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Replies received from

- 27 Member States
- 2 EEA Countries (NO and CH)
- 7 Stakeholder organisations (Avec, BEUC, Clitravi, Copa-Cogeca, EWFC, FVE and UECBV)
What will be presented?

- Member State, EEA and Stakeholder replies
- How to read the replies
- Background of the questions
- Summary of replies for:
  - content of inspection
  - organisation of inspection
  - distribution of responsibilities
- Discussion on summary of replies
- Summarizing remarks
- The way forward
How to read the replies

- Only the number of replies is indicated, not which MS or SH
- Only options with a probable majority (support by 22 or more) are shown in detail (conditions if applicable) in the summarized replies
- Options without a probable majority (support by less than 22) are only briefly mentioned
Content of meat inspection
Questions on content of inspection 3.1-3.3

“New” hazards identified by EFSA (e.g. Salmonella, Yersinia, Toxoplasma and Trichinella);
- 3.1 how should they be tested
- 3.2 should health status influence slaughter procedures
- 3.3 should test result be taken into account by OV in deciding on fitness for human consumption
Summarized replies for content of inspection 3.1-3.3

“New” hazards

- 3.1 Support to be tested by FBO (23), results to CA or at holding

- 3.2 Support for results to be available before slaughter (32) for Salmonella in poultry (24) and pigs (23)

- 3.3 Support to take results into account when OV decides on fitness for consumption (27)
Questions on content of inspection 3.4-3.7

Could visual inspection be extended to;
- 3.4 bovines, sheep and goats

Could meat inspection be differentiated, based on harmonized epidemiological criteria;
- 3.5 for countries or regions
- 3.6 for Member States
- 3.7 for Third Countries
Summarized replies for content of inspection 3.4-3.5

3.4 Visual inspection
- Support for extension to cattle<30 months, lamb and kids (29)
  conditions mentioned are;
  risk assessment, health status of farm and region, integrated production, controlled housing, additional FCI, alert criteria, farm status monitoring and EFSA opinion

3.5 Regional differentiation of meat inspection
- Support for Tuberculosis and Brucellosis (22)
Summarized replies for content of inspection 3.6-3.7

- 3.6 Support for differentiation of meat inspection for MS (27) conditions mentioned are;
  - risk based, EFSA HEI, harmonized EU criteria, cross border FCI, monitoring disease free status and notification of inspection systems

- 3.7 Support for differentiation of meat inspection for TC (28) conditions mentioned are;
  - equivalence of epidemiological criteria, evidence from FVO reports and a signed equivalence agreement with the EU
II Organisation of meat inspection
Questions on organisation of inspection 4.1

4.1 If a slaughterhouse performs good or bad (bonus/malus), should this be reflected in:

- frequency of controls,
- responsibility for slaughterhouse staff or presence of OV
Summarized replies for **organisation** of inspection 4.1

4.1 Support for differentiation of frequency of controls based on bonus/malus (25)

No support for differentiation on the presence of the OV (15) or responsibilities of SH staff (12)
Questions on organisation of inspection 4.2-4.3

Can you accept flexibility for the presence of the OV if;

- 4.2 harmonized alert criteria are applied

- 4.3 inspection is carried out by slaughterhouse staff applying harmonized alert criteria
Summarized replies for organisation of inspection 4.2-4.3

- 4.2 Support for flexibility on presence of the OV, with harmonized alert criteria (26)

  conditions mentioned are;

  only for PM-inspection, AM by OV on farm and permanent OA in SH, only in small/medium SH, harmonised alert criteria, only for integrated production of pigs, poultry, rabbits, calves, lamb and kids and controlled housing conditions, minimal one OV in continuous SH

- 4.3 Doubtful support for flexibility on the presence of OV if SH staff performs inspection with harmonized alert criteria (21)
Questions on organisation of inspection 4.4-4.5

- Will you allow AM-inspection;
  - 4.4 on the farm of provenance
  - 4.5 on a collection centre
Summarized replies for organisaton of inspection 4.4-4.5

- **4.4 Support for AM for all species on the farm (23)**
  
  conditions mentioned are:

  AM≤24 hrs before slaughter, harmonized criteria (epidemiological status, distance farm-SH), only for integrated farms and large homogeneous groups of animals, effective communication farm-SH, farm and SH in same MS, keep AW check in SH, probably costly because of OV logistics

- **4.5 No support for AM for all species in collection centres (20)**
Questions on organisation of inspection 4.6

Can you accept flexibility on the presence of the OV on AM-inspection in discontinuous slaughterhouses
Summarized replies for organisation of inspection 4.6

- No support for flexibility of presence of OV for AM on discontinuous slaughterhouse (20)
III Distribution of responsibilities
Questions on distribution of responsibilities 5.1-5.2

Should pilot projects;

5.1 be limited to the current situation (Annex I, 854)

5.2 or explore the role of;
- OA and FBO in deciding on fitness for consumption when no defects are found during inspection
- SH staff assistance for other species similar to inspection of rabbits and poultry
Summarized replies for distribution of responsibilities 5.1-5.2

Doubtful support to go beyond scope of Annex I, 854 (21)
Questions on distribution of responsibilities 5.3-5.6

What are the minimum tasks or responsibilities for the OV concerning:

- 5.3 FCI
- 5.4 AM-inspection
- 5.5 PM-inspection
- 5.6 Auditing tasks
Summarized replies for distribution of responsibilities 5.3-5.6

- The following OV tasks could be transferred:
  - 5.3 Support for FCI to OA using alert criteria (22)
  - 5.4 No support for AM to OA or SH staff (10)
  - 5.5 Support for PM-inspection to OA using alert criteria and daily OV checks on OA (23)
  - 5.6 No support to shift OV tasks for auditing (8)
Questions on distribution of responsibilities 5.7

For which species, meat inspection tasks other than sampling and testing, can be transferred to SH staff
Summarized replies for distribution of responsibilities 5.7

- Support for SH staff to be used for meat inspection tasks other than sampling and testing in the following species:
  - poultry (22)
  - rabbits (21)
Questions on distribution of responsibilities 5.8

Is detection and removal of pathological abnormalities which are not a public health risk, a task for the FBO?
Summarized replies for **distribution of responsibilities 5.8**

- Support for detection and removal of pathological abnormalities which are not a public health risk to be carried out by the FBO (25)

  Conditions mentioned are:

  training and supervision of the FBO, FCI and AM-info should be used, OV should be informed by FBO on results because of possible AH/AW issues, removal after PM-inspection
Questions on distribution of responsibilities 5.9

Do you see the review of meat inspection;

1. Limited to inspection in the slaughterhouse only

2. Including various controls along the entire meat chain
Summarized replies for distribution of responsibilities 5.9

- Support for limiting inspection to the slaughterhouse only (11)

- Support for including various controls along the entire meat chain (14)

- Support for limiting inspection to the slaughterhouse and various controls along the entire meat chain (3)
6. Further comments

General issues raised were:

- Questions are not always considered clear or differentiated
- Questions do not address situation in entire Union (differences in structure, size, finances of meat production sector)
- EFSA opinion was not yet available
- Because of these previous issues, many gave a preliminary reply
Summarizing remarks

- Several respondents gave preliminary replies because of formulation of the questions, differences between MS and awaited EFSA opinion.

- Many gave conditional answers. But certain conditions will be accepted by one and rejected by another.

- The questionnaire shows only numbers of respondents, not which respondent. So the report is an indication of the views and does not give final positions.

- Because of these previous remarks the Commission considers the replies to the questionnaire as a very useful indication on the views of all.
General Conclusions

- Support for a more risk based meat inspection (e.g. regional differentiation)
- Support for some more flexibility in the organisation of meat inspection
- Certain reluctance to transfer tasks to slaughterhouse staff
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