

2016 programme assessment sheet

Member State:

Disease: Avian Influenza

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. <i>Are the objectives of the programme clearly defined and in line with the guidelines (Commission Decision 2010/367/EU)?</i> | 2.1.1 and 3.1.1 | | | |
| 2. <i>Is the management of the programme clearly described especially as regards the competent authorities, the resources, and the monitoring of the implementation of the programme?</i> | 2.1.1 and 3.1.1 and Part C. | | | |

¹ See definitions in the last page

| | | | | |
|--|------------------|--|--|--|
| <p>3. <i>Is there a clear description of the registration of the poultry holdings allowing a good knowledge of the poultry population?</i></p> | <p>2.1.2</p> | | | |
| <p>4. <i>Is there a clear description of the predominant poultry population and types of poultry production?</i></p> | <p>2.1.3.1</p> | | | |
| <p>5. <i>Is there a good knowledge and estimation of the wild bird population (both local and migratory)?</i></p> | <p>3.1.3</p> | | | |
| <p>6. <i>Is there a clear description and good knowledge of the epidemiological situation of the disease in poultry and in wild birds during the last five years?</i></p> | <p>4. and 5.</p> | | | |
| <p>7. <i>Is there a clear description of the measures in place as regards the notification of the disease, both in poultry and in wild birds, and are these measures in line with the EU requirements (Directive 2005/94/EC article 5 and following)</i></p> | <p>6.</p> | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|------------------------|--|--|--|
| <p>8. <i>Are the geographical areas where the programme will be implemented well defined for poultry and for wild birds, and reasonable to achieve the objectives?</i></p> | <p>2.1.3 and 3.1.2</p> | | | |
| <p>9. <i>For risk-based surveillance programmes, are the risk factors sufficiently described and the targets of poultry species and poultry production categories in accordance with the criteria and risk factors listed in Annex 1 of the guidelines (Commission Decision 2010/367/EU)?</i></p> | <p>2.1.3 and 2.2.</p> | | | |
| <p>10. <i>For representative sampling-surveillance programmes: are the targets of the programme in relation to the number of samples taken in each poultry production category in line with the requirements of the guidelines</i></p> | <p>2.1.3 and 2.2</p> | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------|--|--|--|
| <p><i>(Commission Decision 2010/367/EU)?</i></p> <p><i>If not: specify if higher or lower and if justified</i></p> | | | | |
| <p>11. <i>For surveillance of wild birds, are the risk factors sufficiently described and the targets set for wild birds surveillance in accordance with the criteria and risk factors listed in Annex II of the guidelines (Commission Decision 2010/367/EU)?</i></p> | <p>3.2</p> | | | |
| <p>12. <i>Are the frequency, periods and procedures for sampling of poultry and for wild birds clearly described and in line with the requirements of the guidelines (Commission Decision 2010/367/EU)?</i></p> | <p>2.3 and 3.3</p> | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| <p>13. <i>Are the laboratory screening and confirmatory tests in poultry and in wild birds clearly described, and in line with the requirements of the guidelines (Commission Decision 2010/367/EU)?</i></p> | <p>2.4 and 3.4</p> | | | |
| <p>14. <i>Efficiency/Effectiveness: Are the proposed targets in poultry and wild birds the most cost-efficient and cost-effective given the specific epidemiological circumstances and fulfilling the requirements of EU legislation?</i></p> | <p>7.1.1. and 7.1.2</p> | | | |

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 assessment²

Expert name:

Date Signature

Consensus assessment²

Rapporteur name:

Date Signature

Expert name:

Date Signature

Expert name:

Date Signature

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

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

| | |
|-----------|--|
| Poor | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Globally compliant with the requirements and acceptably clear for the assessor but still clarifications, modifications or additional information is needed |
| Good | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fully compliant and clear or very minor clarifications needed |
| Very good | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The quality and precision of the programme or measure deserve a special mention |