

# Programme assessment sheet

Member State:

Disease: Classical Swine Fever/African Swine fever

Implementation Year: 2016

Programme elements and relevant criteria	Assessment	Relevant part of Annex I	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 <sup>1</sup>
<p>1. Are the following indicators clearly described?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of serologically positive domestic pigs compared to previous year</li> <li>• Number of virologically positive domestic pigs compared to previous year</li> <li>• Number of serologically positive wild boar/feral pigs compared to previous year</li> <li>• Number of virologically positive wild boar/feral pigs compared to previous year</li> </ul>		A.2		
<p>2. Is there a clear description of the evolution of the above mentioned indicators along the years?</p> <p>3. Does it show a positive trend?</p>		A.2		
<p>4. Is there a clear description of the obstacles and constraints identified that may/are hamper/ing the progress of the eradication-surveillance programme?</p> <p>5. Are they relevant for the progress of the eradication-surveillance programme?</p>		A.2		

<sup>1</sup> See definitions in the last page

<p>6. Are the objectives of the programme clearly defined? Are in line with the requirements of point (1) of the Annex to Decision 2008/341?</p>		A.3		
<p>7. Is the management of the programme clearly described particularly as regards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The competent authorities (CA) involved in the implementation of the programme and their responsibilities?</li> <li>• Other stakeholders involved in the implementation of the programme, their role and their communication channels with the CA?</li> </ul>		A.4.1		
<p>8. Is there a clear description of the areas where the programme will be implemented?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it clear where the following activities will be carried out? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ surveillance in holdings</li> <li>§ surveillance in wild boars/feral pigs</li> <li>§ vaccination in holdings and monitoring the efficacy of the vaccination</li> <li>§ vaccination in wild boar/feral pigs and monitoring the efficacy of the vaccination</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Do the limits of those areas make sense from an epidemiological point of view?</li> </ul> <p>9. Are all areas at risk included in the programme?</p> <p>10. Are areas with a low risk of being infected included in the programme?</p>		A.4.2		
<p>11. Is there a clear description of the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The pig industry, type and number of farms?</li> <li>• Feral pigs-wild boar distribution in the country?</li> <li>• Target population: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ for surveillance and or vaccination in holdings?</li> <li>§ for surveillance and or vaccination in feral pigs/wild boar?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>12. Are target populations representative of the populations at risk and adequately selected to early detect the virus?</p>		A.4.3.2		

<p>13. Is there a clear description of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surveillance strategy?</li> <li>• The test used, when are to be used and in which animals?</li> <li>• Sampling schemes at holding level an at animal level and the criteria to include an animal or a holding in the sampling scheme?</li> <li>• Sampling scheme in wild populations?</li> </ul> <p>14. Are the surveillance strategy, testing strategy and analytical methods proposed appropriate for the achievement of the objectives given the existing scientific knowledge?</p> <p>15. Are those the most cost effective possible?</p>		A.3 and A.4.3.5.		
<p>16. Is there a clear description of the vaccination strategy (CSF) particularly as regards :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vaccines to be used in the programme In case of domestic pigs, type of holdings to be vaccinated?</li> <li>• In case of feral pig-wild boar, bait density to be achieved in each area of the programme?</li> <li>• Sampling scheme and tests used to verify the efficacy of the vaccination?</li> </ul> <p>17. Is the vaccination strategy (CSF) proposed appropriate for the achievement of the objectives given the existing scientific knowledge? Are those the most cost effective possible?</p>		A.4.3.6		
<p>18. Is the proposed biosecurity management appropriate from a veterinary/ scientific point of view?</p>		A.4.3.7		

<p>19. Is there a clear description of the benefits of the programme on the economical and animal health points of view particularly on the</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• progress expected compared to the situation of the disease in the previous years, in line with the objectives and expected results?</li> <li>• cost efficiency of the programme including management costs?</li> </ul>		A.5		
<p>20. Does the programme set clear targets for the planned activities? Are those targets proportionate, necessary and feasible given the available resources as described in the programme?</p>		B		
<p>21. Are the targets of the programme in relation to testing, vaccination (CSF):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sufficient for achieving the objectives of the program?</li> <li>• justified and appropriate from a veterinary point of view?</li> <li>• adapted to the epidemiological situation?</li> </ul>		B		
<p>22. From the information provided in the programme, is relevant national legislation, in relation with the disease, in place and in line with EU legislation (disease notification, measures in case of positive results, movement rules, identification etc.)?</p>		A.4.3.1, A.4.3.3, A.4.3.4, A.4.3.8 and 4.3.9		
<p>23. To which extent have previous recommendations of the Task Force for Monitoring Animal Disease Eradication been reflected in the programme in the case of CSF?</p>				

*Overall assessment of the programme and grade<sup>2</sup> (poor/fair/good/very good) :*

*List additional information that may be required for a complete final assessment of the programme (to be performed by the Commission):*

*Proposed changes and/or additions that may be required:*

Individual assessment<sup>3</sup>

Expert name:

Date                      Signature

Consensus assessment<sup>3</sup>

Rapporteur name: Volker Moennig

Date                      Signature

Expert name:

Date                      Signature

Expert name:

Date                      Signature

<sup>2</sup> See definitions in the last page

<sup>3</sup> 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"><li>• Relevant information required by Commission Decision 2008/425/EC is missing</li><li>• Information necessary to assess the validity of a proposed measure is missing</li><li>• Contradictory information is provided in the programme</li><li>• Incompliance with the EU legislation identified</li></ul>
Fair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Globally compliant with the requirements and acceptably clear for the assessor but still clarifications, modifications or additional information is needed</li></ul>
Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Fully compliant and clear or very minor clarifications needed</li></ul>
Very good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The quality and precision of the programme or measure deserve a special mention</li></ul>