EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY

Directorate F - Food and Veterinary Office

DG(SANTE) 2015-7639 - MR

FINAL REPORT OF AN AUDIT

CARRIED OUT IN

BRAZIL

FROM 16 SEPTEMBER 2015 TO 28 SEPTEMBER 2015

IN ORDER TO

EVALUATE THE OPERATION OF CONTROLS OVER THE PRODUCTION OF FRESH HORSE MEAT AND MEAT PRODUCTS INTENDED FOR EXPORT TO THE EUROPEAN UNION, INCLUDING MONITORING OF RESIDUES AND CONTAMINANTS AS WELL AS CERTIFICATION PROCEDURES

In response to information provided by the Competent Authority, any factual error noted in the draft report has been corrected; any clarification appears in the form of a footnote.

Executive Summary

This report describes the outcome of an audit carried out by the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) in Brazil from 16 to 28 September 2015. The objective of the audit was to evaluate the measures taken by the Brazilian authorities to provide adequate guarantees for food safety and public health in relation to exports of horse meat to the European Union (EU) and to follow-up the recommendations of previous FVO audit reports.

Based on the assessment of the 2015 residue monitoring plan, the results of the 2014 plan and the findings made during this audit, the design and implementation of the 2014 and 2015 residue monitoring plans for equidae cannot demonstrate equivalent guarantees as provided for in Council Directive 96/23/EC, in order to remain listed in the Annex to Commission Decision 2011/163/EU. The rearing conditions of the majority of equidae used for production of meat that are in pasture land all their lives and subject to minimum veterinary treatments could be a mitigating factor.

The official control system in Brazil includes the necessary principal elements thus being capable of providing satisfactory assurances regarding compliance with, or equivalence to, EU requirements in line with Article 46.1(h) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004. However, weaknesses in the design and implementation of the horse action plan for equidae and insufficient staff training in some areas of controls undermine the system.

The lack of specific supervision and audit by the State and Central levels of the official controls performed by different local Competent Authorities (CAs) in order to verify the implementation of the horse action plan prevents a uniform application of this plan and does not allow the Central CA to have an overview of the situation.

While official controls at establishment level ensured that slaughter hygiene, Hazard Analysis Critical Control Points, labelling and identification marking met the EU requirements; this was not always the case with regard to microbiology and Trichinella testing and official controls over hygiene and maintenance. The certification procedures in place did not always ensure that the available documentation provided evidence that only EU eligible equidae meat was exported to the EU.

Ante-mortem and post-mortem inspection was implemented largely satisfactorily. However, the employment status of the auxiliaries performing post-mortem inspection was not always in line with the requirements of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 and the official veterinarian did not always carry out the ante-mortem inspection as required by this Regulation.

While animal welfare requirements were met during slaughter, serious animal welfare concerns are raised as the procedures in place did not ensure that weak animals are not delivered to the slaughterhouse.

A number of recommendations have been made to the CA with a view to addressing the deficiencies identified during this audit.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS USED IN THIS REPORT

Abbreviation	Explanation
AWO	Animal Welfare Officer
CA(s)	Competent Authority(ies)
CCA(s)	Central Competent Authority(ies)
CCP(s)	Critical Control Point(s)
COM	European Commission
DG(SANTE)	Directorate General for Health & Food Safety
DIPOA	Department of Inspection of Products of Animal Origin *(Departamento de Inspeção de Produtos de Origem Animal)*
DSA	Department of Animal Health *(Departamento de Saúde Animal)*
EU	European Union
FBO(s)	Food Business Operator(s)
FVO	Food and Veterinary Office
GTA	Movement Permit (*Guia de Trânsito Animal)*
HACCP	Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point
Hygiene Package	Regulations (EC) No 852/2004, No 853/2004 and No 854/2004
LVU	Local Veterinary Unit
MAPA	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (*Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento*)
MRL	Maximum Residue Limit
PEAE	Horse Collection Centre *(Propiedade de Espera de Abate de Equídeos)*
PFE	Holding Supplying Equidae (*Propiedade Fornecedora de Equídeos)*
SDA	Secretariat for Plant and Animal Protection *(Secretaria de Defensa Agropecuária)*

1. INTRODUCTION

The audit took place in Brazil from 16 to 28 September 2015 as part of the planned audit programme of the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO). The audit team comprised two auditors from the FVO.

The audit team was accompanied during the audit by representatives from the Central Competent Authority (CCA), the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (*Ministério da Agricultura, Pecuária e Abastecimento*, MAPA).

The opening meeting was held on 16 September 2015 with the CCA in Brasilia. At this meeting the FVO audit team confirmed the objectives of, and itinerary for the audit, and additional information required for the satisfactory completion of the audit was requested.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE AUDIT

The objective of the audit was to evaluate the measures taken by the Brazilian authorities to provide adequate guarantees for food safety and public health in relation to exports of horse meat to the EU and to address the recommendations of FVO audit report DG(SANCO)/2011-6139 MR).

The audit team in particular:

- Reviewed the public health control systems in place over the production of horse meat including animal welfare during slaughter, sampling programmes and testing for *Trichinella* intended for export to the European Union (EU);
- Reviewed the traceability systems in place for the production of horse meat, including controls over the registration of holdings, animal identification and the movements of animals necessary for certification in accordance with the requirements of Regulation (EU) No 206/2010;
- Reviewed the system in place for the monitoring of residues and contaminants in equidae meat and meat products, including the controls on veterinary medicinal products and;
- Reviewed the systems for certification of animals and meat in relation to the requirements of Council Directive 96/93/EC.

In particular, controls over fresh horse meat in the framework of Regulations (EC) No 178/2002, No 852/2004, No 853/2004, No 854/2004, No 206/2010 and Council Directives 96/22/EC and 96/23/EC were subject to this evaluation.

In pursuit of these objectives, the audit itinerary included the following:

COMPETENT AUTHORITIES			Comments
Competent authorities	Central	1	Opening and final meeting
	Regional	2	At the States of Paraná and Rio Grande do Sul
	Local	7	At two slaughterhouses, equidae collection centres, holdings and local offices visited
FOOD PRODUCTION / PROCESSING / DISTRIBUTION – ACTIVITIES			
Slaughterhouses		2	
Cutting premises		2	Attached to the slaughterhouses visited
Cold Stores		2	Attached to the slaughterhouses visited
Holdings		2	Holdings keeping equidae and involve in horse trade for slaughter
Horse Collection Centres		2	
Laboratories		1	Official laboratory performing residue testing
Veterinary Medical Products		1	Retailer
Local Veterinary Unit		3	One in Paraná and two in Rio Grande do Sul

3. LEGAL BASIS FOR THE AUDIT

The audit was carried out under the general provisions of EU legislation and, in particular Article 46 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules.

N.B. Full EU legal references are provided in Annex 1. Legal acts quoted in this report refer, where applicable, to the latest amended version.

4. BACKGROUND

The table below details the amounts of horse meat exported to the EU from Brazil:

Year	2014	2013	2012	2004
Quantity (Tonnes)	755	1 338	1 954	17 177

EU Member States are authorised to import horse meat from Brazil if the requirements of Model "EQU" certificate of part 2 of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 206/2010 are satisfied.

Details concerning the horse health situation can be found at the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) website:

http://www.oie.int/wahis_2/public/wahid.php/Wahidhome/Home

According to the OIE African horse sickness was never reported in Brazil and Glanders is present in the country.

The previous audit concerning the safety of horse meat in Brazil was carried out from 29 November to 9 December 2011, the results of which are described in audit report DG(SANCO)/2011-6139 MR. Other relevant audit reports are (DG(SANCO)/2013-6850 MR), (DG(SANCO)/2011-8862 MR) and (DG(SANCO)/2013-6850 MR). These reports are accessible at:

Audit Reports - Food and Veterinary Office FVO - European Commission

The action plan received from the Brazilian authorities provided satisfactory guarantees in response to the audit report DG(SANCO)/2011-6139 recommendations related to horse meat with the exception of recommendation number two which relates to the implementation of the horse action plan.

No RASFF notifications relating to Brazilian equidae meat had been issued in recent years.

Just prior to this audit there were three equidae slaughterhouses approved to export to the EU, each of them located in a different State. One of them was suspended by the CA shortly before the FVO audit and the other two were visited during this audit.

5. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1. COMPETENT AUTHORITIES

Legal requirements

Article 46.1 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.

Audit findings

1. The Secretariat for Plant and Animal Protection (SDA, *Secretaria de Defensa Agropecuária*) of the MAPA is the CCA over the production of equidae meat:

    - The Department of Inspection of Products of Animal Origin (DIPOA) is responsible for the official supervision in export approved slaughterhouses.

    - The Department of Animal Health (DSA) is responsible for the implementation of the animal health programmes and controls.

    - At State level the DIPOA is represented by the SIPOA (Inspection Service of Products of Animal Origin) and the Federal Inspection Service *(Serviço de Inspeção Federal)*. The DSA has representation in all States and agreements are in place with the State Department of Animal Health which implement the official controls through a network of Local Veterinary Units (LVUs).

2. With the introduction of circular 67/2012 (horse action plan applicable to all equidae) the CA updated the procedures for certification of equine meat to the EU. This circular includes detailed requirements for holdings, horse collection centres, intermediaries and

slaughterhouses. It also describes the official controls procedures to be followed when issuing equine meat certificates for the EU.

3. In addition, the CA has general procedures in place for official controls and certification which are detailed in several circulars.

4. The FVO audit team noted significant weaknesses in the design of the horse action plan (see findings No 14, No 16, No 17, No 20 and No 21).

5. The officials performing official controls had sufficient powers and authority for enforcement.

6. Regular general supervisions were performed by the DIPOA in the slaughterhouses.

7. There are no specific supervisions/audits carried out by the State and the Central level on the official controls performed at slaughterhouses, holdings and LVUs in relation to the horse action plan. As a consequence the FVO audit team observed an uneven and unsatisfactory implementation of the horse action plan in the two States visited (see findings No 15 and No 21). Moreover, the CA at Central level did not have an overview of the implementation of the horse action plan.

8. The officials performing controls were generally well trained and aware of the procedures in place. However, the FVO audit team noted weaknesses in the training of officials in some areas of control. In one of the slaughterhouses visited the certifying official veterinarian (OV) was not aware of the requirements of Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009. In addition, in one LVU visited, the official issuing movement permits (*Guias de Trânsito Animal*, GTAs) for horses destined for EU slaughter was not fully aware of the horse action plan requirements.

Conclusions on Competent Authorities

9. The official control system in Brazil includes the necessary principal elements thus being capable of providing satisfactory assurances regarding compliance with, or equivalence to, EU requirements in line with Article 46.1(h) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004. However, weaknesses in the design of the horse action plan and insufficient staff training in some areas of controls undermine the system.

10. The lack of specific supervision and audit by the State and central levels of the official controls performed by different local CAs in order to verify the implementation of the horse action plan, prevents an adequate implementation of this plan and does not allow the CCA to have an overview of the situation.

5.2. Controls on live horses, holding registration and animal identification

Legal requirements

Point II.2 of the model certificate "EQU" in Part 2 of Annex II to the Regulation (EU) No 206/2010.

Point II.1.7 of the model certificate "EQU" in Part 2 of Annex II to the Regulation (EU) No 206/2010.

Audit findings

11. In Brazil equidae are not reared for slaughter and are not considered food production animals as such. The equidae sourced for slaughter are work animals bought by dealers from different holdings. These animals tend to be mainly old and no longer suitable for work, are in many cases in poor body condition and are not fattened before slaughter. The animals generally spend all their lives on the property of origin.

12. The Brazilian horse action plan defines different holdings from which equidae can be sent directly for slaughter to the EU:

    - Supplier holding of equidae (*Propiedade Fornecedora de Equídeos*, PFE). These properties must be registered in each State. No such properties were active in the two States visited.

    - Horse collection centre (*Propiedade de Espera de Abate de Equídeos,* PEAE): they can collect equidae for slaughter from different PFEs and *"holdings with auditable veterinary treatment records"*. Only one PEAE in each State visited was in operation. PEAEs were owned by the FBO or sister FBO companies and were located beside or near the slaughterhouse.

    - In addition, the horse action plan defines dealers supplying equidae for slaughter (*negociante intermediario*). These dealers as described in the horse action plan have to be registered and can only source horses from PFEs. In the two States visited there were no such dealers registered.

13. PFEs and PEAEs must keep animal movement records detailing entries and exits and veterinary medicines treatment records. They must obtain from their suppliers *affidavits* regarding compliance with veterinary medicines treatments (Annex II and III to the horse action plan) covering a period of six months.

14. Under the *"Holdings with auditable veterinary treatment records*" (hereafter referred as holdings) category, the horse action plan includes, in practice, all registered holdings in the country as there is no specific register for such holdings. In the two States visited, these holdings supplied all equidae to PEAEs. Two different situations were observed in these States:

- In Paraná these holdings belong mainly to horse dealers who buy equidae from other properties and keep them for a few days before sending them to the PEAE.

- In Rio Grande do Sul the horse dealers bring equidae directly from the holdings to the PEAE.

15. In the State of Paraná the FVO audit team noted that the majority of *affidavits* issued by the holdings for movements to the PEAE covered only few days' residence on the holding of origin. Therefore the required six month period was not documented. Moreover, on the holding visited the owner (horse dealer) could present only one *affidavit* for one lot of horses bought by him despite regularly buying horses for EU slaughter. The *affidavits* issued by this horse dealer did not specify any residence time. The situation was different in Rio Grande do Sul where all *affidavits* reviewed by the FVO audit team documented the required six months period.

16. The horse action plan is not sufficiently detailed concerning the requirements to be fulfilled by these holdings. The plan does not require them to keep records of entry and exit of equidae which makes it difficult to demonstrate the residence period on the holding. Moreover, despite their denomination according to the plan these holdings are not required to keep a veterinary treatment record book.

17. Also the plan lacks clarity regarding the necessary residence period on such holdings. As a consequence the FVO audit team noted different interpretations by the MAPA officials of the residence requirements.

18. Individual States must decide the frequency of controls for PEAEs, PFEs and dealers as defined in the horse action plan. Regular controls were performed in the PEAEs visited. In Paraná these controls did not identify that the *affidavits* presented did not cover the six month period.

19. In the State of Minas Gerais (not visited by the FVO audit team) the existing PEAE and PFE were recently suspended after the CA identified non-compliances regarding registration of animal movements and availability of *affidavits* and medical treatment records.

20. Horse dealers involved in selling equidae to the PEAEs are not required to be registered as such. They are not subject to specific official controls despite being involved practically for all the trade of equidae destined to slaughter. Also holdings from which the dealers buy horses are not subject to specific official controls regarding horse production for slaughter.

21. According to the horse action plan the FBOs should supervise the compliance of holdings supplying equidae for slaughter with the requirements of the plan. One of the FBOs visited did not perform such controls and the CA had not identified this non-compliance. The other FBO visited supervised the holdings in accordance with the plan. Nevertheless, these supervisions are limited and based on statements of the holding

representatives rather than on verification of documentation as the FBOs do not access to animal movement records and declarations of ownership.

22. Equidae intended to be slaughtered for the EU must be identified with an individual numbered six digit ear-tag and branded letter F on the left shoulder. The individual identification of the equidae has to take place, at the latest, when the animals leave the PFE or the holding. The FVO audit team observed in the slaughterhouses visited that equidae were generally identified with the prescribed brand which in a few cases was not legible. With one exception (which was excluded from EU slaughter) all equidae observed were individually identified at arrival to the slaughterhouses.

23. As equidae are not individually identified during the entire six month period before slaughter it is difficult to verify the veterinary treatment history and residence of an individual animal.

24. The movements of equidae intended to be slaughter for the EU must be accompanied by an official GTA. The GTAs only can be issued when the supporting *affidavit* is available.

25. In the State of Paraná the FVO audit team observed deficiencies in the process of issuing a significant number of GTAs. These deficiencies included issues such as GTA dated after the movement had taken place, number of declared animals lower than the animals actually moved and *affidavit* dated two weeks before the GTA. In the other State visited the situation was substantially better. Nevertheless, in one LVU, one GTA was issued despite the official database recording that there were no equidae present in the holding six months before the affidavit was presented. This issue was noted by the CA and a procedure to solve it was introduced in this LVU. In this State also the equidae movements to the PEAE were not consistently recorded as such in the official database.

26. One State CA cannot access information regarding holdings sending horses for slaughter from another State. This makes it difficult to cross check the information contained in the associated affidavits.

Conclusion on control of live horses, holding registration and animal identification

27. Certain weaknesses of the current system for control of live equidae and holding registration in place in Brazil undermine the reliability of the guarantees which support the Statements of Points II.1.7 and II.2 of the model certificate in Part 2 of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 206/2010. These weaknesses include horse dealers not being registered and subject to specific official controls and ineffective official controls not identifying inadequate affidavits.

5.3. Veterinary medicinal products and residues

Legal requirements

Point II.1.7 of the model certificate "EQU" in Part 2 of Annex II to the Regulation (EU) No 206/2010.

5.3.1. Veterinary medicinal products

Authorisation

28. As described in the FVO reports in 2011 (DG(SANCO)/2011-8862 MR) and 2013 (DG(SANCO)/2013-6850 MR), the MAPA is responsible for authorising veterinary medicinal products and publishes the list of authorised products on its webpage.

Distribution and use

29. Similar to the requirements of Regulation (EU) No 37/2010 and Council Directive 96/22/EC, Normative Instruction of MAPA 9/2003 prohibits the use of chloramphenicol and nitrofurans in all animals and Normative Instruction of MAPA 55/2011 prohibits the use anabolic growth promotors, but for bovine animals only.

30. Different to Regulation (EU) No 37/2010, the pharmacologically active substances phenylbutazone and cristal violet can be used in veterinary medicinal products.

31. Similar to the requirements of Council Directive 2001/82/EC, Normative Instruction of SDA/MAPA 25/2012, in force since 1 January 2014, lists the pharmacologically active substances of veterinary medicinal products which require a veterinary prescription (Annex I). List C5 of Annex I lists anabolics (e.g. androlon, boldenon or testosterone) and ß-agonists (e.g. clenbuterol). The Annexes II to XIII to this Instruction provide *inter alia* the templates for veterinary prescriptions and the record keeping requirements for retailers.

32. Normative Instruction of SDA/MAPA 12/2014 adds long acting avermectins to list C1 of the Annex I to Instruction 25/2012. Beforehand, the use of long acting ivermectin in food producing animals had been prohibited for about one year. The retailer visited, could demonstrate to the FVO audit team one properly completed veterinary prescription of a long acting ivermectin for bovine animals. The retailer stated that he does not sell boldenone or testosterone and in the storage room for the controlled (prescription only) products, no products other than those containing long acting ivermectin were stored.

33. Different to the requirements of Directive 2001/82/EC, all other authorised veterinary medicinal products can be purchased over the counter, including phenylbutazone, which is used as a pharmacologically active substance in 11 veterinary medicinal products authorised for horses. However, at the retailer visited, the label of the only product in stock containing phenylbutazone stated that the product should not be used in horses

intended for human consumption. Consequently, the label did not indicate a withdrawal period to be respected.

Controls

34. Similar to Directive 2001/82/EC, national legislation rules the activities of retailers of veterinary medicinal products and requires that the competent authority undertakes an official control before the initial registration of a retailer and issuing him the first licence. The checklist for this control includes general requirements for the premises and storage facilities of the retailer. While there are further official controls focusing on the retailer's activities and his record keeping requirements, the frequency for these controls is not defined and the annual renewal of the licence can be done without a previous official control. At the retailer visited, the CA carried out three official controls in 2015, and recorded some points for improvement linked to amendments of national legislation.

35. As described in FVO report in 2013 (DG(SANCO)/2013-6850 MR), different to Article 10 of Directive 96/23/EC, national legislation does not require farmers to keep treatment records for equines, except for farms with a special status (e.g. PFE holdings). Consequently, most of the official controls on farms and their respective reports do not include checks on treatment records. At one holding visited, the owner of the equidae recorded in a booklet, the date, the product name, the withdrawal period and the names of 36 horses treated with anthelmintics. In the other holding visited no treatment records were available.

36. The owner of equidae needs a GTA for moving animals from his holding to the collection centre and for that purpose has to provide the information of Annex II and Annex III of the horse action plan. In Annex II, the owner has to declare that the equidae have not been used for sport activities, have not been treated with pharmacologically active substances with an anabolic effect, have been kept under control for six months with regard to the administration of veterinary medicinal products and, if treated with veterinary medicinal products, only MAPA registered products were used and the relevant withdrawal periods had been respected. In Annex III, the owner lists the veterinary medicines treatments applied to individual animals during the previous six months specifying the commercial names, date of treatments and withdrawal periods.

Conclusion on veterinary medicinal products

37. The rules for authorisation and use of veterinary medicinal products for equidae are different from those in the EU and notwithstanding the fact that equidae slaughtered for export to the EU are mainly kept on holdings for working purposes, and might rarely been treated with products other than antelmintics, the lack of individual identification of equidae until shortly before slaughter (see finding No 23), the lack of a requirement to keep treatment records on holdings and the related official controls in this regard undermine the CAs' guarantees regarding the use of pharmacologically active substances in equidae which are not authorised to be used in the EU.

5.3.2. Monitoring of residues

38. The 2015 residue monitoring plan for equidae meat lists 84 samples to be taken for testing of substances of Groups A and B. The 2015 plan includes the same substances to be analysed for as the 2014 plan.

39. The 2015 plan covers the subgroups listed in the Annex II to Directive 96/23/EC for equidae with the exception of the essential subgroup A2 and the highly desirable subgroups B2b, B3b and B3d.

40. In 2014 as well as in 2015 to date, samples planned for Group A and subgroup B2e (e.g. phenybutazone) have not been scheduled for sampling, except for three samples analysed with compliant results for chloramphenicol (A6) in 2014. The national coordinator of residue monitoring plans (within the MAPA) explained that there are budgetary restraints and that private laboratories have to be contracted for Group A substances and phenybutazone as the governmental laboratories do not have validated methods for these substances (except for chloramphenicol) in equidae matrices. The coordinator stated that negotiations to contract private laboratories for such analyses are ongoing and are expected to be completed within the next two months.

41. The range of pharmacologically active substance used in the nationally authorised veterinary medicinal products for equidae is considerably larger than the scope of substances covered by the residue monitoring plan for equidae, in particular with regard to subgroup B2a, anthelmitics (e.g. albendazol, fenbendazol, mebendazol, oxfendazol, praziquantel, pyrantel, closantel, levamisol), but also for substances of other subgroups (e.g. cypermetrin, crystal violet, amitraz, ceftiofur, nystatin, cloprostenol, bacitracin, griseofulvin, enro/ciprofloxacin, triclorfon, imidocarb, meloxicam). As national legislation requires the residue monitoring plan to be published (in May for the plan of the current year), farmers can treat their horses with antelmintics containing only these substances which are not subjected to the residue monitoring. One farmer visited used oxfendazol to treat his and the horses of a relative (both farmers being main suppliers of one of the slaughterhouses visited)[1].

42. The levels of action indicated in the 2014 and 2015 plans are primarily based on Codex Alimentarius guidelines. The levels of action for various substances differ from the maximum residue limits (MRLs) defined in the Annex I to Regulation (EU) No 37/2010, e.g. phenylbutazone (10 ppb versus no MRL in the EU), permethrin and fenvarelate (1000 ppb versus no MRL in equine in the EU), tetracyclines (200 ppb versus 100 ppb MRL in the EU) or tobramycin, hygromycin, lindamycin and amikacin (500 or 200 ppb versus no MRL in the EU). However, the governmental laboratory

[1] In their response to the draft report the CA noted that scope of analyses under the PNCRC for equines has recently been extended. The National Agriculture and Livestock Laboratory in Goiás is already testing muscle samples from equines for the organophorus compounds, pyrethroids, pirazole, neonicotinoids, carbamates and benzimidazoles. In 2015 the tests will be experimental. In 2016, testing will be incorporated in the PNCRC-Equines monitoring sub-programme. In addition, the CA pointed out, the SDA is currently evaluating a possible extension, and that any additions of analytes will be notified as appropriate.

visited, responsible for analysing tetracycline in equine muscle, has a procedure in place to ensure that samples with screening positive results above 25 ppb are subject to a confirmatory analysis. The respective laboratory reports on the results include the quantity of tetracycline detected, thus allowing the CA to respect the limit of 100 ppb when certifying equidae meat to be exported to the EU.

43. In line with the requirements of Directive 96/23/EC and Decision 97/747/EC official staff take the residue monitoring samples as initiated by the coordinator who also supervises the proper and timely implementation of the plan using the centralised electronic system (SISRES).

44. In the years 2013, 2014 and 2015 to date, all residue monitoring samples analysed had a compliant result.

Conclusion on monitoring of residues

45. While sampling procedures and analysing of samples taken are in line with EU requirements, the design and implementation of the 2014 and 2015 to date residue monitoring plans for equidae cannot ensure equivalent guarantees as provided for in Directive 96/23/EC, as the majority of substances of Group A and substances of subgroup B2e (phenylbutazone) are either not included in the plans or have not been scheduled for sampling and analysis[2].

5.4. Official controls at establishment level

5.4.1. General and specific hygiene requirements

Legal requirements

Article 12 of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004.

Point II.1.2 of the model certificates in Part 2 of Annex II to the Regulation (EU) No 206/2010.

[2] In their response to the draft report the CA noted that sampling and analysis of the samples was restarted in 2015 for all of the chemical groups that previously had a performance level of zero. In addition, the competent authority stated that analytical capacity is guaranteed to analyse the following number of samples: Group B1: 5 kidney and 6 muscle samples, Group A6: 5 muscle samples plus 10 muscles samples still to be analysed, Group B2a: 8 liver samples, Group B3a: 2 fat samples, Group B3c: 39 samples, Group B2d: 4 kidney samples, Group A1: 2 urine and 2 liver samples still to be analysed, Groups A4, A5 and B2f: 2 liver samples each, still to be analysed, Group B2e: 2 muscle samples still to be analysed, Group B2c: 2 fat samples each, still to be analysed. In their response to the draft report the CA also noted that the financial resources for a complete implementation of the 2016 RMP for equines have been made available, including those required for the acquisition of analytical standards for official laboratories and contracting of private laboratories, which will make it possible to carry out the number of analyses provided for in the 2016 RMP for equines following the timetable established. In addition, the CA noted that up until 2013 the frequency of sampling under the PNCRC for equines was high, approximately 3.0% of the animals slaughtered and that since the start of the RMP in 2006, non-compliant results had not been detected with regard to the substances for which analyses were compromised in 2014 and 2015. The CA also stated that it considers infringements involving Group A substances to be highly unlikely, as, in Brazil, horses sent for slaughter are not subject to intensive production systems and no economic gain is expected from treating the animals with such substances.

Audit findings

46. Documentation of general and specific hygiene official controls, identifying deficiencies and initiating corrective actions, were readily available.

47. In the two slaughterhouses visited the slaughter hygiene was satisfactory.

48. In one slaughterhouse in the carcass and final packaged product chillers, the FVO audit team observed major maintenance and hygiene deficiencies such as broken and dirty surfaces and rusted overhead structures. These deficiencies, not in line with Annex II of Regulation (EC) No 852/2004, were not identified by the official controls.

5.4.2. HACCP-based systems

Legal requirements

Point II.1.1 of the model certificate "EQU" in Part 2 of Annex II to the Regulation (EU) No 206/2010.

Audit findings

49. According to the procedures in place the CA at slaughterhouses verified daily the monitoring of the slaughter Critical Control Points (gastrointestinal contamination of carcasses) by the FBO. The verification was performed as required.

5.4.3. Microbiological criteria for foodstuffs

Legal requirements

Point II.1.6 of the model certificate "EQU" in Part 2 of Annex II to the Regulation (EU) No 206/2010.

Audit findings

50. In the two slaughterhouses visited, the OV verified the microbiological sampling of carcasses and endorsed the records provided by the FBO. The FBOs performed a trend analysis of the results.

51. In one slaughterhouse visited, the official controls did not identify that the FBO procedures did not specify the surface to be sampled by the destructive method for aerobic colony count and *Enterobacteriaceae*. Moreover, carcasses were sampled for *Salmonella* with the destructive method without establishing equivalence against the sponge method prescribed by Regulation (EC) No 2073/2005. In addition, no documentation was available to prove that the laboratory testing methods used were equivalent to the methods prescribed in the above Regulation. This last point was the subject of recommendation No 4 in audit report DG(SANCO)/2011-6139. The CA provided the FVO audit team with the certificates of equivalence of the methods used at the closing meeting.

5.4.4. Trichinella testing

Legal requirements

Point II.1.3 of the model certificate "EQU" in Part 2 of Annex II to the Regulation (EU) No 206/2010.

Audit findings

52. In the two slaughterhouses visited, the *Trichinella* testing was performed by the officials using the magnetic stirrer method described in the EU Regulation.

53. The FVO audit team verified the results of several kill dates finding results for all slaughtered horses.

54. The equipment available did not allow for the 60 to 100 times magnification for the evaluation of suspect areas or parasite-like shapes as required by Annex I, Chapter I (o) of Regulation (EU) No 2015/1375. This observation was also made in audit report DG(SANCO)/2011-6139 which in recommendation No 5 requested the CA to bring *Trichinella* testing equipment in line with the requirements.

5.4.5. Traceability, labelling and identification marking

Legal requirements

Point II.1.5 of the model certificates in Part 2 of Annex II to the Regulation (EU) No 206/2010.

Audit findings

55. The horse action plan specifies traceability checks to be performed by the CA at different stages of production. In addition, the CA should include procedures to verify the traceability plan of the FBO which must include a traceability report of the product presented for certification to the EU.

56. Just prior to this FVO audit the CA has suspended production and certification of equine meat from one equidae slaughterhouse (not visited during this audit). The reasons provided for this suspension was the detection, during official controls, of non-compliances related to traceability (see finding No 75).

57. In the only equidae slaughterhouse approved to export to the EU not visited by the FVO audit team during this audit, the CA suspended production and certification due to traceability non-compliances regarding EU eligible equidae meat identified during official controls.

58. On the final product, reviewed by the FVO audit team, labels and identification marks were applied in line with EU requirements.

5.4.6. Ante-mortem and post-mortem inspection

Legal requirements

Point II.1.4 of the model certificates in Part 2 of Annex II to the Regulation (EU) No 206/2010.

Audit findings

59. In the two slaughterhouses visited FBO employees, under the supervision of the OV, were involved in post-mortem activities. In one of the slaughterhouses five out of seven auxiliaries involved in post-mortem inspection activities, were employed directly by the FBO while in the other slaughterhouse, five out of eight auxiliaries were employed by the FBO. This is contrary to Chapter III of Section III of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 which allows the involvement of slaughterhouse staff in the post-mortem inspection of poultry and lagomorphs only.

60. Ante-mortem inspection was generally performed by the OV in line with the EU requirements. However, in one of the slaughterhouses visited, the FVO audit team observed that ante-mortem inspection was carried out on some occasions by the official auxiliary instead of the OV. This is not in line with Chapter II (B) of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 854/2004.

61. As required by the horse action plan, the CA cross checked the documentation accompanying the equidae at ante-mortem inspection with the outcome of the FBO checks. The CA on the spot checks included the verification of the number of animals and the presence of individual identification tags. Also the ante-mortem controls included the downgrading of animals for non-conformances such as absence of individual identification and absence of Annex II and III forms.

62. Grey horses were post-mortem inspected in line with the EU requirements and there was evidence of condemnation of horses due to the identification of melanosis and melanomata.

63. According to the procedures in place horse heads were split lengthways for the evaluation of glanders. If a positive is identified the whole kill has to be downgraded to non EU status.

5.4.7. Animal welfare at the time of slaughter

Legal requirements

Point II.3 of the model certificates in Part 2 of Annex II to the Regulation (EU) No 206/2010.

Audit findings

64. The CA presented to the FVO audit team a draft piece of legislation to regulate the designation of third parties to train animal welfare officers (AWOs) in line with Article

21 of Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009. According to the CA this piece of legislation was under public consultation before enactment.

65. Except for AWOs, the CA had so far not introduced any procedures to designate a CA/ separate entity/body responsible to ensure that training courses are available for personnel involved in killing and related operations in line with Article 21 of Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009. Moreover, according to the information provided it is envisaged that this training will be provided by the AWO without an indication on how the requirement to have an independent examination (Article 21 (b) of Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009) would be ensured. Therefore the FBO cannot ensure that the persons involved in the slaughter operations listed in Article 7 (2) possess the required certificate of competence.

66. The FVO audit team noted that equidae were handled and stunned satisfactorily in both slaughterhouses visited. Spare stunning equipment was readily available and the FBO and the CA carried out animal welfare checks.

67. In one of the two slaughterhouses visited the FBO had not designated an AWO contrary to the requirements of Article 17. In this slaughterhouse the FVO audit team noted that the FBO had procedures in place for the evaluation of animal welfare covering the different stages from the lairage to stunning. However, these procedures did not include the evaluation of the welfare at the reception. This is not in line with Article 15 and Annex III point 1.1.1 of Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 which requires the AWO, or a person reporting directly to the AWO, to systematically assess the animal welfare conditions of each consignment of animals upon arrival. This Regulation was not known by either the FBO or the OV who still referred to the EU legislation from 1993 that was repealed in 2013. In the same slaughterhouse the OV performed animal welfare checks during stunning and also during ante-mortem inspection. As a result of the ante-mortem inspection during 2015 the OV requested the emergency slaughter of 79 equidae mainly due to cachexia and weaknesses. This number of animals, in addition to those that died in the lairage, amounted to approximately 2% of the total equidae presented for slaughter from which the majority were destined to EU productions. It was noted that in one consignment of 12 equidae, 3 arrived dead or were euthanised. The OV acted correctly in requesting emergency slaughter of these animals. However, the lack of animal welfare assessment on arrival by the AWO meant that the animals suffering was unnecessarily extended (until the time the OV performed the ante-mortem inspection) instead of having been determined immediately upon arrival as required.

68. In the other slaughterhouse visited and adjacent collection centre, owned by the same FBO, the FBO had designated an AWO (veterinarian) and an animal welfare assessment was done systematically upon arrival. Animals that presented signs of weaknesses and distress were promptly euthanised as required. The total amount of animals recorded as dead on arrival, emergency slaughtered and dead on the premises amounted to approximately 1.25%. In one consignment of 18 equidae three animals were dead on arrival and three had to be euthanised while another one died on the premises.

Conclusions on official controls at establishment level:

69. While official controls at establishment level ensured that slaughter hygiene, Hazard Analysis Critical Control Points (HACCP), labelling and identification marking met the EU requirements; this was not always the case with regard to traceability, microbiology and official controls over hygiene and maintenance.

70. Ante-mortem and post-mortem inspection was implemented largely satisfactorily. However, the employment status of the auxiliaries performing post-mortem inspection was not always in line with the requirements of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 and the OV did not always carry out the ante-mortem inspection as required by this Regulation.

71. The CA did not fully address recommendation recommendation No 5 of audit report DG(SANCO)/2011-6139 related to the equipment available for the performance of *Trichinella* testing.

72. Animal welfare requirements were met during handling at lairage and stunning and bleeding. Nevertheless the CA has not yet taken measures to ensure: that FBO staff handling live animals are certified as competent to do so, that FBOs designate an animal welfare officer for each slaughterhouse and that FBOs perform an animal welfare assessment of each consignment of animals upon arrival. This last shortcoming, in particular, has significant negative consequences as the data available on the percentage of animals arriving dead or extremely weak points to serious animal welfare problems prior to or during transport that the FBO should have detected and taken measures to prevent.

5.5. Official certification

Legal requirements

Council Directive 96/93/EC.

Annex V of Regulation (EU) No 206/2010.

Annex VI of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004.

Audit findings

73. As part of the certification procedures, the CA must verify specific documentation such as traceability reports which must be referenced when the FBO makes the certificate requisition in the Administrative Information System of the Federal Inspectorate SIGSIF).

74. In one of the two slaughterhouses, visited by the FVO, the certification procedures were satisfactory and the CA and the FBO keep adequate documentation of the certified consignments.

75. In the other slaughterhouse the supporting documentation for one of the two evaluated certificates issued for export to the EU was not satisfactory. The documentation available could not prove that only EU eligible horses had been used for the production of this consignment. According to the documentation provided the FBO obtained approximately 13 000 kg of meat from the boning of 39 EU eligible equidae. This was significantly in excess of the yields obtained by the company. The certifying officer did not identify this discrepancy. The CA took immediate action and suspended certification and production and requested the diversion of all existing stocks to other markets. At the final meeting the CA presented the FVO audit team with FBO updated traceability procedures to support requests for certification in order to resolve the problems identified.

Conclusion on official certification

76. The certification procedures in place did not always ensure that the available documentation provide evidence that only EU eligible equidae meat was exported to the EU.

5.6. Follow-up

The table below summarizes the follow-up to the relevant recommendation(s) made in report DG SANCO 2011/No 6139-MR Final

No	Previous recommendation	Assessment
No 2	To implement the horse action plan in order to provide guarantees on traceability, identification of equidae and medicinal treatment records for equidae in line with the provisions of Commission Regulation (EC) No 504/2008 and Article 10 of Council Directive 96/23/EC.	Partly addressed by Annex II and III of horse action plan which requires information regards residency of six months and treatment during this period as well as well as declaration regard the use of growth promoters (hormones and B-agonists) Individual identification of animals is only ensured shortly before slaughter. See recommendation No 1 of the current audit report.

The table below summarizes the follow-up to the relevant recommendation(s) made in report DG SANCO 2014/No 7234-MR Final

No	Previous recommendation	Assessment
No 1	Regarding animal welfare at the time of killing; to ensure that a procedure is developed to approve programmes of training courses for personnel involved in killing and related operations, with independent final examinations and delivering relevant certificates of competence, as required by Articles 7 and 21 of Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009.	Not addressed.

6. OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

Based on the assessment of the 2015 residue monitoring plan, the results of the 2014 plan and the findings made during this audit, the design and implementation of the 2014 and 2015 residue monitoring plans for equidae cannot demonstrate equivalent guarantees as provided for in Directive 96/23/EC, in order to remain listed in the Annex to Decision 2011/163/EU. The rearing conditions of the majority of equidae used for production of meat that are in pasture land all their lives and subject to minimum veterinary treatments could be a mitigating factor.

The official control system in Brazil includes the necessary principal elements thus being capable of providing satisfactory assurances regarding compliance with, or equivalence to, EU requirements in line with Article 46.1(h) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004. However, weaknesses in the design and implementation of the horse action plan for equidae and insufficient staff training in some areas of controls undermine the system.

The lack of specific supervision and audit by the State and Central levels of the official controls performed by different local CAs in order to verify the implementation of the horse action plan prevents a uniform application of this plan and does not allow the CCA to have an overview of the situation.

While official controls at establishment level ensured that slaughter hygiene, HACCP, labelling and identification marking met the EU requirements; this was not always the case with regard to microbiology and *Trichinella* testing and official controls over hygiene and maintenance. The certification procedures in place did not always ensure that the available documentation provided evidence that only EU eligible equidae meat was exported to the EU.

Ante-mortem and post-mortem inspection was implemented largely satisfactorily. However,

the employment status of the auxiliaries performing post-mortem inspection was not always in line with the requirements of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 and the OV did not always carry out the ante-mortem inspection as required by this Regulation.

While animal welfare requirements were met during slaughter serious animal welfare concerns are raised as the procedures in place did not ensure that weak animals are not delivered to the slaughterhouse.

7. CLOSING MEETING

A closing meeting was held on 28 September 2015 with the CCA, the MAPA. At this meeting the FVO audit team presented the findings and preliminary conclusions of the audit and advised the CCA of the relevant time limits for production of the report and their response.

The representatives of the CCA acknowledged the findings and conclusions presented by the FVO audit team. In addition, information on action already taken and planned in order to address particular findings in the establishments visited was provided.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

An action plan describing the action taken or planned in response to the recommendations of this report and setting out a time table to correct the deficiencies found should be presented to the Commission within 25 working days of receipt of the report.

No.	Recommendation
1	To review the design and implementation of the horse action plan in order to ensure that it contains all the elements necessary to guarantee the requirements for certification as laid down in Model "EQU" in Part II of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 206/2010. In particular to implement official controls over dealers and holdings supplying horses for slaughter. *Recommendation based on conclusions No 9 and No 27.* *Associated findings No 4, No 14, No 15, No 16, No 17, No 20, No 21, No 23 and No 25.*
2	To ensure that the supervision and audit of the implementation of the horse action plan by the State and Central level takes place in order to ensure an even and adequate implementation of the horse action plan to guarantee the requirements for certification as laid down in model "EQU" in Part II of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 206/2010. *Recommendation based on conclusion No 10.* *Associated findings No 7 and No 21.*
3	To ensure that the official controls evaluate appropriately the level of maintenance and hygiene in EU approved establishments in order to guarantee that EU listed establishments meet the general and specific hygiene requirements for certification laid down in Model “EQU” in Part II

	of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 206/2010. *Recommendation based on conclusion No 69.* *Associated finding No 48.*
4	To ensure that the official controls include within their scope carcass microbiological criteria specified in point II.1.6 of Model "EQU" in Part II of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 206/2010 and that non-compliances identified are rectified. *Recommendation based on conclusion No 69.* *Associated finding No 51.*
5	To ensure that ante-mortem inspection is performed only by official veterinarians to comply with the requirements of point II.1.4 of the Model "EQU" certificate laid down in part 2 of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 206/2010. *Recommendation based on conclusion No 70.* *Associated finding No 60.*
6	To ensure that post-mortem inspection is performed only by official auxiliaries to comply with the requirements of point II.1.4 of the Model "EQU" certificate laid down in part 2 of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 206/2010. *Recommendation based on conclusion No 70.* *Associated finding No 59.*
7	To ensure that *Trichinella* testing equipment is brought in line with the requirements of Regulation (EU) No 2015/1375. *Recommendation based on conclusion No 71.* *Associated finding No 54.*
8	To improve the implementation of the certification procedures in order to ensure that the certifying officer only certifies meat for which adequate supporting documentation, guaranteeing compliance with the requirements of Model "EQU" certificate, laid down in part 2 of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 206/2010, is available. *Recommendation based on conclusion No 76.* *Associated findings No 75 and No 56.*
9	To ensure that, in line with Article 15 of Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 the FBO assesses animal welfare upon arrival of each consignment of animals for slaughter and appropriate actions are taken in order to address high mortality rates. *Recommendation based on conclusion No 72.* *Associated findings No 67 and No 68.*

The competent authority's response to the recommendations can be found at:

http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/rep_details_en.cfm?rep_inspection_ref=2015-7639

ANNEX 1 – LEGAL REFERENCES

Legal Reference	Official Journal	Title
Reg. 178/2002	OJ L 31, 1.2.2002, p. 1-24	Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2002 laying down the general principles and requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Safety Authority and laying down procedures in matters of food safety
Reg. 852/2004	OJ L 139, 30.4.2004, p. 1, Corrected and re-published in OJ L 226, 25.6.2004, p. 3	Regulation (EC) No 852/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the hygiene of foodstuffs
Reg. 853/2004	OJ L 139, 30.4.2004, p. 55, Corrected and re-published in OJ L 226, 25.6.2004, p. 22	Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 laying down specific hygiene rules for food of animal origin
Reg. 854/2004	OJ L 139, 30.4.2004, p. 206, Corrected and re-published in OJ L 226, 25.6.2004, p. 83	Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 laying down specific rules for the organisation of official controls on products of animal origin intended for human consumption
Reg. 882/2004	OJ L 165, 30.4.2004, p. 1, Corrected and re-published in OJ L 191, 28.5.2004, p. 1	Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules
Reg. 2073/2005	OJ L 338, 22.12.2005, p. 1-26	Commission Regulation (EC) No 2073/2005 of 15 November 2005 on microbiological criteria for foodstuffs

Reg. 2074/2005	OJ L 338, 22.12.2005, p. 27-59	Commission Regulation (EC) No 2074/2005 of 5 December 2005 laying down implementing measures for certain products under Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council and for the organisation of official controls under Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council and Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council, derogating from Regulation (EC) No 852/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council and amending Regulations (EC) No 853/2004 and (EC) No 854/2004
Reg. 2075/2005	OJ L 338, 22.12.2005, p. 60-82	Commission Regulation (EC) No 2075/2005 of 5 December 2005 laying down specific rules on official controls for Trichinella in meat
Reg. 504/2008	OJ L 149, 7.6.2008, p. 3-32	Commission Regulation (EC) No 504/2008 of 6 June 2008 implementing Council Directives 90/426/EEC and 90/427/EEC as regards methods for the identification of equidae
Reg. 1099/2009	OJ L 303, 18.11.2009, p. 1-30	Council Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 of 24 September 2009 on the protection of animals at the time of killing
Reg. 1162/2009	OJ L 314, 1.12.2009, p. 10–12	Commission Regulation (EC) No 1162/2009 of 30 November 2009 laying down transitional measures for the implementation of Regulations (EC) No 853/2004, (EC) No 854/2004 and (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council
Reg. 206/2010	OJ L 73, 20.3.2010, p. 1–121	Commission Regulation (EU) No 206/2010 of 12 March 2010 laying down lists of third countries, territories or parts thereof authorised for the introduction into the European Union of certain animals and fresh meat and the veterinary certification requirements

Reg. 37/2010	OJ L 15, 20.1.2010, p. 1-72	Commission Regulation (EU) No 37/2010 of 22 December 2009 on pharmacologically active substances and their classification regarding maximum residue limits in foodstuffs of animal origin
Reg. 2015/1375	OJ L 212, 11.8.2015, p. 7–34	Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/1375 of 10 August 2015 laying down specific rules on official controls for Trichinella in meat
Dir. 96/22/EC	OJ L 125, 23.5.1996, p. 3-9	Council Directive 96/22/EC of 29 April 1996 concerning the prohibition on the use in stockfarming of certain substances having a hormonal or thyrostatic action and of beta-agonists, and repealing Directives 81/602/EEC, 88/146/EEC and 88/299/EEC
Dir. 96/23/EC	OJ L 125, 23.5.1996, p. 10-32	Council Directive 96/23/EC of 29 April 1996 on measures to monitor certain substances and residues thereof in live animals and animal products and repealing Directives 85/358/EEC and 86/469/EEC and Decisions 89/187/EEC and 91/664/EEC
Dir. 96/93/EC	OJ L 13, 16.1.1997, p. 28-30	Council Directive 96/93/EC of 17 December 1996 on the certification of animals and animal products
Dir. 97/78/EC	OJ L 24, 30.1.1998, p. 9-30	Council Directive 97/78/EC of 18 December 1997 laying down the principles governing the organisation of veterinary checks on products entering the Community from third countries
Dir. 98/83/EC	OJ L 330, 5.12.1998, p. 32-54	Council Directive 98/83/EC of 3 November 1998 on the quality of water intended for human consumption
Dir. 2001/82/EC	OJ L 311, 28.11.2001, p. 1-66	Directive 2001/82/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 November 2001 on the Community code relating to veterinary medicinal products

Dir. 2002/99/EC	OJ L 18, 23.1.2003, p. 11-20	Council Directive 2002/99/EC of 16 December 2002 laying down the animal health rules governing the production, processing, distribution and introduction of products of animal origin for human consumption
Dec. 2000/572/EC	OJ L 240, 23.9.2000, p. 19-24	2000/572/EC: Commission Decision of 8 September 2000 laying down animal and public health conditions and veterinary certification for imports of minced meat and meat preparations from third countries and repealing Decision 97/29/EC
Dec. 2006/27/EC	OJ L 19, 24.1.2006, p. 30-31	2006/27/EC: Commission Decision of 16 January 2006 on special conditions governing meat and meat products of equidae imported from Mexico and intended for human consumption
Dec. 2007/777/EC	OJ L 312, 30.11.2007, p. 49-67	2007/777/EC: Commission Decision of 29 November 2007 laying down the animal and public health conditions and model certificates for imports of certain meat products and treated stomachs, bladders and intestines for human consumption from third countries and repealing Decision 2005/432/EC
Dec. 97/747/EC	OJ L 303, 6.11.1997, p. 12-15	97/747/EC: Commission Decision of 27 October 1997 fixing the levels and frequencies of sampling provided for by Council Directive 96/23/EC for the monitoring of certain substances and residues thereof in certain animal products
Dec. 2011/163/EU	OJ L 70, 17.3.2011, p. 40-46	2011/163/EU: Commission Decision of 16 March 2011 on the approval of plans submitted by third countries in accordance with Article 29 of Council Directive 96/23/EC
Dec. 2011/163/EU	OJ L 70, 17.3.2011, p. 40-46	2011/163/EU: Commission Decision of 16 March 2011 on the approval of plans submitted by third countries in accordance with Article 29 of Council Directive 96/23/EC