



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY

Directorate F - Food and Veterinary Office

DG(SANTE) 2015-7373 - MR

FINAL REPORT OF AN AUDIT  
CARRIED OUT IN  
SWEDEN  
FROM 14 APRIL 2015 TO 24 APRIL 2015  
IN ORDER TO  
EVALUATE THE OPERATION OF OFFICIAL CONTROLS OVER THE POST-  
SLAUGHTER TRACEABILITY OF MEAT, MEAT PRODUCTS AND PREPARATIONS,  
COMPOSITE PRODUCTS

*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 audit to Sweden was carried out from 14 to 24 April 2015. The main objective of the audit was to evaluate the operation of official controls over the traceability of meat (meat of domestic ungulates, poultry, lagomorphs and game meat), minced meat, mechanically separated meat (MSM), meat preparations, meat products (hereafter referred to as meat and products thereof), and composite products containing meat and products thereof and other ingredients. Particular attention was paid to the traceability, labelling and identification systems of meat and products thereof, and to composite products containing meat and products thereof and traceability of quantities of each ingredient used.*

*The official control procedures require all establishments to be controlled, at least every five years, in all areas of applicable legislation. Risk based controls are split between the different inspections/audits that take place during the five year period. In the current five year official control plan traceability is scheduled to be covered twice.*

*The CCA is currently implementing actions in relation to traceability following the horse meat scandal and the discovery of certain food fraud in Sweden.*

*The Swedish CCA has already drawn certain lessons from the recent meat scandals and is undertaking specific actions to increase the efficiency of the control system. Significant work remains to be done.*

*In all the establishments visited, the food business operators stated that a traceability system was in place. However, the evaluation of these systems revealed a less positive picture concerning traceability in general and quantitative traceability in particular. In one cold store a robust traceability system was already in place. Two establishments were making good progress towards implementing a good system but the others still had significant progress to make. Two establishments had yet to start work on implementing a traceability system.*

*At the start of the audit, the FVO audit team chose 14 different food (meat based) samples at retail level. The CCA was asked to carry out a quantitative traceability of these samples in co-operation with the FBOs concerned. These exercises were far from successful: out of 14 samples, the CAs and the FBOs concerned could only establish 4 complete chains of traceability supported by the documented evidence. In the other cases significant documents relating to traceability were missing.*

*The FVO audit team also paid attention to the traceability and the use of additives in meat preparations and meat products. In general the situation was satisfactory but certain misuses were noted in some establishments. Nitrites and phosphates are allowed in "traditional products" which, in the absence of specific national rules/guidance, has the potential to include any pork or beef meat injected with curing solution (including in the initial phase of the maturing process).*

*The report makes a number of recommendations to the Swedish CA with a view to addressing the deficiencies identified during this audit.*

## Table of Contents

1	Introduction .....	1
2	Objectives and scope .....	1
3	Legal Basis .....	2
4	Background .....	2
5	Findings and Conclusions .....	3
5.1	Competent authorities.....	3
5.2	Official controls on traceability systems, identification marking and labelling.....	3
5.2.1	<i>Organisation of official controls</i> .....	3
5.2.2	<i>Implementation of official controls</i> .....	4
5.2.3	<i>Official controls on food processing chain</i> .....	4
5.2.3.1	<i>Official controls on FBO's obligations</i> .....	5
5.3	Miscellaneous .....	8
5.3.1	<i>General and specific hygiene requirements</i> .....	8
5.3.2	<i>Use of additives</i> .....	8
6	Overall Conclusion.....	9
7	Closing Meeting .....	9
8	Recommendations .....	9
Annex 1 legal References		

## ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS USED IN THIS REPORT

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
CA(s)	Competent Authority(ies)
CCA(s)	Central Competent Authority(ies)
COM	European Commission
EU	European Union
FBO(s)	Food Business Operator(s)
FVO	Food and Veterinary Office
HACCP	Hazard Analysis of Critical Control Points
NFA	National Food Administration

## 1 INTRODUCTION

This audit took place in Sweden from 14 to 24 April 2015 as part of the Food and Veterinary Office's (FVO) planned audit programme. The FVO audit team comprised two auditors from the FVO.

The FVO audit team was accompanied throughout the audit by a representative of the Central Competent Authority (CCA), the National Food Administration (NFA)

An opening meeting was held in Uppsala on 14 April 2015 with the CCAs. At this meeting the FVO audit team confirmed the objectives of, and itinerary for the audit, and additional information required for its satisfactory completion was requested.

## 2 OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

The objectives of the audit were to:

- evaluate the operation of official controls over the traceability of meat (meat of domestic ungulates, poultry, lagomorphs and game meat), minced meat, mechanically separated meat (MSM), meat preparations, meat products (hereafter referred to as meat and products thereof), and composite products containing meat and products thereof and other ingredients;
- evaluate the implementation of, and official control over, Union legislation on the labelling and identification systems of meat and products thereof.

Particular attention was paid to the following:

- traceability, labelling and identification systems of meat and products thereof;
- composite products containing meat and products thereof and traceability of quantities of each ingredient used.

In pursuit of these objectives, the audit itinerary included the following meetings and visits:

Meetings and visits			comments
CAs	Central	2	Initial and final meeting
	Regional		
	Local		Meetings on the sites visited
Cutting plants		7	
Storage facilities		2	One combined with a cutting plant
Meat product processing establishments		5	Combined with cutting plants
Establishment producing meat preparations/minced		6	Combined with cutting plant

meat/MSM			
Establishment producing composite products containing meat and products thereof		5	Combined with meat preparations and/or meat products activities mentioned above

### 3 LEGAL BASIS

The audit was carried out under the general provisions of Union legislation and, in particular, Article 45 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules.

Full legal references are provided in section 9. Legal acts quoted in this report refer, where applicable, to the last amended version.

### 4 BACKGROUND

The FVO carried out a series of audits in certain Member States between 2009 and 2011 in order to evaluate the controls over the traceability of beef and beef products. Another series of audits was conducted in certain Member States between 2011 and 2012 in order to evaluate the official controls related to slaughter and processing of fresh meat, in particular fresh equine meat. Both series of audits resulted in overview reports (reference numbers DG(SANCO)/2012-6624 and 2013-6950 respectively) and are available on the Directorate-General for Health and Food Safety web-site: at:

[http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/specialreports/overview\\_search\\_en.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/specialreports/overview_search_en.cfm)

Recent events, including the horsemeat scandal, have highlighted deficiencies in the control of traceability of meat traded as a commodity on an European Union (EU) wide basis. Weaknesses in food business operators' (FBOs) compliance with their responsibilities and official controls, in particular, with regard to traceability systems (qualitative and quantitative) and labelling requirements, were identified in several Member States.

This audit focused on these areas in targeted food businesses.

## **5 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

### **5.1 COMPETENT AUTHORITIES**

#### **Legal requirements**

Chapter II of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.

#### **Findings**

1. An overview of how control systems are organised in Sweden, based on information supplied by them, is provided in the Country Profile for Sweden and is available at the following link:

[http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/last5\\_en.cfm?co\\_id=SE](http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/last5_en.cfm?co_id=SE)

2. No modifications have taken place in the structure and responsibilities of the CAs in charge of official controls in the food establishments since the audit DG (SANCO)/2014-7229 carried out in Sweden from 25 November 2014 to 05 December 2014 in order to evaluate the system in place for official controls related to the safety of food of animal origin, in particular, meat and meat products.

### **5.2 OFFICIAL CONTROLS ON TRACEABILITY SYSTEMS, IDENTIFICATION MARKING AND LABELLING**

#### **Legal requirements**

General requirements on traceability systems, identification marking and labelling are laid down in Regulations (EC) No 178/2002, (EC) No 931/2011, (EC) No 853/2004, (EC) No 854/2004, (EU) No 1169/2011, (EU) No1337/2013.

More specific traceability and/or labelling requirements are laid down in Regulations (EC) No 1760/2000, (EC) No 1825/2000, (EC) No 1332/2008, (EC) No 1338/2008 and (EC) No 1334/2008.

#### **Audit findings**

##### *5.2.1 Organisation of official controls*

3. A risk based official control system is in place in Sweden covering all food producing establishments. All establishments should be controlled in all areas of applicable legislation within five years maximum. The content of the risk based controls is split between different inspections/audits taking place during this five year period. Appropriate tools (guidelines, checklists) are available for carrying out the official controls.
4. Guidelines for FBOs have been issued by the NFA in relation to traceability. Traceability should be covered at least twice in five years. Ongoing actions in relation

to traceability following the horse meat scandal and the discovering of food fraud in Sweden are currently being carried out.

5. These actions aim to increase the awareness of FBOs and officials in charge of controls. They concern the following areas:
  - creation of a food fraud unit;
  - specific training for staff to new control methods (180 inspectors on training);
  - identification of non-registered FBOs;
  - revision of the Swedish food act to re-enforce its efficiency, particularly concerning penal sanctions;
  - joint NFA-Stockholm municipality project to improve traceability controls and avoid overlapping (to be carried out between May and September 2015).

#### **Conclusions on organisation of official controls**

6. The NFA has drawn lessons from the horse meat scandal and initiated actions to increase the awareness of FBOs and officials in charge of controls.

#### *5.2.2 Implementation of official controls*

7. During the first day of the visit, the FVO audit team selected 14 meat and meat product samples at retail level. The CA was asked to trace back these 14 samples of meat to the slaughterhouse of origin based on available documentation. Furthermore, the CA was requested to provide documented evidence on the accuracy of the labelling of the goods selected, in relation to ingredients and composition. During visits to establishments in the first week, the FVO audit team verified the traceability of two of the samples. The CA was asked to carry out a documented quantitative trace back of the 12 remaining samples.
8. During the second week, the FVO audit team visited different establishments, which were identified during the above mentioned exercise in order to evaluate the situation on-the-spot.
9. Findings in relation to official controls are described in paragraphs 23 to 25.

#### *5.2.3 Official controls on food processing chain*

10. The CCA and the FBO's concerned were able to provide the complete set of documents relating to the qualitative traceability for 8 of the 14 samples identified. In the other six cases, elements of the documentation, sometimes significant, were missing.



11. From the eight samples, each with a complete set of documents for qualitative traceability the CAs and the FBOs concerned could establish the quantitative traceability. In four cases this was supported by the documented evidence. In the four other cases, data were missing and/or were incomplete or incorrect.

#### *5.2.3.1 Official controls on FBO's obligations*

12. In total, eight establishments were visited. Four were chosen in co-operation with the Swedish CCA and four chosen by the FVO audit team. This selection was based on the evaluation of the results of the traceability exercises carried out. The level of complexity and efficiency of the traceability systems in place in these establishments varied between establishments.
13. In one establishment, the FBO archived incoming and outgoing documentation without any additional registration regarding the different origins, quantities of raw materials received and processed and quantities of final products. A batch number was created per day of production. The quantities of the pigs' heads received and the approval number of the establishment that had delivered the meat were not recorded. No specific batch number was created when organic cutting production was carried out. The dates of production of organic meat were not recorded. No information concerning the quantities of meat of different batches delivered to the clients was available. As a consequence the establishments could not carry out any quantitative exercise or any reconciliation. No documented traceability system was in place to allow a recall to be adequately carried out.
14. Another establishment was directly importing Halal meat from Third Countries. The establishment did not have the Common Veterinary Entry Documents available relating to the consignments evaluated by the FVO audit team. Halal meat was also coming from Member States. The FBO had decided to implement, on a voluntary basis, the Swedish requirement that animals should be stunned before being Halal slaughtered for any meat imported or traded. This requirement could not be documented for deliveries coming from Member States and Third Countries. The traceability system was based on the recording of the date of slaughter at slaughterhouse level, but the FBO could not provide data concerning the quantities of meat present in the establishment for each of the slaughter dates. The storage was made by article number. As a consequence, different slaughter dates were mixed on the same pallet and the owner had no documented system in place for retrieving the meat belonging to different incoming consignments. Neither quantitative traceability nor reconciliation could be carried out by the FVO audit team.
15. In a third establishment, delivery notes accompanying the incoming deliveries were archived in a binder. The quantities of meat arriving at the establishment were not documented in another way. The traceability system was based on the packing date which was used as batch number. Nevertheless, the internal traceability could not be demonstrated. The quantities used at production level were not registered. The

labelling of the bovine meat in consumer packs was not in line with Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000, although the information to allow for a correct labelling was available.

16. A fourth establishment had a system in place foreseeing the manual recording of the quantities of ingredients received and the references/approval number of the slaughterhouses having produced the incoming meat. However this did not provide the reference of the establishment directly delivering the meat. A lot number specific to the establishment visited was attributed for each entering consignment based on the approval number of the slaughterhouse having produced the meat. A batch number was created for each new production. No recording of the final production quantities was carried out except when the FBO carried out internal reconciliation exercises. The exact quantities of each production batch for the goods delivered to the clients were not recorded.
17. In a fifth establishment, a batch number was automatically generated for each pallet or group of pallets belonging to the same purchase order and arriving on the same day. All the batch numbers were recorded in the business system of the company. Once identified and registered, each pallet could be allocated to the production departments where a new batch number was created for any given production carried out. This new batch number was created using the week, the day within the week and an increasing chronological number during the week. Reworks were taken into consideration in the traceability system, but not the timing for these reworks to be processed. At present, there is no system in place for carrying out reconciliation exercises. No system was in place for detecting anomalies between the quantities of meat in store and the quantities of meat used for the production. Also no documented evidence existed linking the production of the batch to the packing date. The batch number was not present on the goods sold to the consumers, but only on the trays sold to the supermarket.
18. In a sixth establishment, the FBO put a traceability system in place including the bar coding of the incoming raw material and outgoing meat products. All consignments of ingredients (e.g. meat, offal, spices) entering the establishment were checked and attributed a bar code. A batch number was created for the production of a given product on any given day. This batch could include one or more recipes. The preparation of each recipe included the scanning of the bar code of all ingredients used and it was explained that the system could automatically deduct the quantities of ingredient picked up from the stock. Nevertheless there was no physical validation of the real weight used for each ingredient used. On the day of the FVO visit, the system was also not able to provide the quantities of meat products produced for each batch, making any reconciliation impossible between the data relating to the initial ingredients and the final products. The FBO explained that no reconciliation system for the final products was in place. Anomalies were detected between the percentage of meat physically present in the recipe of a given meat product and the percentage of meat mentioned on the label.
19. A seventh establishment had a sophisticated traceability system in place: the batch numbers allocated were based on the date of production of the products, the article

number and the internal number of the establishment within the group of companies they belong to. The batch number was present on the trays sent to supermarket but not on the consumer packs. A new batch number was created for any movement of raw material, ingredients, half products or products. Nevertheless, in one of the two cases evaluated by the FVO audit team the data recorded in the company system did not match what the company claimed as being the physical reality, e.g. a production of the 18/03/2015 was recorded as being produced on the 19/03/2015, making the traceability exercise impossible. A consignment note of organic livers received in this establishment mentioned an article number which, after verification by the NFA, proved to be the same for organic and non-organic livers. The FBO gave a commitment to create a specific article number for organic livers.

20. The only cold store visited had a robust system in place based on the bar coding of any single entering pallet of meat. This bar code is scanned and registered in the system as well as the physical location of any bar coded pallet. As soon as an order is received for exiting goods, the system designates the palettes to be extracted from the cold store using the first in first out principle. The exiting goods are scanned allowing the cold store to have an ongoing permanent state of play of all goods stored. The exercises carried out by the FVO team revealed only one minor deficiency relating to one tray of meat.
21. The establishment also receives packed chilled meat to be frozen. The identification of the pallets of chilled meat follows the same rules. A new identification is given to the pallets once the meat is frozen.
22. The FVO audit team was told that, for the time being, the NFA has not issued instructions concerning the procedure to be respected for meat being produced in one establishment and being frozen in another one (delay for freezing and pre-printing of the freezing dates at cutting plant level (on chilled meat)
23. All the establishments mentioned above were subject to official controls as described in point 3. The time allocated per year to these official controls varied from 8 to 42 hours, depending on the type of activity, size and past performances.
24. Controls in relation to traceability of production had been carried out in half of the establishments visited by the FVO audit team. Traceability controls were foreseen in 2015 in two establishments not yet audited on this issue. In most case the traceability controls carried out did not cover the quantitative aspects and the deficiencies/weaknesses identified by the FVO audit team had not been identified by the CA in charge.
25. The CA controls in relation to food additives are not included in the five year plan of controls. However according to the CA, this topic may be covered during controls. No evidence of controls in relation to food additives was included in the official control reports presented to the FVO audit team.
26. In six of the eight establishments visited, the FVO audit team reviewed the recipe (ingredients used) and the label of eight randomly selected meat preparations and meat

products. The list of ingredients including the food additives and the composition of the premixes used was available for each of them. Documents to demonstrate the qualitative traceability were available in all cases assessed (including for the traceability samples)

#### **Conclusions on the implementation of official controls**

27. In all the establishments visited, the FBOs stated that a traceability system was in place. However, the evaluation of these systems revealed a less positive picture concerning traceability in general and quantitative traceability in particular. In one cold store a robust system was in place. Two establishments were making good progress towards implementing a good system but the others still had significant progress to make. Two establishments had yet to start work on implementing a traceability system.
28. All the establishments mentioned above were subject to official controls as described in point 3. In most cases, the traceability controls carried out did not cover the quantitative aspects and the deficiencies/weaknesses, identified by the FVO audit team, had not been identified by the CA in charge
29. The CA controls in relation to food additives are not included in the five year plan of controls.
30. The tracing back of most of the samples identified at the start of the audit was not successful.

### **5.3 MISCELLANEOUS**

#### *5.3.1 General and specific hygiene requirements*

31. In one establishment, significant deficiencies relating to maintenance and cleanliness were identified by the FVO audit team. These deficiencies had been identified earlier by the CA and the FBO was committed to addressing these deficiencies in the near future.

#### *5.3.2 Use of additives*

32. In the “*Guidance document describing the food categories in Part E of Annex II to Regulation (EC) No 1333/2008 on Food Additives*”, traditional cured pork and beef “*(meat that is injected with curing solution (usually between 2,3 -3% salt) including nitrite (max 150 mg/kg to the product) as a preservative and other additives (ascorbic acid or ascorbates and sometimes phosphate) and may after that be tumbled, stored for maturing or immersed in a curing solution) “to be prepared in the households”* is included in the category of meat products. No more specific information defining/describing which are the traditional cured pork and beef products are

available to the CA and FBOs. During the visits on the spot it was noted that E 250 (sodium nitrite) is used for one of the meat preparations assessed and labelled as such.

33. The CA has issued a guidance document for the interpretation of the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 1333/2008, which describes also the interpretation in relation to extracts. During the visits on the spot it was noted that several extracts were used by the FBOs in meat preparations and meat products.
34. In one of the establishments visited the maximum quantity of sodium nitrite used for hams was 180mg/kg exceeding the limit allowed by Regulation (EC) No 1333/2008. This was not detected by the CA as no checks in relations to food additives were carried out in the respective establishment.
35. Nitrite was used also on fresh meat sold as salted meat (at customer requests) in another establishment approved for cutting plants and meat preparations.

### **Conclusions**

36. Some deficiencies relating to hygiene requirements as well as additives legislation were identified.

## **6 OVERALL CONCLUSION**

The Swedish CCA has already drawn certain lessons from the recent meat scandals and is undertaking specific actions to increase the efficiency of the control system. Significant work remains to be done.

## **7 CLOSING MEETING**

A closing meeting was held on 24 April 2015 with the CCA, the NFA. At this meeting the FVO audit team presented the main findings and preliminary conclusions of the audit and advised the CCA of the relevant time limits for the production of the report and their response.

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

## **8 RECOMMENDATIONS**

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

No	Recommendations
1.	To ensure that official controls cover the verification of the requirements of Article 8 of Regulation 1169/2011 as well as of Article 18 of Regulation (EC) No 178/2002, in regard to traceability, including qualitative and

	<p>quantitative aspects.</p> <p><i>Recommendation based on conclusion No 28</i></p> <p><i>Associated findings No 10, No 11 and No 24</i></p>
2.	<p>During official controls, to ensure that food business operators comply with the requirements of Article 8 of Regulation (EC) No 1169/2011 as well as Article 18 of Regulation (EC) No 178/2002, in regard to traceability, including qualitative and quantitative aspects.</p> <p><i>Recommendation based on conclusion No 27</i></p> <p><i>Associated findings No 13-20</i></p>
3.	<p>During official controls, to ensure that food business operators make available any documentation and record considered necessary by the CAs to verify the compliance with traceability requirements as laid down in Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004.</p> <p><i>Recommendation based on conclusion No 27</i></p> <p><i>Associated findings No 13-20</i></p>
4.	<p>To ensure that official controls include controls on the use of food additives, flavourings and certain food ingredients with flavouring properties in order to ensure compliance with the requirements laid down in Regulations (EC) No 1333/2008 and 1334/2008.</p> <p><i>Recommendation based on conclusion No 29</i></p> <p><i>Associated finding No 25</i></p>

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=2015-7373](http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/rep_details_en.cfm?rep_inspection_ref=2015-7373)

## ANNEX 1 – LEGAL REFERENCES

<b>Legal Reference</b>	<b>Official Journal</b>	<b>Title</b>
Reg. 1760/2000	OJ L 204, 11.8.2000, p. 1-10	Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 July 2000 establishing a system for the identification and registration of bovine animals and regarding the labelling of beef and beef products and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 820/97
Reg. 1825/2000	OJ L 216, 26.8.2000, p. 8-12	Commission Regulation (EC) No 1825/2000 of 25 August 2000 laying down detailed rules for the application of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the labelling of beef and beef products
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. 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. 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

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
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. 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. 931/2011	OJ L 242, 20.9.2011, p. 2-3	Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 931/2011 of 19 September 2011 on the traceability requirements set by Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council for food of animal origin
Dir. 92/118/EEC	OJ L 62, 15.3.1993, p. 49-68	Council Directive 92/118/EEC of 17 December 1992 laying down animal health and public health requirements governing trade in and imports into the Community of products not subject to the said requirements laid down in specific Community rules referred to in Annex A (I) to Directive 89/662/EEC and, as regards pathogens, to Directive 90/425/EEC
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 beta-agonists, and repealing Directives 81/602/EEC, 88/146/EEC and 88/299/EEC



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. 2000/13/EC	OJ L 109, 6.5.2000, p. 29-42	Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 March 2000 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling, presentation and advertising of foodstuffs
Reg. 1332/2008	OJ L 354, 31.12.2008, p. 7-15	Regulation (EC) No 1332/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008 on food enzymes and amending Council Directive 83/417/EEC, Council Regulation (EC) No 1493/1999, Directive 2000/13/EC, Council Directive 2001/112/EC and Regulation (EC) No 258/97
Reg. 1333/2008	OJ L 354, 31.12.2008, p. 16-33	Regulation (EC) No 1333/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008 on food additives
Reg. 1334/2008	OJ L 354, 31.12.2008, p. 34-50	Regulation (EC) No 1334/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008 on flavourings and certain food ingredients with flavouring properties for use in and on foods and amending Council Regulation (EEC) No 1601/91, Regulations (EC) No 2232/96 and (EC) No 110/2008 and Directive 2000/13/EC