2016 programme assessment sheet

Member State:
Disease: BLUETONGUE
Implementation Year: 2016

Programme elements and relevant criteria	Relevant parts of the pdf application	Assessment	1.Additional elements / information to request to the CA 2. Changes and/or additions to the programme that should be required to the CA	-Poor -Fair -Good -Very good[1]
1. ***Are the objectives of the programme clearly defined and in line with the requirements of Annex I to Commission Regulation (EC) No 1266/2007?***	3.			
2. ***Has there been a CVET (Community Veterinary Emergency Team) mission report in that country? If yes, is there a reference to this CVET report in the submitted programme and have any specific recommendations provided by the CVET been followed? If not, why?***	2. or 3.			

[1] See definitions in the last page

3. ***Is there a clear description of the epidemiological evolution of the disease over the past 5 years and supported by relevant data and maps? Is information available from previous year(s) on vector's activity season and distribution?***	2.			
4. ***Is there a comprehensive description of the bluetongue programme***	3.			
5. ***Is the management of the programme clearly described especially as regards the competent authorities, the resources, the monitoring of the implementation of the programme, and the role of the stakeholders involved including the farmers?***	4.2.			
6. ***Are the geographical and administrative areas where the programme will be implemented well defined and described and***	4.3.			

reasonable to achieve the objectives? Are relevant maps provided?				
7. ***Is there a clear description of the measures of the programme, including the notification of the disease, the animal population and targeted animals, the rules for holdings registration and animal identification, the rules for the movement of animals, the tests used and the sampling schemes proposed, the vaccines used and vaccination schemes if applicable, the bio-security measures implemented in the holdings, the measures in case of positive result, and the control of the implementation and monitoring of the programme by the competent authority?***	4.4.			

8. ***Does the programme set clear targets for the planned activities? Are those targets proportionate, feasible and consistent with the measures described in the programme?***	7.			
9. ***Are the measures foreseen in the programme (and analysed in point 7 above) in line with the EU requirements (Annex I to Regulation 1266/2007; Directive 2000/75/EC)?***	4.4			
10. ***Are the measures foreseen in the programme (and analysed in point 7 above) sufficient for achieving the objectives of the program, justified and appropriate from a veterinary/scientific point of view, adapted to the epidemiological situation?***	4.4.			
11. ***Is there a clear description of the benefits of the programme? Efficiency/***	5.			

Effectiveness: Are the proposed surveillance measures the most cost efficient and cost effective given the specific epidemiological circumstances and fulfilling the requirements of EU legislation?				

List additional information that may be required for a complete final assessment of the programme:
Comments/Proposed changes:
Overall assessment of the programme and opinion (poor/fair/good/very good) - under the reservation that eventual additional information requested will be satisfactory:

Individual assessment[2] ☐	Consensus assessment[2] ☐
Expert name: Date Signature	Rapporteur name: Date Signature
	Expert name: Date Signature
	Expert name: Date Signature

Definitions grades to be given to the programmes (overall and separate elements)

Poor	• Relevant information required by Commission Decision 2008/425/EC is missing • Information necessary to assess the validity of a proposed measure is missing • Contradictory information is provided in the programme • Incompliance with the EU legislation identified
Fair	• Globally compliant with the requirements and acceptably clear for the assessor but still clarifications, modifications or additional information is needed
Good	• Fully compliant and clear or very minor clarifications needed
Very good	• The quality and precision of the programme or measure deserve a special mention

[2] Check as appropriate and sign the corresponding part, for individual assessment on the left, for consensus assessment in the boxes on the right.