

Programme assessment sheet (v01062015)

Member State:

Disease: Sheep and Goats Brucellosis (*Brucella melitensis*)

Implementation Year:

Programme elements and relevant criteria	Relevant parts of the pdf application	Assessment	1. Additional elements / information to request to the CA	-Poor -Fair -Good -Very good¹
<p><i>Is there a clear description of the epidemiological evolution of the disease in the previous years (main measures, main results including prevalence and incidence) including, if needed, data, graphs or maps?</i></p> <p><i>If relevant, is there a clear description of the evolution of the disease in the wildlife including, if needed, data, graphs or maps?</i></p>	2.			
<p><i>Are the objectives and the main measures of the programme clearly described? Are these satisfactory and adapted to the situation? Do they clearly take into account the results of previous years including the 2014 annual report results (if relevant)</i></p>	3.			

¹ See definitions in the last page

<p><i>Is the timeline for eradication clearly mentioned and justified with objectives figures?</i></p> <p><i>Are interim targets provided (including at least herd prevalence and herd incidence) for different periods in link with the timeline for eradication?</i></p>	4.1.			
<p><i>Is there a clear description of the designation, organisation and roles of the central authority in charge of the supervision and coordination of the programme, and the different departments responsible for implementing the program on the field, and the role of all the stakeholders involved in the programme including the training of the vets and awareness of the farmers?</i></p>	4.2			
<p><i>Is there a clear description of the geographical areas where the programme will be implemented and are these areas well defined to achieve sustainable results? Are relevant and clear maps provided?</i></p>	4.3			
<p><u><i>Is there a clear and detailed description of the measures of the programme, including:</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>-the notification of the disease,</i> <i>-the animals targeted,</i> <i>-the identification of animals and registration of the holdings,</i> <i>-the qualification of the herds,</i> <i>-the rules for movement of the animals and movement controls</i> 	4.4			

<p><i>-the definition and application of the epidemiological units</i></p> <p><i>-the diagnostic tests used and their interpretation</i></p> <p><i>-the testing schemes used including herds testing frequency, animal coverage, interpretation of the test, quality checks of the results, training, etc...</i></p> <p><i>-the post mortem surveillance and follow-up</i></p> <p><i>-vaccines used (if applicable)</i></p> <p><i>-vaccines schemes used (if applicable)</i></p> <p><i>-bio-security measures applied in the herds</i></p> <p><i>-epidemiological data analysis</i></p> <p><i>-definition of a positive results</i></p> <p><i>-measures in case of positive results</i></p> <p><i>-management of infected herds</i></p> <p><i>-definition of an inconclusive results</i></p> <p><i>-measures in case of inconclusive results</i></p> <p><i>-management of wildlife</i></p> <p><i>-compensation schemes</i></p> <p><i>-follow-up and control of the implementation and enforcement of the programme, including reporting and quality checks done</i></p> <p><u>Are each of these measures compliant with, and is there a clear reference to :</u></p> <p><i>-the EU obligations (including Directive 91/68/EEC -as amended last -; and Regulation</i></p>	<p>See EURLex: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

<p>1760/2000/EC)</p> <p><i>If not, are there justifications provided?</i></p> <p><u>Are these measures in line with the guidelines laid down in WD SANCO/ SANCO/6095/2009</u></p> <p><i>If not, are there justifications provided?</i></p>	<p>=CELEX:01991L0068-20131220&qid=1432916578814&from=EN</p> <p>See SANTE website : http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/eradication/eradication_bovine_sheep_goats_brucellosis_en.pdf</p>			
<p><i>Have constraints to progress been identified and are the mitigation measures applied to address those constraints satisfactory for the purposes of the programme?</i></p>	<p>3. and 4.4.</p>			
<p><i>Are the measures proposed in the programme sound from a veterinary/scientific point of view? Are they satisfactory in relation to the epidemiological situation?</i></p>	<p>3. and 4.4 and 7</p>			

<p><i>Does the programme set clear targets on the following indicators?:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Percentage of herds and animals tested</i> - <i>Herd and animal prevalence</i> - <i>Herd incidence</i> - <i>Number of positive herds</i> - <i>Number of positive herds depopulated</i> - <i>Number of animals with positive result slaughtered or culled</i> - <i>Total number of animals slaughtered</i> - <i>Number of herd and animals vaccinated (if applicable)</i> - <i>Number of officially free herds compared to the target and to previous years</i> - <i>Number of herds with unknown status compared to the target and to previous years</i> - <i>Number of positive herds</i> - <i>Number of planned tests (per category of tests)</i> 	7.			
<p><i>Are the above-mentioned targets consistent with the evolution of past years, and feasible and sufficient to achieve the objectives of the programme?</i></p>	2 and 4.1			

<p><i>Efficiency/Effectiveness: Are the proposed measures the most cost efficient and cost effective given the specific circumstances?</i></p>	<p>8</p>			
<p><i>Have any recommendations of the last specific FVO mission been followed?</i></p>	<p>See FVO reports : http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/audit_reports/index.cfm</p>			
<p><i>Have any recommendations of the last specific Task Force sub-group been followed?</i></p>	<p>See SANTE website : http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/health_food-safety/funding/cff/animal_health/vet_programs_en.htm</p>			
<p><i>List additional information that may be required for a complete final assessment of the programme:</i></p>				

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

Expert name:		
Date	Place	Signature

Consensus assessment

Rapporteur name:		
Date	Place	Signature
Expert name:		
Date	Place	Signature
Expert name:		
Date	Place	Signature

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