



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY

Directorate F - Food and Veterinary Office

DG(SANTE) 2015-7430 - MR

**FINAL REPORT OF AN AUDIT
CARRIED OUT IN
BULGARIA
FROM 26 JANUARY 2015 TO 30 JANUARY 2015
IN ORDER TO
EVALUATE THE OFFICIAL CONTROLS ON CONSIGNMENTS IN TRANSIT**

Executive Summary

The report describes the outcome of an audit carried out by the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) in Bulgaria 26 to 30 January 2015. The objective of the audit was to evaluate the official control system implemented by the competent authorities on consignments transiting the EU.

The competent authority ensures that only eligible direct transit consignments enter the EU territory and that transiting goods always leave the Union as required by EU legislation. Controls of indirect transits at warehouses are inadequate and traceability is compromised.

The competent authority was unaware of the requirement to control EU goods re-entering from external transits, which gives rise to the possibility that non-eligible consignments can enter the EU territory and pose an animal health risk.

The system of verification over the controls on transit consignments is not effective in detecting and correcting important errors. Shortcomings are allowed to persist. The relevant recommendations from report DG SANCO 2014-7025 regarding verification have not been satisfactorily addressed.

The report makes additional recommendations to the competent authorities of Bulgaria aimed at rectifying the identified shortcomings and/or further enhancing the controls in place.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Objectives.....	1
3. Legal basis and audit criteria.....	2
4. Background	2
5. Findings and Conclusions	3
5.1. Organisation of the controls, designation of competent authorities and operational criteria.....	3
5.2. Official controls on non-EU goods in transit	5
5.2.1. <i>Controls at the entry Border Inspection Posts</i>	5
5.2.2. <i>Controls at warehouses</i>	6
5.2.3. <i>Controls at the exit Border Inspection Posts</i>	8
5.3. External transits of EU goods	8
5.4. Verification and review	10
5.5. Follow-up	11
6. Overall Conclusion.....	11
7. Closing Meeting	12
8. Recommendations	12

ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS USED IN THIS REPORT

Abbreviation	Explanation
BFSA	Bulgarian Food Safety Agency, the competent authority for the purpose of this audit
BIP	Border inspection post
CVED	Common Veterinary Entry Document
DOCOM	Commercial documents
INTRA	Intra-trade animal health certificate
TRACES	Trade control and expert system

1. INTRODUCTION

The audit took place in Bulgaria from 25 to 30 January 2015. The audit team comprised three auditors from the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO). The audit was undertaken as part of the FVO's planned audit programme.

Representatives from the central competent authority accompanied the audit team during the whole audit. An opening meeting was held on 25 January with the central competent authorities responsible for import controls. At this meeting, the objectives of, and itinerary for, the audit were confirmed and the control systems were described by the authorities when necessary.

2. OBJECTIVES

The main objective of the audit was the evaluation of the system of official controls implemented by the competent authorities on specific consignments transiting the EU, in particular:

- whether the controls are implemented in compliance with the legal requirements, and
- whether the controls are effective and suitable in ensuring that (i) only consignments eligible for transit are accepted and (ii) that transiting goods always leave the Union.

In addition to the main objective, the audit also evaluated the implementation of corrective actions included in the action plan addressing the recommendations made in report DG (SANCO)/2014-7025 (hereinafter, the 2014 report).

The scope of the audit covers the implementation of the controls at entry and exit BIPs, warehouses approved for storing non-conforming goods and ship suppliers, including operational criteria of the system, ability of staff implementing the controls and verification procedures, in relation to:

- commercial consignments originating in third countries, transiting the Union,
- intra-community movements of EU goods moving via third countries ("external transits" for the purpose of this report, not to be confused with the T1 – external transit procedure of Customs),
- movements of goods taking place by road, railway, and water lines, including transits between airports.

The following are excluded from the scope:

- transshipments,
- personal consignments and movements of pet animals, and
- external transits via EFTA countries.

3. LEGAL BASIS AND AUDIT CRITERIA

The audit was carried out under the general provisions of EU legislation and, in particular Article 45 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council.

Annex 1 comprises a list of legislation as audit criteria for this report. Legal acts quoted refer, where applicable, to the last amended version.

The Commission General Guidance for consignments of live animals and animal products from third countries in transit and transshipment (SANCO/10844/2011, hereafter – Guidance on transit) is also used as an audit criterion.

4. BACKGROUND

Council Directives 97/78/EC (for animal products) and 91/496/EEC (for live animals) set out the veterinary procedures and requirements for importing into the EU commercial consignments. While consignments to be imported must meet both animal and public health requirements, consignments of animal products in transit between third countries via the EU are only required to meet the animal health requirements. It is therefore necessary that the competent authorities ensure that those consignments, for which public health guarantees have not been provided, do not enter the EU market.

Bulgaria is a Member State with a significant number of consignments in transit, due to its geographical location in South Eastern Europe: bordering Serbia and Macedonia to the west, Turkey to the south and the Black Sea to the east, Bulgaria is an important corridor to and from the Middle East countries.

- Transits of non-EU goods via Bulgaria consist of movements between Turkey and the Balkan Countries, the Russian Federation and other neighbouring countries. Those consignments can be temporarily stored in specifically approved warehouses.
- EU consignments arrive in Bulgaria from other Member States by land, in many cases crossing the territory of Serbia or via the ports in the Black Sea after crossing Turkey. Those EU consignments can be intended for the Bulgarian market or for further export.

During a period of 18 months before the date of this audit, the activity for transits via Bulgarian territory was as follows:

- For consignments transiting without intermediate storage:
 - 942 entered and exited the EU directly through Bulgarian Border Inspection Posts (BIPs),
 - 1512 entered via Bulgarian BIPs and exited via other Member States, and
 - 2545 exited through Bulgarian BIPs after having entered through BIPs in other Member States.
- For consignments stored in Bulgaria, there is only one warehouse approved under Article 12 and 13 of Directive 97/78. Of the consignments arriving at the warehouse,

577 entered via Bulgarian BIPs and 235 via BIPs in other Member States. The consignments were subsequently divided into 9217 outgoing certificates.

An overview of how the control system is organised is available in the FVO country profile for Bulgaria, here: http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/country_profiles/details.cfm?co_id=BG.

5. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1. ORGANISATION OF THE CONTROLS, DESIGNATION OF COMPETENT AUTHORITIES AND OPERATIONAL CRITERIA

Legal requirements

Articles 4, 6 and 8 of, and Annex II to, Regulation (EC) No 882/2004; Article 3(2)(c) of Decision 2004/292/EC.

Findings

1. The Bulgarian Food Safety Agency (BFSA) is the competent authority for import/transit controls of products of animal origin and live animals. The Border Control Directorate is responsible for policy, coordination of the controls, issuing instructions and verification in the BIPs.
2. Orders PD-11-767 and PD-11-754 are the framework for the interaction between Customs and BFSA for, amongst other things, the exchange of information. The Customs information system classifies the consignments and flags those originating in third countries requiring veterinary controls for imports or transits. The agreement does not refer to EU goods re-entering the Union (see finding 30).
3. In relation to the external transits of EU goods, there was no evidence of sufficient communication between the services in charge of intra-community movements, animal health and border controls. For example, Intra-trade animal health certificates (INTRA) and commercial documents (DOCOM) created in the trade control and expert system (TRACES) were frequently incompletely filled in by officials issuing them (no indication of transiting places) contrary to Annex to Regulation (EC) No 599/2004 and Chapter III, Annex VIII of Regulation (EC) No 142/2011. The Border Control Directorate did not communicate the issue to the Animal Health service to eliminate these errors, which meant that border officials were not informed of arriving consignments that required controls. Such communication would contribute to ensuring that only animals and products eligible for such transits can re-enter the EU and is required in Article 4(5) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.
4. The competent authority informed the audit team that the instructions for the controls are described in the BIP instruction (Order PD-11-1404). It was noted the following:
 - a. For the checks at the entry BIP, the instruction requires notification of the arrival of consignments one day before arrival. This requirement goes further than EU requirements.

- b. For checks at the exit BIP as provided in Article 11 of Directive 97/78/EC, the instructions are not always specific. For example, the allocation of responsibilities to Customs and BIPs is not detailed. In particular, BIP staff is responsible for seal checks at exit but it is not described how Customs should or could identify exiting consignments and communicate them to the veterinary services. Staff at the BIP visited explained that the written procedure requires from the officials on duty to check TRACES every hour for notifications on consignments intended to exit via their BIP.
 - c. For the controls in the warehouse, instructions were issued from central level at the start of operations in 2013. Additional instructions were drafted after the 2014 FVO audit. However, the instructions are insufficient, allowing staff to let consignments leave the warehouse without a Common Veterinary Entry Document (CVED) in TRACES.
 - d. The most recent update of the Commission guidance for non-conforming consignments destined to military bases and the most recent toolkit available in TRACES from October 2014 had not been incorporated in the instructions.
 - e. For controls on external transit of EU goods, there is no instruction available to the officials. Representatives of the Border Control Directorate and the Animal Health Directorate confirmed that this trade pattern had never been identified so the need to issue any instructions never arose (see finding 30).
5. In relation to resources, it was noted that staff at the warehouse were basing the controls on the goods in stock on an IT programme that did not work and they could not make it function during the audit. At this warehouse, one official was in charge of the controls, with a considerable workload as the warehouse has a very high throughput. Two other officials were in the process of learning the work, because the official in charge was leaving the service shortly.
6. The Training Unit at the BFSA develops internal rules regarding courses and organises training. Official veterinarians at the BIPs have received training in the past, including sessions of the Better Training for Safer Food (BTSF) programme. The training for verification and audits was planned for the first quarter of 2015.
7. TRACES is used for recording the controls on transits. All sites visited had access to the internet and staff knew how to use the system as required in Article 3(2)(c) of Decision 2004/292/EC. When TRACES was not correctly used, it coincided with inadequate/insufficient instructions.

Conclusion

8. The competent authority has allocated resources to the controls at the borders, but the instructions provided and the communication within and between authorities is insufficient to ensure that staff is up-to-date and that the controls are implemented and effective.

5.2. OFFICIAL CONTROLS ON NON-EU GOODS IN TRANSIT

Legal requirements

Article 3 of Directive 91/496/EEC; Article 1 of Regulation (EC) No 282/2004; Articles 12, 13 and 17 of Directive 97/78/EC; Articles 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Commission Decision 2000/571/EC; Article 41 of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009; Articles 6 and 7 of, and Annexes I and III to, Regulation (EC) 136/2004; Article 3(2)(c) of Decision 2004/292/EC.

Findings

5.2.1. Controls at the entry Border Inspection Posts

9. Notification to the entry BIP of non-EU consignments in transit is done according to Article 3(3) of Directive 97/78/EC. The national requirement of notification 24 hours in advance (see finding 4) for all types of consignments goes beyond EU legal requirements (this is only required for live animals, as laid down in Article 3(1) of Directive 91/496/EEC and Article 1(1) of Regulation (EC) No 282/2004). For road BIPs, this notice is generally not achievable. Staff in the BIP confirmed that pre-notifications of products did not arrive with the one-day notice.
10. The competent authority has not granted access to TRACES to private operators, so notifications are done by other means and the officials create part I of the CVED in TRACES. This increases the possibility of human error and the workload for officials.
11. In relation to the documentary checks for non-EU consignments at the entry BIP, the veterinary health certificates from origin were checked as required. Copies of original documents were kept in the BIP archive. All copies reviewed by the audit team were correctly filled in and used the correct model as provided in Article 4(3)(a) of Directive 97/78/EC.
12. It was noted in the 2014 report that box I.22 (indicating the warehouse of destination) was not routinely filled in by the BIP of entry. The audit team observed a significant improvement in this regard, and the information is now introduced routinely. The competent authority has also removed from TRACES all the different variations of the name and number of the warehouse and now all the entries are coherent. An error in box I.19 is still repeated, where goods are indicated as conforming to EU requirements, when this is not the case. This is not in compliance with Annex III to Regulation (EC) 136/2004.
13. Officials at the BIP of entry apply new seals to consignments in transit. The number is indicated in the CVED document. In the warehouse, the official veterinarians did not have their own seals and instead the consignment was sealed by the food business operator, which is not in line with the requirement of Article 11(c) of Directive 97/78/EC.

5.2.2. Controls at warehouses

14. The Customs warehouse is approved in accordance with Article 12(4)(b) and Article 13(1)(a) of Directive 97/78/EC. It is also approved under Regulation (EC) No 853/2002 as required.
15. The consignments arrive at the warehouse with the original veterinary certificates, as required. The BIP of entry keeps a copy of the original certificate for three years. At the warehouse, official veterinarians always completed box 41 of the CVED in TRACES to provide confirmation of the arrival of the consignment and its conformity to the entry BIP, except for specific consignments which arrived from other Member States without a TRACES document, contrary to the requirement in Article 3(2)(c) of Decision 2004/292/EC (see finding 24).
16. The officials explained that documentary and identity checks are done upon the arrival of every consignment and before dispatch. Records of those controls are reflected in the CVEDs, as required. The officials explained that at the time of arrival, before the goods go into storage, every box is stamped with the CVED number (as required by Articles 1 and 4 of Decision 2000/571/EC) (see finding 17).
17. The warehouse operator explained the storage procedures to the audit team: there is a specific area in the general storage, dedicated to non-conforming goods. The handling during storage is automated. The access of the auditors to this area was discouraged for safety reasons, and the inspection of consignments was limited to the area of preparation of consignments for departure. The audit team noted, however, that several boxed consignments had not been stamped with the CVED number, contrary to the procedure explained by the officials (see finding 16) and Article 1 of Decision 2000/571/EC.
18. The audit team carried out an exercise to reconcile amounts for a pre-selected consignment. The following was noted:
 - a. The electronic system of the officials indicated an incorrect amount in storage. This was concluded by comparing with (i) amounts reflected in the exiting CVEDs and (ii) the stock of goods in the operator's database.
 - b. The operator's database allowed for correct reconciliation of all amounts.
 - c. It was confirmed that the official database was not working, giving also wrong quantities for other consignments (see finding 5).
 - d. This situation is compounded by the fact that (i) reconciliation using TRACES is not possible, as consignments destined to military bases are not introduced in TRACES (see finding 20) and (ii) the physical inspection of the warehouse is limited, contrary to the requirements of Article 3(2)(c) of Decision 2004/292/EC.
19. The use of the split function of TRACES for issuing subsequent CVEDs has improved since the 2014 audit. This allows linkage to the original CVED of entry. The consignments are dispatched with the subsequent CVED and a verified copy of the original certificate. The CVEDs indicate that a full identity check has been carried out.

Officials confirmed that checks included labels, commodity and number of boxes as required in Article 1 of Decision 2000/571/EC.

20. Part of the consignments exiting the warehouse are destined to locations that are not available in TRACES (military bases in different Member States). Officials issued handmade CVEDs that were then returned from destination signed by a military authority as received. This is a system improvised by the officials under central level guidance on the phone, and does not fulfil the requirements of Article 3(2)(c) of Decision 2004/292/EC.
21. Significant progress was noted after the 2014 audit in relation to the quality of subsequent CVEDs. When those CVEDs were in TRACES, the exit of the consignments was confirmed using box 41 of the CVED. The rest were confirmed by military authorities (see finding 20).
22. When the warehouse sent non-conforming goods for destruction, the arrival of the consignment was not always confirmed by the competent authority at destination in TRACES (box 41 of the CVED). In the CVED, the place for destruction indicated was the exit BIP instead of the local veterinary unit where the processing plant was located. Documentation from the incinerator confirming the destruction was available at the warehouse. The procedure to send consignments for destruction was unclear for the officials in the warehouse, and instructions were not available contrary to the requirements of Article 17 of Directive 97/78/EC.
23. During the preparation of the audit it was noted that some exit CVEDs indicated in box I.22 "Direct to a ship". On-the-spot it was confirmed that this was a misunderstanding as the ship was a final destination but the exit point was a military exit BIP. This error predated the Commission guidance for military consignments included in the TRACES Toolkit "CVED-P guidance for non-conforming consignments destined for US military bases in Europe".
24. The audit team enquired about some other consignments with handmade CVEDs. They concerned consignments entering the EU via other Member States and arriving at the warehouse accompanied by a document issued in national databases. They arrived without a unique TRACES reference number, only with a local reference number. Official staff, when possible, traced the local number and found the TRACES number document. These cases were always linked to Member States or specific BIPs that are not using TRACES to issue a CVED before releasing the consignment, contrary to the requirements. This causes two immediate problems to the officials:
 - a. they are not aware of the expected arrival of the consignment, and
 - b. they cannot issue subsequent CVEDs using the split function in TRACES, therefore impeding documentary traceability.

5.2.3. Controls at the exit Border Inspection Posts

25. Veterinary controls at the point of exit are only triggered by Customs, so only consignments identified by them are redirected to the veterinary authorities at the BIP. After veterinary checks at the exit BIP are carried out, the relevant part of box 41 of the CVED is filled in TRACES as provided in Annex III to Regulation (EC) 136/2004.
26. When a transiting consignment exits without veterinary checks, the veterinarians communicate with Customs and search to find if the consignment has left EU territory. The written procedure requires the exit BIP to check TRACES notifications every three hours and be updated of the intended time of exit of non-conforming consignments.
27. In the case when the consignment needs to be sent to military bases in the EU, the veterinarians at the warehouse send the consignment with a CVED outside TRACES (see findings 20 and 35). The consignee is not approved in TRACES and the certificate cannot be issued in the system electronically. The officials at the warehouse stated they were instructed on how to draft the documents by the central competent authority by phone contrary to Article 3(2)(c) of Decision 2004/292/EC (see finding 20).

Conclusion on the controls on transits of non-EU goods

28. The controls at the entry and exit BIPs on transits of non-EU goods comply with the EU requirements and provide guarantees that only eligible goods are accepted into the EU and they always leave the territory. The controls at the warehouse are weakened by the poor checks on traceability and the inadequate physical checks of the goods.

5.3. EXTERNAL TRANSITS OF EU GOODS

Legal requirements

Article 6(1) of Council Directive 89/662/EEC; Article 7(1) of Council Directive 90/425/EEC; Article 12 of Regulation (EC) 206/2010.

Findings

29. The notification of the arrival of EU goods re-entering the EU after an external transit is not a requirement of the legislation. When consignments arrive at the border, Customs can identify them and consult the BIP staff if necessary.
30. At the road BIP visited, for EU goods transiting externally and re-entering the EU, Customs were routinely consulting with the BIP for veterinary requirements and eligibility to enter the EU. For each of the consignments, the BIP issued a written routine reply confirming that such consignments were not subject to import controls. There was no further assessment of the eligibility of these goods to re-enter the EU. The following are examples of consignments that entered the EU without the required specific controls:
 - a. Consignments of live poultry commodities (day-old chicks and hatching eggs): these are a frequent transit from different Member States via Serbia to be exported to the Middle East. Serbia is not listed in Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 798/2008 and live

poultry commodities having crossed this territory should not have been allowed to re-enter the EU. BIP staff was unaware of this restriction, and informed Customs that these consignments were not subject to import legislation (which is, indeed, correct) and no checks were required. However, they did not carry out the controls that would have indicated that these consignments were not eligible to enter the EU.

It was also noted that the veterinary services at the point of origin in other Member States were often not filling in correctly the relevant boxes of the INTRA-certificate: in many cases boxes I.26 (transited third countries) and I.27 (transited Member States) were not filled in, and in others Serbia was included in box I.27. Control part II was never filled in at the BIP for these consignments.

- b. A consignment of two bulls for breeding: BIP staff informed the audit team that the truck was not sealed and was stopped at the border, but the consignment was released following instructions received from central level. No checks are reflected in the INTRA-certificate. In principle, bovines moving via Serbia should not re-enter the EU, but there is a derogation to Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 206/2010 for animals intended for immediate slaughter or for fattening. However, this does not apply to animals imported for breeding purposes.

The central competent authority explained that the need to control external transits was never identified and instructions were never requested contrary to requirements of Article 6(1) of Directive 89/662/EEC. Border controls on external transits were consequently never carried out.

31. A failure in the TRACES system prevented the BIPs from receiving notifications related to EU consignments (INTRA) moving through some exit points. The audit team was informed that this has been happening since June 2014. This undermined the ability of the BIPs to control all relevant consignments contrary to the requirement of Article 7(1) of Directive 90/425/EEC. The BIP staff explained that they had found a way around the problem by doing routine searches in TRACES of relevant consignments. This was not documented. Central level was unaware of this longstanding problem.

Conclusion on the controls on external transits of EU goods

32. The competent authority was unaware of the requirement to control EU goods re-entering from external transits, and controls are not done. Consignments that should not have been allowed re-entry to the Union were not rejected, even though they did not fulfil the animal health requirements, which may pose an animal health risk in the EU.

5.4. VERIFICATION AND REVIEW

Legal requirements

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

Findings

33. Verification activities include internal audit and central/local supervision and the system is described in the country profile. Official controls on transits are included under the import control system.
34. Internal audits are planned once every five years for each BIP. Audit reports were reviewed during the audit (e.g. an audit of the controls in the warehouse from October 2013). The reports are comprehensive and detailed, and the audits are able to detect non-compliances, including some of those included in the FVO report. However, the effect of the audits was severely undermined, contrary to the requirements in Article 8(3) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, by:
 - a. recommendations closed on the basis of non-documented information and lacking adequate evidence on file of the implementation of actions, or
 - b. no action by the competent authority, so recommendations remained open beyond the stated deadline without evidence on file of any follow-up by the audit Directorate. This was noted in the 2014 report, and the related recommendation has not been addressed satisfactorily.
35. Central and local supervision are weakened by:
 - a. the supervisors' lack of awareness both on verification principles and relevant technical issues (especially local supervisors). This also was noted in the 2014 report, and the related recommendation has not been addressed satisfactorily;
 - b. the central supervision shadows the local supervision with the same checklist template;
 - c. the lack of compliance with planned arrangements: the plan is to supervise every BIP twice per year, but the BIP visited had no central supervision during 2014 and the warehouse had only one.

As a consequence of the above, supervision reports did not include significant shortcomings detected during the FVO audit (repeated mistakes in CVED boxes 19 and 22, problems created by CVEDs issued by other Member States outside TRACES, notifications of INTRA-certificates not received, handmade CVEDs) contrary to the requirements in Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.

Conclusion on the verification and review

36. The system to verify that transit consignments are controlled correctly is not effective in detecting and correcting important errors. Whilst internal audits are effective in detecting shortcomings of the system, the competent authority does not implement corrective actions, which means that deficiencies persist without correction.

5.5. FOLLOW-UP

The table below summarises the follow-up to the relevant recommendation(s) made in report DG SANCO 2014-7025:

No.	Recommendation	
1.	To ensure that staff in charge of verification activities receives, for their area of competence, appropriate training enabling them to perform their duties competently, as required in Article 6(a) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, and that the training covers as appropriate the areas referred to in Chapter I of Annex II to the same Regulation.	Not addressed See findings 33-35 Recommendation remains open
2.	To ensure that corrective action is taken when needed to address the shortcomings identified by the verification activities, as required in Article 8(3)(b) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.	Not addressed See findings 33-35 Recommendation remains open

6. OVERALL CONCLUSION

The competent authority ensures that only eligible direct transit consignments enter the EU territory and that transiting goods always leave the Union as required by EU legislation. Controls of indirect transits at warehouses are inadequate and traceability is compromised.

The competent authority was unaware of the requirement to control EU goods re-entering from external transits, which gives rise to the possibility that non-eligible consignments can enter the EU territory and pose an animal health risk.

The system of verification over the controls on transit consignments is not effective in detecting and correcting important errors. Shortcomings are allowed to persist. The relevant recommendations from report DG SANCO 2014-7025 regarding verification have not been satisfactorily addressed.

7. CLOSING MEETING

A closing meeting was held on 30 January 2015 with representatives from the relevant competent authorities. At this meeting, the audit team presented the main findings and the preliminary conclusions of the audit. The competent authority did not express disagreement with the findings and conclusions presented.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

The competent authority is invited to provide details of the actions taken and planned aimed at addressing the recommendations set out below, including deadlines for their completion ('action plan'), within 25 working days of receipt of the translated draft audit report.

No.	Recommendation
1.	To ensure that controls at the warehouse are implemented in line with the EU requirements laid down in Decision 2000/571/EC. <i>Recommendation based on conclusion 28.</i> <i>Associated findings: 17, 18, 20, 22.</i>
2.	To develop a system of controls of EU goods re-entering the Union after transiting via third countries, to ensure that only eligible consignments are authorised into the territory as provided in Article 6(1) of Council Directive 89/662/EEC and Article 7(1) of Council Directive 90/425/EEC. <i>Recommendation based on conclusion 32.</i> <i>Associated findings: 4(e), 30, 31</i>

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=2015-7430

ANNEX 1 – LEGAL REFERENCES

Legal Reference	Official Journal	Title
Reg. 882/2004 - Article 45 (MS)	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
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. 91/496/EEC	OJ L 268, 24.9.1991, p. 56-68	Council Directive 91/496/EEC of 15 July 1991 laying down the principles governing the organization of veterinary checks on animals entering the Community from third countries and amending Directives 89/662/EEC, 90/425/EEC and 90/675/EEC
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
Dec. 2007/25/EC	OJ L 8, 13.1.2007, p. 29-34	2007/25/EC: Commission Decision of 22 December 2006 as regards certain protection measures in relation to highly pathogenic avian influenza and movements of pet birds accompanying their owners into the Community
Reg. 338/97	OJ L 61, 3.3.1997, p. 1-69	Council Regulation (EC) No 338/97 of 9 December 1996 on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora by regulating trade therein
Dec. 2004/292/EC	OJ L 94, 31.3.2004, p. 63-64	2004/292/EC: Commission Decision of 30 March 2004 on the introduction of the Traces system and amending Decision 92/486/EEC

Dec. 97/394/EC	OJ L 164, 21.6.1997, p. 42-43	97/394/EC: Commission Decision of 6 June 1997 establishing the minimum data required for the databases on animals and animal products brought into the Community
Dec. 97/152/EC	OJ L 59, 28.2.1997, p. 50-52	97/152/EC: Commission Decision of 10 February 1997 concerning the information to be entered in the computerized file of consignments of animals or animal products from third countries which are re-dispatched
Reg. 282/2004	OJ L 49, 19.2.2004, p. 11-24	Commission Regulation (EC) No 282/2004 of 18 February 2004 introducing a document for the declaration of, and veterinary checks on, animals from third countries entering the Community
Reg. 142/2011	OJ L 54, 26.2.2011, p. 1-254	Commission Regulation (EU) No 142/2011 of 25 February 2011 implementing Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down health rules as regards animal by-products and derived products not intended for human consumption and implementing Council Directive 97/78/EC as regards certain samples and items exempt from veterinary checks at the border under that Directive
Dec. 2001/812/EC	OJ L 306, 23.11.2001, p. 28-33	2001/812/EC: Commission Decision of 21 November 2001 laying down the requirements for the approval of border inspection posts responsible for veterinary checks on products introduced into the Community from third countries
Reg. 136/2004	OJ L 21, 28.1.2004, p. 11-23	Commission Regulation (EC) No 136/2004 of 22 January 2004 laying down procedures for veterinary checks at Community border inspection posts on products imported from third countries
Dec. 97/794/EC	OJ L 323, 26.11.1997, p. 31-36	97/794/EC: Commission Decision of 12 November 1997 laying down certain detailed rules for the application of Council Directive 91/496/EEC as regards veterinary checks on live animals to be imported from third countries

Dec. 2009/821/EC	OJ L 296, 12.11.2009, p.1	2009/821/EC: Commission Decision 2009/821/EC of 28 September 2009 drawing up a list of approved border inspection posts, laying down certain rules on the inspections carried out by Commission veterinary experts and laying down the veterinary units in Traces
Dec. 94/360/EC	OJ L 158, 25.6.1994, p. 41-45	94/360/EC: Commission Decision of 20 May 1994 on the reduced frequency of physical checks of consignments of certain products to be implemented from third countries, under Council Directive 90/675/EEC
Dec. 2000/208/EC	OJ L 64, 11.3.2000, p. 20-21	2000/208/EC: Commission Decision of 24 February 2000 establishing detailed rules for the application of Council Directive 97/78/EC concerning the transit of products of animal origin from one third country to another third country by road only across the European Community