EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY

Food chain: stakeholder and international relations
Multilateral international relations

Brussels,
SANTE D2/PL/BS/ (2016) 608023

NOTE FOR THE FILE

Subject: **Summary Report of the Expert Group on veterinary import controls legislation "veterinary checks" – 07.12.2016**

Participants: **Veterinary representatives from all Member States except Bulgaria, Cyprus, Greece, Hungary, Portugal and Romania, and from Norway and Switzerland.**
Commission Personnel (DG SANTE): Patricia Langhammer (D2), Bruno Saimour (D2), Ewa Camarra (G2), Matjaz Klemencic (G2), Christian Juliusson (G3), Eric Thévenard (G4), Lucie Carrouée (G4), Aidan Cahill (G4), Didier Carton (G5), Jolita Maciulyte (F4)

Introduction:

COM welcomed the MS to the meeting and presented the updated Agenda, as attached.

The following points were added for discussion in the relevant chapters:

- DK: number of samples to take in ABP consignments (see point 5f) ABP issues).
- BE: certification for EU products transiting in third countries by road before re-entering the EU (see point 5i) transit issues).

1. REVIEW OF LEGISLATION

COM informed that the draft Official Control Regulation (OCR) is also discussed in the CVO meeting on 07.12.2016 and that the Council will adopt its position at first reading on this Regulation (on the basis of the agreement reached with the European Parliament last June) in December 2016 together with the statement of the Council's reasons. Then it will be sent to the Parliament, which is expected to vote on the agreed text in the first quarter of 2017 and this vote will conclude the legislative process. After the translation, the OCR will be published in the Official Journal.

The OCR contains the basic requirements for import controls and several empowerments to the Commission to provide an additional level of details to the basic rules, including certain derogations and sector specific requirements, in order to meet the identified practical needs. As the OCR will be fully applicable by 14 December 2019, the

Commission started to work in more detail to address the different empowerments and COM gave a presentation on the tertiary legislation planned for import controls.

In addition, COM invited MS to reflect on the following question, which is also addressed to the CVOs:

> **With the OCR creating a common system of border inspections, how would you envisage the cooperation with the COPHs and the Heads of Agencies to support it?**

2. RE-ENFORCED CONTROLS

COM gave a presentation of the re-enforced check regime (REC) in TRACES and indicated that around 80% of RECs are launched by MS, against 20% launched by COM. The RECs launched by COM are mainly based on results from market controls for which the RASFF national contact points tend to forget to propose REC measures. From the beginning of 2016, the rate of RECs launched by MS improved significantly, which means that the MS are more and more aware of their responsibilities in this matter.

Case of pyrrolizidine alkaloids
DE identified pyrrolizidine alkaloids in imported honey and proposed to launch a REC in TRACES, which was refused by COM for the following reason:

The presence of pyrrolizidine alkaloids can be potentially a risk for public health and controls are fully justified from a public health point of view. However, the analysis methods and criteria are not harmonised across the MS. Many different pyrrolizidine alkaloids are existing and the MS are currently discussing on the toxicity, action levels and criteria that should apply for their analyses. Due to that lack of harmonisation, COM decided it was not appropriate to launch the REC at EU level, but it is up to the MS to consider the usefulness to carry out more strengthened controls on such consignments on national level.

Case of naproxen
BE proposed a REC of naproxen in horse meat which was accepted by COM. Naproxen is not listed in Regulation (EU) No 37/2010, which means that the substance is prohibited and that a zero tolerance approach must apply, meaning that not any content of naproxen is allowed.

UK asked if the list of establishments under REC measures could be available in TRACES for the economic operators of the EU. COM answered that this information is not published in TRACES, as it was decided at the time when the Guidance Document was drafted to align with the privacy policy applied in the Commission and in the RASFF system, however, it is up to MS, if they want to publish such information. At UK's request, this topic will be included in the agenda of the next Expert Group.

3. TRACES ISSUES: UPDATE ON CVED AND IMPORT CERTIFICATE

COM presented an update of the development on the draft legislation concerning the CVED (SANTE/2016/10907) and the generic import certificate (SANTE/2016/10906). The draft documents are half through the internal consultation steps and an updated version was distributed to MS.

COM explained that any references to animal-by products (ABPs) were deleted from the generic import certificate as there are different legal bases involved for the adoption of the certificates for food than for the ones for animal-by products. Most of the certificates for food have to undergo the examination procedure in the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed (PAFF) while ABP certificates are under PRAC with the involvement of the Parliament and the Council. Therefore the generic certificate for ABPs will be included in a new Chapter in Annex XV to Regulation (EU) No 142/2011 in the next change of that Regulation.

Transitional period in the two drafts: the transitional period for the CVED is quite long as COM wants to be sure that the document is available in TRACES NT and ready to use. For the generic import certificate, the situation is different as the certificate can be issued in TRACES NT within the planned timeframe; however, the option to issue it on paper needs to be maintained as not all third countries will use TRACES NT. The legal basis for all third countries to use TRACES NT will only be applicable when the tertiary legislation to the Official Control Regulation will be applicable.

COM clarified some questions and MS provided additional comments to boxes I.8, I.10, I.23, I.29, II.16 and III.2 of the CVEDs.

Other TRACES issues

DE asked if the TRACES Helpdesk communicates in German language in case of questions or problems. COM confirmed that there are some German speakers in the TRACES Helpdesk, but they cannot guarantee their 100% availability on a daily basis.

NL asked that the subtype "farmed stock" is added in TRACES for the prepared fishery products under CN codes 1604 and 1605, as it is for fishery products of Chapter 03. This would help the selection of consignments, especially in case of re-enforced checks for medicine residues.

4. TAXUD ISSUES

COM reported that the EU-CVED Single Window Project is evolving and eight MS are participating (CZ, IE, PL, SI, LV, BG, CY and LT) while four MS (AT, NL, FR, DE) have expressed interest in the project.

The works in TRACES NT to host the Certificate of Organic Inspection (COI) and the FLEGT certificate continue and TAXUD has finalised together with SANTE and the other DGs involved (AGRI and ENV) the business case for electronic exchange of information of these two certificates. A joint visit of DG TAXUD and SANTE in SI took place in October to see the details of the EU-CVED Single Window implementation.

On 5/6th December 2016 the first meeting of the Customs 2020 Project Group initiated by DG TAXUD took place, which aims to study the possible framework to develop a EU Single Window environment for customs (EU-SW) including the legal context. This Project Group will develop the details for the implementation of the business case regarding the electronic exchange of information on all certificates hosted in TRACES-NT, in particular CVED, CED, CHED-PP, COI and FLEGT certificate. The business case includes a requirement for quantity management and the Project Group needs to study, how this can be mirrored in a legal basis to enable the inclusion of quantity management on entry documents in TRACES-NT.

COM asked MS to liaise closely with their customs colleagues to ensure that their interests are presented in the Customs 2020 Project Group.

5. MISCELLANEOUS

a) Update of BIP list

COM informed that the last update to the BIP list was published on 1 November 2016 (Implementing Decision (EU) 2016/1917).

COM is drafting a new amendment Decision with changes to the BIP list and the TRACES units, which is planned to be adopted in the first quarter of 2017. COM invited MS to provide any change as soon as possible and warned MS not to come with last minute changes on the day before the drafts are presented in the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed for adoption, as then such changes cannot be accommodated.

COM reminded MS, as usual, to use the relevant template and to send it to the following e-mail address: sante-consult-d2@ec.europa.eu

b) Live animal facilities

IT had asked for the approval conditions of BIPs (or Inspection Centers) for veterinary checks on animals entering the Union from third countries. They especially wanted to know if it is compulsory to have different premises and equipment for every animal species.

COM acknowledged that Annex A to Directive 91/496/EEC provides few details on facilities requirements for BIP of live animals. Although a strict separation for each animal species is not mandatory, the premises and equipment must be appropriate and suitable for the relevant animal species received in the BIP. For example, a stable or a crush for registered horses is not suitable to house or handle pigs or goats. COM (Directorate F) showed some pictures to clarify the necessity of different premises and equipment for some species.

COM expects that such requirements will be clarified in the tertiary legislation to the Official Control Regulation.

c) Draft Decision on fish transfer in third countries

COM had circulated the updated version of the draft Regulation (SANTE/10575/2016) which was presented for discussion in the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed on 30 November 2016. This draft provides a simplified model certificate for fishery consignments caught by EU vessels and landed in third countries before being introduced in the EU. Initially, a second draft document was derogating from the full range of veterinary checks in the BIP considering that the fishery products keep their EU status and that they do not pose any risk of animal health. However, that second draft had to be withdrawn as Directive 97/78/EC does not provide a legal basis to derogate from veterinary checks in BIPs. Such derogation will be possible in future, as the Official Control Regulation provides the empowerment to derogate from identity and physical checks in the border control post of entry.

ES expressed its disappointment concerning the withdrawal of the second draft and they claimed not having the capacity to check every consignment of such transferred fishery products in their BIPs.

COM provided clarification to the questions of some MS and DE proposed to clarify in the footnote of box I.11 when an approval and when a registration number is necessary to be mentioned.

COM made MS aware that DG MARE had raised their attention to short comings regarding the approval and listing of MS flagged reefer vessels and asked MS to liaise with their colleagues responsible for the controls of fishery products to ensure that all fishery products arriving are originating from approved reefer vessels.

d) Update on the draft equidae regulation

COM gave a presentation on the ongoing work regarding the draft equidae legislation and asked MS, if it is necessary for the monitoring of horses in temporary admission to rely on the CVEDA in TRACES or if in addition the health certificate should be used.

AT commented that, in case of temporary admission with an internal circulation between different MS, it is not necessary to issue intra-trade health certificates considering that the traceability of horses is already covered through the CVED registered and updated in TRACES.

COM asked MS to provide written comments and to liaise with their animal health colleagues to ensure that a common approach is presented when the document will be discussed in the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed.

e) Questions to the implementation of the positive list

COM reminded that the implementation of the last update of the positive list (Implementing Decision (EU) 2016/1196) will start on 1 January 2017 and that they have received several questions from consultants advising companies, trade associations and Member States. COM clarified that the update is mostly related to the update of CN codes according to the Customs nomenclature, as a good cooperation with Customs authorities is necessary for the selection of consignments going through the BIPs. There are some rumors that many "new" products will be under the BIP control regime and COM clarified that the main "new" products are the following:

- Products containing meat extract or meat concentrate: several MS wished to have them back in the BIPs, complaining that it is too difficult to make the difference between meat extract (exempted), meat powder (not exempted) or meat concentrate (exempted). As simplification, all these products are now under the same status as legally speaking all these products are considered to be meat products - they need to originate from approved establishments and come with a meat product certificate.

- Empty gelatin capsules for food: as empty gelatin capsule for feed are already under the veterinary checks regime, it seems to be logical that empty gelatin capsules for food are checked as well, as the same general hygiene standards as for all food is applicable. In addition, the BSE (bovine spongiform encephalopathies) attestation in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 999/2001 is applicable. Therefore gelatin capsules for food will be checked in BIPs from 1st January 2017.

- Other products such as filled capsules, food supplements, beverages containing animal products: the updated Decision provides clarification that such products only need to be checked in case they comply with the rules applicable for composite products under BIP checks. Regarding food supplements packaged for the final consumer: while the old decision refers to "small amounts" which are outside the check regime, the new decision defines "20%" for such small amount to align the percentage with the one allowed in Chapter 21 of the Combined Nomenclature as these products are under heading 2106.

Various MS outlined detailed questions to the import requirements for empty gelatine capsules and COM clarified that only empty gelatine capsules destined for food or animal feed are under veterinary control in BIPs while those destined for other purposes than food and feed (e.g. pharmaceutical use) will not be under veterinary control in BIPs. COM confirmed that gelatine capsules filled with animal products, e.g. fish oil, have to be accompanied by the health certificate applicable for that animal product, e.g. fishery product certificate. More detailed information was provided by e-mail (D/7561955, 09.12.2016) and is published on the website on:

http://ec.europa.eu/food/animals/vet-border-control/faq_en

For amino acids for animal feed, the certificate laid down in Chapter F of Annex XV to Regulation (EU) No 142/2011 needs to be presented and the consignments need to be channelled to their destination.

f) Animal-by product issues

- COM clarified the use of the certificate for freeze dried pet food from NZ – this product is considered to be raw and the certificate for raw pet food needs to be used.

- COM presented the outcome of a meeting with the NZ and Member States should strictly follow declaration of imported commodity in the health certificate. For example, pet food or materials for the production of pet food should not be entered into TRACES as "feed for farmed animals". It must be indicated "technical use". COM will revise all special certificates for the import from NZ to avoid any misunderstandings.

- COM clarified the import condition for lanolin: it may be subject to harmonised requirements for the import of intermediate products, fats for feeding of farmed animals, fats for purposes other than feeding of farmed animals or for proposes outside the feed chain. If necessary, Member States may authorise import under national requirements.

- COM reminded that Member States can authorise the imports of animal by-products and derived products only from eligible non-EU countries. MSs may find detailed instructions on eligible non-EU countries in the column "Third countries' lists" of Table 1 of Chapter I or Table 2 of Chapter II of Annex XIV to Regulation (EU) No 142/2011. Pending the processing standards, applicable to particular commodities, the list of non-EU countries may be different:

Third countries' lists
Third countries listed in: (a) Part 1 of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 206/2010; (b) Annex I to Decision 2004/211/EC; or (c) Part 1 of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 798/2008.
The following third countries: (a) in the case of untreated blood products of ungulates: Third countries or parts of third countries listed in Part 1 of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 206/2010 from which imports of fresh meat of any domestic ungulate species is authorised and only for the period indicated in column 7 and 8 of that Part. Japan.

When there is just a reference to a certain list, all non-EU countries listed in that list should be eligible. When special requirements apply, only those non-EU countries that comply with the relevant special requirements or that have been specially spelled out are eligible for imports.

- DK asked for clarification of rules for sampling for Salmonella in fishmeal. COM clarified that rules for that purpose are laid down in Section 2 of Chapter I of Annex XIV and in the health certificate in Chapter I of Annex XV to Regulation (EU) No 142/2011. According to those, 5 samples per consignment should be taken for the examination for Salmonella.

COM asked MS for their procedures and BE and DE informed that they take only 5 samples in such cases. COM confirmed that the best option would be to follow the legal criteria set by EU legislation.

g) Export of processed animal protein (PAP)

COM informed that a draft proposal (SANTE/2016/10539) amending Regulation (EC) No 999/2001, discussed in the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed, Section Biological Security, of 15 November 2016, as well as in several TSE and ABP Working Group meetings, contains a section which involves the responsibilities of BIPs. That section enables MS to export processed animal proteins of category 3 and derived from ruminant materials to third countries. To be sure that the proteins are really intended to third countries, with no risk of diversion to forbidden purposes, and that they cannot be mixed fraudulently with materials of category 1 or 2, the draft lays down a specific procedure of channelization between the establishment of origin and the BIP of exit from the EU. The BIP must check the seal put on the container doors and referred to in the commercial document (DOCOM) issued in TRACES. The seal check can be carried out in a frequency determined by the BIP based on its risk assessment.

Some MS representatives were not aware of this draft and its implications for their BIPs and COM clarified several questions to the draft. NL asked if the BIPs can delegate the seal checks to customs and COM replied, although the BIP is designated as officially responsible for this task, it can be delegated to other authorities according to the standard requirements for delegation as laid down in Regulation (EC) No 882/2004. FR asked if the proposal provides the legal basis to collect fees for financing this additional task. COM answered that Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 provides such possibility which can be used by MS. DE was concerned how their BIPs should become aware of such consignments exiting the EU and COM replied that the BIP will receive a TRACES notification as soon as the commercial document would be validated by the operator in TRACES. It is the responsibility of the operator to present the consignment to the BIP of exit and if he fails to do so, this should have consequences to the frequency of seal checks and the result of the risk assessment carried out.

COM reminded MS that they need to liaise urgently with their relevant representatives as the draft will be presented for vote at the next Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed on 13 December.

h) Checks on re-imported consignments

Due to questions related to the controls for re-import of EU consignments, which have been refused by a third country, COM reminded MS that during the last sessions of training courses for the BIPs under the Better Training for Safer Food Programme (BTSF) from DG SANTE, a specific workshop was dedicated to re-imports. The main conclusions of this workshop were that the BIP needs to carry out a documentary and identity check – in case of suspicion they may carry out a physical check – and the consignments need to be channelled to the establishment of origin in the MS in which the health certificate has been issued.

If the consignment consists of a sealed container and the products have not been unloaded from the container and were rejected by customs or by another competent

authority before they reached their destination in the third country, a non-manipulation certificate has to be presented to the BIP, which can be issued by the carrier, e.g. the truck driver who has been accompanied the consignment. If the original seal has been removed from the container e.g. by customs authorities and a new seal has been affixed, this has to be stated on the non-manipulation certificate, preferably by the competent authority which removed the seal and affixed the new seal.

In all other cases, the consignment needs to be accompanied by the original health certificate or an authenticated copy thereof together with the reason for refusal and the guarantee related to storage, transport and non-handling of the products. This paper with the reason and the guarantee (non-manipulation certificate) should be issued by the competent authority responsible for the rejection and storage of the product, although this is not specifically spelled out in Article 15 of Directive 97/78/EC, but that part of the Article was drafted under the assumption that the products had reached their destination in the third country and were already unloaded from the means of transport and stored and then rejected by the competent authority or by the importer of the third country.

COM reminded MS also that the BIP should contact the competent authority responsible for the establishment of origin in relation to their preparedness to accept the consignments back and the notifications in TRACES for the departure of the consignment from the BIP and for its arrival at the establishment of origin need to be done. NL asked, if consignments sent back due to commercial reasons would be treated as re-imports and several MS agreed that they would treat such consignments as re-imports in accordance with Article 15 of the above Directive.

i) Questions on transit consignments

COM had distributed Revision 4 of the "General Guidance for consignments of live animals and animal products from third countries in transit and transhipment" (SANCO/10844/2011 of 01.12.2016) and explained the changes to Annex II and Annex III to the Guidance.

As explained in earlier Expert Groups, COM monitors monthly the feedback from the US bases on arrival of non-conforming consignments in their bases. While the feedback from US bases in Germany improved – currently there are problems with feedback from Hohenfels and Spangdahlem, the lack of feedback from some US bases in IT, EL and ES is still a problem. These are in particular bases in Aviano, Naples, Ghedi, Souda and Moron. COM is sending monthly the results from TRACES to the USEUCOM and asks for improvement of the performances in these bases. However, relevant MS should look into TRACES and verify that TRACES is correctly used to allow the US bases to fulfil their reporting obligations. COM confirmed that IT provided a reply that their above bases continue to confirm the arrival of consignments by email or fax.

ES commented that there are few US NATO bases in their territory for which it is very difficult to know if they receive goods. COM answered that it is the responsibility of each MS to investigate and clarify the nature of goods movements.

COM received a question from NL about the approval required for ship suppliers according to Directive 97/78/EC, in particular if the ship suppliers need to be approved under Articles 12 and 13 of the aforementioned Directive. COM explained that the

confusion could arise from Article 13 which refers to some provisions in Article 12, considering that the requirements for storing non-conforming goods are very similar between customs warehouses and ship suppliers. But it does not mean that an Article 12 approval (customs warehouse) is mandatory before issuing Article 13 approval (ship suppliers). In other words, the only approval required for ship suppliers is the one laid down in Article 13 of Directive 97/78/EC and double approvals are not necessary. However, the relevant customs warehouse and the relevant ship supplier need to be approved under customs legislation as customs warehouses.

BE asked some clarification on the certification required for EU products transiting through third countries before re-entering the EU. COM answered that EU products are usually circulated freely within the EU and the same principle must apply in case of "internal transit" where the products are transited through third countries before reaching their destination in the final Member State (e.g. products from Croatia transiting through Serbia to go to Bulgaria). In such case, the only necessary certification could be a transit certificate required by the third country, but there is no need for an EU health certificate unless this is expressively indicated in EU legislation. However, checks need to be carried out at BIPs to ascertain that the relevant product is of EU origin.

j) Listing of establishments for gelatine

According to the last changes to Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 and Regulation (EC) No 2074/2005, imports of treated raw material for gelatine and collagen must fulfil different conditions, depending on the treatment type of the material.

If the treatment is not specific in the meaning of point 4(b)(iii) of Chapter I of Sections XIV and XV of Annex III to Regulation (EC) No 853/2004, the material must come from establishments, approved or registered (e.g. approved slaughterhouses, approved cutting plants, approved establishments of fishery products). The same principle is applicable for untreated raw material in the meaning of point 4(a) of the same Chapter.
In case the treatment is specific in the meaning of points 4(b)(i) and (ii) of Chapter I of Sections XIV and XV of Annex III to Regulation (EC) No 853/2004, the material must come from "*establishments under the control of and listed by the competent authority*" of the third country. COM explained that they originally aimed not to require EU-listing for such establishments, but they received advices from the Legal Service that it would be difficult to sustain this position legally. Therefore the listing procedure with Directorate F has started and the lists of establishments will appear soon in a specific section in TRACES.

DE asked if the transitory measures should apply in the meantime, before the publication of the lists, and COM confirmed. In addition, COM clarified that tanneries and collection centers do not need to be listed in an EU list.

k) Import of chilled Nile Perch

COM issued letters to 7 MS regarding the outcome of the checks on chilled Nile Perch in their airport BIPs and so far 4 MS had replied. COM was particularly interested to know if the consignments found in the BIPs had undergone super-chilling and if the physical checks had revealed any infringements related to the cold chain.

DE commented that the method of super-chilling, if properly applied, does not involve any freezing or defrosting and fully meets the requirements of the hygiene package, considering that the products are preserved at a temperature approaching that of melting ice.

COM clarified that the requested investigation should be especially focussed on the possible practices of slow defrosting, which are clearly not in line with the hygiene requirements and reminded MS to provide the outstanding replies.

l) Reporting residue results and EFSA guidelines

PL raised of a point concerning the EFSA exercise on the reporting data regarding the residue plans carried out by the MS. Considering the data related to BIPs are already entered in TRACES, they would like to avoid any double input for the BIPs in case EFSA would develop a separate IT tool for entering the data.

COM confirmed that the Unit in charge of residue plans assigned this specific task to EFSA, who is developing an IT tool for the reporting of data. They will ask EFSA to liaise with the TRACES team to see how TRACES could exchange the relevant data with their IT system. In reply to some MS COM acknowledged that the laboratory module in TRACES would need some improvements, if it would be considered to be the source for the data requested by EFSA.

m) Follow up on falsified certificates from China

BE asked which procedures are applied in other MS when falsified certificates for consignments from China are suspected.
FR explained that they usually contact the Chinese Embassy and ask confirmation of the authenticity of the documents. In the meanwhile, the consignments are detained in the BIPs. But they also rely on the operators to speed up the process of authentication, considering that detention of consignments is very expensive. IT confirmed that they proceed likewise. NL informed that they have a bilateral agreement with China, which enables them to access the Chinese database of certificates to verify their authenticity.

COM concluded that it is important that any consignments with doubts of the authenticity of their certificates remain detained, until such doubts have been clarified.

(signed)
D2 – Import Controls

Encl: Agenda
List of distributed documents

Cc: Experts in 28 MS, Norway, Iceland, Switzerland, Faroe Islands + ESA, M. Scannell, S. Juelicher, B. Van Goethem, P. Colombo, B. Gautrais, A. Gavinelli, K. Van Dyck, E. Zamorra Escribano, E. Thevenard, P. Loopuyt, D. Lange, S. Goux, K. Elliott, G. Gallhoff, K. De Smet, P. Caricato, C. Laso Sanz, S. Perucho Martinez, G. Maréchal, N. Guth, A. Dionisi, J. Bloemendal, S. Andre, R. Scalia, D. Carton, K. Kroon, P. Bernorio, H. Hansen, H. Klein, A.E. Füssel, B. Logar, M. Klemencic, E. Camara, R. Span, J. Baele, G. Balkamos, M. Tomasi, J. Maciulyte, T. Voynova, L. Rantamaki, I. Celms, V. Zamfirescu, O. Prunaux, I. De Stobbeleire, M. Wils, G. Jennes, Unit D2.

EXPERT GROUP ON VETERINARY IMPORT CONTROLS LEGISLATION
"VETERINARY CHECKS"
14 September 2016

– AGENDA –

1) Review of legislation
2) Re-enforced controls
3) TRACES issues: update on CVED and import certificate
4) TAXUD issues
5) Miscellaneous
   a) Update of BIP list
   b) Live animal facilities
   c) Draft Decision on fish transfer in third countries
   d) Update on the draft equidae regulation
   e) Questions to the implementation of the positive list
   f) Animal-by product issues
   g) Export of processed animal protein (PAP)
   h) Checks on re-imported consignments
   i) Questions on transit consignments
   j) Listing of establishments for gelatine
   k) Import of chilled Nile Perch
   l) Reporting residue results and EFSA guidelines
   m) Follow up on falsified certificates from China