



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY

Directorate F - Food and Veterinary Office

Ares(2015)2299367

DG(SANTE) 2014-7216 - MR FINAL

FINAL REPORT OF AN AUDIT

CARRIED OUT IN

CANADA

FROM 02 TO 15 MAY 2014

IN ORDER TO EVALUATE THE OPERATION OF CONTROLS OVER THE PRODUCTION OF FRESH MEAT, MEAT PRODUCTS, MINCED MEAT, MEAT PREPARATIONS AND CASINGS FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION DESTINED FOR EXPORT TO THE EUROPEAN UNION UNDER THE AUSPICE OF THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY AND CANADA ON SANITARY MEASURES TO PROTECT PUBLIC HEALTH AND ANIMAL HEALTH IN RESPECT OF TRADE IN LIVE ANIMALS AND ANIMAL PRODUCTS

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

The report describes the outcome of an audit carried out by the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) in Canada from 2 to 15 May 2014.

The objective of the audit was to evaluate the capacity of the Canadian competent authorities (CA), the Canadian Food Safety Authority (CFIA) to implement and to enforce the sanitary measures and the control systems put in place to fulfil the requirements for fresh meat, meat products, minced meat and meat preparations and casings for human consumption intended for export to the European Union (EU) under the auspices of the "Agreement between the European Community and Canada on sanitary measures to protect public health and animal health in respect of trade in live animals and animal products." The initial scope of the audit was extended to cover also the official controls in relation to veterinary medicinal products (VMP) and residues in live horses and horse meat.

The FVO audit team visited five slaughterhouses with integrated cutting plants (two of these visited by both sub-teams on different days for horses or bovines/bison) and one casing establishment. The FVO audit team also visited one border crossing (horses imported from the USA), three feed lots (horse, bovine and bison), one wholesaler and one retailer of VMPs as well as one CFIA area office.

No major problems were identified in relation to general and specific hygiene requirements in any of the slaughter establishments visited. However, the casing establishment which was not exporting to the EU at the time of the FVO audit did not fulfil the requirements for EU listing.

The CFIA does not ensure that the lists of establishments approved for export to the EU are kept up to date and communicated to the Commission as required. After the FVO audit was announced several requests for de-listing of establishments were made by the CA.

The FVO audit also identified shortcomings in relation to official controls over the traceability of bovine animals and bison destined for export to the EU.

No shortcomings were identified in relation to the implementation of the CFIA Ractopamine-Free Pork Certification Programme. The Growth Enhancement Products (GEP) free programme for bovines and bison is well documented but deficiencies in the design and the implementation of the programme question its robustness.

There are serious concerns in relation to the reliability of the controls over both imported and domestic horses destined for export to the EU. It cannot be guaranteed that horses have not been treated with illegal substances within the last 180 days before slaughter.

The residue monitoring in horse meat has been largely implemented as foreseen and in line with Codex Alimentarius requirements but the effectiveness of follow-up of non-compliant results has been variable. Whilst the CFIA puts the responsibility for follow-up of non-compliances largely on the shoulders of the slaughterhouses, the CFIA does not always fulfil its obligations for verifying and ensuring the effectiveness of the follow-up investigations and corrective actions. The CFIA is in this regard hampered by a lack of direct powers over primary producers and transient agents (dealers).

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

Table of Contents

1	<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1
2	<u>OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE</u>	1
3	<u>LEGAL BASIS</u>	2
4	<u>BACKGROUND</u>	2
5	<u>FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS</u>	3
5.1	<u>LEGISLATION AND COMPETENT AUTHORITIES</u>	3
5.1.1	<u>LEGISLATION</u>	3
5.1.2	<u>COMPETENT AUTHORITIES</u>	5
5.2	<u>HOLDING REGISTRATION, ANIMAL IDENTIFICATION AND MOVEMENT CONTROLS</u>	6
5.3	<u>RACTOPAMINE-FREE PRODUCTION OF PIG MEAT DESTINED TO BE EXPORTED TO THE EU AND ITS CONTROLS</u> ..	8
5.4	<u>HORMONE-FREE PRODUCTION OF BEEF MEAT DESTINED TO BE EXPORTED TO THE EU AND ITS CONTROLS</u> ..	8
5.5	<u>PRODUCTION OF HORSE MEAT DESTINED FOR EXPORT TO THE EU AND ITS CONTROLS</u>	10
5.5.1	<u>CONTROLS OVER IMPORTED AND DOMESTIC LIVE HORSES</u>	10
5.5.2	<u>PRE-SLAUGHTER CONTROLS OF HORSES</u>	12
5.5.3	<u>VETERINARY MEDICINAL PRODUCTS AND RESIDUES IN RELATION TO HORSE MEAT</u>	13
5.6	<u>LISTING OF ESTABLISHMENTS</u>	17
5.7	<u>OFFICIAL CONTROLS AT ESTABLISHMENT LEVEL</u>	18
5.7.1	<u>ANTE-MORTEM INSPECTION</u>	19
5.7.2	<u>POST-MORTEM INSPECTION</u>	19
5.7.3	<u>GENERAL AND SPECIFIC HYGIENE REQUIREMENTS</u>	19
5.7.4	<u>HACCP-BASED SYSTEMS</u>	20
5.7.5	<u>MICROBIOLOGICAL TESTING</u>	21
5.7.6	<u>TRICHINELLA TESTING / FREEZE TREATMENT</u>	21
5.7.7	<u>TRACEABILITY AND HEALTH/IDENTIFICATION MARKING</u>	22
5.7.8	<u>ANIMAL WELFARE AT THE TIME OF SLAUGHTER</u>	23
5.7.9	<u>DOCUMENTATION OF OFFICIAL CONTROLS</u>	24
5.8	<u>OFFICIAL CERTIFICATION</u>	24
6	<u>OVERALL CONCLUSIONS</u>	25
7	<u>CLOSING MEETING</u>	26
8	<u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	26
	<u>ANNEX 1 - LEGAL REFERENCES</u>	28

ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS USED IN THIS REPORT

Abbreviation	Explanation
CA	Competent Authority
CAR	Corrective Action Request
CBSA	Canadian Border Service Agency
CCA	Central Competent Authority
CCIA	Canadian Cattle Identification Agency
CFIA	Canadian Food Inspection Agency
CVS	Compliance Verification System
ECD	Equine Certification Document
EID	Equine Identification Document
EU	European Union
FARAD	Food Animal Residue Avoidance Databank
FBO	Food Business Operator
FPI	Food Processing Inspector
FPS	Food Processing Supervisor (regional level)
FSEP	Food Safety Enhancement Programme
FVO	Food and Veterinary Office
GEP	Growth Enhancement Product
HACCP	Hazard Analyses and Critical Control Points
MHMOP	Meat Hygiene Manual of Procedures
MIA	Meat Inspection Act
MIR	Meat Inspection Regulations
MRL	Maximum Residue Limit
OIE	World Organisation for Animal Health
OV	Official Veterinarian
QMS	Quality Management System
RVO	Regional Veterinary Officer
SI	Slaughter Inspector
US	United States of America
USDA	US Department of Agriculture
VIC	Veterinarian In-Charge (OV in charge of official controls in establishment)
VMP	Veterinary Medicinal Products

1 INTRODUCTION

The audit took place in Canada from 2 to 15 May 2014. The audit was undertaken as part of the FVO's planned audit programme. The audit team comprised four auditors from the FVO, subdivided into two sub-teams during the on-site reviews.

The FVO audit team was accompanied during the audit by representatives from the Central Competent Authority (CCA), the CFIA.

An opening meeting was held on 2 May 2014 with the CFIA. At this meeting the FVO audit team confirmed the scope of and itinerary for the audit, and additional information required for the satisfactory completion of the audit was requested.

2 OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

The **objective** of the audit was to evaluate the implementation, controls on and enforcement of the sanitary measures in place aimed at ensuring fulfilment the requirements applicable to exports from Canada to the EU of the commodities included in the scope of the audit.

The **scope** of the audit was to review the structure and operation of control systems in Canada's meat sector (fresh meat from ruminants, equidae and pigs, meat products, minced meat, meat preparations and casings) for export to the EU.

The audit also reviewed the effectiveness of the action taken by the competent authorities (CAs) in response to the recommendations of the previous FVO audit report DG(SANCO)/2010-8522.

Finally, it was decided also to include the operation of controls on VMPs and residues in relation to live horses and horse meat in the scope of the audit.

In pursuit of the objective, the following sites were visited:

COMPETENT AUTHORITIES			COMMENTS
Competent Authorities	Central	2	Opening and closing meeting
	Regional	1	CFIA Area Office
	Local		Present at sites visited
FOOD PRODUCTION / PROCESSING / LIVE ANIMALS / VETERINARY MEDICAL PRODUCTS - ACTIVITIES			
Slaughterhouses		7	4 horse / 1 pigs / 1 bovines / 1 bison (2 visited twice on different days for different species)
Cutting plants		7	Co-located
Casing establishments		1	
Livestock holdings		3	1 horse assembly centre / 1 bovine and 1 bison feedlot
Border crossing		1	Point of Entry for US horses into Canada
Veterinary Medical Products		2	1 wholesaler / 1 retailer
Laboratories		4	On-site <i>Trichinella</i> laboratories

3 LEGAL BASIS

- Council Decision 1999/201/EC on the conclusion of the Agreement between the EC and the Government of Canada on sanitary measures applicable to trade in live animals and animal products (hereafter referred to as: the Veterinary Agreement), and in particular Article 10 of this Veterinary Agreement.
- The general provisions of EU legislation and, in particular, Article 46 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules.

Other relevant EU legislation, which was taken into consideration during the audit and legal acts quoted in this report are provided in the Annex to this report.

4 BACKGROUND

The Veterinary Agreement was adopted by Council Decision 1999/201/EC and last amended by Commission Decision 2013/397/EC of 26 May 2009.

The Veterinary Agreement contains, *inter alia*, the list of live animals and animal products for which equivalence of sanitary measures has been established for trade purposes, and where equivalence of these measures has not yet been concluded upon. It also establishes which standards apply in trade.

In the context of exports from Canada to the EU, for animal health measures as regards fresh meat, meat products, minced meat and casings for human consumption, the Veterinary Agreement provides that existing certification is to be used. As regards meat preparations, Canadian exports should meet EU requirements.

Details concerning the animal health situation in Canada can be found at the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) website: <http://oie.int.eng.en/>

According to the OIE a number of diseases affecting bovines, pigs and horses have never occurred or have not occurred for almost 50 years, including: foot and mouth disease, rinderpest, African horse sickness, Glanders, African swine fever, classical swine fever and swine vesicular disease.

Canada is included in Annex II to Commission Regulation (EU) No 206/2010 authorising Member States' imports of fresh meat and in Annex II, Part 2 of Commission Decision 2007/777/EC authorising Member States' imports of meat products.

The previous FVO audit to review the structure and operation of control systems in Canada's meat sector for export to the EU was carried out from 23 November to 6 December 2010, the results of which are described in FVO audit report DG(SANCO)/2010-8522 (hereafter referred to as FVO audit 2010-8522). This report is published on the Commission website at:

http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/ir_search_en.cfm

The action plan received from the Canadian authorities in response to the report's recommendations provided satisfactory guarantees in relation to six of the seven recommendations and unsatisfactory response to one recommendation relation to controls on horses imported from the US for immediate slaughter (*recommendation No 4*).

The CFIA provided the FVO audit team with the following trade statistics in relation to the import of horses from the United States of America (US):

Import of horses from the US				
	2010	2011	2012	2013
Number of horses	76 907	57 454	70 329	55 910
Feeder/Slaughter horses	57 290	45 491	54 894	43 103

The CFIA pointed out that this information is as accurate as the data they receive or is entered in the system by the Districts. Not all the data for the year 2013 is entered.

The CFIA also provided to the FVO audit team the following trade statistics relating to exports to the EU:

Exports to the EU (Tonnes)¹			
	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
Beef	0	387	399
Bison meat	0	202	229
Pork	272	0	0
Horse meat	1 294	9 174	7 588
Casings	17	5	0

The trade statistics show a clear decline in the exports of pork and casings from Canada to the EU during the period 2010 to 2013 while the export of beef and bison meat dropped during the fiscal year 2010/11 but stabilised at a relative low level during the last two years.

The export of horse meat dropped during the fiscal year 2010/11 but has since stabilised at a level similar to what was found during the FVO audit 2010-8522.

5 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 LEGISLATION AND COMPETENT AUTHORITIES

5.1.1 Legislation

Legal requirements

According to the Veterinary Agreement equivalency has been agreed in relation to public health requirements for fresh meat from ruminants, equidae and pigs (**YES 1**), but with some Special Conditions for exports from Canada to the EU.

For meat products and animal casings for human consumption equivalency has been agreed in principle in relation to public health requirement (**YES 2**), which means that some specific issue(s) still has to be resolved and that existing certification (EU legislation) is to be used for export of meat products and animal casings for human consumption from Canada to the EU.

¹ The information provided by the CFIA refers to the Canadian fiscal year (1 April – 31 March).

For minced meat equivalency has been agreed in relation to public health requirement in the form of compliance with importing Party's requirements (**YES 3**), which means that existing certification is to be used for exports from Canada to the EU.

For meat preparation further evaluation is required (**E**), which means that trade may occur if the exporting Party meet the importing Party's requirements.

In relation to animal health requirements equivalency has been agreed in the form of compliance with importing Party's requirements (**YES 3**), which means that existing certification is to be used for exports from Canada to the EU.

The Canadian animal welfare requirements, contained in the existing Canadian legislation, have been assessed by the Commission Services and are considered to provide standards comparable to those specified in Council Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 on the protection of animals at the time of killing.

It should be noted that certain EU legislation quoted in points 6, 8, 9, 15, 16 and 17 of Annex V to the Veterinary Agreement has been repealed.

Legal requirements regarding public health measures applicable to the sector audited are established in the following main EU legislation: Regulations of the European Parliament and of the Council (EC) No 178/2002, (EC) No 852/2004, (EC) No 853/2004, (EC) No 854/2004, (EC), (EC) No 2073/2005, (EC) No 2075/2005 and (EC) No 999/2001.

The certification requirements for exports from Canada to the EU are listed in section 5.8 of this report.

Residues are not included within the scope of the Veterinary Agreement and this part of the audit was therefore carried out under the general provisions of EU legislation, and in particular Council Directives 96/23/EC and 96/22/EC.

Findings

The Canadian Meat Inspection Programme consists of the following Acts, Regulations, Policies and Standards:

- Health of Animals Act and Regulations;
- Meat Inspection Act (MIA);
The MIA deals with the import, export and inter-provincial trade of meat products², the registration of establishments, the inspection of animals and meat products in registered establishments and the standards for those establishments and for animals slaughtered and meat products prepared.
- Meat Inspection Regulations (MIR);
While the MIA states the general purpose of the legislation, the MIR are more detailed and specific as to what is required and what has to be done. The MIR incorporates by reference other applicable legislation and technical documents such as the Food and Drugs Act and Regulations as well as the CFIA Manuals;
- Meat Hygiene Manual of Procedures (MHMOP);
The MHMOP is divided into specific chapters which elaborate on MIR requirements and includes in Chapter 11 the export requirements for different markets, amongst these for the EU.
Meat Hygiene Directives (MHD) are issued as needed to amend the MHMOP and office

² The Canadian term "meat products" covers fresh meat, minced meat, meat preparations as well as meat products as defined in Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 853/2004.

consolidations of the MIA and the MIR.

- Food Safety Enhancement Program (FSEP) Manual;
The FSEP is a multi-commodities CFIA programme to implement the Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) principles of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. The FSEP manual is essential for operators of federally registered establishments in developing their control programmes and HACCP plans as required under the MIR.

Conclusions

National legislation is in place in the area covered by this audit. Full equivalency with EU requirements has been agreed in relation to public health requirements for fresh meat from ruminants, equidae and pigs and in relation to animal welfare.

5.1.2 Competent Authorities

Legal requirements

Article 46 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 stipulates that EU Controls in third countries shall verify compliance or equivalence of third country legislation and systems with EU feed and food law and EU animal health legislation. These controls shall have particular regard to points (a) to (e) of the aforementioned Article, point (g) is covered in section 5.5 as regards horses.

Findings

The CFIA is Canada's CCA responsible for development, implementation and maintenance of federally mandated programmes for meat inspection and animal health. The CFIA is included in the portfolio of the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and the Minister of Health of the Government of Canada. The Internet address for the CFIA website is: www.inspection.gc.ca. The CFIA is the only authority with responsibilities related to the scope of this audit.

With its headquarters in Ottawa, the CFIA is organised into 4 operational areas (Western, Ontario, Quebec and Atlantic) that are subdivided into 18 regional offices and local offices in meat processing facilities (front-line staff).

Every federally registered slaughter establishment is assigned an Official Veterinarian (OV) in Charge (VIC) for supervision of ante-mortem and post-mortem inspection and overall operations of the establishment.

Where multiple inspection stations are required, at least one competent CFIA Slaughter Inspector (SI) is assigned for ante-mortem and post-mortem inspection (screening) under functional and line supervision of the VIC. Federally registered establishments with more than one scheduled work shift are assigned additional CFIA staff (OV, SI) per shift under the supervision of the VIC.

Every establishment federally registered for processing activities, storage or packaging and labelling of meat products is assigned a responsible CFIA Food Processing Inspector (FPI) under functional and line supervision of a Food Processing Supervisor (FPS).

More detailed information on the CFIA organisation and operational procedures, including legal powers, official supervision, resources and staff training can be found in FVO audit report 2010-8522.

Observation:

- The CFIA supervisory system is well organised and generally found to be operating in accordance with the Canadian rules and regulations.

- Some areas where the official controls were found not to be operating in a fully satisfactory way are highlighted in the following chapters of this report.

Conclusions

The structure of the CFIA is described in the previous FVO report 2010-8522 and no significant changes have taken place since then. The CFIA supervisory system for official controls is generally well organised and implemented but shortcomings were identified in relation to specific areas (see later).

5.2 HOLDING REGISTRATION, ANIMAL IDENTIFICATION AND MOVEMENT CONTROLS

Legal requirements

The certification requirements for fresh meat of bovine (including bison) in model certificate “BOV” in part 2 of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 206/2010 and for fresh pig meat in the model certificate in Annex II to Commission Decision 2005/290/EC imply that (a) system(s) for holding registration and animal registration should be in place.

Findings

Currently the livestock species subject to mandatory identification and traceability requirements in Canada are cattle, bison, sheep and pigs.

The national legislation requires that bovine animals (including bison) are ear tagged at least at the time of leaving the farm of birth but it is also accepted that the tagging can take place in approved tagging sites, e.g. markets and feedlots. Animals having lost their ear tag can be re-identified at any step, including at slaughterhouse level if convincing documented evidence is provided by the person in charge of the animals.

All regulated parties required to apply or replace an approved tag may order them through an approved dealer. The approved ear tag used in Canada is a tamper-evident Radio Frequency Identification (RFID), yellow colour for bovine animals and white for dairy and bison, and bear a unique number, using the ISO 11748 standard (with country code). The approved ear tags ordered are allocated to a site: this information is reported and recorded in responsible administrator's database. The administrator responsible for bison, bovine and ovine is the Canadian Cattle Identification Agency (CCIA), whereas the Canadian Pork Council is the administrator responsible for pigs and farmed wild boars. Agri-Traçabilité Québec (ATQ) is an organisation similar to an administrator responsible for management of traceability information reported from Quebec livestock traceability regulations.

Livestock identification and traceability databases in Canada include the ATQ database in the province of Quebec, PigTrace and the CCIA database in Alberta. The CCIA is a non-profit, industry led organisation established to promote and protect animal health and food safety concerns in the Canadian cattle herd.

It is the intention to develop a new electronic umbrella structure that will link the two databases but there is no information available on when it is expected to be operational. There is at the moment no possibility of data sharing from the existing databases. For the time being, the registration of the movements, if required, is managed separately.

The reporting of cattle birth and movements is only mandatory in the Alberta province. Movements of the identified species cattle and bison are recorded at slaughter (tags of slaughtered animals are retired), at movement to a rendering plant and at export. The premises where tags are retired have to notify the database within 30 days of the tag retirement. Slaughter of unidentified cattle and bison is

authorised provided the origin of the animal can be established.

A consultation paper dated 5 November 2013 has been drafted in order to evaluate the impact of possible changes in requirements for livestock identification and traceability regulations, in particular, in regard to reducing the delay for notifying events (movements, imports, exports, death) from 30 days to 7 days³.

The CFIA has produced a User's Manual for Livestock Identification and Traceability Program (latest version: 9 July 2013). The purpose of this document is to help the CFIA inspectors in verifying compliance and enforcing livestock identification and traceability requirements provided under Part XV of the Health of Animals Regulations. Additional requirements regarding the animals within the hormone-free beef programme are described in User's Manual (see section 5.4).

Each group of porcine animals within the CFIA Ractopamine-Free Pork Certification Program must be identified with a unique identification to maintain segregation and to facilitate traceback throughout the system, in the event of a violation. The use of producer *affidavits* is an important component of this programme (see section 5.3).

Observations:

- The above procedures for identifying and tracing pigs within the programme were followed in the integrated management system supplying pig to the slaughterhouse visited.
- All bovine animals and bison seen in feedlot and/or slaughterhouses were identified with the appropriate RFID tags.
- The livestock producing farms (bovine/bison) are obliged to keep data on the identification number and enough information about the animal to be able to trace its origin⁴. However, there are:
 - no obligations to keep an on-going inventory of the ear tags ordered, used and destroyed;
 - no limits to the number of ear tags that can be ordered;
 - no cross-checks to verify the plausibility comparing with the animals present;
 - no other measures to avoid/detect misuse of ear-tags.
- The CCIA database is mostly used for recording the bovine/bison ear tags allocated to the farms and tagging sites. It is mandatory to notify the CCIA of ear tags applied, of re-tagging and of the identification of dead animals within 30 days.
- The CCIA database does not record all animal movements. The departure of bovine animals or bison from the farms and feedlots is not communicated to the database.
- There are no official controls in place to verify or reconcile the identification of bovine animals or bison on individual farms or feedlots.

Conclusions

There are significant weaknesses in the design and implementation of the bovine/bison animal identification and registration system. The absence of a risk based audit system and the near

3 In their response to the draft report the CA noted that: "Through the same consultation process it is proposed that the identification of holdings would become mandatory nationwide through federal regulations; that domestic movement of livestock be reported; and that the scope of the program be broadened to include caprine and cervid."

4 In their response to the draft report the CA noted that: "The tag distributors must report to the responsible administrator all tag transactions within 24 hours. All approved tags applied to bovines sent to a tagging site to be identified must be issued to the farm of origin."

absence of reliable movement controls, physical controls of ear tags allocated and ear tagging at farms and feedlot level as well as the absence of reconciliation exercises question the robustness of the system that is the basis for certifying the animal health attestation in Section II.2 of the model certificate "BOV".

5.3 RACTOPAMINE-FREE PRODUCTION OF PIG MEAT DESTINED TO BE EXPORTED TO THE EU AND ITS CONTROLS

Legal requirements

Point 9.1 of the health certificate for pig meat in Annex II to Commission Decision 2005/290/EC requires the OV to certify that the fresh meat complies with the relevant Canadian public health standards and requirements, which have been recognised as equivalent to the EU standards and requirements.

According to Article 29.1 of Council Directive 96/23/EC, third countries from which Member States are allowed to import animals and products of animal origin covered by this Directive, have to provide guarantees for residue monitoring of groups of residues and substances referred to in Annex I of the Directive. Beta-agonists are included in Group A, point 5, of this Annex. In particular, the third paragraph of this point requires that guarantees must have an effect at least equivalent to those provided for in this Directive and must meet the requirements of Article 11.2 of Council Directive 96/22/EC.

Findings

According to Chapter 11, Section 11.7.3.6.9.1.3 of the MHMOP pigs must be raised in accordance with the conditions prescribed in the CFIA Ractopamine-Free Pork Certification Programme which is described in [Annex E](#) to Section 11.7.2 of the MHMOP.

The measures taken by the FBO to comply with applicable requirements must be reviewed and found satisfactory by the relevant CFIA officials (the on-site VIC, the RVO and the Area Office export specialist).

At the time of the FVO audit only two slaughterhouses with integrated cutting facilities and one independent cutting plant were approved and listed for export of porcine meat to the EU.

One of the listed slaughter establishments was visited by the FVO audit team even though it had never exported to the EU. The whole integrated production system was 100% Ractopamine free (feed mills, breeding and nursery farms, fattening farms, transport and slaughter/cutting plant) and under the same ownership.

Conclusions

No shortcomings were identified in relation to the implementation of the CFIA Ractopamine-Free Pork Certification Programme.

5.4 HORMONE-FREE PRODUCTION OF BEEF MEAT DESTINED TO BE EXPORTED TO THE EU AND ITS CONTROLS

Legal requirements

The requirement for bovine meat (including bison) intended for human consumption and exported to the EU are laid down in the model certificate "BOV" in part 2 of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 206/2010. Point II.1.7 of the certificate stipulates that only meat from animals covered by residue monitoring plans submitted in accordance with Council Directive 96/23/EC in particular Article 29

is eligible for export to the EU.

Findings

The Canadian program for certifying freedom from Growth Enhancing Products (GEPs) for the export of beef to the EU is described in Annex R to Chapter 11 of the MHMOP. However, this Annex R has not been included in the version of the MHMOP published on the CFIA website.

The CFIA has designed a more detailed programme for certifying freedom from GEPs in the form of a User's Manual (latest version: 1 November 2011). This manual contains the identification, inspection, documentation and certification procedures that have to be followed to ensure that meat from cattle within the GEP programme never have been administered any GEPs and therefore comply with the requirements for exports to the EU.

The GEP programme includes producer control programmes with oversight performed by way of periodic and systematic evaluations from private veterinarians trained and approved by the CFIA and for which the duties, obligations and responsibilities are defined.

Besides the compulsory individual animal identification by an approved RFID tag, mixed status facilities are required to have also an additional visual identification programme in place as well. Mixed status facilities must also keep records of the purchase, reception, use and disposal of GEPs in order to guarantee the GEP freedom for animals within the GEP programme.

Movements between registered holdings must be covered by a completed CFIA approved Transfer Certificate accompanied by a copy of a valid Certificate of Compliance which has been completed by the CFIA-approved veterinarian.

It is compulsory to physically check 100% of animals for the presence of implants if they are obtained from an auctions market, community pasture/forestry reserve or from a facility that use or have used GEPs.

Slaughter and process of eligible animals must be carried out in federally registered establishments approved for export to the EU. A verification programme which include physical checks for the presence of implants at the time of slaughter and a CFIA sampling programme must be in place.

Observations:

- The above procedures were followed in all cases audited. Bovine animals within the GEP programme kept in a mixed feedlot visited were identified with the additional colour coded visual ear tags that clearly indicated which lot they belonged to and that they were EU eligible.
- The producer must maintain an animal inventory, and records including Enrolment forms, Transfer Certificates, Tag Replacement Reports, GEP administration associated records etc., must be kept for a minimum of three years from the date of birth of the calves.
- The CFIA-approved veterinarian in charge of farms and feedlots within the GEP programme is also working as a private consultant and treating veterinarian in the holdings under his supervision. A conflict of interest can therefore not be excluded.
- At one feedlot visited several of the shipping movement documents issued on the farms of origin were incorrectly completed, e.g.: 1) dates, names, signatures or identification numbers missing, 2) blank pre-signed photocopies filled in, 3) valid GEPs assessment report not present. These deficiencies had not been identified by the CFIA-approved veterinarian during his six monthly controls.
- One supplying farm was approved for the GEP programme on the same day that animals

were sent to the feedlot.

- Yearly verification visits can be carried out by the CFIA District Veterinarians but no such visits had been made in the two feedlots visited during the FVO audit. Only follow-up visits relating to problems identified, e.g. residues identified at slaughter had been made.
- In one case official samples from bovine animals within the GEP programme supplied by one feedlot to a slaughterhouse had been found to contain traces of Ractopamine. The official follow up carried out by CFIA officials in the feedlot had identified the most likely source to be from cross contamination due to insufficient “flushing” of a feed truck that also had been used for feed for non-EU cattle. A new documented system had been implemented where a dedicated feed truck was used for bovine animals within the GEP programme only.

Conclusions

The Canadian program for certifying freedom from GEPs for bovines and bison is well documented but deficiencies in the design and the implementation of the programme, including the shortcomings in relation to animal identification and movement controls mentioned in section 5.2 of this report undermine its reliability.

5.5 PRODUCTION OF HORSE MEAT DESTINED FOR EXPORT TO THE EU AND ITS CONTROLS

Legal requirements

The requirement for horse meat intended for human consumption and exported to the EU are laid down in the model certificate "EQU" in part 2 of Annex II to Regulation (EU) No 206/2010. Section II.1.7 of the certificate stipulates that only horse meat from horses covered by residue monitoring plans submitted in accordance with Council Directive 96/23/EC in particular Article 29 is eligible for export to the EU.

Findings

5.5.1 *Controls over imported and domestic live horses*

Since October 2011 all shipments of live horses from the US by ground transportation may only be introduced into Canada via designated points of entry. At these points, the Canadian authorities have appropriate facilities in place to unload the animals as well as CFIA staff to perform checks.

In addition to the veterinary health certificate, there are two other documents that must accompany horses imported for immediate slaughter from the US:

- The Equine Information Documents (EID), which is a signed *affidavit* issued by the last owner(s) covering a visual and written description of the animal, medical history for the preceding six months and an owner declaration.
- The Equine Certification Document (ECD) signed by an authorised veterinarian in the US refer to the animal health certificate covering the number of animals in the consignment and states that the individual EIDs have been completed.

Provisions for so called transient agent (dealer) declarations are included. A transient agent is a person who maintains responsibility for the care of equine animals from the time of purchase for slaughter until arrival to a meat processing establishment in Canada. The transient agent declaration is applicable for an animal destined for slaughter in the near future (the time needed to assemble, schedule, and move to slaughter) and may not be used *in lieu* of an ownership declaration. The transient agent declaration may be repeated on the EID as many times as necessary to cover the

period prior to slaughter.

At the point of entry the official veterinarian issues a certificate containing the decision on the eligibility of the consignment for slaughter. If one or more horses are refused entry, the entire consignment of which the animal(s) form part of is not allowed entry. The official veterinarian has to void the original certificate. If allowed entry, the transport means is sealed and a transport document is issued. The imported horses must be slaughtered within 96 hours of arrival.

Horses destined for feedlots (feeder horses) are also subject to import controls, which have been delegated by the CFIA to the Canadian Border Service Agency (CBSA). At the entry point the horses are inspected in the truck to verify fitness for travel and any other irregular signs. If any problems are identified, the consignment is referred to the CFIA official veterinarian. The CBSA are not required to seal consignments of horses destined for feedlots after they have been found eligible for the import and as long as they are accompanied by the correct model certificate, which includes the requirement for testing for infectious equine anaemia.

Consignments containing feeder horses must not be accompanied by an ECD and EIDs.

Observations:

- Horses from the US are imported from feedlots or from individual owners through transient agents (horse dealers) and have often passed through auctions.
- The CFIA stated that the regulatory requirements for controls on animal health and animal welfare at the border entry point do not require the unloading of animals. Imported horses are therefore not always unloaded during import controls, but may be unloaded in case a closer examination is needed.
- No cross checks are carried out by the veterinarian between the information on the EIDs (description or identification) and individual horses. The CFIA stated that the EIDs are not legally required for the verification of import conditions at the point of entry. The import controls focus on animal health and animal welfare conditions.
- Cases were seen where animals had been rejected for animal welfare reasons without the certificates having been cancelled. Although the consignments had been returned to the US they were allowed entry within a few hours on the original certificates. There is no system in place to inform all points of entry of rejected consignments and the reasons for this.
- The FVO audit team identified at the slaughterhouse of destination that one rejected horse had been delivered and accepted for slaughter and that another horse had been removed from the consignment instead.
- The ECDs do not provide guarantees regarding the validity of the US owners' declarations, only that the EIDs are complete. However, incomplete EIDs for imported horses were seen by the FVO audit team at the slaughterhouses visited.
- At the point of entry visited, the CFA did not keep any records on the number of consignments of feeder horses referred by the CBSA to the CFIA.

Horses of Canadian origin must be accompanied by an EID, completed by the previous owner and if applicable a transient agent. Transient agents obtain horses from auctions, feedlots and individual owners and supply them to the slaughterhouses. Some transient agents have their own feedlot.

In order to reduce the administrative burden, animals which form part of an the Equine Lot Programme approved by the CFIA may be identified with a group identification mark and the EID may then be replaced by a Sub Lot Equine Information Document (SLEID). At present only one

Equine Lot Programme covering three feedlots at different locations supplying horses to one slaughterhouse has been approved by the CFIA. The horses in the programme are obtained from individual owners, through auctions or imported from the US.

5.5.2 Pre-slaughter controls of horses

The MHMOP requires that the FBOs must have effective control programs and procedures to ensure claims made on the EIDs they accept may be considered valid. Verification takes place through documentary checks and phone calls.

The FBOs must have signed agreements in place with owners and transient agents allowing the CFIA animal health inspectors to verify the accuracy of information during on-the-spot visits. So far this verification task has not been implemented.

Since 2014 the CFIA has the task of verifying the accuracy of the owners' declarations once per trimester at the slaughterhouses.

Observations:

- The FVO audit team identified a number of shortcomings and weaknesses in the FBOs control programs and procedures to ensure claims made on the EIDs may be considered valid.
- The FVO audit team therefore requested the FBOs in the different establishments visited to verify a number of EIDs, which led to a several non-compliances being identified:
 - one owner kept the animals in his feedlot, whilst the primary use was indicated as recreational;
 - one owner did not sign the document and did not want to provide details of the visual identification of the horse;
 - one owner only kept the horse for one month contrary to the indicated period of at least a six month;
 - one agent representing different owners without phone contact details, stated that no animals had been sent for slaughter by the transient agent mentioned in the EID since January 2014 despite the fact that evidence seen clearly contradicted this statement.
- The FVO audit team identified a number of non-compliances on the completeness of the EIDs, which had not been noticed by the FBO or the CFIA staff.
- In order to verify the accuracy of the EIDs, transient agents were in one establishment requested to interview previous owners whilst in other establishments this was done by the FBO staff. This approach to rely upon the transient agent can be considered as a conflict of interest.
- In one slaughterhouse, the six month period must be covered by the previous owner and not by the additional time the animal remains in the care of the transient agent, whilst in other slaughterhouses, the transient agent was considered as the next owner.
- In cases where non-compliances were found on the EIDs, the action taken by the FBOs varied from accepting the animals or to euthanise horses of US origin and return horses of Canadian origin. CFIA staff was not systemically informed of the non-compliances and the record keeping by the FBO was generally poor.
- Good practice was noted in one slaughterhouse, where the FBO with the support of the CFIA staff required that the EIDs are accompanied by picture-identification and introduced

sanctions in case of incomplete or incorrect information on EIDs. The FBO was testing carcasses for residues of VMPs and prohibited substances before releasing the meat in these cases.

- Apart from the one feedlot participating in the Equine Lot Programme, the CFIA has no overview of the Canadian feedlots where horses are kept before sending the horses for slaughter.

5.5.3 *Veterinary medicinal products and residues in relation to horse meat*

The general system of authorisation, distribution and use of VMPs (including official controls), and the monitoring of residues, has been described in the [report 2011-8913](#). The text below provides an update and is specific to horses.

5.5.3.1 *Veterinary medicinal products*

Health Canada is responsible for the marketing authorisation of VMPs.

Observations:

- Whilst in the EU horses are food producing animals until and unless they have been signed out of the food chain, in Canada horses are by default not considered to be food producing animals until they have been designated for this purpose.
- Health Canada has developed a policy through which certain low risk veterinary health products for horses, dogs and cats can be placed on the market without the need for a traditional marketing authorisation provided they meet set criteria established by Health Canada.
- As noted in 2011, the setting of national maximum residue limits (MRLs) for pharmacologically active substances continues to be work in progress in Canada. Health Canada presented a priority list of substances to be evaluated in the time to come.
- VMPs for horses containing substances for which no MRL has been established in Canada, including substances which according to section B.01.048 the Food and Drug Regulations are not permitted to be sold to be administered to food producing animals (chloramphenicol, nitrofurans, clenbuterol, nitroimidazoles and stilbenes), can be authorised for use in horses. According to Health Canada the product information should contain in these cases a warning: “Federal law prohibits the administration of this preparation to animals that produce food or that are intended for consumption as food” - “Not to be used in horses for food production”.
- VMPs for horses seen at the wholesaler and retail outlet visited by the FVO audit team (i.e. various formulations of phenylbutazone, estradiol and anthelmintics) contained a warning on the label and/or package insert “not to be used in horses for food production”. However, one particular pack size of a nitrofurantoin containing wound ointment for horses did not have the warning. Health Canada informed the FVO audit team during the closing meeting that the marketing authorisation holder had been requested to include the warning on the label.

Veterinary clinics and farm supply shops are the main outlets for VMPs for horses. These are mainly supplied by wholesale distributors.

VMPs that contain substances contained in the [Prescription Drug List](#) are available on prescription only. However, various antimicrobials and anthelmintics are available over the counter.

Observations:

- The CFIA has published a list of VMPs including withdrawal periods which may be used in horses intended for food ([annex E7](#) to Chapter 17 of the MHMOP), as well as a list of ‘essential substances’ for horses with a default 180 day withdrawal period ([annex E6](#) to Chapter 17) in line with Commission Regulation (EC) No 1950/2006.
- For many of those substances included in Annex E7 to Chapter 17, the VMPs containing these have not been authorised for use in food producing horses by Health Canada. However, according to CFIA, product specific withdrawal periods have been based on EU MRLs.
- Testosterone is included in Annex E7 to Chapter 17, and is thus permitted for use in horses for food production (within 180 days prior to slaughter) in Canada. However, Articles 4 and 5 of Council Directive 96/22/EC prohibit the therapeutic and zootechnical use of testosterone in production animals, including during the fattening period for breeding animals at the end of their reproductive life.
- [Annex E5](#) to Chapter 17 contains a list of substances not permitted for use in horses for food production. This list contains, *inter alia*, chloramphenicol, nitrofurans, beta-agonists, nitroimidazoles, stilbenes, thyrostats, chlorpromazine, dapsone, antibiotics for growth promotion purposes, boldenone, estradiol, resorcylic acid lactones and steroidal hormonal implants for growth promotion purposes, which is largely in line with the banned and prohibited substances in the EU.
- Veterinarians are permitted to import veterinary and human medicinal products for ‘own use’ in food producing animals. In its responses to recommendation number 9 of the 2011 FVO report, the CFIA indicated that Health Canada has been working on exploring various options to address this issue through legislative changes. However, no changes have been made to date.
- Veterinarians and/or feedlot operators can request the Food Animal Residue Avoidance Databank (FARAD) to recommend a withdrawal period for a product/substance not included in Annexes E5 to E7 to Chapter 17. The advice is consequently accepted by the CFIA. The horse feedlot visited had made use of this possibility in order to use a product authorised for cattle.
- There is no legal requirement on owners or keepers of horses to identify their animals until dispatch for slaughter, or to keep records of treatments with veterinary medicinal products, although record keeping is encouraged in Chapter 17. Horses in the EU need to be identified from birth (Commission Regulation (EC) No 504/2008) and treatment records shall be kept by veterinarians and keepers of horses (Article 10 of Directive 96/23/EC).
- Feedlots taking part in the CFIA’s voluntary Equine Lot Program ([Annex E4](#) to Chapter 17) are expected to have group/lot identification of the animals and to keep treatment records. At present there is one participant in the Equine Lot Program with three feedlot locations. The number of horses originating from those feedlots represent, according to CFIA, approximately 25% of the horses slaughtered in Canada.
- In line with [Annex E2](#) or [E4](#) to Chapter 17 respectively, medicines used for the last 180 days prior to slaughter should be declared in the group/lot EID when horses are presented for slaughter.
- For the period preceding the six months prior to slaughter, substances which if used in the EU would exclude EU horses from the food chain (Article 10.2 of Directive 2001/82/EC), can be legally used in Canada (and in the US).

- On several EIDs examined by the FVO audit team it was declared that the horses had been kept on a feedlot either in Canada or the US. These feedlots were not part of the approved feedlot programme.
- The approved feedlot visited kept treatment records per age-cohort (a lot of horses) distributed over various pens. The VMPs used and the withdrawal periods observed were in line with CFIA/FARAD recommendations.

Health Canada is responsible for controls on wholesalers. The provincial veterinary authorities are responsible for controls on retail outlets of VMPs as provincial legislation applies to these businesses.

Observations:

- The wholesaler of VMPs visited by the FVO audit team was licensed by Health Canada in accordance with national requirements. The premises had been inspected at the required frequency (each three years). Non-conformities noted during those inspections (e.g. in relation to re-labelling activities) had been corrected by the company and this had been verified by Health Canada. Standardised inspection reports were used.
- The retail outlet visited by the FVO audit team was licensed and annually inspected by the provincial authority in line with provincial requirements. Standardised checklists / inspection reports were used. The content of the inspections was limited to checking the storage facilities, the expiry dates and registration numbers on the products in stock, and the qualifications of the sales staff.
- The CFIA is not directly empowered to carry out investigations on holdings of horses in relation to the storage and use of veterinary medicinal products. Nevertheless, according to [Section 5.5.7](#) of Chapter 17, slaughter plant operators shall have a signed agreement from the owners and equine buyers presenting equines for slaughter at their facility accepting the CFIA verification activities on premises holding horses in order to verify the validity of EIDs. To date the CFIA has not carried out such verification activities on premises holding horses, except on approved feedlots.

5.5.3.2 Monitoring of residues

Canada follows the guidelines of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC/GL 16-1993 “Codex guidelines for the establishment of a regulatory programme for control of veterinary drug residues in foods”). The residue monitoring plan follows a fiscal year, from April to March.

The 2007 and 2011 FVO audits identified problems with follow-up of non-compliant test results and recommended to the CFIA to strengthen the legal and/or administrative framework to permit the application of follow-up procedures (recommendation number 6 in the report 2011-8913).

Observations:

- At the four slaughterhouses visited by the FVO audit team the residue monitoring plan was largely implemented as foreseen. Samples were taken randomly and were well distributed over the year.
- Samples were taken by official staff, kept and transported in appropriately sealed bags and containers.
- Issues with sample storage and transport were noted during the 2011 FVO audit. In response to recommendation number 3 of the report the CFIA indicated that updated guidelines

would, *inter alia*, clarify appropriate storage temperatures and dispatch procedures. Current guidelines stipulate that samples should be ‘frozen’. Samples may be kept up to a week in a domestic freezer at the CFIA office before shipment to the laboratory. The freezer temperature was not controlled in any of the slaughterhouses visited. Samples were transported in insulated boxes. Transport to the laboratory would normally take one day, but some examples were seen where it took up to four days. Upon arrival these samples were unfit for analysis. New samples were taken from other carcasses.

- Time between sampling and the test result varied between two weeks and six months, with a median of between two and three months. One slaughterhouse chose to condemn all sampled carcasses, whilst another slaughterhouse retained all sampled carcasses or meat thereof until the test result was known.
- Non-compliant test results have been reported at all four slaughterhouses in the past two fiscal years.
- One slaughterhouse claimed it had not been informed by the CFIA of non-compliant residue findings and had not conducted investigations as required by section 5.5.7 to Chapter 17. The CFIA had not conducted a verification of the operator’s control procedures and corrective actions (or rather the lack of these) as required by section 5.5.7. No Corrective Action Report (CAR) was raised by the CFIA as this was not considered necessary.
- The second slaughterhouse interviewed the suppliers of horses in which residues had been found. In one case the horse owner admitted to have used the anthelmintic that had been found, but indicated that he had not filled out or signed the EID. In the case of two horses, which tested positive for an antibiotic, the operator concluded that the transient agent had probably administered the substance. This agent was consequently targeted for sampling of subsequent deliveries. The CFIA did not issue a CAR, but the operator raised an internal deviation report. There was no documented evidence that the operator’s corrective actions had been verified by the CFIA. The CFIA at central level was not aware of the outcome of the operator’s investigations. Letters had been sent to the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) with a request for an investigation but no responses were received to date.
- The third slaughterhouse delegated the investigation of residue findings to the transient agent. However, the agent was potentially implicated in the case of a beta-agonist finding, since according to the EID, the horse had been in the care of the agent in the week prior to slaughter. The potential conflict of interest was not noted by the operator or by the CFIA. No CAR was issued and there was no documented evidence that corrective actions had been verified by the CFIA.
- The same slaughterhouse had established a blacklist of suppliers. However, the FVO audit team noted that a blacklisted supplier kept supplying the establishment after a slight change of name and address.
- The fourth slaughterhouse investigated each residue finding. Following a residue finding in 2012 the CFIA had raised a CAR. The operator had consequently presented an action plan. It had implemented a comprehensive sanction and penalty system, as well as its own testing programme. Each carcass was screened for phenylbutazone and each week a pooled sample of 5 carcasses was screened for a very comprehensive range of substances. Most findings related to phenylbutazone (16 in 2013 and 1 in 2014 to date – out of 5000+ samples), but showed a declining trend over time. The owners of the horses were blacklisted and the suppliers were issued with heavy financial penalties. Such suppliers were placed under surveillance by the slaughterhouse. Also the completeness of EIDs supplied had improved considerably since financial penalties had been imposed in this area. The CAR was closed

after the CFIA considered the actions taken to be adequate.

- As already mentioned in section 5.5.3.1, the CFIA is not directly empowered to carry out investigations on holdings of horses in relation to the use of veterinary medicinal products. CFIA can neither force owners or holders of horses to take corrective measures nor apply (administrative) sanctions, other than through the private agreement between the slaughterhouse and the supplier. Moreover, the supplier with whom the slaughterhouse has an agreement can be a transient agent, rather than the original horse owner. As a result of this agreement the CFIA is not entitled to visit the original owner in case of a residue violation.
- In the cases of residue findings in US horses (in 2013 and 2014), which were examined by the FVO audit team, the CFIA requested the USDA to carry out an investigation. The USDA has not provided a response to any of those cases.

Conclusions

The official export certificate accompanying live horses from the US does not include any statement relating to public health nor is there a reference made to the ECD, which despite being signed by an USDA-accredited veterinarian is not an official document issued by the USDA. The ECD only states that the number of horses on the consignment matches with the number of completely filled out EIDs.

There are no official checks to verify the veracity of the EIDs or whether the horses actually match the identifications registered on the EIDs. The information contained in several EIDs checked by the FVO audit team appeared incomplete, unreliable or false. It can therefore not be ensured that horses slaughtered in Canada for export to the EU have not been treated with substances which are not permitted in the EU, in particular hormonal growth promotants.

The Canadian rules for authorisation and use of VMPs for horses are significantly different from those in the EU. Although for the last six months before slaughter the rules for use are largely in line with EU requirements (with the exception of testosterone), the lack of horse identification requirements until shortly before slaughter, the lack of a requirement to keep treatment records on holdings, and the lack of enforcement powers at holding level are different to the situation in the EU and undermine the CA's guarantees regarding the use of substances in horses which are not permitted to be used in the EU.

Residue monitoring in horse meat has been largely implemented as foreseen and is in line with Codex Alimentarius requirements. However, the effectiveness of follow-up of non-compliant results has been variable. Whilst the CFIA puts the responsibility for follow-up of non-compliances largely on the shoulders of the slaughterhouses, the CFIA does not always fulfil its obligations for verifying and ensuring the effectiveness of the follow-up investigations and corrective actions. As observed in earlier FVO audits, the CFIA is in this regard hampered by a lack of direct powers over primary producers and transient agents.

5.6 LISTING OF ESTABLISHMENTS

Legal requirements

Article 12 of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 requires that products of animal origin may be imported into the Community only if they have been dispatched from, and obtained or prepared in, establishments that appear on lists drawn up, kept up-to-date and communicated to the Commission.

Findings

In response to recommendation 2 of report 2010-8522 the Canadian authorities stated that “...*Subsequent to approval, inspection activities are conducted under the CFIA Compliance Verification System (CVS) and Quality Management System (QMS). Specific requirements applicable to export to the EU are conducted by the CFIA on-site inspector by performing annual CVS task 3.2.01 Export Requirements for Countries other than USA, and monthly CVS task 3.2.04 (Additional Supervisory Visits to Establishments). Please refer to chapter 18, Annex A from MHMOP.....*”

The Canadian authorities further stated that “*Chapter 11, section 11.7.3.3.5 will be added to MHMOP. It will indicate inspectors are requested to annually go through section 11.7.3 EU and Annex M for verification of export requirements specific to EU*”. This response was considered to be satisfactory and the recommendation was closed due to the action taken.

Observations:

- Chapter 11, section 11.7.3.3.5 has not been added to the MHMOP and Annex M has not been used for annual verification of export requirements specific to the EU as stated in the CCA response. There is no Annex A published under Chapter 18 of the MHMOP.
- After the FVO audit was announced several requests for the de-listing of establishments were made by the CCA. In one of the requests for de-listing, the establishment name specified was different to that contained in the approved list (a change of ownership had previously taken place with a consequent change to the name of the establishment which had not been communicated to the Commission Services).
- The Canadian CCA had requested the de-listing of one slaughterhouse in July 2013 but the wrong number had been indicated in the request which wrongly resulted in a double listing of the same establishment under two slightly different numbers. This error had not been discovered by the CCA until the FVO audit team requested to visit this establishment.
- One casings establishment visited was listed without fulfilling the requirements (several points were noted as “incomplete” or “non-compliant” in the Annex M that had been filled in a few days before the FVO visit – no older Annex M was available)⁵.

Conclusions

The CFIA does not ensure that the list of establishments approved for export to the EU are kept up to date and communicated to the Commission as required. The casing establishment visited did not fulfil the requirements for EU listing. The guarantees provided by the CFIA in response to recommendation 2 of report 2010-8522 have not been fully implemented.

5.7 OFFICIAL CONTROLS AT ESTABLISHMENT LEVEL

Legal requirements

Article 12 of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 lays down that the CA of the third country of origin has to guarantee that establishments placed on the list of establishments from which imports of

⁵ In their response to the draft report the CA noted that: “This issue was an isolated incident and was addressed by senior management at the Area level. In addition, a Compliance Verification System (CVS) task specific for verification of EU requirements will be created for yearly delivery at all EU eligible establishments. Implementation of this task is targeted to begin in the next fiscal year (April 2015). Verification of EU requirements by inspection staff will be documented in the CVS database and this information will be tracked and reported to senior management on a regular basis.”

specified products of animal origin to the EU are permitted, together with any establishments handling raw material of animal origin used in the manufacture of the products of animal origin concerned, complies with the relevant EU requirements, in particular those of Regulation (EC) No 853/2004, or with requirements that were determined to be equivalent and that an official inspection service supervises the establishments and has real powers to stop the establishments from exporting to the EU in the event that the establishments fail to meet the relevant requirements.

The veterinary certification requirements for fresh and minced bovine (including bison) and fresh equine meat are laid down in the relevant model certificates in Annex II, Part 2 to Regulation (EC) No 206/2010, for porcine meat in Annex II to Commission Decision 2005/290/EC, for meat products in Annex III to Commission Decision 2007/777/EC, for meat preparations in Annex II to Commission Decision 2000/572/EC and for animal casings in Annex IA to Commission Decision 2003/779/EC.

Findings

In response to recommendation 1 of report 2010-8522 the Canadian authorities stated that “*all non-compliant issues identified during the EU audit findings have been addressed through Corrective Action Request (CAR) procedure*”. This response was considered to be satisfactory and the recommendation was closed due to the action taken.

A similar but more detailed response was provided by the Canadian authorities in relation to recommendation 5 of the FVO report and this response was also considered to be satisfactory and the recommendation was closed due to the action taken.

5.7.1 *Ante-mortem inspection*

The ante-mortem inspection was carried out appropriately, apart from one case where the severe lameness of one horse identified at the point of entry had not been recorded in the ante mortem inspection records⁶.

5.7.2 *Post-mortem inspection*

Observations:

- In one slaughterhouse, the CA did not notice that the skin of the head of one horse was not entirely removed before presentation for post-mortem and the lower part of the carcasses were inspected only⁷.
- In three slaughterhouses, the renal fat was not removed from the kidneys. In one of these slaughterhouses, the kidneys were not inspected, the lower part of the carcasses was inspected only. These deficiencies had not been recorded during official controls.

5.7.3 *General and specific hygiene requirements*

The FVO audit team found that significant efforts had been made to correct the deficiencies identified during the previous FVO audit. In one of the slaughterhouses visited, which was suspended by the CFIA after the previous audit in 2010, the CA only lifted this suspension after

⁶ In their response to the draft report the CA noted that: “Addressed at the time of the audit using the CVS inspection process. CFIA has conducted a follow up of non-compliant item and item has been corrected.”

⁷ In their response to the draft report the CA noted that: “Addressed at time of the audit using the CVS inspection process. CFIA has conducted a follow up of non-compliant items and items has been corrected. This statement is applicable to all bullet points.”

having verified the corrective action taken by the FBO. The CA had continued to follow-up the ongoing improvements made by the FBO.

Observations:

- The above-mentioned establishment is now largely in compliance with regard to lairage and kill floor. However, some deficiencies were identified, mainly in the chillers and cold store room that only had undergone limited renovation, which could lead to potential contamination of carcasses⁸.
- In another establishment visited the de-hiding was not carried out in a hygienic way. At one point at the slaughter line, the skin was rolling in on the carcass and exposed meat was in touch with contaminated hide. Immediate corrective action was requested by the CA.
- The other establishments were generally in line with the requirements with only minor non-compliances identified by the FVO audit team, e.g.:
 - The procedure for the use of the lockers in changing rooms was not complied with (e.g. separation between work clothes and street clothes);
 - Dirty cattle were accepted for slaughter which made it very difficult to avoid faecal contamination of carcasses;
 - Edible offal (hearts, kidneys and livers) remained too long at ambient temperature;
 - Handling of cardboard boxes and unprotected meat by the same operators;
 - Cardboard boxes not completely closed and sealed (possible to access meat without breaking the seal);
 - The use of insufficiently protected wooden pallets in close proximity to exposed meat. The special condition in the Veterinary Agreement to phase out the use of wooden pallets in rooms with exposed products is not fulfilled.

5.7.4 HACCP-based systems

The FSEP manual requiring HACCP standards to be implemented in all CFIA registered establishments under the MIR became mandatory in November 2005. The HACCP programmes have to be evaluated regularly by the on-site VIC/FPI and the RVO/FPS as part of their official controls.

Once every two years HACCP System Design Tasks are conducted by a CFIA team led by a FSEP Specialist Inspector to evaluate in depth the HACCP programme in accordance with Chapter 18, Section 18.4.4 of the MHMOP. This task is performed more frequently in the case of new HACCP plans, follow-up to a food safety recall, failure to meet microbiological performance standards or failure to meet CFIA pathogen control policy requirements.

Observations:

- One month prior to the FVO visit a HACCP System Design review identified numerous significant deficiencies in one slaughterhouse visited and a lengthy CAR was issued. However, the VIC and the RVO had not identified previously any of these non-compliance during their CVS controls⁹.

8 In their response to the draft report the CA noted that: “Addressed at time of the audit using the CVS inspection process. CFIA has conducted a follow up of non-compliant items and items have been corrected. This statement is applicable to all the bullet points.”

9 In their response to the draft report the CA noted that: “This issue was an isolated incident at one establishment and

- Freezing of boxed meat in one establishment was done in the storage freezer and the statement regarding time/temperature had never been verified. The boxed meat for freezing was in some cases stacked on pallets without separators to allow air to flow freely which made it impossible to achieve the stated time/temperature requirement¹⁰.

5.7.5 Microbiological testing

The Canadian carcass sampling for pathogen reduction follows requirements similar to the US requirements. Each year 58 consecutive samples were taken from the most important species on each of the slaughter days using the swab method for *Salmonella* testing. The annual testing programme is completed if the results are considered to be acceptable, i.e. no more than two positive results out of the 58 samples tested.

One sample per 300 horses slaughtered is to be taken for *E coli* testing, which in most of the establishments visited resulted in one sample per day. No sampling for total bacterial counts are required according to the Canadian requirements.

Observations:

- The sampling of carcasses for *Salmonella* testing was verified in one horse slaughterhouse visited and all the test results were favourable and in line with the CA findings. One pooled sample was also taken for *Salmonella* testing of meat trimmings each day when horse meat was being cut.
- In the same establishment water samples were taken weekly and tested for total bacterial count, *E coli*, *faecal streptococci/enterococci* and total coliforms. The result of one recent microbiological test was unfavourable for *faecal streptococci/enterococci* and the FBO initiated an investigation, re-testing and took corrective actions by hyper-chlorination of the main system. The water was tested for physico-chemical parameters annually. This had been recorded by the CA as part of the official controls.
- In another establishment exporting fresh horse meat to Finland the FBO, despite there being no legal requirement for this, did test exported horse meat for *Salmonella* following the requirements for fresh bovine meat as laid down in Regulation (EC) No 1688/2005.
- In one establishment exporting minced bison meat to the EU daily samples from each production of minced bison meat were taken and tested in line with the requirements of Regulation (EC) No 2073/2005. Additional samples were taken for staphylococcus, *Listeria monocytogenes* and *E. coli* O157.

5.7.6 *Trichinella* testing / freeze treatment

The MHMOP does not require testing for *Trichinella* of horse carcasses intended for the Canadian market.

In three slaughterhouses visited all horses slaughtered during the period verified were tested for *Trichinella*. In one of the establishments, one US horse had been found to be positive and the results were confirmed by the national reference laboratory in Saskatoon where genotyping was carried out. The results were communicated to the US through the CFIA.

The staff carrying out the testing in the in-house laboratories are all qualified and participate in quarterly proficiency tests organised by the national reference laboratory in Saskatoon. Records on

was addressed by senior management at the Area level.”

10 In their response to the draft report the CA noted that: “Addressed at time of the audit using the CVS inspection process. CFIA has conducted a follow up of non-compliant item and item has been corrected.”

results were kept on-site. Each proficiency test contains four samples of which one is negative and the three other samples are positive to varying degrees and the larvae must be counted.

The freeze treatment for *Trichinella* was performed in one pig slaughterhouse visited for pork exported to markets other than the EU. The establishment did not carry out any *Trichinella* testing (no laboratory approval). No exports for the EU had taken place in this establishment since listing for the EU – only exports for “SHIP STORES” and for “TRANSIT” via EU borders had taken place.

The establishment was listed for the freeze treatment and controls over the time/temperature were carried out in accordance with the requirements and were well documented. The requirements on the form “Attestation of Freezing” was a temperature of -26 °C for the product for a minimum time of 48 hours. In one case checked the product had been kept for 3 days due to the weekend.

Observations:

- One case was seen where a staff member had failed the proficiency test and then participated and passed in a new proficiency test within one month.
- In one other slaughterhouse the quarters were still stamped with the special *Trichinella* mark (round stamp with the letter “T”) and in two cold stores the labels of cartons containing horse meat intended for export to the EU also bore this mark. It was not identified or recorded by the CA that the practice had not been updated in line with current EU requirements¹¹.

5.7.7 *Traceability and health/identification marking*

The Canadian traceability and health/identification requirements for exports to the EU are described in Chapter 11 of the MHMOP; Section 11.7.3.6.8 “Traceability requirement” and Section 11.7.3.5 “Special marking and packaging requirements”.

All food business operators (FBOs) had traceability systems in place to trace back meat to the animal or groups of animals. The systems in place in the establishments allowed a clear and easy to understand separation between EU and non EU eligible commodities. In the cases audited the production of the EU eligible meat was carried out before any non EU eligible production would start and the EU eligible carcasses/meat were properly identified and stored separately from the non- EU eligible carcasses/meat. Reconciliation was possible in all the cases evaluated by the FVO audit team.

Observations:

- In one establishment visited, the slaughter dates mentioned on the certificates for horses and bovine/bison were provided by the FBO and there was no documented procedure to ascertain the link between the production of meat and the slaughter dates. However, in the near future a system for scanning the barcodes of the bovine/horse carcasses at the entrance to the de-boning room was expected to solve this deficiency. The equipment had already been installed¹².

11 In their response to the draft report the CA noted that: “MOP Ch. 11 mentions that horse meat should be tested for *Trichinella* using the validated digestion method. It is not a requirement to stamp boxes with the special *Trichinella* mark (round stamp with letter “T”). This is an industry practice to identify that meat in those boxes/quarters have been tested for *Trichinella*.”

12 In their response to the draft report the CA noted that: “Addressed at time of the audit using the CVS inspection process. CFIA has conducted a follow up of non-compliant items and items have been corrected. This statement is applicable to all the bullet points.”

- In another establishment visited, the horse carcasses fit for human consumption were not health marked with the oval stamp to indicate eligibility for the EU, but with the internal Canadian health mark. Carcasses were retained and only released for de-boning once results of the *Trichinella* testing were available.
- Fresh meat produced from horses imported from the US did not clearly indicate the origin on the labels. In the certificates verified, the animal health declaration indicated that the meat of the horses was of origin Canada and of origin US.
- In one of the three slaughterhouse visited, it had not been noted by the CA during official controls that the link between the EIDs and the horse carcasses was missing.
- In one establishment, the FBO could not ascertain that the minced meat produced from fresh bison meat, was prepared within the no more than 6 days after slaughter or in the case of de-boned, vacuum-packed beef, within the no more than 15 days after slaughter, neither through supporting documentation nor through the labels attached to the meat. This is not in line with Section V of Annex III to Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 as required in section II.1.3 of the export certificate (model BOV). This shortcoming had not been identified by the CA.

5.7.8 *Animal welfare at the time of slaughter*

In response to recommendation 6 of report 2010-8522 the Canadian authorities stated that “*The Canadian requirements for animal welfare controls are equivalent to those of the EU. ...The Manual of Procedure Chapter 12 (recently drafted with updated information and expanded guidance for field staff) is currently being piloted in Canadian equine processing establishments and a phased in implementation plan in other species will be completed by January 1, 2013.....*” This response was considered to be satisfactory and the recommendation was closed due to the action taken.

Serious concerns were raised in report 2010-8522 in relation to the lairage facility in one establishment visited. Although not seen in operation the design was not considered to be suitable for semi-wild animals such as bison and the structure did not allow proper cleaning and disinfection. The approval of this establishment for export to the EU was later suspended pending considerable refurbishment and upgrading.

Observations:

- No significant animal welfare concerns were found in any of the establishments visited, despite one incident where the CFIA had to intervene at the moment of stunning¹³.
- In three of the four horse slaughterhouses visited, horses were stunned with a rifle and captive bolt pistols were present as the back up stunning equipment.
- In some cases where the operator was not satisfied with the stunning of bovine animals a second stunning was immediately performed with the back-up stunning equipment.
- A new lairage and kill floor had been constructed in the establishment where serious concerns had been raised during the 2010 FVO audit. The FBO agreed at the request of the FVO audit team to reschedule the planned slaughter of bovine animals on the day of the visit and instead slaughtered a number of bison. This demonstration confirmed that the new facilities provided satisfactory conditions for the safe handling and slaughter of bison.

¹³ In their response to the draft report the CA noted that: “Addressed at time of the audit using the CVS inspection process. CFIA has conducted a follow up and non-compliant item has been corrected.”

5.7.9 Documentation of official controls

The Compliance Verification System (CVS) included in Chapter 18 of the MHMOP is a computerised tool used by CFIA inspectors to verify FBO compliance with regulatory requirements. The CVS document and communicate verification results including the follow-up to non-compliances identified and the enforcement action taken when non-compliances have not been corrected by the FBO as required.

The CVS provides an efficient and uniform approach to how CFIA inspection staff verify registered establishments' compliance with regulatory requirements. Each verification task generated in accordance with national frequencies includes detailed procedures for the inspection staff to follow when conducting verifications.

Observations:

- The CVS verification tasks were generally carried out and documented as required in all the establishments visited except one casing establishment where the annual verification of EU compliance had not been performed. A similar shortcoming was identified during the 2010 FVO audit.

Conclusions

No major problems were identified in relation to the general and specific hygiene requirements in most of the establishments visited. However, a number of shortcomings were found by the FVO audit team in relation to the traceability of horse meat, bovine meat and minced bison meat.

5.8 OFFICIAL CERTIFICATION

Legal requirements

Article 9 and Annex VII to the Agreement prescribe the principles of model attestation and guidelines for certification whereas the equivalency determination indicated in Annex V to the Agreement stipulate the model health attestation. The models of the health certificates for imports into the EU of the products of animal origin covered by this audit are laid down in the following EU acts:

- Regulation (EU) No 206/2010 for imports of fresh meat of domestic bovines, including minced meat (model "BOV") and fresh meat of horses (model "EQU");
- Commission Decision 2005/290/EC for imports of fresh pig meat;
- Commission Decision 2007/777/EC for imports of meat products;
- Commission Decision 2000/572/EC for imports of meat preparations;
- Commission Decision 2003/779/EC for imports of casing for human consumption;

Point (h) of Annex V sets out that CAs of the exporting country shall ensure that rules of certification equivalent to those laid down in Council Directive 96/93/EC are followed.

Findings

In response to recommendation 7 of FVO report DG(SANCO)/2010-8522 the Canadian authorities stated that” *The CFIA export verification and certification procedures are fully described in the Meat Hygiene Manual of Procedures, Chapter 11 - Exports, and are compliant with Council Directive 96/93/EU. The RVO and the VIC responsible for conducting Quality Management System*

verifications of inspection staff will ensure that program requirements are being delivered as required. This response was considered to be satisfactory and the recommendation was closed due to the action taken.

Documented procedures are in place concerning the certification of the products covered by the scope of the audit and intended to be exported to the EU. Similar procedures are followed in relation to certifying EU eligibility of products on the domestic transfer documents.

Certification for fresh meat is done by the on-site VIC while the certification of meat products and casing is done by an OV in a designated CFIA District Office based on verification documentation received from the on-site CFIA inspector (FPI).

Observations:

- In one casing plant visited, although the registration, the labelling, the traceability and documentation was not satisfactory, nevertheless, an export certificate was issued. In addition, for the same consignment a certificate for transit and one for import was issued (casings for Cyprus)¹⁴.
- Although required, the FBO had no written procedures for preparing the documentation needed for certification.
- In one slaughterhouse, the verification by the RVO of the certification process did not cover all the topics foreseen in the report template. Although two certificates had been verified by the RVO, none of these covered exports to the EU.

Conclusions

Some shortcoming were identified that could affect the reliability of the certification for exports to the EU.

6 OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

No major problems were identified in relation to general and specific hygiene requirements in any of the slaughter establishments visited. However, the casing establishment which was not exporting to the EU at the time of the FVO audit did not fulfil the requirements for EU listing.

The CFIA does not ensure that the lists of establishments approved for export to the EU are kept up to date and communicated to the Commission as required. After the FVO audit was announced several requests for de-listing of establishments were made by the CA.

The FVO audit also identified shortcomings in relation to official controls over the traceability of bovine animals and bison destined for export to the EU.

No shortcomings were identified in relation to the implementation of the CFIA Ractopamine-Free Pork Certification Programme. The GEP free programme for bovines and bison is well documented but deficiencies in the design and the implementation of the programme question its robustness.

There are serious concerns in relation to the reliability of the controls over both imported and domestic horses destined for export to the EU. It cannot be guaranteed that horses have not been treated with illegal substances within the last 180 days before slaughter.

The residue monitoring in horse meat has been largely implemented as foreseen and in line with Codex Alimentarius requirements but the effectiveness of follow-up of non-compliant results has

¹⁴ In their response to the draft report the CA noted that: “This issue was an isolated incident at one establishment and was addressed by senior management at the Area level.”

been variable. Whilst the CFIA puts the responsibility for follow-up of non-compliances largely on the shoulders of the slaughterhouses, the CFIA does not always fulfil its obligations for verifying and ensuring the effectiveness of the follow-up investigations and corrective actions. The CFIA is in this regard hampered by a lack of direct powers over primary producers and transient agents (dealers).

7 CLOSING MEETING

A closing meeting was held on 15 May 2014 with the CCA. At this meeting, the preliminary findings of the audit were presented by the FVO audit team and discussed.

The representatives of the CCAs acknowledged the findings presented by the FVO audit team.

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 60 working days of receipt of the report.

N°.	Recommendation
1.	To develop risk based procedures for the audit of the bovine/bison holdings (farms, feedlots, markets, tagging stations) and to include physical checks on the animals in the holdings audited, as well as reconciliation exercises on a routine basis (e.g. ear tags, animal movements, ongoing EU eligibility).
2.	To address the deficiencies identified in relation to the design and implementation of the program for certifying freedom from GEPs for bovines and bison in order to improve the robustness of the programme.
3.	To ensure that testosterone and other substances which are banned to be used in food producing animals according to Council Directive 96/22/EC are not used in horses from which meat is intended for export to the European Union.
4.	To ensure that treatment records are kept on horse holdings in line with Article 10 of Council Directive 96/23/EC and that horses are adequately identified for this purpose, either individually or as a lot.
5.	To ensure that follow-up on non-compliant test results has an equivalent effect to the requirements of Articles 16-19, 22 and 23 of Council Directive 96/23/EC.
6.	To ensure that the approval conditions for export to the EU are subject to regular review as required by Chapter 18 of the MHMOP and that the lists of establishments approved for export to the EU are kept up to date, fully reflecting the activities carried out and communicated to the Commission as required by Article 12 (3) of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004.

N°.	Recommendation
7.	To ensure that minced bison meat is produced in line with the provisions of Section V of Annex III to Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 as required in section II.1.3 of the export certificate (model BOV).

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=2014-7216

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. 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

Legal Reference	Official Journal	Title
Reg. 1688/2005	OJ L 271, 15.10.2005, p. 17-28	Commission Regulation (EC) No 1688/2005 of 14 October 2005 implementing Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards special guarantees concerning salmonella for consignments to Finland and Sweden of certain meat and eggs
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. 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. 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
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

Legal Reference	Official Journal	Title
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. 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. 1999/201/EC	OJ L 71, 18.3.1999, p. 1-2	1999/201/EC: Council Decision of 14 December 1998 on the conclusion of the Agreement between the European Community and the Government of Canada on sanitary measures to protect public and animal health in respect of trade in live animals and animal products
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. 2003/779/EC	OJ L 285, 1.11.2003, p. 38-41	2003/779/EC: Commission Decision of 31 October 2003 laying down animal health requirements and the veterinary certification for the import of animal casings from third countries
Dec. 2004/432/EC	OJ L 154, 30.4.2004, p. 44-50, corrected and re-published in OJ L 189, 27.5.2004, p. 33	2004/432/EC: Commission Decision of 29 April 2004 on the approval of residue monitoring plans submitted by third countries in accordance with Council Directive 96/23/EC

Legal Reference	Official Journal	Title
Dec. 2005/290/EC	OJ L 93, 12.4.2005, p. 34–39	2005/290/EC: Commission Decision of 4 April 2005 on simplified certificates for the importation of bovine semen and fresh pig meat from Canada and amending Decision 2004/639/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