EUROPEAN COMMISSION
HEALTH AND CONSUMERS DIRECTORATE-GENERAL

Food chain and animal health expenditure

SANCO/2014/

REPORT ON THE

MEETING OF THE TASK FORCE FOR MONITORING ANIMAL DISEASE ERADICATION IN THE MEMBER STATES

Brussels, 28 February 2014

TASK FORCE FOR MONITORING ANIMAL DISEASE ERADICATION

Annual meeting of the Plenary Task Force

Friday, 28 February 2014- 9.30 H – 17.30 H

Participants:

AT, BE, BG, CH, CY, CZ, DE, EE, EL, ES, FI, HR, HU, IE, IT, LV, PL, PT, RO, SI, SE, SK, UK.

Private Experts:

-- Dr. M. Madsen, DK (chair of the Salmonellosis sub-group)
- Dr. F. De Massis, IT (chair of the bovine and sheep and goats Brucellosis sub-group);
- Prof V. Moening, DE (chair of the CSF sub-group);

European Commission (DG SANCO)

Unit G5:

- C. Bertrand (CB), Chair,
- L. Vandenberghe (LV),
- V. Piazza (VP),
- C. Boesinger - Froidevaux (CBF)
- S. Idei (SI)
- G. Seif (GS)
- C. Pinna (CP)
- B. Catanese (BC)

Unit F6:

- A.Vela Ramirez (AVR)

Unit A3:

- D. Delacourt (DD)
- I. Van Rompuy (IVR)

Unit A4:

- A. Mathy (AM)
- G. Serneels (GS)
- U. Keen (UK)

Agenda: see Annex 1.

1. Introduction

C. Bertrand, Head of Unit G5 welcomed the delegations and the private experts and opened the meeting.

The agenda was adopted (see detailed agenda-Annex 1). The delegations did not express any suggestions for new items.

2. Reports of the Task Force subgroups

- Classical swine fever: Romania (Chair)
- Salmonellosis: Bulgaria (Chair)
- Brucellosis: (Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia) (Chair)

1. INFORMATION ON THE 5th MEETINGS OF THE "CSF" SUB-GROUP OF THE TASK FORCE ON MONITORING ANIMAL DISEASE ERADICATION HELD IN BUCHAREST, ROMANIA, 16-17 APRIL 2013

Prof.V. Moening (DE), chair of the classical swine fever (CSF) subgroup, presented the outcome, conclusions and recommendations of the meeting held in Bucharest, Romania, 16-17 April 2013.

The chair revoked the objectives of the subgroup meeting and presented the situation in Romania including historical data from 2007-2009 on commercial farms, non-professional holdings and in wild boars and the results of the implementation of vaccination including commercial holdings and backyard population. He underlined that no case of CSF was detected since 2007.The chair gave an overview about the channel system and results of FVO audit in Romania in 2012. The chair emphasized that the epidemiological situation in the neighbouring countries as well as the IPA[1] Regional Projects on CSF in the Western Balkans were presented during the subgroup meeting.

The main conclusions and recommendations are listed below.

[1] The IPA (Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance) project is financed by DG Enlargement and managed by DG SANCO for the benefit of the 7 Western Balkan countries.

CONCLUSIONS

- The CSF Subgroup of the Task Force acknowledged the large progress compared to the first subgroup meeting that took place in 2009 in Bucharest.

- The CSF Subgroup concluded that the active and passive surveillance programmes presented by Romania would ensure rapid detection of and reaction to new outbreaks.

- The detailed data provided by Romania on domestic pigs covering the entire territory of the country strengthen the notion that the hypothesis that CSF-virus is still circulating in the country is not valid.

- Convincing evidence was presented on the effectiveness of the channelling system. The system is quite labour-intensive and Romania undertakes considerable efforts to operate the system. The assessment of the CSF Subgroup is backed up by recent FVO audits.

- The end of vaccination by 31st December 2009 did not lead to new CSF outbreaks in domestic pigs, i.e. the exit strategy was effective.

- The system of registering individual animals in backyard holdings seems quite sophisticated and laborious.
-
- The (still) high number of non-commercial (backyard) holdings poses a constant risk for the re-introduction of CSF.

- It was stated that – except for 2011 - the Romanian wild boar population has been stable for years despite the general European trend of increasing wild boar densities. The national hunting bag has also been stable for years.

- Vaccination of wild boar in northern and eastern border areas stopped in 2011. However, detailed serological data of wild boar were not provided.

- The country has a well-organized laboratory network with good capacity. Figures on the capacity were presented. In the beginning of 2013 the LIMS system has been introduced in the NRL and all county laboratories.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- The surveillance data on domestic pigs presented to the CSF Subgroup should include more information on location, size and census of non-professional holdings (splitted between CS area and outside CS system area) in order to improve the demonstration of the favorable epidemiological situation.

- The CSF Subgroup recommends seeking ways to simplify the control system in pig holdings, e.g. for the purpose of CSF control, reference to the holding instead of the individual animal might be sufficient for tracing back animals in case of swine fever outbreaks.

- The serological investigation of sick animals should be stopped, since CSF-specific antibodies are unlikely to occur in these animals.

- Passive surveillance in backyard operations should be carried out systematically to be able to detect an eventual re-introduction of CSF as early as possible.

- Since wild boar are always potential host animals for CSF virus, more efforts should be put into gathering information about the actual status and dynamics including their geographical distribution of the national wild boar population.

- Age-related serology of wild boar samples should be introduced in order to allow better evaluation of the data.

- The system of individual labs to procure reagents and test kits should be reconsidered and improved. Mutual information on the availability of tests in county laboratories is essential for an effective usage of the national laboratory capacity.

Full report of this subgroup meeting as document SANCO/2013/11408 is publicly available here.

Copy of presentation: Annex 2.

2. INFORMATION ON THE 7th MEETINGS OF THE "FOODBORNE ZOONOSES – SALMONELLOSIS" SUB-GROUP OF THE TASK FORCE ON MONITORING ANIMAL DISEASE HELD IN SOFIA, BULGARIA, 21-22 MARCH 2013

Dr M. Madsen (DK), chair of the Salmonella subgroup, presented the outcome of the meeting held in Bulgaria, Sofia on 21-22 March 2013.

As an introduction, he explained that most recently the Salmonella subgroup meetings focus only on the programmes of the hosting country, while at the beginning more than one country presented their programmes during these subgroup meetings.

The chair gave an overview about topics that the meeting encompassed, such as experiences and challenges of the implementation of the Salmonella control programme in breeding, laying hens and broiler flocks of *Gallus gallus* as well as in turkeys. The chair recalled potential obstacles to successful implementation of *Salmonella* control programs in poultry which were discussed with the host in details in the subgroup meeting. He emphasized that the co-ordinated approach between bodies involved in the implementation of the programmes is prerequisite in order to achieve goals.The specific activities of the National Reference Laboratory Salmonella on detection, serotyping and antimicrobial sensitivity determinations, ring trials were presented briefly.

Discussions with the host leaded to conclusions and recommendations that were introduced to delegations in details and are listed below.

CONCLUSIONS

Organisation:

- The Salmonella Control Programmes of the Republic of Bulgaria are clearly organized at central, regional and municipal levels, with a greater frequency of official sampling that the minimum requirement being carried out in many cases.

Biosecurity:

- Good check lists are available for biosecurity key points at farm level and responses to biosecurity recommendation are checked according to agreed deadlines.
- It appears that training in biosecurity measures is an important part of the work carried out at municipal level.
- Prolonged down-time and verified effective cleaning and disinfection are used to minimize the risk of carry-over of statutory Salmonella serovars between flocks.

Data reporting:

- Communication between central, regional and municipal levels seems efficient, with provision of monthly reports to the central level for monitoring purposes, as documented by the provision of copies of monthly reports.
- However, the data presentation provided during our visit was not entirely clear, e.g. data for grandparent and parent flocks were combined, and also for layer and broiler breeders.

Sampling and testing:

- Sample submission is efficient, and samples are refrigerated until dispatch in case of delay of transport of more than 24 hours for samples to reach the laboratory, which is normally arranged by courier.
- Additional epidemiological sampling is carried out as needed.
- The detection sensitivity relating to operator samples and feed samples in particular is open to question and may lead to limitations on further progress.

National Reference Laboratory (NRL) Salmonella:

- Ring trials for regional and private laboratories are organized by NRL Salmonella which is good.
- Previous ring trials have been carried out with pure Salmonella cultures in sterile skimmed milk without competitive flora, but for the next ring trial natural sample material will be used which should be commended.

Industry cooperation:

- Experience from other countries shows that industry involvement is crucial for the successful development of NCPs. It was confirmed that a good cooperation existed between the industry and the CA.

Vaccination:

- It is acknowledged that vaccination is voluntary. However, from the data presented on vaccinated flocks it appears that vaccination programmes are not strictly adhered to (e.g. some flocks are not fully vaccinated) which means that the full value of a vaccination programme is not achieved).
- From the historical data presented it appears that the percentage of vaccinated flocks is decreasing. This could be a risk factor if more and more flocks are left fully susceptible to Salmonella colonization.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Data reporting and analysis:

- For the ongoing data analysis, data for grandparent and parent flocks should be separated, and also for layer and broiler breeders.
- It could be considered to introduce an electronic system/data base for the data reporting and data analysis.

Sampling:

- The focus on timely sampling of broiler flocks should be continued, to allow for efficient slaughter planning in order to minimize cross-contamination at the slaughter plant.
- A simple and unique flock identification is proposed, e.g. composed of farm ID + house no. + stocking date which works well in other countries.
- An ongoing comparison between samples taken at the same time by both CA and FBO ensures the quality of samples taken by the FBO and discrepancies in findings should be further investigated.
- The importance of testing breeder birds is emphasized as missing samples at this level could jeopardise the favourable national situation with respect to low Salmonella prevalence.

NRL Salmonella:

- The national quality control of regional and private laboratories could be strengthened by using the samples from the annual EU CRL Salmonella ring test for proficiency tests distributed by the National Reference Laboratory.
- A lower number of Salmonella organisms and realistic sample matrix should be used for future NRL proficiency tests for regional and private laboratories in order to test their detection capability. Further use of pre-enrichment broth from EURL ring trials was also proposed as a possible additional EQA measure.
- The quality of diagnostic procedures at regional and private laboratories should be investigated as 25% of isolates submitted to NRL for serotyping turn out to be organisms other than Salmonella, suggesting a possible problem of overgrowth of Salmonella by competing organisms.

Residue testing:

- It is recommended that random checks for antibiotic residues during confirmatory and official sampling be carried out.

Feed:

- It is unusual that no positive samples for Salmonella in feed have been registered. This should be further investigated with respect to sampling procedure and laboratory examination methods.

Public health:

- Further cooperation with public health authorities should be sought, e.g. through the establishment of common stakeholder meetings with participation from industry, BFSA and public health authorities.

Full report of this subgroup meeting as document SANCO/11068/2013 is publicly available here.

Copy of presentation: Annex 3.

3. INFORMATION ON THE MEETING OF THE "BOVINE AND SHEEP AND GOATS BRUCELLOSIS" SUB-GROUP OF THE TASK FORCE ON MONITORING ANIMAL DISEASE ERADICATION, HELD IN SKOPJE, (FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA) ON 14-15 MAY 2013.

Dr F. De Massis, (IT) chair of the bovine and sheep and goats Brucellosis sub-groups presented the summary of the implementation of sheep and goats brucellosis eradication programmes and the conclusions and recommendation of the meeting held in Skopje, FYROM on 14-15 May 2013.

As an introduction, he reminded that one of the scopes of the Task Force (by 2010) is also to provide technical support to candidate and third countries: for that reason a Task Force was held in **Skopje.**

The chair presented the situation in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in relation to the implementation of the brucellosis programmes, including structure of veterinary

service, distribution of bovine and ovine/caprine livestock data from 2013. He underlined that although the test coverage at herd and animal level is not 100% but it is difficult to evaluate it due to the discrepancies between database and the real number of existing holdings. The bovine Brucellosis programme has been implemented since 2007.Regarding the sheep and goat Brucellosis programme, a number of drawbacks were identified during the test –and-slaughter policy implemented before 2008.

The chair gave an overview about the National Database and about the National Veterinary Information System. He presented the activities of the Reference Laboratory for Animal Brucellosis.

The main conclusions and recommendation are listed below:

CONCLUSIONS

1. The shortage of resources at local level could compromise the implementation of the programme in the future.

2. The I&R system is almost in line with the EU legislation, however it is still not fully implemented.

3. The new veterinary information system is well designed for monitoring Brucellosis eradication programmes, however it is not fully implemented.

4. Strategies for the eradication of sheep and goat Brucellosis are well adapted to the initially estimated prevalence of the disease and its evolution in the recent years.

5. For cattle, the data provided on testing coverage at animal and herd level is not sufficient to give a complete picture of the situation.

6. Testing cattle younger than 12 months may lead to inconclusive results.

7. The serological testing seems not to cover the total eligible animal population.

8. In flocks or herds with confirmed brucellosis infection where tests and slaughter strategy is carried out, parallel testing is not performed while it is a tool for more rapid elimination of infected animals.

9. Cattle holdings have the possibility to be classified according to their sanitary status as "Officially Brucellosis-free". However, a similar classification is not in force for sheep and goat holdings.

10. The I&R system is not yet fully operative and this does not allow getting accurate information with respect to the vaccination or testing coverage.

11. Bacteriology investigation is not used extensively in those areas where tests and slaughter policy is conducted.

12. In unvaccinated herds or flocks where brucellosis infection is confirmed, the total depopulation is not considered as an alternative to test and slaughter strategy.

13. Data shown about trend of human brucellosis incidence reveal a remarkable drop in the incidence after year 2008, in which a mass vaccination campaign started in sheep and goat population.

14. The Veterinary Institute-Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Skopje is the approved NRL and the only laboratory authorised to carry out specific tests for the diagnosis of Bovine Brucellosis.

15. The currently existing veterinary information system is dedicated to activities to be performed in the framework of the existing control plan, however it is still not fully operative at the moment.

16. The compensation scheme (100% of market value) may discourage farmers in implementing bio-security measures.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The veterinary services should be reinforced in terms of financial resources to ensure the implementation of the programme at medium and long term.

2. The I&R system should be fully implemented and the contained information refined, so the system can work as a basic tool for monitoring the progress of brucellosis eradication programmes.

3. The need to make the currently existing veterinary information system fully operative for the activities to be performed in the framework of the existing eradication plan for brucellosis control in cattle, sheep and goats should be urgently considered.

4. Efforts should be made to control 100 % of cattle herds in order to get a more reliable estimate of prevalence of bovine brucellosis at national level. In order to save resources, it is recommended to test animals older than 12 months.

5. For small ruminants, the efforts made during recent years should be continued.

6. Rev.1 vaccination should not be discontinued in those areas where alternative means for controlling the disease are not available or the prevalence has not dropped to an acceptable level for implementing a test- and- slaughter policy.

7. Where necessary, local vaccination plans should be revised in order to ensure the covering of the whole population at risk.

8. In flocks or herds with confirmed brucellosis infection animals resulting positive to RBT should be slaughtered regardless to their testing with CFT. If possible, testing should be carried out in parallel.

9. Provision should be implemented in national legislation in order to allow the qualification of sheep & goat holdings and territories with the status of "officially-free or free as intended in the EU 91/68/EEC Directive.

10. The use of bacteriological confirmation should be improved as a complementary tool to identify infected flocks.

Full report of this subgroup meeting as document SANCO/12518/2013 is publicly available here.

Copy of presentation: Annex 4.

3. POINTS FOR DISCUSSIONS

3.1 "COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING DECISION AS REGARDS THE STANDARD REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR NATIONAL PROGRAMMES FOR THE ERADICATION,CONTROL AND MONITORING OF CERTAIN ANIMAL DISEASES AND ZOONOSES CO-FINANCED BY THE UNION AND REPEALING COMMISSION DECISION 2008/940/EC "(SANCO/12909/2013)

VP Introduced these points and explained that the purpose of this document is to introduce updated standardised schemes for the report on the implementation of the co-financed programmes. She gave an overview on the main changes compared to the previous decision.
VP highlighted that Member States are requested to send the reports on the implementation of the co-financed programmes 2015 no longer to the functional mailbox, but directly to the SANCO BO, similarly as it is already the case since the submission of the programmes 2014.
Delegations made comments on the application as well as on the design and content of individual tables of Annexes III, IV,VI (mainly for *Salmonella*, Rabies and pig diseases).
Delegations were requested to send further comment by 7 March to enable Commission to present this document in the forthcoming SCoFCAH.

3.2. STATE OF PLAY OF PDF FOR SUBMISSION OF 2015 PROGRAMMES AND INTERMEDIATE REPORTS 2014

SANCO BO team, the IT developers **AM**, **GS** , **UK** demonstrated the use of PDF templates such as Annex IV for the submission of the programmes 2015-onwards and also hold a demo on the use of Annex X developed for the reports on the implementation of the co-financed programmes.PDF templates are used voluntarily since years and mandatorily for the submission of the programmes 2014 since last year. For the future it will become also mandatory to complete the reports on the implementation of the programmes in PDF format.
Delegates asked questions on unit cost, reimbursement ceiling, possibility to attach maps and pre-filling of tables with data. The IT-developers emphasized that it is possible to add XML files to the PDF, furthermore any other supporting document can be added to the PDF.
It is also feasible to transform data to XML from Excel. Moreover, it is possible to transfer data submitted during the test case into a production case.
Several Member States expressed their willingness to test the system. The BO team projected mid-March as probable timing to launch the test case for all MSs for the updated PDF templates for programme submission.

CB gave an update on the reallocation of responsibilities within the veterinary sector on the occasion of recent move of veterinarians in the Unit and introduced CFB as the contact person for IT-issues in the Unit. **CFB** presented the timetable for the testing case of the PDF templates.

Copy of presentation: Annex 5.

3.3 "MULTI-ANNUAL WORK PROGRAMME FOR THE YEARS 2015-2017 FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF UNION CO-FUNDED PROGRAMMES OF ERADICATION, CONTROL AND SURVEILLANCE OF ANIMAL DISEASES AND ZOONOSES –WORKING DOCUMENT-PRELIMINARY DRAFT"

CBF explained that the legal basis for co-financing will change with a need for simplified, rationalized co-financing systems. The new Union expenditure management Regulation (Common Financial Framework or CFF) inter alia provides that work programmes shall be adopted by the Commission. The purpose is to allow co-ordination, prioritisation and to better contribute to effective use of Union financial resources. He presented in details priorities, objectives, expected results and description of the activities to be funded as well as eligibility and award criteria for the submitted programmes. **CBF** provided delegates with a timetable and indicative amount of the grants awarded. Regarding setting of the co-financing rates, he emphasized that 50 % is the general rate and there is a possibility for 75 % for cross border activities for MSs with GNI per inhabitant less than 90 % of the Union average. Furthermore, activities linked to combat serious human, animal or plant health risks for the Union may be eligible up to 100%.

3.4. STATE OF PLAY OF DRAFT REGULATION (SANCO/ INTERINSTITUTIONAL REFERENCE NUMBER: 2013/0169(COD)

State of play of: Draft Regulation (SANCO/2013/0169(COD)) CFF laying down provisions for the management of expenditures relating to the food chain, animal health and animal welfare, and relating to plant health and plant reproductive material '"food and feed expenditure".

CB briefed delegations on the state of play of adoption of Common Financial Framework for Food and Feed (CFF). He presented the past calendar starting with the Publication of Commission proposal in June 2013 by mentioning relevant stages of the negotiations between June and December 2013 when the proposal was discussed with EP and Council. He referred to the trilogues and political agreement made in December 2013.
The consolidated text was adopted in Com Agri on11 February 2014. He introduced the next steps towards adoption of Regulation.

3.5 RATES FOR CO-FUNDING AND ELIGIBLE COSTS

LVB presented the main changes to Financing Rates and Eligible Measures Under the CFF 2014-2020.He introduced the forms of financing 2014-2020 and its implications, budgetary changes, maximum rates of grants, emergency measures, eligible costs under the programmes by comparing future rules applicable in 2014-2020 to the current situation 2007-2013.
He emphasized that the major changes concern the form of financing in the form of "grants" and the budget, as additional financial resources will no longer be available from heading 2.
Under emergency measures "shall" becomes "may" and explained the term "retroactivity".
In the framework of the programmes, additional eligible measures may be eligible such as cost of cleaning, disinfection, cost of slaughter/culling of animals, and any other necessary measures where duly justified. **LVB** also reminded delegations on how the claims for 2013 programmes should be reported.

Copy of presentation: Annex 6.

4. POINTS FOR INFORMATION

4.1 WD ON PRINCIPLE AND CRITERIA ON WHICH IS BASED THE REACTTION OF THE COMMISSION IN CASE OF UNSATISFACTORY IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAMMES CO-FINANCED UNDER ARTICLE 27 OF COUNCIL DECISION 2009/470/EU (SANCO/12785/2012 rev 2)

CFB explained that the purpose of this document is to inform the Member States on the principles and criteria on which the Commission bases its reaction to the unsatisfactory implementation of Member State veterinary monitoring, control and eradication programmes co-financed under Article 27 of Council Decision 2009/470/EC. The document lays down provisions on Commission reaction on non-compliances or deviations, assessment of the gravity of the problem. The first Commission reaction will be for the first year, a warning letter addressed to the concerned Member state; from the second year onwards financial correction could be implemented based on a percentage which can vary from 10 to 100%.

The current revised version of the document was produced taking into account the comments from Member States following the presentation of SANCO/12785/2012 Rev.1 at the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health meeting on the 1 March 2013.

CBF explained that the annual reports of the programmes are assessed and the level of implementation of the measures described in the approved programmes is evaluated. The Union payment depends on the outcome of this assessment. Fulfilment of relevant EU requirements is prerequisite. He highlighted that in line with the principal described in the Financial Regulation sound financial management shall apply to Union funds.

He stressed that the Commission reacts in cases of failures that either significantly affect the achievement of the programmes objectives and/or its cost-effectiveness or where there is an obvious breach of relevant legislative requirements. The document does not cover the application of financial corrections in cases of failure to comply with EU rules not relating to the technical implementation of the programme, such as breaches of the legislation on the

award of public contracts, competition, application for reimbursement of non-eligible costs, etc.
Copy of presentation: Annex 7.

4.2 TIMING 2014-2015. (WD SANCO/10404/2014)

VP explained that the purpose of the document is to clarify changes due to the switchover from old regime (according to Council Decision 2009/470/EC and in compliance with the CFF proposal) to new regime of submission of programmes.

She highlighted that the deadline for submission of 2015 Programmes is 30 April 2014. Programmes submitted after that deadline will not be taken into account [Article 27(2) of Council Decision 2009/470/EC]. She underlined that the Commission may ask the Member State to provide additional information if a programme proposed for co-financing does not contain all the requested information or if certain technical and financial amendments are necessary according to the old regime.

Regarding timeframe of the approval of the 2015 programmes under the new regime, no later than 30 November 2014 (notably, the year preceding the implementation of the programmes), the Commission will arrange an annual meeting of the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed (SCoPAFF) to inform the Member States on the outcome of the evaluation procedure. In this context, the Commission will present the list of the programmes technically approved and proposed for co-financing, and will discuss their financial and technical details with the national delegations [CFF proposal – Art. 13 and Statement from the Commission on the procedures for the approval of programmes].

The final list of programmes selected for co-financing and the final amount allocated to each programme will be communicated to the Member States during a meeting of the SCoPAFF, which will be held before the Commission takes its final decision [CFF proposal - Statement from the Commission on the procedures for the approval of programmes].

The national programmes and associated funding will be approved by 31 January 2015 by means of a grant decision in relation to the measures implemented and the costs incurred from 1 January to 31 December of that year [CFF proposal – Art. 13].

VP also emphasized that the presented document includes flowcharts on procedure for programmes and a summary table on transition from old regime to new regime.

Copy of presentation: Annex 8.

4.3. EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAMMES SUBMITTED BY MEMBER STATES FOR 2015-ONWARDS

SI underlined the aim of the assessment of the veterinary programmes and revoke a call for expression of interest that was published 28.2.2102[2] with the aim to select experts to assist the Commission with the pre-assessment of the programmes. Delegates were reminded that the deadline for submission of applications is open until 31 March 2014 and that once selected, the candidates must not resubmit an application. Reserve lists expire this year, thus valid only to evaluate the programmes submitted in 2014.
SI presented an example for a standard checklist on Avian Influenza for evaluators to score the programmes and show a timetable including well-defined Commission actions and expert actions. She briefly presented the experience gained during the preliminary evaluation of the programmes submitted in the previous years. External experts were assigned to a group of evaluators per disease in accordance to their experience. Experts were asked to complete an individual evaluation sheet in accordance with a guidance document. Each individual programme was assessed by at least 2 experts, none of them from the same nationality of the programme under assessment. One expert per group was designated as rapporteur responsible for drafting the consensus report that was agreed during the meetings held in Brussels with all the experts and chaired by the Commission.
The Commission completed the evaluation of the programmes and contacted MS asking for modifications or additional information if needed following the technical and financial evaluation.
For the 2014 programmes, 208 programmes were submitted from 28 different Member States, and out of 208, still 85 programmes were drafted in national languages.
Official translation requires resources and may take up to eight weeks, submission of the veterinary programmes in English is welcome as English is the working language of the consensus meeting.
Similarly to the previous years, the 2015 programmes will also be evaluated with the technical assistance of external experts; some lessons learnt will be taken into account for the improvement of the assessment of the 2014 programmes, being nevertheless the 2014 experience very positive.

SI underlined that, based on the outcome of the external study (by GHK) on the evaluation of the eradication, control and monitoring programmes for the period 2005-2010, MSs are strongly recommended from 2014 to submit **multi-annual programmes** for all diseases where the activities are expected to largely remain the same for a number of years to reduce administrative burdens while increasing collective focus on medium-term strategic goals.

Copy of presentation: Annex 9.

END

[2] http://ted.europa.eu/udl?uri=TED:NOTICE:65566-2012:TEXT:FR:HTML&src=0

Annexes

Annex 1: Agenda
Annex 2: Power point presentation on CSF subgroup meeting
Annex 3: Power point presentation on Salmonella subgroup meeting
Annex 4: Power point presentation on Brucellosis subgroup meeting
Annex 5: Power point presentation on PDF templates
Annex 6: Power point presentation on Eligible measures under CFF 2014-2020
Annex 7: (SANCO/12785/2012 rev 2)
Annex 8: (WD SANCO/10404/2014)
Annex 9: Power point presentation on External evaluation of the programmes submitted by Member States for 2015.

Annex 1

TASK FORCE FOR MONITORING ANIMAL DISEASE ERADICATION

Annual meeting of the Plenary Task Force

Friday, 28 February 2014- 9.30 H – 17.30 H

Conference Centre A. Borschette – Rue Froissart 36 – Bruxelles – SALLE AB / 1D

AGENDA

1. Introduction, opening by Christophe Bertrand: Head of Unit G5-

2. Reports of the Task Force subgroups:

- Classical swine fever (Chair)
- Salmonellosis: Bulgaria (Chair)
- Brucellosis: FYROM (Chair)

3. Points for discussion

3.1 "Commission Implementing Decision as regards the standard reporting requirements for national programmes for the eradication, control and monitoring of certain animal diseases and zoonoses co-financed by the Union and repealing Commission Decision 2008/940/EC" (SANCO/12909/2013).

3.2 " Commission Implementing Decision concerning the adoption of the 2015-2017 multi annual work programme and its financing in the framework of the implementation of Union co-funded programmes of eradication, control and surveillance of animal diseases and zoonoses" (SANCO/10181/2014)

3.3 Rates for co funding and eligible costs

4. Points for information

4.1 WD on principle and criteria on which is based the reaction of the Commission in case of unsatisfactory implementation of programmes co-financed under Article 27 of Council Decision 2009/470/EU (SANCO/12785/2012 rev 1)

4.2 Timing 2014-2015. (WD SANCO/10404/2014)

4.3 External evaluation of the programmes submitted by Member States for 2015.

4.4 State of play of pdf for submission of **2015 programmes** and **intermediate reports 2014**.

4.5 State of play of: Draft Regulation (SANCO/)CFF laying down provisions for the management of expenditures relating to the food chain, animal health and animal welfare, and relating to plant health and plant reproductive material '"food and feed expenditure".

5. Miscellaneous

Annex 7

I. 

II. EUROPEAN COMMISSION
III. HEALTH & CONSUMERS DIRECTORATE-GENERAL
IV.
V. Veterinary and International affairs
VI.
VII. Unit G5 – Food chain and animal health expenditure
VIII.
IX.
X.

SANCO/12785/2012 Rev2

WORKING DOCUMENT

on

Principles and criteria on which is based the reaction of the Commission in cases of unsatisfactory implementation of programmes co-financed under Article 27 of Council Decision 2009/470/EC

(The final version of this document has been presented to the Member States on 28/02/2014 and to the AOSD on 07/04/2014)

I. Introduction

In accordance with Article 27 of Council Decision 2009/470/EC, the Commission approves for Union co-financing, annual and multiannual programmes for the eradication, control and monitoring of certain animal diseases and zoonoses submitted by the Member States.
Following each implementation year of a programme, the Member States shall submit a final technical and financial report and payment application to the Commission which thereafter decides on the payment of the Union contribution on the basis of assessment of the results of the programmes. Each programme's results are checked against the level of implementation of the measures described in the approved programme as well as the fulfilment of relevant EU legislative requirements.

The Commission has the duty of ensuring that the use of Union funds is in line with the principles of sound financial management laid down in the Financial Regulation (Regulation (EU) No 966/2012) which sets the rules applicable to the budget of the Union.

On the same line, every year the financial decision approving the co-financing of veterinary programmes, defines the conditions for the payment of the EU contribution (including efficient implementation, and compliance with relevant EU rules) and provides for a reduction by the Commission of the financial contribution by having regard to the nature and gravity of the infringement, and to the financial loss for the Union.

The purpose of this document is to inform the Member States on the principles and criteria on which the Commission bases its reaction to the unsatisfactory implementation of Member State veterinary monitoring, control and eradication programmes co-financed under Article 27 of Council Decision 2009/470/EC.
The current revised version of the document was produced taking into account the comments from Member States following the presentation of SANCO/12785/2012 Rev.1 at the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health meeting on the 1 March 2013.

The document does not cover the application of financial corrections in cases of failure to comply with EU rules not relating to the technical implementation of the programme, such as breaches of the legislation on the award of public contracts, competition, marketing authorisation of veterinary medicinal products, application for reimbursement of non-eligible costs, etc.

II. Non-compliances or deviations from the approved programme activities requiring Commission reaction:

The non-compliances listed below should lead to a reaction by the Commission:

1. Severe or moderate non fulfilment of EU minimum monitoring or surveillance requirements (i.e. non achievement of obligatory testing targets set in EU legislation);
2. Obvious significant breach of relevant EU veterinary legislation (other than monitoring/surveillance requirements e.g. breach of legal provisions on the use of antimicrobials to control *Salmonella* infection, etc.);
3. Non realisation of planned activities of the programme (testing, vaccination etc.) to an extent significantly affecting the achievement of its objectives (early detection, control, eradication etc.) or cost effectiveness;

4. Implementation of practices or measures (regarding monitoring, surveillance, control, eradication, animal movements, identification, measures in case of positive results, etc) deviating from those foreseen in the approved programme significantly affecting the achievement of its objectives or cost effectiveness;
5. Failures, other than those in point 1 to 4, significantly affecting the achievement of the programme objectives and/or its cost effectiveness.

III. Assessment of the gravity of the non-compliance

1. Quantifiable level:

Where there are quantifiable legislative requirements (monitoring/surveillance) not being satisfied or where there is quantifiable deviation from the targets/objectives set in the approved programme, the gravity of the failure shall be defined as follows:

Gravity level	Low	Moderate	Severe
Compliance with minimum legislative requirements	≥ 90%	70-90%	<70%
Compliance with targets/objectives set in approved programme	≥80%	60-80%	<60%

As regards the targets set in the approved programmes not linked to legislative requirements, factors affecting the amount of activities (testing, animals culled etc.) fully outside the control of the Competent Authorities or other valid technical justifications provided by the Member States will be taken into account for defining the gravity of the under-implementation and the appropriateness of Commission reaction.

2. Non-quantifiable level:

Cases of breach of relevant EU legislation, alteration of practices of measures foreseen in the approved programme where it is not possible to make a direct quantitative assessment of the extent of the failure, the Commission defines the gravity taking into account the negative impact to the objectives and the cost effectiveness of the programme. For this purpose the Commission is using prevailing scientific knowledge and other existing guidelines or recommendations such as those developed in specific subgroups of the Task Force for Monitoring Animal Disease Eradication.

IV. Additional elements to assess the non-compliance

The following elements will be taken into account in the assessment for the application of financial corrections as set in the table under point V.2:

- The evolution of the deficiencies from previous years (first time occurrence, improving, stable, aggravating, etc.);
- Intention or degree of negligence of the competent authority (CA) ;
- Measures taken by the CA to remedy the situation;
- Duration of the non-compliance.

V. Approach followed

1. Criteria

- The occurrence of any of the non-compliances listed in point II of this document should lead to at least a warning letter to the CA of the MS explaining the unsatisfactory evaluation of the results of the programme and mentioning that financial corrections would be applied should no significant improvement be achieved in the following year(s).
- Moderate and severe non-compliances that are repeated for two or more consecutive years with no significant improvement, shall always lead to the application of financial corrections.
- In cases where the situation is not satisfactory but there is a significant improvement on the non-compliance comparing to the previous year it may be decided to derogate from the second bullet point and not apply financial corrections, always taking into account the gravity and the consequences on the objectives and the cost effectiveness but also the principle of equal treatment between MS.
- Non-compliances occurring only in a specific region(s) of a MS could lead to the application of financial corrections only on the eligible measures for activities related to that specific region, taking however into account the consequences to the overall programme.
- Non-compliances occurring only in a specific subpopulation under the programme (e.g. TSE monitoring in small ruminants) could lead to the application of financial corrections only on the eligible measures for activities related to monitoring/surveillance described in the relevant part of the programme, taking however into account the consequences to the overall programme.
- In cases of severe shortcomings in the implementation of critical activities (e.g. non or very low implementation of foreseen vaccination) which affect the achievement of the objectives of the approved programme, the Commission may apply a financial correction of 100% to the reimbursement of all the eligible activities under the programme by derogation to the method described in point IV.2.

2. Level of financial correction:

The level of correction to be applied is decided taking into account the level of the gravity of the non-compliance but also the elements described in part IV:

Level of non-compliance	Basic level of correction (first time)	Maximum level of correction	Multiplication factor for non improvement in subsequent year	Multiplication factor for significant improvement in subsequent year
Moderate	10%	50%	x2	x1 or x 0.5
Severe	25%	100%	x2	x1 or x 0.5

If there are unequivocal evidences to demonstrate that up to a certain extent the non-compliance is a consequence of the CA intention or negligence, or the Commission assessment concludes that measures taken by the CA to remedy the situation are insufficient, up to 10% could be added to the basic level of correction.

Corrections of less than 10% shall not be applied.

Example: The programme of Member State X demonstrates a non-compliance of moderate gravity for 5 consecutive years with no improvement.

Commission reaction:
Year 1: Warning letter
Year 2: 10% correction (first year of correction, basic level)
Year 3: 20% correction (level applied in previous year x2 – non improvement)
Year 4: 40% correction (level applied in previous year x2 – non improvement)
Year 5: 50% correction (previous year x2, but 50% ceiling attained)

VI. Entry into force

These provisions will apply starting from the reimbursement of programmes implemented in 2013.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
HEALTH & CONSUMER PROTECTION DIRECTORATE-GENERAL

Veterinary and International Affairs

Unit G5 –Food chain and animal health expenditure

Working document

Annex 8

SANCO/10404/2014

Animal disease eradication, control and monitoring programmes

Timing for 2014, 2015 and following years

Contents

Timing 2014-2015 and following years .....
1. 2014 Programmes: old regime (Decision 2009/470/EC) .....
submission .....
2. 2015 programmes: transitory regime (from Decision 2009/470/EC to the CFF Regulation) .....
3. 2016 Programmes: new regime (CFF Regulation) .....
ANNEX I – Flowcharts on procedure for programmes……..
ANNEX II – Summary table: Transition from old regime to new regime……...

1. 2014 PROGRAMMES: OLD REGIME (COUNCIL DECISION 2009/470/EC)

The old regime for submission, approval, monitoring and reporting of programmes, as provided by Council Decision 2009/470/EC, will last fully apply to **2014 Programmes**, namely programmes submitted in 2013 for implementation in 2014.

Eligibility criteria for those programmes are laid down in Commission Decision 2008/341/EC.

SUBMISSION

The deadline for the submission of 2014 Programmes was 30 April 2013 [Article 27(2) of Council Decision 2009/470/EC].

APPROVAL

2014 Programmes were approved in November 2013 [Article 27(5) of Council Decision 2009/470/EC].

MONITORING AND REPORTING

The Commission will monitor and evaluate the progress of 2014 Programmes based, *inter alia*, on the following information:

- The intermediate technical and financial report of the programme, to be presented by the Member State by 31 July 2014 [Article 27 (7) of Council Decision 2009/470/EC];

- Final technical and financial reports, to be submitted by 30 April 2015 [Article 27 (7)(b) of Council Decision 2009/470/EC].

PAYMENTS AND REIMBURSEMENTS

The deadline for the submission of payment applications relating to the expenditure incurred by a Member State in respect of 2014 programmes is 30 April 2015 [Article 27 (8) of Council Decision 2009/470/EC].

The deadline for the Commission to decide on the payment is 30 October 2015 [Article 27 (8) of Council Decision 2009/470/EC].

1. 2015 PROGRAMMES: TRANSITORY REGIME (FROM COUNCIL DECISION 2009/470/EC TO THE CFF REGULATION)

A transitory regime will apply to **2015 Programmes**, namely programmes submitted in 2014 for implementation in 2015.

Eligibility criteria for those programmes are laid down in Commission Decision 2008/341/EC.

SUBMISSION – OLD REGIME

The deadline for submission of 2015 Programmes is 30 April 2014. Programmes submitted after that deadline will not be taken into account [Article 27(2) of Council Decision 2009/470/EC].

The Commission may ask the Member State to provide additional information if a programme proposed for co-financing does not contain all the requested information or if certain technical and financial amendments are necessary.

APPROVAL – NEW REGIME

No later than 30 November 2014 (notably, the year preceding the implementation of the programmes), the Commission will arrange an annual meeting of the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed (SCoPAFF) to inform the Member States on the outcome of the evaluation procedure. In this context, the Commission will present the list of the programmes technically approved and proposed for co-financing, and will discuss their financial and technical details with the national delegations [CFF proposal – Art. 13 and Statement from the Commission on the procedures for the approval of programmes].

The final list of programmes selected for co-financing and the final amount allocated to each programme will be communicated to the Member States during a meeting of the SCoPAFF, which will be held before the Commission takes its final decision [CFF proposal - Statement from the Commission on the procedures for the approval of programmes].

The national programmes and associated funding will be approved by 31 January 2015 by means of a grant decision in relation to the measures implemented and the costs incurred from 1 January to 31 December of that year [CFF proposal – Art. 13].

MONITORING AND REPORTING – NEW REGIME

By 31 August 2015 (notably, the year of approval and implementation of the programme), Member States will submit to the Commission an intermediate financial report for each approved annual national programme [CFF proposal – Art. 14].

By 30 April 2016 (notably, the year following the implementation of the programmes), Member States will submit to the Commission an annual detailed technical and financial report for each approved annual or multiannual national programme. That report will include the results achieved, measured on the basis of the indicators referred to in the regulation and a detailed account of eligible costs incurred [CFF proposal – Art. 14].

PAYMENTS AND REIMBURSEMENTS – NEW REGIME

The deadline for the submission of the payment request for 2015 Programmes is 30 April 2016 (notably, the year following the implementation of the programmes) [CFF proposal – Art. 15].

Payments will be made within 90 calendar days [Art. 90 of Reg. 966/2012 (Financial Regulation)].

2. 2016 PROGRAMMES: NEW REGIME (CFF REGULATION)

The new regime for submission, approval, monitoring and reporting of programmes, as provided by the upcoming CFF Regulation, will fully apply starting from **2016 Programmes**, namely programmes submitted in 2015 for implementation in 2016.

Eligibility criteria for those programmes are laid down in the CFF Regulation itself.

PREPARATORY WORK

Preparatory work for the design of the work programme for the implementation of the national programmes will be carried out with experts of Member States in early February 2015 (notably, the year preceding the implementation of the programmes themselves) [CFF proposal - Statement from the Commission on the procedures for the approval of programmes].

The deadline for the adoption of the work programme for the implementation of 2016 Programmes is 30 of April 2015, provided that the draft budget for 2016 is adopted [CFF Proposal - Art.36.3].

SUBMISSION

The deadline for submission of 2016 Programmes will be 31 May 2015. The national programmes submitted after 31 May will not be eligible for financing [CFF proposal – Art. 12].

APPROVAL

No later than 30 November 2015 (notably, the year preceding the implementation of the programmes), the Commission will arrange an annual meeting of the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed (SCoPAFF) to inform the Member States on the outcome of the evaluation procedure. In this context, the Commission will present the list of the programmes technically approved and proposed for co-financing, and will discuss their financial and technical details with the national delegations. [CFF proposal – Art. 13 and Statement from the Commission on the procedures for the approval of programmes].

The final list of programmes selected for co-financing and the final amount allocated to each programme will be communicated to the Member States during a meeting of the SCoPAFF, which will be held before the Commission takes its final decision. [CFF proposal - Statement from the Commission on the procedures for the approval of programmes].

The national programmes and associated funding will be approved by 31 January 2016 by means of a grant decision in relation to the measures implemented and the costs incurred from 1 January to 31 December of that year. [CFF proposal – Art. 13].

MONITORING AND REPORTING

By 31 August 2016 (notably, the year of approval and implementation of the programme), Member States will submit to the Commission an intermediate financial report for each approved annual national programme. [CFF proposal – Art. 14].

By 30 April 2017 (notably, the year following the implementation of the programmes), Member States will submit to the Commission an annual detailed technical and financial report for each approved annual or multiannual national programme. That report will include the results achieved, measured on the basis of the indicators referred to in the regulation and a detailed account of eligible costs incurred [CFF proposal – Art. 14].

PAYMENTS AND REIMBURSEMENTS

The deadline for the submission of the payment request for 2016 Programmes is 30 April 2017 (notably, the year following the implementation of the programmes) [CFF proposal – Art. 15].

Payments will be made within 90 calendar days [Art. 90 of Reg. 966/2012 (Financial Regulation)].

ANNEX I – Flowcharts on procedure for programmes

a. 2014 Programmes – old regime

2013		2014	2015		
by 30 April	**by 30 November**	**by 31 July**	**by 30 April**		**by 30 October**
Submission of programmes by MSs	Approval of the programmes Standing Committee	Submission of interim technical and financial reports	Submission of final technical and financial reports	Submission of payment applications	Payment decision

b. 2015 Programmes – transitory regime

2014		2015			2016	
by 30 April	**by 30 November**	**by 31 January**		**by 31 August**	**by 30 April**	**within 90 days**
Submission of programmes by MSs	*Ad hoc* Standing Committee*: - List of programmes technically approved and proposed for co-financing - Provisional amounts allocated - Provisional maximum level of EU contribution - Provisional conditions Art. 13 CFF and CFF COMM Statement	Standing Committee: - Final list of programmes selected for co-financing - Final amounts allocated CFF COMM Statement	Grant decision approving programmes and funding Art. 13 CFF and Art. 121 FR	Submission of interim financial reports Art. 14 CFF	Submission of final technical and financial reports and Submission of payment request Art 14 CFF and Art. 15 CFF	Time limit for payments Art. 15 CFF and Art. 90 FR

c. 2016 Programmes – new regime

2015					2016			2017	
early February	**by 30 April**	**by 31 May**	**June - end September**	**by 30 November**	**by 31 January**		**by 31 August**	**by 30 April**	**within 90 days**
Annual Plenary Task Force Discussion on: - Priorities to be adopted through the Work Programme (reflecting Annex III of CFF regulation) - Expected budget for Y N CFF COMM Statement	Adoption of the Work Programme Art. 36 CFF	Submission of programmes by MSs Art. 12 CFF	Preliminary evaluation by the Commission	*Ad hoc* Standing Committee*: - List of programmes technically approved and proposed for co-financing - Provisional amounts allocated - Provisional maximum level of EU contribution - Provisional conditions Art. 13 CFF and CFF COMM Statement	Standing Committee: - Final list of programmes selected for co-financing - Final amounts allocated CFF COMM Statement	Grant decision approving programmes and funding Art. 13 CFF and Art. 121 FR	Submission of interim financial reports Art. 14 CFF	Submission of final technical and financial reports and Submission of payment requests Art 14 CFF and Art. 15 CFF	Time limit for payment Art. 15 CFF and Art. 90 FR

ANNEX II – Summary table: Transition from old regime to new regime

Programmes	Old regime - CD 2009/470/EC				New regime – CFF Regulation				
	Submission	Approval	Reporting	Payment and reimbursement	Preparatory work	Submission	Approval	Reporting	Payment and reimbursement
2014	√	√	√	√					
2015	√						√	√	√
2016					√	√	√	√	√