



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY

Health and food audits and analysis

DG(SANTE) 2018-6457

**FINAL REPORT OF AN AUDIT
CARRIED OUT IN
URUGUAY
FROM 23 APRIL 2018 TO 04 MAY 2018
IN ORDER TO
EVALUATE THE CONTROL SYSTEM IN PLACE GOVERNING THE PRODUCTION
OF FOOD OF ANIMAL ORIGIN (HORSE MEAT) INTENDED FOR EXPORT TO THE
EUROPEAN UNION**

Executive Summary

This report describes the outcome of an audit carried out by Directorate-General for Health and Food Safety in Uruguay from 24 April to 4 May 2018. The objectives of the audit were to evaluate the operation of official controls over the production of horse meat destined for export to the European Union and the certification procedures.

The audit found that the control system put in place is based on legislation which overall adequately covers EU requirements, but this legislation does not cover the movement of horses between holdings, which may be relevant for the reliability of the compulsory sworn statements by owners in respect of residency and use of veterinary medicinal products.

Official controls are supported by documented control procedures and supervision and audit of the official controls are in place, but they effectively do not include horse holdings. As a result, and while the certification procedures themselves are in line with the requirements of Directive 96/93/EC, the guarantees provided by the competent authority in relation to the requirements concerning the residency of the horses and the use of veterinary medicinal products are dependent on the veracity of the sworn statements issued by owners and the official controls of the relevant documents which take place shortly before slaughter, at the assembly centres. However, the adequacy and effectivity of these controls could not be assessed as, contrary to the specific request from the audit team before the audit, none of the assembly centres were found to be in operation.

The provisions for the approval and listing of establishments eligible for export of horse meat to the European Union are in themselves adequate, as are the control procedures in these establishments aimed at ensuring that the establishments continue to meet the relevant European Union standards. Nonetheless, deficiencies found in particular in one slaughterhouse, and not efficiently dealt with point to incorrect implementation and gaps in enforcement, in practice.

As regards animal welfare, and although previous shortcomings in relation to stunning and bleeding were corrected, the official controls in the assembly centres do not ensure that European Union and national welfare requirements are met, and were not effective in correcting established non-compliance. Moreover, and although the centres were found not in operation and no animals were therefore present, the centres' records on the one hand, and the condition of the centres on the other, clearly indicate that when in operation and with the numbers of animals present, animal welfare would be compromised.

Finally, as regards veterinary medicinal products, the national legal provisions concerning substances mentioned in the European Union model health certificate for horse meat allow attestation that the specific European Union requirements in respect of these substances have been met. However, the presence on the market of veterinary medicinal products containing esters of oestradiol 17-beta for other species (cattle) and the indications that such preparations are being used, means that the competent authority cannot reliably certify that public health requirements for the European Union market are met for meat derived from those species. In addition, the absence of controls on-farm on the use of veterinary medicinal products in horses, together with the shortcomings in respect of labelling and of indications for correct use, compromises guarantees that drug withdrawal periods have been complied with.

The report contains recommendations to the competent authorities to address the identified shortcomings.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Objective and scope	1
3	Legal Basis	2
4	Background	3
5	Findings and Conclusions	3
5.1	Legislation and implementing measures	3
5.1.1	Legislation	3
5.2	Competent authorities	5
5.2.1	Structure and organisation	5
5.2.2	Legal powers, independence and authority for enforcement	5
5.2.3	Imports of live horses	6
5.2.4	Resources	6
5.2.5	Organisation of the control system	6
5.2.6	Documented control procedures	7
5.2.7	Supervision and audits	7
5.3	Listing of establishments	8
5.4	Holding registration, Animal Identification and movement	9
5.5	Official controls at establishment level	10
5.5.1	Specific requirements for slaughterhouses	11
5.5.2	General requirements applicable to all establishments	12
5.5.3	Horse assembly centres	13
5.5.4	Implementation of the actions taken in response to the recommendations made in the 2016 Report.	14
5.6	Official certification	15
5.7	use of veterinary medicinal products and certification requirements	16
6	Overall Conclusions	19
7	Closing Meeting	20
8	Recommendations	20
Annex 1 – Legal references		

ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS USED IN THIS REPORT

Abbreviation	Explanation
CCA	Central Competent Authority
CA	Competent Authority
DG Health and Food Safety	Directorate-General for Health and Food Safety of the European Commission
COTE	Internal Transfer Certificate (<i>Certificado oficial de transferencia de exportación</i>)
EC	European Community
EU	European Union
FBO	Food Business Operator
DGSG	Directorate General of Livestock Services (<i>Dirección General de Servicios Ganaderos</i>)
DIA	Animal Industry Division (<i>División de Industria Animal</i>)
DICOSE	Livestock Movements Control Division (<i>División de Contralor de Semovientes</i>)
DILAVE	Department of Control of Veterinary Products (<i>Departamento de Control de Productos Veterinarios</i>)
DSA	Animal Health Division (<i>División de Sanidad Animal</i>)
GPT	Guía de Propiedad y Tránsito – animal movement document
HACCP	Hazard Analysis of Critical control Points
MGAP	Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries (<i>Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca</i>).
OV	Official Veterinarian
SNIG	National Livestock Information System (<i>Sistema Nacional de Información Ganadera</i>)

1 INTRODUCTION

The audit took place in Uruguay from 24 April to 4 May 2018. This audit forms part of the planned audit programme of the Directorate-General for Health and Food Safety (DG Health and Food Safety) for 2018.

The audit team comprised two auditors from DG Health and Food Safety and who were accompanied during the whole audit by representatives of the central competent authority (CCA) involved in the implementation of the controls covered under the scope of the audit. In addition, the availability of representatives of other (local or central) competent authorities (CAs) involved in the control systems was ensured during the relevant part of the audit

An opening meeting was held on 24 April 2018 with the CCA, the Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries (*Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca* MGAP). At this meeting, the audit team confirmed the objective of, and itinerary for the audit, and additional information required for the satisfactory completion of the audit was requested.

2 OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The objective of the audit was to evaluate the official controls systems over the production of horse meat intended for export to the European Union (EU), as well as certification procedures, in order to assess whether the systems in place provide guarantees that the production of those commodities are in line with the requirements laid down in EU legislation and, in particular, are able to support the attestations contained in the relevant export health certificates (e.g. Regulation (EU) No 206/2010 and Decision 2007/777/EC).

In this context, the audit team evaluated the implementation of the actions taken by the CAs in response to the recommendations made in audit report DG(SANCO)/2016-8860 (hereafter "the 2016 report"), which *inter alia* covered the operation of controls over the production of and certification procedures for fresh horse meat destined for EU export.

In terms of scope, the audit focused on:

- the national legislation in force,
- the organisation and competencies of the CAs, including enforcement powers,
- the performance of the CAs in terms of both the design and on-the-ground implementation of the official control systems in respect of the production chain of fresh horse meat intended for EU export, including oversight over official controls, and
- the design and operation of export certification procedures

The audit team paid particular attention to the following aspects:

- *Legislation/standards*: national legislative and other measures to give effect to the relevant EU standards, including an assessment of their application and, where necessary, enforcement in facilities involved in the EU export chain of horse meat and products derived therefrom.

- *Competent authorities*: Structure and organisation, independence, training of staff, legal/enforcement powers, existence and operation of documented control procedures, supervision (or other verification activities) over official controls, import controls.
- *Public health and animal welfare at slaughter*: Approval and listing procedures for establishments in the context of exports to the EU. Official supervision of farms with regard to food safety, slaughterhouses, horse processing establishments and cold stores; and official supervision at the time of slaughter regarding animal welfare.
- *Veterinary medicinal products (VMP)*: national rules concerning their authorisation, controls over their distribution and use with particular regard to VMP not authorised in the EU, and to residues of VMP in horse meat intended for the EU.
- *EU exports*: eligibility, traceability, and certification of horse meat and products derived therefrom, intended for export to the EU.
- *Laboratory services*: designation of laboratories by the national authorities to carry out analyses on horse meat and products derived therefrom intended for EU export; organisation of laboratory services, accreditation/validation of testing methods, as appropriate.

The table below lists the sites visited and the meetings held in order to achieve the above objectives:

COMPETENT AUTHORITY		
Central	1	Opening and closing meetings
Regional	1	
Local	3	In all establishments visited
FOOD BUSINESS ESTABLISHMENTS		
Horse slaughterhouses	3	
Cutting plants	3	Integrated with slaughterhouses
Horse assembly centres	3	Integrated with slaughterhouses
Farms	1	Beef and horse farm, raising horses for breeding and using horses for daily work
Pharmacies	3	Selling veterinary medicinal products on prescription
Market	1	At bovine/horse auction
Border inspection point	1	At the border with Brazil
Police station	1	In charge of animal movement controls

3 LEGAL BASIS

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 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.

A full list of the EU legal instruments referred to in this report is mentioned in the Annex to this report. Legal acts quoted refer, where applicable, to the last amended version.

4 BACKGROUND

According to the CA, the 2017 horse population amounted to 415,367 horses (other than sport horses, which represent ± 5 % of the population). In 2016, the number was 411,386. Sport horses are not authorised for slaughter for human consumption and, since May 2015, the CA do not authorise import of live horses for slaughter from Brazil.

An annual average of just over 36,600 were slaughtered over the years 2015 to 2017. Over the same period an annual average of 5,807 tonnes of horsemeat was exported, of which 3,885 tonnes (67%) to the EU. EUROSTAT data indicate that these figures make Uruguay the second biggest exporter of horse meat to the EU in 2017 (third biggest exporter in 2016). EU Member States are permitted to import horse meat from the whole Uruguayan territory if the requirements of the model "EQU" health certificate laid down in Annex II of Regulation (EU) No 206/2010 are satisfied.

The previous Commission audit covering horse meat was carried out in 2016, the results of which are described in the 2016 report, available at:

http://ec.europa.eu/food/audits-analysis/audit_reports/details.cfm?rep_id=3793

The 2016 audit report documented shortcomings in the operation of the control system, in particular related to requirements for residency at the holdings, administration of VMP, and animal welfare at slaughter. The overall conclusion of the report was that the system in place did not provide adequate guarantees concerning some of the statements in the "EQU" certificate. Specific recommendations on these points were made in the audit report. In response to these recommendations the Uruguayan CCA provided an action plan, which was found, based on a desk analysis, to address satisfactorily the recommendations of the report.

5 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 LEGISLATION AND IMPLEMENTING MEASURES

Legal requirements

Article 46 (1) (a) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004

Findings

5.1.1 Legislation

- 1 The national legislation applicable to the production and certification of products of animal origin to be exported to the EU largely remain the same as described in the previous audit report.

- 2 The main changes in the national legislation since 2016 and relevant to the scope of the audit are the following:
 - *Resolution DGSG/No 437/017* updating the horse movement conditions from holding to a market, from holding to an assembly centre (adjacent to a horse slaughterhouse approved for export), from a market to any other destination, and for horses imported for immediate slaughter;
 - *Resolution DGSG/No 110/018* further updating horse movement conditions from holding to a market and from holding to an assembly centre, and in particular the wording for the sworn statement by the last owner confirming that animals are born on the national territory (residence requirement), and that during the 180 days prior to movement no veterinary medicinal products (VMP) with special withdrawal period, mentioned in the list established in the national legislation (see paragraph 84.), were administered.
 - *Resolution/ No 244/017* updating the conditions for movement of horses within, and from the 50 km belt along the border with Brazil. It requires, among others, that movement is authorised by the local CA and horses sent for slaughter have undergone, with negative result, tests for glanders.
 - *Resolution DSGN/No 140A/017*, prohibiting the administration of VMP containing oestradiol 17-beta its esters for equine species.
- 3 The legal acts mentioned do not cover all the elements of the supply chain of live animals for slaughter (see paragraph 35). They foresee that movement and medication requirements are implemented by the operators (animal owners or keepers) and documentation is based on their sworn statements. They foresee “when feasible” (*en oportunidad*) official controls at farms, in transit and at horse concentration sites, but there is currently no system for such controls in place, except at assembly centres adjacent to slaughterhouses, i.e. a few hours or days prior to slaughter. Individual identification of horses is required for the movement to the assembly centres.
- 4 Decree No 177/004, governing the control system for VMP administrated in meat and milk producing holdings, foresees compulsory record keeping, and its verification by official, authorised and private veterinarians when the certificate for movement to slaughter is issued, but also at any other occasion. However, the way the chain for horse movement is organised, these controls occur first at the end of the chain, at the level of assembly centres.

Conclusions on legislation and implementing measures	
5	Uruguay has updated national legislation applicable to exports of horse meat to the EU in order to fulfil the requirements of the "EQU" export certificate, as amended.
6	However, as the legislation is drafted, the official controls do not cover the whole chain of the supply of live animals for slaughter, but only occur at the end, which affects the

possibilities for establishing the veracity of declarations on residency and use of veterinary medicinal products.

5.2 COMPETENT AUTHORITIES

Legal requirements

Article 46 (1) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004

Findings

5.2.1 *Structure and organisation*

- 7 The organisation of the CA has not changed since previous audits. The DGSG of the MGAP is the CA responsible for the supervision of establishments, animal health controls and the inspection of holdings. In contrast to bovines, horses are not individually identified and entered as such in the National Livestock Information System database (SNIG); their movements are only recorded as group movements from point A to point B. Thus, on-the spot inspections at farm level, carried out by official agents of SNIG, do not cover horses.
- 8 As described in the 2016 report, under the DGSG, the Animal Industry Division (*División de Industria Animal* - DIA) is responsible for official controls in meat processing exporting establishments. Three area supervisors of the Slaughter Department of the DIA are in charge of supervising the performance of the official veterinarians (OVs) at slaughterhouses and cutting plants. Private veterinarians may be trained and then accredited to certify the movements of live animals between holdings or to slaughterhouses.
- 9 The Animal Health Division (*División de Sanidad Animal* – DSA) is in charge, with its local offices, of animal health controls in order to support the statements of the export health certificates "EQU" as laid down in Regulation (EU) No 206/2010 (e.g., for horses, 90 days of residency in the territory prior to slaughter). These controls take place in animal markets and in the assembly centres, from which horses are sent directly for slaughter. No official controls take place at farm level.
- 10 The Department of Control of Veterinary Products (*Departamento de Control de Productos Veterinarios* - DILAVE) is in charge of registration of production, import and export and marketing of pharmacological and biological products for use in animals and for approval of all establishments dealing with the above, including pharmacies.

5.2.2 *Legal powers, independence and authority for enforcement*

- 11 The audit team observed that the CA had sufficient enforcement powers, independence and authority to carry out the official controls necessary for the certification of fresh horse meat to be exported to the EU.

5.2.3 Imports of live horses

- 12 The CA informed the audit team that since May 2015, Uruguay does not allow the import of live horses for slaughter from Brazil. Import of live horses is only allowed for breeding and competition purposes, and slaughter of these horses for human consumption is not authorised.
- 13 The audit team visited the border inspection post in Aceguá, which according to the CA is the only place through which the import of live horses is allowed. Documentation seen by the team indicated that in 2018, 58 live horses were imported from Brazil to date, all for breeding or competition purposes. This border inspection post is in principle a document keeping office. When a consignment is expected to arrive, the Uruguayan official moves to the Brazilian side of the border where a quarantine centre, used by both countries and having appropriate facilities, is situated. No animals were present in the premises during the audit team's visit.
- 14 According to the CA and the special police force *Brigada Especial para la Prevención y Represión del Abigeato* operating in the border area to deal with theft and smuggling, no issues related to possible illegal entry of horses from Brazil were noted for the last two years (last case: 2016).
- 15 Special conditions apply for movement of horses from the 50 km belt along the border with Brazil: every movement has to be authorised by the local DSA and all horses have to undergo a glanders test in an official laboratory, with negative result.

5.2.4 Resources

- 16 During the visits to the establishments and offices, the audit team did not note a shortage of staff, facilities or equipment necessary to perform official controls.

5.2.5 Organisation of the control system

- 17 Export establishments are under supervision of DIA. The control system in place requires the permanent presence of OVs at slaughterhouses and cutting plants during working hours. Area supervisors carry out monthly supervisory visits of establishments (see paragraphs 24, 53).
- 18 Assembly centres, adjacent to export slaughterhouses and owned by them, are approved and audited by the DSA. An annual audit is required for renewal of approval. In practice, visits take place more often as DSA officials and authorised veterinarians are present in order to issue certificates for transport of horses to the slaughterhouse. (see paragraph 37).
- 19 DSA and police officials are present in the animal markets in order to verify animal movement documentation. (Police for all destinations, and DSA in case of transport of horses for slaughter only).

- 20 There is no system for official controls in horse holdings, in particular to verify the reliability of information provided by the horse owners/keepers in the form of a sworn statement regarding residence and VMP administration. The CA stated that there are "indirect controls" as the private veterinarians have reporting duties. However, this applies only to animal health issues.
- 21 The CA stated that the police are involved in the control of animal movements, each consignment with documents being required to be presented to the police station closest to the place of the animal's origin and of destination. The police keep a copy of the ownership and transit document (*Guía de Propiedad y Transporte* – GPT) and send it to the DGSG, at the end this data contained in the transit document is entered in SNIG in the records of the holdings of origin and destination. The audit team found, however, that this is limited to a documentary control which mainly focuses on ownership, and that the police seldom or never carry out an identity check to verify correspondence between the consignment and the documents.
- 22 Pharmacies selling VMP on prescription are under the supervision of DILAVE. They are registered and issued with a license, which is valid one year and extended every year in May; there is no requirement for an on-the-spot visit at this occasion. DILAVE carries out on-the-spot inspections of about 30 % of pharmacies annually.

5.2.6 Documented control procedures

- 23 Documented control procedures are in place for the performance of official controls in establishments and assembly centres. Prescribed forms, the use of which is compulsory for the producers/food business operators (FBOs) are provided by the DGSG for control of use of VMP and registration of entry and exit of animals in the assembly centres, and should be validated/verified by official or authorised veterinarians. This, however, could not always be confirmed in cases seen by the audit team, which also established that the controls were not necessarily effective in ensuring compliance with applicable rules (see sections 5.5.2 and 5.5.3).

5.2.7 Supervision and audits

- 24 Area supervisors of the Slaughter Department of the DIA carry out at least one audit every month in the export approved establishments in order to verify FBO compliance and to supervise the activities of the OVs, who have to be present during the working hours in the establishments. Supervisors plan their controls according to needs. An area supervisor is in charge of several establishments, e.g. one supervisor encountered was responsible for nine establishments producing against specific importing country's standards, three other export establishments, as well as five establishments producing for the domestic market.

During an audit a standard official form has to be used, covering all the sectors of the establishment, activities of the FBO and controls by the CA, to identify non-conformities. When non-conformities are found, they are described in free text, and

signed by the supervisor, the OV and the representative of FBO. Based on the result of the audit, an establishment is classified in one of three categories: "A" – acceptable, "M" – marginally acceptable, "N" – not acceptable. After the audit, the supervisor issues a corrective action request. In response, normally the next day, the FBO provides an action plan. Its implementation is verified by the OV.

During the visits in the establishments the audit team found that the supervisory audits were carried out at the prescribed frequency, following the procedure described above.

The assembly centres adjacent to the slaughterhouses are under DSA supervision (see section 5.5.3).

Conclusions on competent authorities

- 25 The CAs responsible for the official control system over the production of horse meat are clearly designated, and documented control procedures are in place, supported by supervision over and audits of official controls.
- 26 However, and in line with the legal provisions, the official controls do not cover all of the supply chain; in particular, controls at horse holdings to verify owner's declarations in relation to residency and VMP use, are absent.
- 27 Moreover, the controls were in practice found not to be sufficiently effective in ensuring compliance with the applicable rules, which affects the reliability of the guarantees provided.

5.3 LISTING OF ESTABLISHMENTS

Legal requirements

Article 12 of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004

Findings

- 28 The procedures in place for approval and listing of meat processing establishments for exports of fresh meat to the EU were described in previous reports covering this topic, and were found to be adequate.
- 29 The approval procedures were followed in the establishments visited by the audit team. In particular, the audit team verified the procedure in one establishment undergoing major reconstruction, and found documentation to be adequate. However, some hygiene deficiencies were noted in this establishment (see paragraph 52) referred to by the FBO as "temporary solutions", due to the reconstruction.
- 30 However, in one establishment, in which serious deficiencies were found during the 2016 audit, and for which the CCA had provided guarantees, some similar deficiencies

were found during the current audit (see paragraphs 51, 62), and the corrective actions had therefore not been sufficiently effective.

Conclusions on listing of establishments

- 31 The CA has put in place procedures to list establishments for exports to the EU which are, in themselves, adequate. However, the implementation of these procedures was not fully effective in ensuring continued compliance of all listed establishments with the relevant EU requirements.

5.4 HOLDING REGISTRATION, ANIMAL IDENTIFICATION AND MOVEMENT

Legal Requirements

Regulation (EU) No 206/2010, Part 2 of Annex II, point II.2 of the model certificate “EQU”.

Findings

- 32 The system of horse movements is described in the 2016 report (paragraph 32).
- 33 Requirements for movements of horses within the national territory are laid down in DGSG/RG/No 92/010 and No 110/018. Since 2015, the CCA does not allow import of horses for immediate slaughter. Therefore, all horses currently slaughtered are to be of national origin.
- 34 The organisation of the horse market in Uruguay implies that there are five movement options: from holding to holding, from holding to market, from market to holding, from market to assembly centre and from holding to assembly centre. The assembly centre is the compulsory stop before the slaughterhouse. Thus, the movement of horses directly to slaughter without passing an assembly centre, is not an option.
- 35 The first movement option, from holding to holding, is not mentioned in the legislation and, consequently, the compulsory horse movement document (GDT) does need to contain in its section 12 the sworn statement, in which the owner/keeper provides a legally binding declaration that the animals have not been treated with substances listed in Regulation (EC) No 1950/2006 in the previous 180 days.
- 36 At the farm of origin, horses are hot branded with the mark of the owner (which the CA refers to as "group identification"). No system for individual identification of horses exists, until the last step before the assembly centre. In practice, individual identification occurs at the farm or market, when the decision has been taken to send the animals for slaughter. Horses are identified with ear tags by the owner and provided with individual identification documents (*la reseña*). The latter contain the following information: shape of the hot brand, individual identification number, reference to the GDT, horse description, details of the responsible person (owner/keeper) and the sworn statement. The individual identification document is issued on the basis of the GDT

from the previous movement, and which should contain the sworn declaration. All the steps of identification and certification of movement are done by the owner/keeper. Tags are provided by the slaughterhouse, on request.

- 37 No official controls occur until the assembly centre, to which horses should arrive after having been individually identified. In the assembly centre, an authorised veterinarian verifies the individual identity documents and issues a "private" certificate for horses for slaughter". On this basis, a DSA official verifies the documents and issues an official certificate for horses for slaughter. With this set of documents, a horse can be moved for slaughter. However, the operation of these controls in practice could not be assessed by the audit team because none of the assembly centres were found to be in operation when visited (see also paragraph 57.)
- 38 Discrepancies in the records of entry and departure of animals in one horse assembly centre were found by the audit team (see paragraph 61).
- 39 Copies of GDT at each stage of movement are returned to SNIG for updating the horse census in the holding of origin. In the cases verified by the audit team, the data base records confirmed what the system was designed for (number of horses per holding as per annual census, with manual adjustments of figures, but not individual animals, after each movement). It takes up to a several weeks after each movement to update data in SNIG.

Conclusions on holding registration, animal identification and movement

- 40 The legislation related to animal identification and movement does not cover the movement of horses between holdings, which risks gaps in the chain of the compulsory sworn statements. The guarantees provided by the CA in relation to use of VMP and 90 days residence requirements are based on official controls of the relevant documents which take place at the very end of the chain in the assembly centres, without controls at earlier stages in the process. The adequacy and effectiveness of these controls could not be assessed by the audit team.

5.5 OFFICIAL CONTROLS AT ESTABLISHMENT LEVEL

Legal requirements

Article 10 of Regulation (EC) No 852/2004

Article 12 of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004

Points II.1, II.2 and II.3 of the model certificate 'EQU' of part 2 of Annex I to Regulation (EU) No 206/2010

Findings

5.5.1 Specific requirements for slaughterhouses

Ante-mortem inspection

- 41 *Ante-mortem* inspection was carried out after arrival of horses, usually late in the afternoon, by an official auxiliary (OA) and repeated the following morning, before commencing slaughter operations, by an OV.
- 42 In all slaughterhouses visited by the audit team, *ante-mortem* inspection records were kept and, where reviewed, found to be satisfactory.

Post-mortem inspection

- 43 The *post-mortem* inspection is carried out as laid down in national Regulation 369/83 by OA under supervision of OV, and fulfils the requirements laid down of Annex I, Section IV, Chapter I, Point B.1 to Regulation (EC) No 854/2004). Samples for examination for *Trichinella* were taken from the masseter muscle.

Post-mortem records indicated mostly seizures of offal. In one slaughterhouse, slaughtering around 19,000 horses/year, no condemnation of whole carcasses was registered during three consecutive months (January- March); in another, slaughtering around 7,000 horses per year 1-2 whole carcasses were condemned per month.

- 44 *Trichinella* examinations are carried out in the in-house laboratories authorised by DGSG. The laboratory visited was run by a private veterinarian having a contract with the FBO concerned. Evidence of initial training received was seen by the audit team. The laboratory used the magnetic stirrer method for pooled sampled digestion, as described in the official instruction of August 2015, and which refers to Regulation (EU) No 1375/2015 (reference method of detection). The laboratory had adequate equipment. Its records indicated that to date no positive results had been recorded. Samples for examination were taken by OA.
- 45 This laboratory had no link to DILAVE (which has its own parasitology laboratory, but is not involved in *Trichinella* examination in slaughterhouses) and was not supervised by it. The CA stated that DILAVE was preparing for the possible role as reference laboratory for authorised private laboratories. It was audited every year by DIA (last visit March 2018). It has also established contacts with OIE reference laboratory in Canada, Centre for Food-Borne and Animal Parasitology, Canadian Food Agency; Saskatoon University) which provided it with updated information on *Trichinella* detection.

Animal welfare controls at slaughter

- 46 In all slaughterhouses visited handling, restraining and stunning of horses was carried out correctly. Reserve stunning equipment was available and kept in the area where the

animal was released from the stunning box. Bleeding in cases observed by the audit team took place within 1 min 10 sec and -1 min 45 sec from stunning.

- 47 In one slaughterhouse, floors in the lairage were in poor condition, with several holes and risk of damage to horses' legs.
- 48 In all slaughterhouses, maximal capacity of the pens was indicated on the fences, and it was respected in the cases seen by the audit team.
- 49 In one slaughterhouse visited, waiting pens had no roof to protect horses against sun. The CA stated that protection against the sun is not required under national legislation. However, in two other slaughterhouses, some pens had roofs, installed at the initiative of the FBOs involved.

5.5.2 General requirements applicable to all establishments

- 50 Two out of three visited slaughterhouses had acceptable structures and lay-out, with some maintenance deficiencies.
- 51 In the third slaughterhouse, more substantial structural deficiencies were present. The cold store unit (containing freezing tunnels and cold and freezer stores) was generally in poor condition, with water infiltration into walls and floors, gaps between wall cladding, condensation on ceilings, water leakage through the ceiling, from tubes above etc. in places onto packed products, with snow and ice build-up on the stored products. Floors were damaged, leakages and rust were found, and the dispatch area was not pest-proofed. In terms of operations, at the beginning of slaughtering operations, two sterilisers were found to operate below 82 °C. Generally, de-hiding as such was carried out properly with some minor deficiencies, and no visible contamination was seen on the carcasses.
- 52 In one of the establishments, general hygiene issues were noted in the changing areas and in the cold store/freezer areas, with leakage, snow and ice build-up. Cleaning of hooks took place in a dirty room with unacceptable hygiene standards. This establishment being under major reconstruction, the FBO referred to deficiencies noted as "temporary solutions". At the beginning of slaughtering operations, one steriliser was operating under 82°C, due to which the FBO stopped operations until the unit was repaired and reached the temperature. Poor cleaning and maintenance were found in the offal chiller.
- 53 The official controls carried out by the OV's followed the official procedures and a supervisor carried out audits approximately once a month. All three establishments visited have been classified as "A" (Acceptable). The audit team agreed with this classification in two of them, but disagreed on the third, which should be classified as "M". In this establishment, the CA had identified the non-conformities, but the action plan agreed and put in place has not been effective and as a result, the establishment remained non-compliant. As result, the FBO, in co-operation with the CA developed a

new plan which was in the process of being implemented but nonetheless, the establishment was still classified as "A".

5.5.3 Horse assembly centres

- 54 Horse assembly centres are owned and run by the slaughterhouses concerned. They are situated a few hundred metres from the slaughterhouses and horses, unloaded from trucks, spend some days in a centre and usually the day before slaughter walk to waiting pens in the slaughterhouse. They can only leave the assembly centre for slaughter in the slaughterhouse concerned. To pass via an assembly centre is compulsory. As such, horse assembly centres should be considered as field lairages in the sense of Article 2.6 of Annex II to Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009.
- 55 Assembly centres have to fulfil the requirements laid down in Resolution DGSG/RG/No 92/010. These include, amongst others, in-out loading facilities (ramps), watering facilities and shade in order to meet animal welfare needs. There are no limits for how long a horse can be kept in such a centre.
- 56 The assembly centres seen by the audit team were large empty fields with no, or very limited vegetation, and a very limited number of water troughs. There was also a limited number of shelters with roof, offering shade.
- 57 All three assembly centres were empty during the four working days the audit team went to visit them. This was contrary to the specific request by the audit team and confirmed in the formal audit plan, that all establishments/facilities should be in active operation during the visit of the audit team. However, the assembly centre registers seen by the audit team indicated that before the visits horses had been present in the centres every day, sometimes up to several hundred of them. The facilities available – water troughs and sun shelters - were clearly inadequate for the large number of horses indicated in the documents. Moreover, some shelters had roofs in poor condition¹.
- 58 In one assembly centre visited, the audit team noted that water troughs were filled with stagnant dirty water and algae. The CA had visited this assembly centre a few days prior to the audit but had not recorded this irregularity, nor the fact that shelter intended for storage of feed for horses was also used for storage of equipment for the slaughterhouse. The CA noted that the roofs of the shelters were damaged and had requested the FBO to replace them, but this had not been done. According to documentation of CA visits, this request had been repeated several times in 2017 but had not been addressed by the FBO, without further action by the CA having been taken.
- 59 The audit team noted that a burial site was indicated on the plan of the assembly centre and requested to see it. However, no one present could show the burial site, including

¹ In contrast with slaughterhouses Article 1 c), of DGSG No. 92/010 of July 14, 2010, concerning the requirements of facilities acting as assembly centres, states *they must have enough water and shade, in order to offer the animals conditions that takes into account the needs for their well-being*

in the paddock where it was supposed to be situated. In this paddock, there were signs indicating that animals other than horses for slaughter had been kept, i.e. bovines, and which had gone unnoticed. The CA stated that grazing of cattle in the horse assembly centre was not acceptable.

- 60 The FBO provided documents according to which only one dead horse was buried in a burial site in 2017. The reason cited was "dead on arrival".
- 61 An FBO register of entering/leaving horses (*Planilla para Contralor Interno*) in the case reviewed by the audit team was unreliable, and in particular, the figures concerning horses entering and leaving the site did not match. This register, as required by Resolution DGSG /RG/No 92/010, has to be kept up-to-date and to be available for inspection by official and authorised veterinarians when they deliver a certificate for movement of horses to export slaughterhouse. There is also a column for entering remarks related to veterinary controls. There was no indication that controls had been carried out during one month (in other control documents related to VMP controls and also issued from the assembly centre, the column "controls" had been duly signed), despite the fact that consignments of horses for slaughter had been sent from the centre over 23 days, or that the discrepancies between horses moving in and out, as mentioned above, had been noted.

5.5.4 Implementation of the actions taken in response to the recommendations made in the 2016 Report.

- 62 Deficiencies found in one slaughterhouse visited (see paragraph 51), in which similar deficiencies were found at previous audit indicate that the corrective actions in response of Recommendation No 2 of the 2016 report, although found to be adequate on paper, were not effectively implemented or not sufficiently effective in correcting and/or preventing deficiencies.
- 63 Improvements were noted at stunning and bleeding (see paragraph 46) in the cases seen by the audit team and this part of the Recommendation no 4 of the 2016 report can be considered as addressed. However, deficiencies found in relation to animal welfare in the lairages of the slaughterhouses and the situation found in the assembly centres visited (see paragraphs 49, 57, 58) raise new and serious questions about animal welfare at the time of killing.
- 64 Weaknesses in the official controls along the chain of supply of live horses (see paragraph 37) impact on the guarantees provided by the CA in relation to Recommendation no 5 of the 2016 report.

Conclusions on official controls at establishment level

- 65 The system of official controls in horse slaughterhouses as designed is adequate to ensure that establishments meet the relevant EU standards/. However, deficiencies found in particular in one slaughterhouse, identified by the CA but not adequately classified and not efficiently dealt with point to incorrect implementation and gaps in

enforcement, in practice.

- 66 The official controls in the assembly centres do not ensure that EU and national animal welfare requirements are met, and were not effective in correcting established non-compliance. Moreover, and while the centres –contrary to specific request from the audit team- were found not in operation and no animals were therefore present, the centres' records on the one hand, and the condition of the centres on the other, clearly indicate that when in operation and with the numbers of animals present, animal welfare would be compromised and, taken together with the ineffective controls, cannot be adequately safeguarded.
- 67 The implementation of announced actions in respect of three of the recommendations made in the 2016 audit report has been partly effective in correcting the related deficiencies.

5.6 OFFICIAL CERTIFICATION

Legal requirements

Article 6 of Directive 96/93/EC.

Article 14 of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004.

Articles 14 and 18 of Regulation (EU) No 206/2010, Article 4 of Decision 2000/572/EC,

Findings

- 68 The system for official export certification is described in report DG(SANCO) 2013-6727.
- 69 The audit team reviewed documents covering a number of consignments sent from the slaughterhouses visited with an Official Certificate for Export Transfer (COTE) and compared them with the International Health Certificate issued after re-inspection by the Certification Office in the port of Montevideo. No discrepancies were found between the documents. The audit team noted that the export certificate was signed before the shipping day. The contrary practice, with certificates issued only when the consignments had left and which had been remarked upon during previous audits had been abolished.

Conclusions on certification

- 70 The certification procedures are in line with the requirements of Directive 96/93/EC.

5.7 USE OF VETERINARY MEDICINAL PRODUCTS AND CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

Legal requirements

The public health attestation in the EQU certificate (Regulation (EC) No 206/2010) states that the meat the certificate refers to was obtained in a country in which the administration to domestic solipeds of substances listed in its section II.1.7 (i) -i.e. thyrostatic substances, stilbenes, stilbene derivatives, their salts and esters, oestradiol 17-beta and its ester-like derivatives- is prohibited, and the administration of substances listed in its section II.1.7 (ii) i.e. other substances having oestrogenic, androgenic or gestagenic action and beta-agonists is only allowed for therapeutic or zootechnical treatment.

Findings

- 71 DGSG has provided written guarantees to the Commission that the administration of substances mentioned in section II.1.7.(i) of EQU certificate, as amended, are prohibited, and the administration of substances mentioned in section II.1.7.(ii) is only allowed for therapeutic or zootechnical use.
- 72 DILAVE provided the audit team with the basis in national legislation related to prohibited substances or substances with restricted use, mentioned in the EQU certificate.
- 73 In particular, the administration of oestradiol 17-beta and its derivatives to horses has been prohibited since March 2017 (Resolution DGSG/No 140A/017).
- 74 The CA explained that all working horses are by definition considered to be food producing animals, although it did not provide a legal basis for this statement. Horses kept for competition cannot be provided with a transport document (GPT) for slaughter (Art. 8 of Decree 169-010).
- 75 The CA explained that competition/reproduction horses are identified with microchips and the FBO should check all horses for presence of microchips on arrival at the slaughterhouse. In the slaughterhouses visited, the CA explained that horses with microchips will be slaughtered but the meat not approved for human consumption. FBOs do not keep records of these checks and therefore, the audit team was not in a position to verify whether this practice is followed.
- 76 The audit team visited three pharmacies selling veterinary medicinal products (VMP) on prescription. All three were registered by DILAVE and displayed valid licences, as required. One pharmacy was annually inspected by DILAVE but the other two had not been checked. DILAVE explained that there is no national requirement for a frequency of inspection visits. In 2017, out of 893 licensed pharmacies, 246 had been inspected. An inspection report seen in the pharmacy visited contained one single remark, i.e. that the pharmacy was selling antibiotics and hormonal products on prescription.

- 77 In the pharmacies visited the audit team saw several VMP containing esters of oestradiol 17-beta. None of the labels on these products contained the declaration "not to be used in horses". One indicated use in large animals ("*animales grandes*") . Another compound indicated cattle as the intended species. The few prescriptions for oestradiol 17-beta seen in the pharmacies visited all referred to cows, in which it can legally be used in Uruguay for therapeutic/zootechnical purposes.
- 78 As regards products containing the beta-agonist clenbuterol and the non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug phenylbutazone, some product labels contained the text "*not to be used in food producing animals*", which according to the CA is a legal requirement, but others did not contain this wording.
- 79 The national legislation concerning controls over VMP –Decree 177/004– requires the producers of meat and milk – horses included – to keep records of any medical treatment, and prescribes the model of the register - "*Planilla de control sanitario*". It also requires that OV's, authorised and private veterinarians verify this register on several occasions – at certification for dispatch to slaughterhouse, at all treatment events. However, and as mentioned, official controls only take place at the assembly centres.
- 80 In the farm visited, keeping 750 horses (out of which 200 were working horses and the remaining breeding horses for competition) the audit team saw records of the use of VMP in horses. The form laid down in Decree 177/004 was used. However, the column foreseen for veterinary controls was not completed despite the fact that the farm had recently sent horses for slaughter (as no veterinary visit occurs on such occasions). For the period from September 2017 to April 2018 there were 6 entries in the register, all referring to anti-parasitic treatment of groups of horses, with withdrawal periods ranging from 14 to 50 days.
- 81 The keeper stated that only working horses would be sent for slaughter. When asked about what would happen with breeding horses at the end of their productive life, the keeper stated that they would be buried on-farm.
- 82 According to the CA and private veterinarians in the holding and the pharmacies visited, the individual treatment of working horses is unusual for economic reasons, the value of these horses being very low.
- 83 The sworn statement on the GPT contains a declaration by the owner/keeper of non-use of certain VMP during the last 180 days before the movement. The wording to be used is laid down in resolution DGSG/No 110/018 Article 1 .b which states "*..... in the last 180 days prior to the movement, none of the medications whose administration requires special waiting times for sending horses to slaughter has been provided, in accordance with the provisions of Resolution DGSG No. 92/010 of July 14, 2010.*" This Resolution, in its Article 4, refers to a list of such VMP and which is, in fact, the Annex to Regulation (EC) No 1950/2006 (without mentioning it). It contains "essential substances for treatment of horses" as laid down in Article 2 to the Regulation.

- 84 The CA explained that this list is available on the website of the MGAP and it is the owner's/keeper's responsibility to consult it. The audit team noted that the link provided in Resolution DGSG No 92/010 does not work. The list concerned contains 19 pages of largely technical text and may be difficult to understand for horse owners/keepers. There is no official instruction about how to use it, in particular, which substances are included in formulations available on the market i.e. the final medicinal product in the hand of the owner/keeper. In one horse slaughterhouse, the FBO himself drew up an instruction for his suppliers, being a simplified list of "essential substances".
- 85 The MGAP list does not contain VMP other than "essential substances", i.e. those which are far more likely to be used in daily treatment (mostly antibiotics, anti-parasitic drugs, etc.). Thus, by signing the sworn statement the owner/keeper effectively declares that the withdrawal period for VMP in the list of essential substances has been respected, but not for other VMP that may have been used.
- 86 Contrary to what is required in Resolution DGSG No 92/010, the individual identification documents accompanying horses to assembly centres (*las reseñas*) seen by the audit team refer not to national legislation, but directly to the list in the Annex to Regulation (EC) No 1950/2006. This raises questions concerning the legal value of such a declaration. The audit team drew the attention of the CA to the fact that this reference may be difficult to understand for animal keepers. The CA stated that they can replace it by a national legal act.
- 87 The audit team requested the results of the 2017 national residue monitoring plan, concerning horse meat. The plan was in compliance with the minimum requirements in term of the groups of substances analysed and the number of samples. However, the current documentation accompanying horses to slaughter does not provide guarantees that animals are sent for slaughter only after withdrawal periods have been complied with for the majority of VMP.
- 88 There is no requirement for the sworn statement to be issued for movements of horses between two holdings. Therefore, in the case of such movements, the owner of the second farm has no basis to issue this statement in case of a further move of these horses for slaughter. The movement of working horses between holdings is, however, considered unusual by the CA.
- 89 Due to the lack of official controls at farm level, where the VMP are used, and official controls only being carried out shortly before slaughter at the assembly centre, the veracity of the sworn statement in relation to the use (or absence of use) of VMP may only be (partially) ascertained by means of residue testing at slaughter.

Conclusions on the use of veterinary medicinal products

- 90 The absence of controls on-farm on the use of veterinary medicinal products in horses, together with the findings of products on the market with incomplete labels and shortcomings in the measures aimed at ensuring correct use of veterinary medicinal

products likely to be used in horses, compromises guarantees that drug withdrawal periods have been complied with and that horsemeat intended for the EU market does not contain residues of pharmacologically active substances in excess of EU maximum residue limits.

- 91 The national legal provisions in place concerning substances mentioned in the EU model health certificate for horse meat allow attestation that the specific EU requirements in respect of these substances have been met. However, the presence on the market of veterinary medicinal products containing esters of oestradiol 17-beta, and label indications for food producing animals other than horses (i.e. cattle) and evidence that such preparations have been used, means that the CA is not in position to reliably certify that public health requirements for the EU market are met for meat derived from those species.

6 OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

The control system put in place is based on legislation which overall adequately covers EU requirements, but this legislation does not cover the movement of horses between holdings, which may be relevant for the reliability of the compulsory sworn statements by owners in respect of residency and use of veterinary medicinal products.

Official controls are supported by documented control procedures and supervision and audit of the official controls are in place, but they effectively do not include horse holdings. As a result, and while the certification procedures themselves are in line with the requirements of Directive 96/93/EC, the guarantees provided by the competent authority in relation to the requirements concerning the residency of the horses and the use of veterinary medicinal products are dependent on the veracity of the sworn statements issued by owners and the official controls of the relevant documents which take place shortly before slaughter, at the assembly centres (field lairages). However, the adequacy and effectivity of these controls could not be assessed as, contrary to the specific request from the audit team before the audit, none of the assembly centres were found to be in operation.

The provisions for the approval and listing of establishments eligible for export of horse meat to the European Union are in themselves adequate, as are the control procedures in these establishments aimed at ensuring that the establishments continue to meet the relevant European Union standards. Nonetheless, deficiencies found in particular in one slaughterhouse, and not efficiently dealt with point to incorrect implementation and gaps in enforcement, in practice

As regards animal welfare, and although previous shortcomings in relation to stunning and bleeding were corrected, the official controls in the assembly centres do not ensure that EU and national welfare requirements are met, and were not effective in correcting established non-compliance. Moreover, and although the centres were found not in operation and no animals were therefore present, the centres' records on the one hand, and the condition of the

centres on the other, clearly indicate that when in operation and with the numbers of animals present, animal welfare would be compromised.

As regards veterinary medicinal products, the national legal provisions concerning substances mentioned in the EU model health certificate for horse meat allow attestation that the specific EU requirements in respect of these substances have been met. However, the presence on the market of veterinary medicinal products containing esters of oestradiol 17-beta for other species (cattle) and the indications that such preparations are being used, means that the CA cannot reliably certify that public health requirements for the EU market are met for meat derived from those species. In addition, the absence of controls on-farm on the use of veterinary medicinal products in horses, together with the shortcomings in respect of labelling and of indications for correct use, compromises guarantees that drug withdrawal periods have been complied with.

7 CLOSING MEETING

A closing meeting was held on 4 May 2018 with the MGAP. At this meeting, the audit team presented the main findings and preliminary conclusions of the audit.

The representatives of MGAP acknowledged the findings and conclusions presented by the audit team. In addition, information on actions already taken and planned was provided for the correction of structural and maintenance problems in one establishment.

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

An action plan describing the actions taken or planned in response to the recommendations of this report and setting out a timetable to correct the deficiencies found should be presented to the Commission within one month of receipt of the report.

No.	Recommendations
1.	The CCA should take measures to ensure that official controls are carried out in line with established procedures and are correctly documented, and that the correction of deficiencies is effectively enforced in order to provide reliable guarantees that the relevant EU requirements are met and can be attested to in the relevant EU model health certificate. <i>Recommendation based on conclusions Nos 27,65, 66</i> <i>Associated findings Nos 23, 57, 58, 61</i>

No.	Recommendations
2.	The CCA should take measures to ensure that the establishments authorised and listed for the export of horse meat to the EU meet the relevant EU requirements, and in particular the conditions laid down in Article 12 of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004. In this context, it should ensure correct classification of the establishments and take measures to ensure that the identified deficiencies, both during the previous and this audit, are corrected. <i>Recommendation based on conclusions Nos 31, 65</i> <i>Associated finding No 30, 51, 52, 53, 63</i>
3.	The CCA should take measures to strengthen and support the arrangements in place aimed at providing reliable guarantees as regards the requirements concerning residency and use of veterinary medicinal products as laid down in the "EQU" model health certificate laid down in Part II of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 206/2010. In particular, it should address the movements of horses between holdings, and provide for official controls on holdings to reinforce the reliability of the sworn statements issued by the owners. <i>Recommendation based on conclusions Nos 6, 26, 40, 90</i> <i>Associated findings Nos 3, 4, 20, 35, 37</i>
4.	The CCA should take measures to ensure that both the national provisions as well as the requirements of Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 on the protection of animals at the time of killing are respected, in order to support the animal welfare attestation of point II.3 of the "EQU" model health certificate laid down in part 2 of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 206/2010. In particular, the CCA should urgently address the animal welfare conditions in assembly centres (field lairages) and waiting pens. <i>Recommendation based on conclusions No 66</i> <i>Associated findings Nos 47, 49, 57, 58</i>
5.	The CCA should take measures to rectify the shortcomings identified in respect of the labelling of veterinary medicinal products and of other measures aimed at their correct use, in order to ensure that that drug withdrawal periods have been complied with and that horsemeat intended for the EU market does not contain residues of pharmacologically active substances in excess of EU maximum residue limits. <i>Recommendation based on conclusion 90</i> <i>Associated findings Nos 83-86</i>
6.	The CCA should take measures to ensure that food derived from animals other than horses which have been treated with oestradiol 17-beta for therapeutic or zootechnical purposes is not exported to the EU, so that the certification

No.	Recommendations
	requirements pertaining to Article 11 of Directive 96/22/EC are fulfilled. <i>Recommendation based on conclusion 91</i> <i>Associated findings No 77</i>

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

http://ec.europa.eu/food/audits-analysis/rep_details_en.cfm?rep_inspection_ref=2018-6457

ANNEX 1 – LEGAL REFERENCES

Legal Reference	Official Journal	Title
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. 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
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
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. 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. 1950/2006	OJ L 367, 22.12.2006, p. 33-45	Commission Regulation (EC) No 1950/2006 of 13 December 2006 establishing, in accordance with Directive 2001/82/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the Community code relating to veterinary medicinal products, a list of substances essential for the treatment 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. 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. 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 <i>Trichinella</i> in meat