

# **QUESTIONNAIRE TO MEMBER STATES TO PREPARE THE WORKING GROUP MEETING ON 4-5 SEPTEMBER 2008**

## **I. COMPLEMENTARY INFORMATION FOR THE COMMUNICATION ON MECHANICALLY SEPARATED MEAT**

### **Regulation (EC) No 999/2001**

#### **1. Article 9(2)**

Does the Member State intend to continue with the production of each of the two types of MSM?

2. As a risk manager, does the competent authority not consider that there are hygienic and, possibly, health risks with the use of MSM, in particular the hard or high pressure MSM?
3. As a risk communicator, has the competent authority communicated these risks to consumers in its territory?
4. Does the competent authority consider that there is a future necessity for the production of MSM in its territory?
5. Does the competent authority consider that there is a future use for MSM in their territory?

## **II. COMPLEMENTARY INFORMATION FOR THE REPORT ON THE EXPERIENCE GAINED FROM THE APPLICATION OF THE HYGIENE PACKAGE**

### **Regulation (EC) No 852/2004**

#### **1. Article 5 (HACCP)**

(i) Identify the difficulties in the application of HACCP in particular with regard to small businesses.

(ii) Is it desirable and practicable to provide for the extension of HACCP to food business operators carrying out primary production?

[No record of response to (ii) above by AT, DE, EE, ES, GR, IT, LV, MT, PL, PT, RO, SK to this sub-question]

**2. Article 6** (*Registration and approval of food businesses*)

Registration difficulties, in particular with regard to the information to be supplied to the competent authority and possible fees that may be imposed.

Approval difficulties with regard to establishments that have to be approved.

**3. Articles 7, 8 and 9** (*Guides to good practice*)

Have Member States encouraged the development of such guides for (i) hygiene and (ii) for the application of the HACCP principles?

When such guides are available, are they widely used by the sectors?

When such guides are available, are they taken into account by the competent authorities? If yes, how?

**4. Annex I** (*Primary production*)

Difficulties with regard to the application of Annex I, in particular "hazard analysis" by primary producers and record keeping.

## **Regulation (EC) No 853/2004**

**5. Article 1(5)(c)** (*Scope – national measures*)

Difficulties in relation to derogation from the scope, in particular marginal, localised and restricted activities regulated by national measures.

**6. Annex I** (*Definitions*)

Difficulties deriving from the definitions, including composite products.

**7. Annex II** (*Identification marking*)

Difficulties as regards marking of food of animal origin.

**8. Annex II** (*Food chain information*)

Difficulties as regards food chain information in the poultry and porcine sectors.

Anticipated difficulties as regards food chain information in the equine and veal calf sectors in 2009 and for other species in 2010, with special emphasis on the timing for the submission of the FCI (How are implemented the provisions: "in good time before the animals arrive", 24h...?), trade and imports issues, feedback to farmers and the FCI link with certificates accompanying animals.

## **Regulation (EC) No 854/2004**

### **9. Article 4** (*General principles for official controls in respect of all products of animal origin falling within the scope of the Regulation*)

Difficulties with regard to audits by competent authorities on good hygiene practices and HACCP-based procedures

### **10. Article 5 and Annex I** (*Controls on meat*)

Difficulties regarding meat inspection and, in particular, the involvement of official auxiliaries and slaughterhouse staff, the presence of official veterinarians, health marking

Difficulties in implementing *Trichinella* control requirements, in particular the following provisions of Regulation (EC) No 2075/2005:

#### (a) Article 2 (*Sampling of carcasses*)

- (i) How many slaughterhouse food business operators in the Member State avail of the derogation in paragraph 2(a) (cutting carcasses into a maximum of six parts on the same premises pending the results of the *Trichinella* examination)?
- (ii) Has the food business operator in each instance provided full traceability to the satisfaction of the Member State?
- (iii) In the event of traceability not being guaranteed, does the competent authority restrict the cutting of the carcase until the results are made available?
- (iv) Under paragraph 2(b) by way of derogation from (a) carcasses may be cut up at a cutting plant attached to or separate from the slaughterhouse. Does the competent authority provide prior approval in each instance?
- (v) Does the competent authority provide supervision in each instance?
- (vi) How does the competent authority ensure that a carcase or the parts thereof do not have more than one cutting plant as their destination?
- (vii) In the case of how many slaughterhouses in your Member State has there been a positive result?
- (viii) Have all the parts been declared unfit for human consumption in each instance?
- (ix) How does the Member State guarantee that (viii) is achieved in each instance?

#### (b) Article 3 (*Derogations*)

- (i) How many swine holdings are there in your Member State?

(ii) How many of the holdings at (i) above have been recognised by the competent authority as free from *Trichinella* under paragraph 2 of the Article in accordance with Chapter II of Annex IV to the Regulation?

(iii) Has the Member State implementing (ii) above submitted an annual report to the Commission containing the relevant information? If yes, please provide copies of the annual reports and of the communications.

(c) Article 7 (Contingency plans)

Has the Member State prepared a contingency plan by 31 December 2006? If not, by what date was it prepared? Please provide a copy.

(d) Article 10 (Inspection of *Trichinella*-free holdings)

Does the competent authority in your Member State ensure that inspections are carried out of holdings recognised as free from *Trichinella*?

At what frequency/periodicity are such inspections made in your Member State?

How does the competent authority in your Member State ensure that, nevertheless, all breeding sows and boars coming from *Trichinella*-free holdings are examined in accordance with Article 2(1)?

(e) Article 11 (Monitoring programmes)

Does the competent authority implement a monitoring programme covering domestic swine, horses and other animal species susceptible for *Trichinella*?

Are the frequency of testing, the number of animals to be tested and the sampling plan laid down in the monitoring programme?

Does the monitoring programme include serological methods as an additional tool?

(f) Article 12 (Withdrawal of official recognition of *Trichinella*-free holdings)

Has the competent authority had to withdraw the holding's official recognition as free from *Trichinella*?

If yes,

- in how many cases?
- has the Member State informed the Commission and the other Member States? (please provide copies)

(g) Laboratories and analytical methods

Do all the laboratories in charge of *Trichinella* controls start an accreditation procedure?

To which extent is the trichinoscopic method still used in your Member State?