



Replies to the Questionnaire on the review of meat inspection

Arie Ottevanger
Seconded national expert
SANCO DDG 2. G4 Food
DG SANCO, European Commission

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



I 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 **organisation 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

THANK YOU FOR
YOUR
COOPERATION
AND
ATTENTION !!!