EUROPEAN COMMISSION
HEALTH AND CONSUMERS DIRECTORATE-GENERAL

Directorate G - Veterinary and International Affairs
Unit G2 - Animal health

Brussels, 03.06.2014

Discussion paper

on

Progress under the Animal Health Strategy for the European Union (2007-2013) where *"Prevention is better than cure"* and possible future steps

Discussion paper

on

Progress under the Animal Health Strategy for the European Union (2007-2013) where *"Prevention is better than cure"* and possible future steps

I. Introduction

In 2007, the Commission adopted an Animal Health Strategy under the motto *"Prevention is better than cure*[1]*"*. It was followed by its Action Plan in 2008[2]. In addition a detailed programming document was compiled. They constituted a challenging programme shaped in 4 pillars. Two underlying principles applied to all: partnership and communication.

The strategy's overall goals were:

- Goal 1: to ensure a high level of public health and food safety by minimising the incidence of biological and chemical risks to humans;
- Goal 2: to promote animal health by preventing/reducing the incidence of animal diseases, and in this way to support farming and the rural economy;
- Goal 3: to improve economic growth, cohesion and competitiveness assuring free circulation of goods and proportionate animal movements;
- Goal 4: to promote farming practices and animal welfare which prevent animal health related threats and minimise environmental impacts.

Purpose of this document

This document aims to take stock of the state of play by capturing the various elements of progress made both in planned actions and in complementary, relevant, aligned actions. It also aims to identify areas where progress has been sub-optimum and the reasons therefore. Finally, it aims to trigger discussions as to what the next steps in the EU level animal health policy development might be from 2014 onwards.

II. Discussion

Underlying principles	**Partnership and Communication**

Partnership

- An Animal Health Advisory Committee (AHAC)[4]: since 2008, 3 meetings annually (4 in 2009).

1 COM(2007) 539 final
2 COM(2008) 545 final
4 http://ec.europa.eu/food/animals/health/advisory_committees/index_en.htm

- two public consultations on general aspects and on administrative burden reduction[5]. Consultations on smaller initiatives also took place[6].
- Targeted discussions among the Chief Veterinary Officers (CVOs) on selected topics, resulting in CVO conclusions, e.g. on biosecurity, on surveillance[7] on effectiveness of the veterinary fund[8], on African Swine fever guidelines[9] etc.

Communication "in peacetime"

- Different forms depending on the message that was being delivered and the target audience: it included participation in international and national events, developing relationships with the media and non-governmental organisations, regular updates of websites.
- Centrally planned and organised annual themes and events as leverage to national authorities and to stakeholders.
- An external evaluation into the effectiveness of communication in 2013. It suggests high levels of satisfaction with the communication activities and tools on animal health.
- Major events either in the context of annual Veterinary Weeks around pre-defined themes[10] emphasised by a central Conference in Brussels or ad-hoc on specific issues, such as bluetongue conference on vaccination[11].
- Many films to various groups, (e.g. farmers, travellers, pet owners), including specific ones made in cooperation with the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) for the Vet2011[12] campaign. A multitude of these can be found on DG SANCOs website[13].
- Participation in Europe's major agricultural fairs[14].
- A travelling purpose-made van until end of 2011 visiting annually several dozens of national, regional fairs, events at veterinary schools, similar venues, (e.g. 37 in 2011).
- Annual seminars with veterinary students from many dozens of veterinary faculties of Europe, being briefed in European issues and multiplying key messages[15].

Communication in case of crisis

- European press releases such as during foot and mouth disease outbreaks in the UK or Bulgaria, the bluetongue epidemic or classical swine fever etc.

---

5 http://ec.europa.eu/food/animals/docs/ah-proposals-reg-general-consultation-new-animal_health_law_en.pdf

6 on animal by-products implementing rules, horse identification, import of zoo animals, guidelines on surveillance and control of African swine fever, etc.

7 http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-9547-2010-INIT/en/pdf

8 http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-7814-2010-INIT/en/pdf

9 http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/controlmeasures/docs/sanco_7138_2013_asf_wb_en.pdf

10 E.g. on biosecurity, on animal identification, One Health, etc.

11 Link to be provided soon

12 World Veterinary Year in 2011

13 http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/health_consumer/information_sources/videos_ahw_en.htm

14 E.g. Grüne Woche in Berlin, Germany, Salon d'Agriculture in Paris, France as well as smaller events

15 Link to be provided soon

- Communication to address incorrect public perception, for example when handling the so called "swine flu" crisis in 2009 or after the interest in the Schmallenberg virus in 2012[16].
- A range of Commission, SCoFCAH, CVO statements, communication to the WTO SPS, Member States presentations.

Pillar 1	**Prioritisation of EU intervention**

Categorisation of animal diseases

- In partnership with the World Organisation on Animal Health (OIE) and with an external contractor a study underlying the development of a disease categorisation and prioritisation tool.
- During 2013, with the participation of Member States' experts, the testing of the first version of the tool, eight diseases were assessed[18].
- The principles of categorisation integrated into the text of the proposal for a Regulation on animal health (PRAH). Transmissible animal diseases which are a priority for the EU should be categorised into one or more of five different groups of measures for their prevention and control.
- Preparatory work with the CVOs ("Adelbrecht process"[19]), also at later CVO and AHAC meetings. The method and process for listing and categorising these diseases is still under discussion.
- The Multiannual Financial Framework for a budget for expenditure in relation to food and feed over the next seven years includes a total maximum budget of EUR 1 891,936 million. A proposal on the basic rules for management of such expenditure[20] (along with that for plant health etc.) was adopted in 2013 and is expected to achieve the agreement of the co-legislators in early 2014.
- Simple and reliable performance indicators to guide policy, priorities, allocate resources etc. were developed in the context of the Multiannual Financial Framework for a budget for expenditure in relation to food and feed[21].

Pillar 2	**A modern animal health framework**

2.1. A single and clearer regulatory framework

16 http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/schmallenberg_virus/index_en.htm
18 http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/expert_group_ah_en.htm
19 9536/08
20 COM(2013) 327 final
21 http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/biblio/documents/2014/DB2014_WD_I_en.pdf cf. from p. 227

- Adoption of a major proposal for a Regulation on animal health[22], in a package with, *inter alia*, a proposal on official controls[23]. to set out general principles for good animal health in EU legislation, for terrestrial and aquatic animals.
- Elements[24] (many new) range from basic definitions and responsibilities of various actors, via provisions on enhanced surveillance, vaccination, vaccine banks, registration, identification, traceability, trade and import rules and emergency measures. Many of these feed from other actions under the Strategy, listed in this document elsewhere.
- It confirms to priorities of Smart Regulation[25] to simplify, reflecting expectations in reducing administrative burdens, and to the priorities of the Europe 2020 strategy[26], such as for smart growth, by helping the sector to become more resilient due to active prevention measures and more flexible risk management.

2.2. Developing efficient cost and responsibility sharing schemes (CRRS)

Animal diseases

- A feasibility study, following the pre-feasibility one, has been completed.
- Based on the impact assessment[28] for the proposal for management of EU veterinary expenditure (see page 6) the proposal contained no provisions on CRSS.

Feed sector

- In 2007 a report was delivered to the European Parliament and the Council[29] on possibilities for financial guarantees for feed business operators. Following a subsequent consultation with stakeholders, further progress on that matter was not pursued.

2.3. Revision of the animal by-product rules

- New basic rules[30] keeping key concepts (e.g. classification in three categories) but were streamlined and made more proportionate (e.g. end point in manufacturing etc.).
- One single but comprehensive implementing Regulation[31].
- To assist implementation a guidance document has also been published[32], and a series of trainings organised under the Better Training for Safer Food initiative.

2.4. EU influence on international standards

---

22 COM(2013) 260 final
23 COM(2013) 265 final
24 http://ec.europa.eu/food/animals/health/regulation/index_en.htm
25 COM(2010) 543 final "Smart Regulation in the European Union".
26 COM(2010) 2020 "Europe 2020 - A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth".
28 SWD(2013) 194 and 195
29 2007(469) final
30 Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council,
31 Commission Regulation (EC) No 142/2011
32 http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/biosafety/animalbyproducts/guidance_doc_r142_2011_7_1_2012_en.pdf

- Streamlined, Commission-led coordination of EU comments and positions with Member States in the Council[33].
- A Memorandum of Understanding[34] concerning their general relations between the Commission and the OIE in 2011. Under this, the Commission retains its formal observer status at the OIE[35] and is granted membership of the Global Framework for the progressive control of Trans-boundary Animal Diseases (GF-TADs) Global Steering Committee and of the Advisory Committee of the OIE World Animal Health and Welfare Fund.
- In the meantime relations flourish between the EU and the OIE. The Commission and Member States are involved in the work of the OIE in many ways, (e.g. various OIE working groups, ad hoc groups and participation in OIE sessions, seminars, workshops, and regional and global conferences of the OIE).

2.4. Towards an export strategy at EU level

- Use of a mix of policy instruments for the recognition of the EU animal health regionalisation measures by third countries as well as against sanitary barriers to EU market access.
- Ongoing and future negotiations with third countries, in particular Russian Federation and with the Customs Union[36].
- Negotiation of EU harmonised export certificates with third countries and integration in TRACES.
- Actions during the unjustified reaction of trading partners following the detection of animal diseases in the EU territory (eg: avian influenza, Schmallenberg virus or due to African Swine fever cases in wild boar.)
- A WTO SPE notified document on EU's animal health regionalisation policy[37].
- For demonstrating the fulfilment of specific third country requirements the EU certification and traceability system needs further development in particular for products moving through several Member State before export.

Pillar 3	**Animal-related threat prevention, surveillance and crisis preparedness**

3.1. Supporting on-farm biosecurity[38] measures

33 http://ec.europa.eu/food/international/organisations/EU_comments_position_papers_en.htm

34 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2011:241:0001:0002:EN:PDF

35 The Commission doesn't pay statutory contributions to the budget of the OIE and that the Commission representatives do not actively participate in the debates pertaining to the adoption of international standards, i.e. the Commission doesn't speak on behalf of the EU in those deliberations which are reserved for member country Delegates.

36 http://ec.europa.eu/food/international/trade/eu-russia_spsissues_en.htm

38 Biosecurity refers to those measures taken to keep diseases out of herds, or groups of animals where they do not currently exist or to limit the spread of disease within the herd.

- A screening of existing on-farm biosecurity guidelines in 2009[39].
- Their foreseen consolidation at EU level by stakeholders eventually did not take place, to take into account the level of risk associated with different types of production systems and species, except for certain food safety aspects (e.g. Salmonella) in the poultry or egg sector[40]
- A new regulation for poultry compartments, based on existing basic rules on avian flu[41] and taking into account effective on-farm biosecurity measures as an important criterion of compartmentalisation for disease control and/or trade purposes.
- The consultation in the making of the PRAH revealed preference for widening this concept, for basic EU definitions and criteria for on-farm biosecurity measures, but also local and voluntary implementation thereof[42]. Similar points came from dedicated CVO conclusions on the issue[43].
- A consultation on administrative costs revealed significant costs[44] for many livestock operators and veterinary authorities, for the development and checks of on-farm biosecurity plans already (not including compliance costs for implementation).
- Definitions and a wider and explicit legal base in the PRAH as regards responsibilities, recognising that biosecurity is one of the key prevention tools at the disposal of operators and the possiblity to adopt later delegated acts for supplementary and detailed requirements, should the need arise.
- Provision of funding to finance and promote on-farm biosecurity measures relating to infrastructures, via existing funds was supported by an explanatory document and its promotion to CVOs and to the AHAC.

3.2. Identification and Tracing

- The TRACES system has been improved and now is a single window for veterinary matters, a modern system offering certification, traceability, control and reporting functions for the import, export, border control and intra-EU trade. It is a source of rapid and quality data on trade of live animals and other commodities.
- Basic rules for an even more integrated system (including RASFF, plant health etc.) have been proposed for all official controls[46].
- While TRACES is compulsory for all Member States and EEA countries, there are now a growing number (currently 40) of third countries which are using it on a voluntary basis for imports into the EU.

39 See point 2: http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/strategy/docs/summary_06032009.pdf

40 http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/biosafety/salmonella/impl_reg_en.htm

41 Regulation (EC) No. 616/2009, OJ L 181. 14.07.2009, p. 16 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:181:0016:0024:EN:PDF

42 p. 11, http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/strategy/pillars/docs/sum_results_consultation_en.pdf

43 15000/2/09

44 http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/docs/ah-law-impact-assesment_en.pdf cf. from page 174.

46 COM(2013) 265 final

- All EU harmonised export certificates (20 commodities, e.g. to Canada, New-Zealand, Mexico, USA), except to Russia, are available in the TRACES system
- Introduction of electronic certification to replace paper certification for the movement of live animals has been studied[47] and will be accommodated once new basic rules both for animal health and for official controls have been agreed.
- The possibility for the use of electronic individual identification for bovine animals was assessed in 2010-11[48] and its introduction on a voluntary basis was proposed in 2011[49]. Its adoption is expected by the European Parliament and the Council soon.
- An interface named BOVEX was also developed to allow the exchange of information between national bovine identification databases. After preliminary analysis its operation started in April 2013 between Italy and Spain and it is expected to be extended to other member states, Greece and France already working on it.
- Rules for compulsory electronic identification for horses in 2008[50]. However, more recent events in 2013 involving fraudulent food made from horse meat highlighted the need to revise certain elements of the system. That is currently still ongoing.

3.3. Better border biosecurity

- Scrutiny of the current animal health import control legislation and its implementation.[51]
- Several guidance documents published.[52]
- The review of the basic rules has been merged with that of the revision of the official control rules and is now contained in that proposal.
- Various aids in many language versions published and updated, such as a film[53] and posters[54] to make travellers aware of restrictions and of their responsibilities in bringing in products of animal origin for their personal consumption.
- Similar posters[55] and videos[56] for owners of pets entering the EU.
- A conference in 2008 was partially dedicated to border biosecurity.
- Specific measures for cleansing and disinfecting livestock lorries entering the EU and their checks at the point of entry due to African swine fever [57], [58].

---

47 https://circabc.europa.eu/sd/a/1809e3e7-d3e3-4a2f-8713-9e9e075399c3/TRACES_eCert_StudyReport_1.pdf
48 http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/identification/bovine/elec_id_bovine_en.htm
49 COM(2011) 524 final, COM(2011) 525 final, latter replaced by COM(2012) 162
50 Commission Regulation (EC) No 504/2008, OJ L 149, 7.6.2008, p. 3–32
51 http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/bips/expert_group_en.htm
52 http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/bips/guidelines_en.htm
53 http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/animalproducts/personal_imports/films2008_en.htm
54 http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/animalproducts/personal_imports/index_en.htm
55 http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/animalproducts/personal_imports/pets_posters_en.htm
56 http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/liveanimals/pets/video_en.htm
57 Commission Decision 2011/78/EU, OJ L 30, 4.2.2011, p. 40
58 Commission Implementing Decision 2013/426/EU, OJ L 211, 7.8.2013, p. 5

3.4. Veterinary surveillance and animal health crisis preparedness/management

Veterinary Surveillance

- PRAH provisions to enhance the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of future animal health surveillance in the Union, by laying down and clarifying basic concepts, definitions and responsibilities, allowing for better use of the synergies between surveillance undertaken by the different actors in the field.
- It is also flexible enough that the surveillance methodology, frequency and intensity could be adapted to each specific disease and take into account the specific purpose, the status in the region and any additional surveillance conducted by operators.
- The development of an Animal Diseases Information System (ADIS) started in partnership with OIE in 2008.
- Following the delivery of an ADIS prototype in 2012, the next steps are currently being discussed with the OIE. The project would now need to move to a new phase which will focus on the core functionalities identified in the first step, to deliver the final interface of the system. Additional resources may need to be allocated.
- Appropriate training in the context of the "Better Training for Safer Food" initiative. Since 2008 on aquaculture, animal by-products, contingency planning, emerging animal diseases, bees and zoo animals either to follow up new rules or to fill identified knowledge gaps. Topics on animal identification and traceability, on movement of pets and traded dogs and cats, and on trade of semen, ova and embryos have started recently or will start in 2014.

EU animal health emergency preparedness:

- An internal audit of DG SANCO' internal arrangements, done in 2009, with recommendations for minor improvements, all followed up.
- An external evaluation to screen and to improve the network responsible for EU preparedness against major threats to animal health in 2011-2012[59], concluding that the rapid response system works well and over the last decade significant progress has been made in its effectiveness and efficiency, including reduction in EU emergency payments. It highlighted the need to remain vigilant, by continuing to build on the progress achieved so far. However, this remains a challenge within budgetary constraints, in the current financial climate.
- PRAH provisions streamlining requirements for contingency plans, more role for the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) as regards their proper implementation.
- A series of BTSF training sessions on contingency planning in 2012-13 and another in 2014-15.
- A dedicated working group of senior contingency planners from Member States' veterinary authorities to meet annually under FVO lead (first was in Sept 2013).

[59] http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/strategy/pillars/docs/23_final_report_eu_rapid_response.pdf

- A specific initiative looked into the reinforcement of the necessary EU antigen/vaccine banks. The paper on key messages from an expert group was discussed widely with the Chief Veterinary Officers and with the AHAC.
- Some of the recommendations were built into the PRAH[61], while others were followed up by the complete renewal of the EU vaccine bank for foot and mouth disease.
- Opinions on other diseases however may necessitate further discussion, especially given the significant costs an EU vaccine bank entails.
- Fast track approaches for EU-wide marketing authorisation of veterinary vaccines for the prevention of bluetongue, subject to EU emergency measures or for non-regulated diseases, such as Schmallenberg infection.

Pillar 4	**Science, Innovation, and Research**

4.1. Science

- An evaluation of the network of EU and National Reference Laboratories dealing with animal diseases in 2009[62] concluding that their role greatly contributes to harmonised diagnosis and control of the relevant animal diseases in the European Union. The duties and tasks performed by the EURLs, as defined in the EU legal basis, have been met and are considered good value for money.
- The European Food Safety Authority providing high-quality and independent scientific advice and risk assessments: during 2008-2013 EFSA delivered 26 scientific opinions on various animal health risks and diseases (e.g. on Rift Valley fever, African swine fever, bovine Tb vaccination, Q fever, bluetongue, FMD in wildlife etc.) and was a regular participant both at SCoFCAH, and AHAC meetings. EFSA also supported the Commission with scientific and technical assistance on Schmallenberg virus (5 reports issued) and E. multilocularis infection in animals.
- The "Veterinary Fund" for rapid and targeted studies such as Q fever national studies and for EU-wide voluntary surveillance studies on bee colony losses (17 Member States) and on FMD through the Agreement with FAO (EuFMD).
- Collaboration between European agencies (EFSA, EMA, ECDC) and national bodies strengthened both formally[63] and also in the context of tackling various emerging risks such as e.g. antimicrobial resistance in humans and in animals.

4.2. Innovation and Research

- The 7th research framework programme (2007-2013) supported animal health and welfare research, alongside national efforts and other European co-operative research activities. An extensive overview of these projects can be found online[64].

---

61 Cf. recital 74-81 and Article 46-52

62 http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/laboratories/eval_com_ref_labs_report_112009_en.pdf

63 http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/cooperationagreements/docs/mouecdc.pdf

64 http://ec.europa.eu/research/bioeconomy/pdf/186225_2011_2696_animal_health_research_en.pdf

- The development for a suitable framework at EU level to mitigate disincentives to manufacturers and maintain EU capacities of veterinary medicines production included assistance to producers of veterinary medicines in several ways, the multi-strain concept for animal vaccines has been accommodated for in EU legal text[65] and for medicines variations both the basic[66] and Commission[67] rules have been revised.
- A complete revision[68] has been ongoing since 2010 to increase the availability of veterinary medicinal products, to reduce the administrative burden on enterprises, to improve the functioning of the internal market for veterinary medicinal products and to assess the possibilities to have an improved response to antimicrobial resistance related to the use of veterinary medicines. This revision is in a package with a proposal for revision of the legislation on medicated feed.

Beyond the original Strategy

Certain needs and drivers for European animal health public administration since 2007-8 has surpassed the original Strategy in several ways, necessitating the allocation or re-allocation of resources and to some extent affecting its potential, as well as delivery on some of the original items. Among these the following could be mentioned (not in order of importance or all-inclusive):

- The bluetongue epidemic,
- Newly emerging animal diseases such as Q-fever, pandemic (H1N1) 2009 influenza virus or Schmallenberg disease,
- The occurrence of FMD in wildlife at the Bulgarian-Turkish border
- Significant bee colony losses in many countries in and outside the EU,
- Obligation to align EU acquis to the TFEU following the Lisbon Treaty,[70],
- Inter-institutional discussions on various aspects of basic acts (e.g. essential vs. non-essential elements), and on delegated and implementing Commission acts,
- Commission-wide obligations on simplification of legislation and reduction of administrative burden,
- SANCO initiative on wider and integrated officials controls across the whole food chain, including also e.g. plant health,
- Not least, the financial situation in Member States and consequently as regards the Commission budget.

Two cases are mentioned below to give a more details on how such examples may be relevant:

A specific case 1: initiative on bee health

---

65 Commission Directive 2009/9/EC, OJ L 44, 14.2.2009, p. 10

66 Directive 2009/53/EC, OJ L 168, 30.6.2009, p. 33

67 Commission Regulation (EC) No 1234/2008, OJ L 334, 12.12.2008, p. 7

68 http://ec.europa.eu/health/veterinary-use/rev_frame_index_en.htm

70 Cf. Articles 290 and 291 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union

A proactive partnership was also employed for bees. Although bees are part of EU animal health legislation (and relevant OIE standards) they represent a less regulated area. No bee-specific elements were in the Animal Health Strategy either. However, an increase in bee mortality in several countries within and outside the EU prompted organisations concerned about bee health to call for more focus on this. Taking into account the particularities of beekeeping sector and the principles of proportionality and subsidiarity, the Commission published in 2010 a Communication on honeybee health[71].

This Communication outlined initiatives to understand better the causes and extent of colony losses. These include the establishment of an EU reference laboratory for bee health, designing and co-financing voluntary surveillance studies into colony losses and pathogens, BTSF trainings on bee health and many more. While most of the key initiatives have been delivered and much data has been gathered with efforts both from Member States and Commission; to date, the complexity of bee colony losses remain, and simple and/or definite solutions are not likely to be found soon.

A specific case 2: fight against bluetongue

Many resources were devoted during these years to bluetongue, many of the generic concepts discussed elsewhere, (e.g. vaccination, EU co-financing, flexibility, transfer of responsibility to livestock keepers, smart regulation for the sector etc.) were employed to specifically target this disease and have resulted in significant improvement both of the epidemiological situation and in a revised legal framework on the level of basic[73] and implementing rules[74].

III. Summary

Conclusions

The Animal Health Strategy and the Action Plan have been successful in identifying key gaps and deliverables and eventually delivering on most of those. However, there was less success in keeping to the foreseen deadlines, some of which in retrospect can be considered too ambitious, especially in light of available resources.

By and large and most importantly, however, it helped the EU to achieve a relatively calm period without major animal health crises, as also substantiated, *inter alia*, by the decreasing number of compensation payments for emergencies[75]. Two rounds of enlargements have also been properly followed up, contributing to further improvement of animal health in the EU.

Possible way ahead and questions

The next period of EU animal health policy development will be shaped by the ongoing work on the future Regulation on animal health. First, by continuing discussions in the European Parliament and in the Council; and secondly, after the final Regulation has been adopted, on

---

71 COM(2010) 714 final, http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/liveanimals/bees/docs/honeybee_health_communication_en.pdf

73 Directive 2012/5/EU, OJ L81, 21.3.2012, p. 1

74 Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 456/2012, OJ L 141, 31.5.2012, p. 7

75 http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/strategy/pillars/docs/23_final_report_eu_rapid_response.pdf cf. from page 133

details in its delegated and implementing rules; and thirdly, their implementation. These will take up significant resources in coming years, for the Commission, Member States and stakeholders alike.

The foreseen timetable does not allow a comprehensive evaluation, similar to the one done in 2005-2006, supporting the 2007-2013 Strategy. In addition, currently no evaluation is possible of the changes which have been made since 2008. Other, smaller evaluations were part of the Strategy itself. The next evaluation is likely to take place from ca. 2018 onward, after sufficient time has passed since the adoption and implementation of the forthcoming new rules (i.e. the Animal Health Regulation and its delegated and implementing acts). In the meantime the fundamental goals of the 2007-2013 Strategy will remain valid.

It is possible however that in the period between 2014-2020 it might be more opportune to discuss more precisely defined areas, already covered by the IA of the PRAH to some extent. In this context, relevant scientific studies, focus documents of limited scope and similar elements could be the bulk of work. This does not necessarily call for a new Strategy for 2014-2020. In fact, more flexible annual or biannual planning and initiatives may suit better current needs.

Questions to stakeholders:

- Do you agree with this list and details of the achievements?
- Are there missing items or elements you would like to be included or highlighted?
- Do you consider that the Strategy fell short on delivering agreed outputs or outcomes?
- If so, where, how, and in what ways?
- What are your views on the major challenges for the future?
- What is your opinion on the possible way ahead?
- Would you consider it useful that DG SANCO develops a Commission staff working document on possible developments in 2014-2020?