepared by the FBO.

5.5.2.2 Post-mortem inspection

In all but two of the establishments visited, the post-mortem inspections were carried out correctly and documented. Nevertheless in one bovine SH, the internal pterygoideus muscles were not cut to search for *cysticercosis* lesions. In another ovine SH, green offal and spleen were only seldom visually checked.

5.5.2.3 General and specific hygiene

In different establishments deficiencies were identified in relation to maintenance and cleaning or disinfection; condensation of steam (sometimes over exposed meats), water tanks not protected against pest or exposed to open air, rusty equipment and rails were noted.

In three slaughterhouses visited, equipment not connected to the drain (not positively ducted), or leaking was noted. It was also noted that there was extensive use of suspended hoses to clean aprons, equipment and floor, with splashing and risk of contamination of exposed carcasses or cut meat. In one slaughterhouse, the splitting saw was not sterilized between carcasses.

Inadequate flow of by-products and of trucks transporting live animals and fresh meat (often inadequately cleaned) was noted in one pig SH.

In another pig SH, relevant and continuous disruption of the cold chain could potentially compromise the safety of meat; the production volumes of the establishment were evidently exceeding the structural capacity of the premises, in particular that of the blast freezers, leading to relevant volumes of production being stored outside the chillers. This has not been detected by the local CA, despite the fact that 10 MVOs and auxiliaries were present full time at the premises.

In the same slaughterhouse, empty livestock trucks inadequately cleaned were seen leaving the premises with a risk of cross-contamination. No action was taken by the FBO or by the local CA in response to the finding of the FVO audit team.

Similar disruption to the cold chain due to the exceeding of structural capacities and not noted by the local CA was seen by the FVO audit team in another slaughterhouse.

In another establishment, carcasses with traces of faecal contamination were allowed to enter the cutting room without being previously trimmed.

5.5.2.4 HACCP-based systems

In the establishments visited, with the exception of four premises, an appropriate own check control system was in place, supervised by the CA.

In one ovine SH the unique Critical Control Point was faecal contamination of carcasses, and the limit set was zero tolerance; however, the monitoring procedure had foreseen a tolerance of 5 contaminated carcasses out of 20 randomly checked.

In a bovine SH, no procedures were set in order to ensure EU traceability of live animals and products thereof along the slaughterline (see 5.2.2).

In two pig SHs visited, in which the throughput was not adapted to the structural capacity of the premises, the procedures for maintenance of the cold chain were not adapted to the current working conditions and were limited to the freezing of products only. The procedures for cleaning and disinfection of trucks for live animals were also not adequate and not complied with.

5.5.2.5 Microbiological testing

The system in place has not been changed since the previous audit and remains non-compliant as it still does not cover the same organisms as laid down in Regulation (EC) No 2073/2005.

5.5.2.6 Traceability and identification marking

Traceability systems were in place in all establishments visited. However, in the bovine SH visited the system was not able to ensure that only carcasses originating from EU eligible animals could be exported to the EU; in addition, no written procedures on the traceability system applied in the premises could be shown to the FVO audit team (see 5.2.2).

5.5.2.7 Animal welfare at the time of slaughter or killing

No deficiencies were identified in most of the premises visited.

In one pig SH, however, in which the throughput was clearly exceeding the capacity of the establishment (see 5.5.2.4 and 5.5.2.8) a truck was kept under the sun for more than two hours without the pigs being unloaded because lairages were also overcrowded.

5.5.2.8 Documentation of official controls

In all cases evaluated documentation was available concerning the official controls carried out.

In the slaughterhouses, the controls were based on the programmes validated by the regional supervisor. Different areas of the FBO's own checks programmes were verified with a prescribed frequency. However, the way of documenting official checks in different establishments has not been consistent: in one establishment, simple notes were kept, with no written procedure for follow up and no evidence of follow up (corrective action request, deadline, answer of the FBO, verification), while in another establishment, a prescribed form called "*Notificacion de no complimiento*" containing follow up details, was sometimes (but not consistently) used. In this establishment the form was not used to identify and follow-up a serious disruption to the cold chain: dozens of pallets of frozen products were kept at room temperature, and on-the-spot verification of products in two boxes showed a temperature of -5°C.

Moreover, the evaluation by the FVO audit team of different documented controls revealed an approach to official controls as strongly "document" oriented rather than “content” oriented. In several cases the check-lists available were filled in a “mechanical” way, not reflecting the current situation in the premises supervised. As a result, activities (e.g. some water controls, items related to processing of poultry animals, etc.) not carried out by the FBO were checked by the local CA.

Some of the deficiencies identified by the FVO audit team had gone unnoticed by the official controls carried out by the CAs.

5.5.3 Conclusions

A documented set of control procedures is in place, but the manner in which the controls are carried out does not ensure that EU requirements are consistently met. The traceability system applied in the bovine SH did not ensure that only EU eligible carcasses could be exported.

5.6 Official certification

5.6.1 Legal requirements

Council Directive 96/93/EC lays down the general rules to be observed by third countries in issuing certificates required for exports to the EU, according to the specific EU veterinary legislation.

The specific animal health, public health and veterinary certification requirements for the introduction into the EU of products of animal origin intended for human consumption, are laid down in the product specific Commission Regulations.

The Appendix IX of the agreement establishing an association between the EU and the Republic of Chile establishes the principles to be followed when a consignment of animals and animal products is certified for export to one of the parties.

5.6.2 Findings

In response to Recommendation No 5 of the previous report (*To take appropriate action to bring*

the issuing of export certificates in line with Council Directive 96/93/EC) the CCA stated that the quality management system for the certification of exports under standard ISO 9001 would have been strengthened at regional and local levels by means of internal audits and by a training course proposed to the local official inspection teams in the second half of 2011.

The FVO audit team found that the export certificates seen were backed up by the appropriate documentation provided by the FBO.

5.6.3 Conclusions

Certification procedures are in place and were complied with. The documents provided by the FBOs justified the export certificates being issued. However, the control system in place at holding level does not support the export certification for beef (see 5.2.3).

6 OVERALL CONCLUSION

The legislation in place, the structure of the CA, its powers and authority for enforcement are satisfactory. Trained staff resources are available and detailed control procedures are in place. Nevertheless these control procedures are sometimes mechanically implemented without taking into account the current reality in the establishments evaluated. As already noted in the 2011 audit report, in several cases the regional and local CA failed to use their powers appropriately for enforcement vis-à-vis the number of animal holdings which showed relevant non compliances.

The PABCO system, intended to guarantee that holdings for porcine and ovine animals, their meat and their products fulfils the sanitary requirements and the good husbandry practices required

The PABCO A system is intended by the CCA to provide the guarantees that bovine animals slaughtered for EU export fulfil the EU requirements. However this system is currently unable to ensure that only EU eligible animals are slaughtered for the EU market. As already mentioned in the 2011 audit report, the weak supervision at PABCO holdings and the relevant shortcomings identified by the FVO audit team at holding and slaughterhouse levels (and already mentioned in the 2011 audit report) make this system unreliable for ensuring traceability of bovine animals and their certification as EU eligible animals.

Evidence of treatments of cattle with phenylbutazone was collected during the audit; although the National Residues Monitoring Plan includes testing for phenylbutazone, treatment of EU eligible bovine animals does not seem to be considered a risk factor for targeting sampling.

The system in place to approve establishments is acceptable but its implementation shows weaknesses and questions the ability of the CAs to keep under constant review the approvals of establishments listed for export to the EU. This has been noted already in the 2011 audit report.

A documented set of control procedures is in place, but the manner in which the controls are carried out does not ensure that EU requirements are consistently met. The traceability system applied in the bovine SH did not ensure that only EU eligible carcasses could be exported.

Certification procedures are in place and were complied with. The documents provided by the FBOs justified the export certificates being issued.

7 Closing Meeting

A closing meeting was held on 1 March 2013 in Santiago with the CCA, the SAG. At this meeting the FVO audit team presented the findings and preliminary conclusions of the audit and advised the CCA of the relevant time limits for production of the report and their response.

The representatives of the CCA acknowledged the findings and conclusions presented by the FVO audit team.

8 Recommendations

An action plan, describing the action(s) taken or planned in response to the recommendations of this report and setting out a timetable to correct the deficiencies found, should be presented to the Commission within 25 working days of receipt of the report.

N°.	Recommendation
1.	To keep the approvals under constant review for all establishments currently listed for the European Union according to Article 12.3 of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004, in order to confirm their compliance with the requirements of Regulations (EC) No 852/2004 and No 853/2004.
2.	To improve the PABCO system (Planteles de Animales Bajo Certificación Oficial) for ovine holdings and animals, ensuring that all holdings are provided with a single PABCO code and that all movements of animals are accompanied by a movement document, as prescribed by the national legislation, in order to fulfil the requirements on traceability prescribed by the PABCO system and the European Union requirements laid down in Regulation (EU) No 206/2010, and be in a position to certify all the statements contained in the OVI certificate laid down in Regulation (EU) No 206/2010
3.	To improve urgently the system of official controls over the PABCO A system, to ensure that all deficiencies concerning identification of animals, movements controls, notifications of events to the SIPEC database are detected, corrected and properly followed-up by authorised veterinarians and official veterinarians, in order to guarantee that all bovine animals slaughtered for the European Union fulfil the requirements laid down in Regulation (EU) No 206/2010, and be in a position to certify all the statements contained in the BOV certificate laid down in Regulation (EU) No 206/2010.
4.	To ensure that, in respect of animals/products derived from which are intended for export to the EU, drug withdrawal periods are sufficiently long to guarantee the absence of detectable residues in meat and that testing for residues of such substances (e.g. phenylbutazone) is included in the scope of the residue monitoring plan in line

N°.	Recommendation
	with the requirements of Article 29 of Council Directive 96/23/EC.
5.	To improve the official controls carried out at establishment level with the aim to better detect the deficiencies in relation to the general and specific hygiene requirements contained in Regulations (EC) No 852/2004 and No 853/2004, as required by Article 12.2 (b) and (c) of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004.

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=2013-6865

Annex 1 - Legal References

Legal Reference	Official Journal	Title
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. 882/2004	OJ L 165, 30.4.2004, p. 1, Corrected and re-published in OJ L 191, 28.5.2004, p. 1	Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules
Reg. 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. 853/2004	OJ L 139, 30.4.2004, p. 55, Corrected and re-published in OJ L 226, 25.6.2004, p. 22	Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 laying down specific hygiene rules for food of animal origin
Reg. 854/2004	OJ L 139, 30.4.2004, p. 206, Corrected and re-published in OJ L 226, 25.6.2004, p. 83	Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 laying down specific rules for the organisation of official controls on products of animal origin intended for human consumption
Reg. 2073/2005	OJ L 338, 22.12.2005, p. 1-26	Commission Regulation (EC) No 2073/2005 of 15 November 2005 on microbiological criteria for foodstuffs

Legal Reference	Official Journal	Title
Reg. 2074/2005	OJ L 338, 22.12.2005, p. 27-59	Commission Regulation (EC) No 2074/2005 of 5 December 2005 laying down implementing measures for certain products under Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council and for the organisation of official controls under Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council and Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council, derogating from Regulation (EC) No 852/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council and amending Regulations (EC) No 853/2004 and (EC) No 854/2004
Reg. 2075/2005	OJ L 338, 22.12.2005, p. 60-82	Commission Regulation (EC) No 2075/2005 of 5 December 2005 laying down specific rules on official controls for Trichinella in meat
Reg. 1162/2009	OJ L 314, 1.12.2009, p. 10–12	Commission Regulation (EC) No 1162/2009 of 30 November 2009 laying down transitional measures for the implementation of Regulations (EC) No 853/2004, (EC) No 854/2004 and (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council
Reg. 206/2010	OJ L 73, 20.3.2010, p. 1–121	Commission Regulation (EU) No 206/2010 of 12 March 2010 laying down lists of third countries, territories or parts thereof authorised for the introduction into the European Union of certain animals and fresh meat and the veterinary certification requirements
Dir. 93/119/EC	OJ L 340, 31.12.1993, p. 21-34	Council Directive 93/119/EC of 22 December 1993 on the protection of animals at the time of slaughter or killing
Dir. 96/22/EC	OJ L 125, 23.5.1996, p. 3-9	Council Directive 96/22/EC of 29 April 1996 concerning the prohibition on the use in stockfarming of certain substances having a hormonal or thyrostatic action and of ß-agonists, and repealing Directives 81/602/EEC, 88/146/EEC and 88/299/EEC

Legal Reference	Official Journal	Title
Dir. 96/23/EC	OJ L 125, 23.5.1996, p. 10-32	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
Dir. 96/93/EC	OJ L 13, 16.1.1997, p. 28-30	Council Directive 96/93/EC of 17 December 1996 on the certification of animals and animal products
Dir. 97/78/EC	OJ L 24, 30.1.1998, p. 9-30	Council Directive 97/78/EC of 18 December 1997 laying down the principles governing the organisation of veterinary checks on products entering the Community from third countries
Dir. 98/83/EC	OJ L 330, 5.12.1998, p. 32-54	Council Directive 98/83/EC of 3 November 1998 on the quality of water intended for human consumption
Dir. 2002/99/EC	OJ L 18, 23.1.2003, p. 11-20	Council Directive 2002/99/EC of 16 December 2002 laying down the animal health rules governing the production, processing, distribution and introduction of products of animal origin for human consumption
Dir. 2004/68/EC	OJ L 139, 30.4.2004, p. 321-360. Corrected and re-published in OJ L 226, 25.6.2004, p. 128.	Council Directive 2004/68/EC of 26 April 2004 laying down animal health rules for the importation into and transit through the Community of certain live ungulate animals, amending Directives 90/426/EEC and 92/65/EEC and repealing Directive 72/462/EEC
Dec. 1999/120/EC	OJ L 36, 10.2.1999, p. 21-47	1999/120/EC: Commission Decision of 27 January 1999 drawing up provisional lists of third country establishments from which the Member States authorise imports of animal casings
Dec. 2003/779/EC	OJ L 285, 1.11.2003, p. 38-41	2003/779/EC: Commission Decision of 31 October 2003 laying down animal health requirements and the veterinary certification for the import of animal casings from third countries

Legal Reference	Official Journal	Title
Dec. 2004/432/EC	OJ L 154, 30.4.2004, p. 44-50, corrected and re-published in OJ L 189, 27.5.2004, p. 33	2004/432/EC: Commission Decision of 29 April 2004 on the approval of residue monitoring plans submitted by third countries in accordance with Council Directive 96/23/EC
Dec. 2005/269/EC	OJ L 84, 2.4.2005, p. 19-20	2005/269/EC: Council Decision of 28 February 2005 on the conclusion of the Agreement establishing an association between the European Community and its Member States of the one part, and the Republic of Chile, of the other part
Dec. 2007/777/EC	OJ L 312, 30.11.2007, p. 49-67	2007/777/EC: Commission Decision of 29 November 2007 laying down the animal and public health conditions and model certificates for imports of certain meat products and treated stomachs, bladders and intestines for human consumption from third countries and repealing Decision 2005/432/EC