Brussels, 04 May 2017
Case No: 79798
Document No: 853637

Final report

EFTA Surveillance Authority's Mission to Norway

on Animal By-Products

from 13 to 22 February 2017

Please note that comments from Norway to the draft report are referred to in footnotes in *underlined italic print* in this final report. Comments and information on the corrective actions already taken and planned by Norway are included in Annex 4.

Executive Summary

This report describes the outcome of a mission carried out by the EFTA Surveillance Authority in Norway from 13 to 22 February 2017.

The objective of the mission was to verify that official controls related to animal by-products (ABPs) were carried out in compliance with the European Economic Area (EEA) legislation.

In Norway the relevant EEA legislation has been incorporated into the national legislation. The competent authority for official controls on ABPs has been designated and it is mostly ensured that ABPs are handled and processed in line with EEA legal requirements.

A system of official controls, with documented procedures and reporting of results, is in place, though official controls on ABPs are not risk based. At competent authority central level, several specific control programs and other initiatives have been implemented or planned. In general, the staff of the competent authority is sufficiently trained, although a lack of specific knowledge regarding validation procedures and use of the Traces system for EEA trade of relevant consignments was noted.

Some discrepancies were noted regarding the official list of ABP establishments, plants and operators and regarding use of commercial documents. Traders of ABPs have so far not been included in official controls and limited official controls are in place regarding transporters of ABPs and regarding catering waste from international traffic. Furthermore, Norway does not ensure that other EEA States are informed, by means of the Traces system, of relevant consignments sent to or received from other EEA States.

The report includes a number of recommendations addressed to Norway, aimed at rectifying the identified shortcomings and enhancing the control system in place.

Table of contents

1 Introduction

The mission took place in Norway from 13 to 22 February 2017. The mission team comprised two inspectors from the EFTA Surveillance Authority (the Authority) and a national expert.

The opening meeting was held at the Norwegian Food Safety Authority's (NFSA) head office in Oslo on 13 February 2017, with representatives of NFSA, the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, the Ministry of Health and Care Services and the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Fisheries. At the meeting, the mission team confirmed the objectives and the itinerary of the mission. The Norwegian representatives provided additional information to that set out in the reply to the Authority's pre-mission document.

Throughout the mission, a representative of NFSA head office accompanied the mission team. In addition, representatives from regional levels of NFSA participated during local meetings and visits to the different types of establishments and operators.

A final meeting was held in Oslo on 22 February 2017, at which the mission team presented its main findings and some preliminary conclusions from the mission.

The abbreviations used in the report are listed in Annex 1.

2 Scope and Objective of the mission

The main scope of the mission was to assess the implementation by Norway of requirements on animal by-products and derived products (ABPs), as laid down in the following EEA acts, as amended and adapted to the European Economic Area (EEA) Agreement by the sectoral adaptations referred to in Annex I to that Agreement:

- Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 laying down health rules as regards animal by-products and derived products not intended for human consumption, and;
- Commission Regulation (EU) No 142/2011 of 25 February 2011 implementing Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down health rules as regards animal by-products and derived products not intended for human consumption.

The main objective of the mission was to evaluate the control system in place for application in Norway of the above mentioned EEA acts and other relevant EEA legislation referred to in Annex 2 to this document, focusing on the general organisation of relevant official controls.

To the extent that the provisions of former EEA legislation on ABPs, in particular Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002, are materially similar to those in Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 and Regulation (EC) No 142/2011, official controls and other activities carried out on the basis of the previous legislation were also taken into account for the present mission.

The assessment was carried out based on the EEA legislation referred to in Annex 2 to this report. The assessment was further based on the Norwegian reply to the pre-mission

document of the Authority, the gathering of relevant information, appropriate verifications by means of interviews, review of documents and records and on-the-spot inspections.

The meetings with representatives of the competent authority and visits to relevant sites during the mission are listed in Table 1.

Table 1: Overview of meetings and visits during the mission

Meetings/sites	No	Comments
Competent authorities	**9**	An opening meeting and a closing meeting in Oslo with staff from NFSA central level and representatives from relevant Ministries. Meetings with NFSA representatives from three NFSA regions and NFSA officials responsible for controls in visited sites.
Biogas plant	**1**	Approved biogas plant receiving municipal sewage, fish and food waste.
Food business operators	**3**	One fishery establishment also approved as an ABP intermediate plant and two multispecies slaughterhouses also approved as ABP intermediate plants.
Pet food plant	**1**	Approved for production of raw pet food.
Processing plants for ABPs	**3**	Two plants processing land animal ABPs[1]. One plant processing aquaculture ABPs.
Airport	**1**	An airport handling catering waste from international traffic.
Fur feed plant	**1**	A plant preparing fur feed and approved as an ABP collection centre.

3 Legal basis for the mission

a) Article 1(e) of Protocol 1 to the Agreement between the EFTA States on the Establishment of a Surveillance Authority and a Court of Justice;
b) Point 4 of the Introductory Part of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement;
c) *Commission Decision 98/139/EC of 4 February 1998 laying down certain detailed rules concerning on-the-spot checks carried out in the veterinary field by Commission experts in the Member States;*
d) Article 49 of *Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 laying down health rules as regards animal by-products and derived products not intended for human consumption;*
e) Article 45 of *Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules.*

4 Background

4.1 Previous missions

The Authority published a report following a mission to Norway in September 2010 on ABPs. The main conclusion at that time was that Norway could not ensure that all ABPs were handled and processed in line with EEA legal requirements. The report included a

[1] *One plant processing land animal ABPs was also approved as intermediate plant.*

number of recommendations addressed to Norway that were followed-up by the Authority. Other missions to Norway related to the scope of this mission include a mission on Transmissible Spongiform Encephalopathy's (TSEs) in April 2013 and a mission on feed safety in April 2016. The final reports from these missions can be found on the Authority's website (www.eftasurv.int).

4.2 Information on production and trade

According to information provided by Norway, approximately 210.000 tons of fish meal, 120.000 tons of fish oil, 11.500 tons of category 1 meat and bone meal and 144.000 tons of category 3 processed land animal proteins, were produced in Norway in 2016. Some key figures regarding ABPs generated in Norway and regarding trade, import and export of ABPs, as provided by Norway, can be found in Annex 3 to this report.

5 Findings and conclusions

5.1 Legislative and implementing measures

Legal Requirements

Article 7 of the EEA Agreement requires acts referred to or contained in the Annexes to the Agreement to be made part of the Norwegian internal legal order.

Article 51 of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 requires that EEA States shall communicate to the Authority the text of the provisions of national law they adopt in areas under their competence which directly concern the proper implementation of this Regulation.

Article 53 of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 requires that EEA States shall lay down the rules on penalties applicable to infringements of this Regulation and shall take all measures necessary to ensure that they are implemented. The penalties provided for must be effective, proportionate and dissuasive. The EEA State shall notify those provisions to the Authority.

Findings

According to information provided by Norway in its reply to the pre-mission document of the Authority, the Norwegian Food Act, No 124 of 19 December 2003, relating to food safety and plant and animal health, provides the legal basis for regulations regarding animal by products not intended for human consumption. Norway incorporated Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 and Commission Regulation (EU) No 142/2011 into its internal legal order through the adoption of Regulation No 1064 of 14 September 2016[2]. In addition to implementing the EEA acquis on ABPs as such, the national implementing regulation describes national derogations and rules on sanctions, also with reference to Articles 23 to 28 in the Food Act. It was noted by the mission team that information on national rules on penalties applicable to infringements have not been notified formally to the Authority.

[2] https://lovdata.no/dokument/SF/forskrift/2016-09-14-1064

Conclusions

The relevant EEA legislation has been made part of the Norwegian legal order, as required by Article 7 of the EEA Agreement. National rules on penalties applicable to infringements of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 have not been notified to the Authority as required in Article 53 of the Regulation.

5.2 Competent authorities and official controls

5.2.1 Designation of competent authorities and responsibilities

Legal Requirements

Article 4(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 requires that Member States monitor and verify that the relevant requirements of that Regulation are fulfilled by operators along the entire chain of animal by-products and derived products. For that purpose, they shall maintain a system of official controls in accordance with relevant Community legislation.

Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires Member States to designate the competent authorities responsible for the official controls set out in the Regulation. It also lays down operational criteria for the competent authorities.

Findings

According to information provided by Norway in its reply to the pre-mission document of the Authority, NFSA is the competent authority responsible for official controls related to ABPs in Norway. The NFSA operates under the auspice of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, the Ministry of Health and Care Services and the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Fisheries.

According to information provided by Norway in its reply to the pre-mission document of the Authority, NFSA has not delegated any competencies regarding controlling compliance with ABP requirements to other authorities although explained during the mission that coordination with other authorities was often needed such as with County Governors, the Norwegian Environment Agency and municipalities. The mission team was also informed that NFSA does not control incineration plants approved in accordance with EEA environmental legislation.

The mission team noted during a visit to an airport that NFSA and the Directorate of Norwegian Customs have an agreement, further developed by regional agreements, between these authorities. The scope of this cooperation includes customs controls at airports regarding collection and disposal of foodstuffs confiscated from passengers (See chapter 5.3.2).

Conclusions

Norway has designated a competent authority for the handling of ABPs in line with the requirements laid down in the Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 and maintains a system of official controls in relation to relevant EEA legislation as required by Article 4(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009.

5.2.2 Coordination and cooperation within the competent authority

Legal Requirements

Article 4(5) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires that when, within a competent authority, more than one unit is competent to carry out official controls, efficient and effective coordination and cooperation shall be ensured between the different units.

Findings

According to information provided by Norway in its reply to the pre-mission document of the Authority, NFSA's official controls related to ABPs are organised at central level by NFSA's head office seafood section, belonging to the fish and seafood department. An interregional ABP expert group was established in October 2015 as a subgroup under NFSA's interregional seafood forum. This ABP expert group is subject to a mandate and centrally prepared guidelines for interregional expert forums applicable to all NFSA control sectors. The interregional ABP expert group supports and participates in regional ABP expert groups that shall ensure efficient and effective coordination and cooperation within NFSA regions.

The mission team met with one of the regional expert groups consisting of three officials with varied background and was informed of active coordination of activities within the region and also active cooperation with NFSA central office and the interregional ABP expert group. The mission team was informed that the regional ABP expert groups could also be specialised for certain areas of ABP controls and therefore also work beyond their regional boundaries within NFSA. The mission team noted that the work of these ABP regional expert groups is coordinated with expert groups working on other areas such as feed and food.

The mission team noted that NFSA has a detailed intranet webpage supporting NFSA officials with detailed guidelines on various topics related to ABPs, including a detailed guideline[3] issued in relation to the implementation in Norway of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 and Commission Regulation (EU) No 142/2011.

Conclusions

Coordination and cooperation within the competent authority is ensured as required by Article 4(5) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.

5.2.3 Planning of official controls

Legal Requirements

Article 45 of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 requires that the competent authority shall at regular intervals, carry out official controls and supervision of the handling of animal by-products and derived products falling within the scope of this Regulation.

[3] https://www.mattilsynet.no/sletting/veileder_animalske_biprodukter_10692009_og_1422011.17525/binary/Veileder%20animalske%20biprodukter%20(1069-2009%20og%20142-2011)

Article 32 of Regulation (EU) No 142/2011 requires that the competent authority shall take the necessary measures to control the entire chain of collection, transport, use and disposal of animal by-products and derived products, as referred to in Article 4(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009, and that those measures shall be carried out in accordance with the principles for official controls laid down in Article 3 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.

Article 3 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires that official controls are carried out regularly, on a risk basis and with appropriate frequency.

Findings

According to information provided by Norway in its reply to the pre-mission document of the Authority, the management and prioritisations of NFSA official controls are based on an annual central assessment further outlined in the central internal budget allocation letter (BDS) provided to the regions for further planning and prioritising of official controls. The mission team noted that the 2017 BDS states that prioritised and control campaigns coordinated controls related to generation of ABPs should focus on capture-based aquaculture, land animal slaughterhouses, food production, wild fish processors and fish slaughterhouses. Further identified areas of focus concern traceability of ABPs, processing plants and special users of ABPs. In 2015 NFSA did coordinated controls on wild fish food establishments and composting plants and in 2016 on land animal slaughterhouses, fish ABP processing plants, and also continuing controls of composting plants.

NFSA head office has developed and maintains a multiannual national control plan (MANCP), available on NFSA's website[4]. According to information provided by Norway, official controls regarding ABPs are included in the scope of the MANCP.

The mission team noted that traders and transporters of ABPs have not so far been included in official controls and, although transport activities were included in official controls in the establishments and plants serviced by the transporters, the transport companies themselves had rarely been included in official controls.

The mission team visited an airport and noted that no official controls had been done regarding catering waste from international traffic. It was further informed that in another NFSA region, also no official controls had been done regarding catering waste from international air traffic. The mission team noted that detailed information regarding amounts and disposal routes of catering waste from international traffic could not be provided for all NFSA regions (See chapter 5.3.4).

According to information provided by Norway in its reply to the pre-mission document of the Authority, NFSA has a risk based approach when prioritizing official controls of primary producers and food establishments where ABPs are generated but not for ABP operators and plants. The mission team noted that the regions have in general not implemented a risk-based approach related to official controls on ABPs, but some initiatives to do so were noted by the mission team. In the 2017 BDS, all NFSA regions are instructed to gather information regarding all ABP activities in their region, and to develop a risk-based approach to official

[4] https://www.mattilsynet.no/om_mattilsynet/multiannual_national_control_plan__english_version.23956/binary/Multi-annual%20national%20control%20plan%20-%20English%20version

controls on ABPs. The mission team noted that in general inspection frequencies in the regions visited were either not set or not based on risk assessment.

Conclusions

Not all necessary measures to control the entire chain of ABPs and derived products are taken as required by Article 32 of Regulation (EU) No 142/2011 and it is not fully ensured that official controls related to ABPs are carried out on a risk basis as required by Article 3(1) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.

5.2.4 Reporting and action taken in case of non-compliances

Legal Requirements

Article 8(1) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires official controls to be carried out in accordance with documented procedures. Article 9 of the same Regulation requires the competent authority to draw up reports on the official controls that it carries out, describing the purpose, the control methods and the results of the official controls and, where appropriate, the corrective action required.

Article 46 of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 requires that, if the official controls and supervision carried out by the competent authority reveal that one or more of the requirements of this Regulation are not met, it shall take appropriate action.

Findings

The NFSA inspection reports examined by the mission team included descriptions of observations made during controls, evaluations of the observations, general shortcomings identified and deadlines set for corrective actions. In the establishments visited, NFSA had also carried out follow-up controls by e.g. new inspections or evaluation of the corrective actions notified by the establishments.

According to information provided by NFSA in its reply to the pre-mission document of the Authority, for control programs planned at central level, specific control guidelines are prepared in NFSA´s electronic database (MATS) using obligatory or optional control points related to relevant legal provisions. It was explained to the mission team that currently MATS is not fully operational for other ABP controls because of the ongoing technical implementation of Regulations (EC) No 1069/2009 and Regulations (EU) No 142/2011. The mission team noted that, in one region visited only two control points were used, a general reference to the newly adopted ABP regulation and another on traceability. It was explained that although many control points could be found in MATS, those were not used as they contained obsolete legal references.

Conclusions

Official controls are carried out in accordance with documented procedures and results of controls are reported, as required by Article 8(1) and Article 9 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004. It is ensured that appropriate actions are taken when controls and supervision carried out of by the competent authority reveal that requirements are not met, as required by Article 46 of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009.

5.2.5 Resources and training of staff

Legal Requirements

Article 4(2)(c) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires competent authorities to ensure that they have access to a sufficient number of suitably qualified and experienced staff.

Article 6 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires that the competent authorities ensure that staff receive appropriate training, and are kept up-to-date in their competencies.

Findings

According to information provided by the NFSA in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, the training of staff is ensured through a central NFSA training plan on ABPs and through participation of control staff in control programs on specific topics planned by the central level of NFSA. Relevant staff from NFSA also attends the "Better Training for Safer Food" program related to ABPs organised by the European Commission.

According to information provided by NFSA in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, in 2016 the following ABP related training initiatives were described: control of fish processing plants, land animal slaughterhouses, biogas and composting plants. It was noted that recent training initiatives emphasized the recent implementation of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 and Regulation (EU) No 142/2011 in Norway and that the setup of an NFSA interregional ABP forum plays a role regarding ensuring cascade training for local inspectors through the regional contact points. The mission team was provided with a detailed list of participants in training initiatives and confirmed during meetings with staff from both local and central level that they had participated in relevant training initiatives.

The mission team noted that the officials met in general were qualified and experienced. However, it was noted that officials in the visited NFSA regions were not in all cases aware of specific legal requirements related to non-compliances detected by the mission team in the visited establishments (see chapter 5.3).

Conclusions

The competent authority has, in general, access to qualified and experienced staff and it is mostly ensured that relevant control staff has received appropriate training and are kept up to date in their area of competence as required by Article 4(2)(c) and Article 6 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.

5.3 Official controls and requirements along the ABP chain

5.3.1 Categorisation and disposal

Legal Requirements

Article 7(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 requires that animal by-products shall be categorised into specific categories which reflect the level of risk to public and animal health arising from those animal by-products, in accordance with the lists laid down in Articles 8, 9 and 10 of the same Regulation.

Section 3 of Chapter III of Annex XVI of Regulation (EU) No 142/2011 requires that in the case of disposal of animal by-products in remote areas in accordance with Article 19(1)(b) of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009, the competent authority shall monitor regularly the remote areas to ensure that those areas and the disposal operations are properly controlled.

Findings

According to information provided by NFSA in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, detailed guidance have been prepared regarding categorisation of various types of ABPs, such as regarding ABPs of fish and poultry origin and also regarding how intestines shall be categorised based on the cleanliness after removal of intestinal content.

In all the establishments visited during the mission it was noted that ABPs were correctly categorised. The mission team visited a company collecting fallen stock for the whole of Norway. The company ran both a call centre and a web-based request system for farmers. The transport vehicles used for collection were dedicated for the transport of fallen stock and all movement of vehicles could be monitored centrally.

According to information provided by NFSA in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, in northern Norway fallen stock can be disposed of in remote areas as further defined in Regulation No 1064 of 14 September 2016 incorporating Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 and Commission Regulation (EU) No 142/2011 in the Norwegian legal order. The mission team noted that two landfills in these remote areas are listed on NFSA official ABP list under other registered operators and. According to information provided by NFSA during the mission, official controls are done for these landfills.

Conclusions

Animal by-products and derived products are categorised into specific categories as required by Article 7(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009. Disposal of animal by-products in remote areas is monitored regularly by the competent authority, as required by Section 3, Chapter III, Annex XVI of Regulation (EU) No 142/2011.

5.3.2 Collection, transport, identification and traceability

Legal Requirements

Article 21(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 requires that operators shall collect, identify and transport animal by-products without undue delay under conditions which prevent risks arising to public and animal health.

Article 21(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 requires that operators shall ensure that animal by-products and derived products are accompanied during transport by a commercial document or, when required, by a health certificate.

Article 26 of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 requires that the treatment, processing or storage of animal by-products, in establishments or plants approved in accordance with Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 or Article 6 of Regulation (EC) No 852/2004, shall be carried out under conditions which prevent cross-contamination.

Section XIV, Chapter II, point 1 and Section XV, Chapter II, point 1 of Annex III to Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 requires that a document indicating the establishment of origin and containing the information set out in the Appendix to this Annex must accompany raw materials for the production of gelatine or collagen for human consumption, during transport when delivered to the processing establishment. The Appendix to this Annex lays down a model document to accompany raw materials destined for the production of gelatine or collagen.

Article 17 of Regulation (EU) No 142/2011 lays down requirements regarding commercial documents and health certificates, identification, the collection and transport of animal by-products and traceability, as further detailed in Chapter I, II and III of Annex VIII of Regulation (EU) No 142/2011.

Article 32 (2) of Regulation (EU) No 142/2011 requires that official controls on the entire chain of collection, transport, use and disposal of animal by-products and derived products shall include checks on the keeping of records and other documents required by the rules laid down in this Regulation.

Findings

In a slaughterhouse visited by the mission team, it was noted that transport containers, owned by a contracted transporter, and used to transport ABP category 1 and 3 material, were not dedicated and did not have a fixed marking. It was also noted that a container for the collection of ABP category 1 material was not marked. In another slaughterhouse visited, plastic boxes owned by a company trading and further processing ABPs, were either labelled with a fixed green marking indicating that they should only be used for ABP category 3 material or without a fixed marking but where a label, indicating the ABP category was put on an inner plastic packaging material. In the same establishment it was also noted that metal containers for in-house collection of ABP category 1 material were not labelled.

In the slaughterhouses visited, all hides from bovines, for use as raw material for the production of gelatine or collagen for human consumption, were sent for further processing but it was noted that the hides were accompanied by ABP commercial documents only.

The mission team visited a pet food plant producing raw pet food and noted that commercial document for incoming ABPs from poultry processing plant, slaughterhouses and fish processing plants did not include reference to sub categories of the ABP category 3 material received. The company did not use commercial documents for their final products.

The mission team visited a collection centre, preparing ensilaged ABPs to be fed to fur animals. It was noted that commercial documents were not used for deliveries to farmers, transport of material that could not be used for quality reasons to a composting plant and also commercial documents did not accompany incoming material of ensilaged whole poultry carcasses. The mission team visited a biogas plant and noted that no commercial documents were used for collection and transport of former foodstuffs from supermarkets and catering waste from restaurants etc.

The mission team visited an airport. It was explained to the mission team by airport representatives that all catering waste collected from air traffic was considered to be ABP category 1 irrespective of the air route. All waste collected in the airplanes were collected by contracted sanitation services in plastic bags and transported to a container that was seen

located in a covered area and correctly labelled. No commercial documents were used for the transport to incineration of the material collected but records of weight were kept. During the visit a customs officer met explained that in agreement with NFSA, collection and disposal of relevant material confiscated from passengers is sent for incineration accompanied by a document that follows the product and is returned, signed by the receiver, back to customs. Figures for confiscated material are sent annually to NFSA regional level. It was noted that the documents used did not fulfil all the requirements of a commercial document and was not produced in triplicate. The freezer where customs keep the confiscated material was seen labelled as ABP category 1 and was located in a locked room.

Conclusions

It is not always ensured that animal by-products and derived products are accompanied during transport by a commercial document as required by Article 21(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 and that requirements regarding commercial documents, identification, the collection and transport of animal by-products and derived products, as required by Article 17 of Regulation (EU) No 142/2011, are fulfilled.

It is not ensured that raw materials for the production of gelatine or collagen for human consumption are accompanied by a model document as laid out in Appendix to Annex III of Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 as required by Section XIV, Chapter II, point 1 and Section XV, Chapter II, point 1 of Annex III to that Regulation.

5.3.3 Hygiene, own checks, HACCP and processing requirements

Legal Requirements

Article 25 of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 lays down general hygiene requirements for ABP operators and plants and Article 28 of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 requires that operators shall put in place, implement and maintain own checks in their establishments or plants in order to monitor compliance with this Regulation.

Article 29 of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 requires operators carrying out one of the following activities to put in place, implement and maintain a permanent written procedure or procedures based on the hazard analysis and critical control points (HACCP) principles for the: (a) processing of animal by-products; (b) transformation of animal by-products into biogas and compost; (c) handling and storage of more than one category of animal by-products or derived products in the same establishment or plant; (d) manufacturing of pet food.

Article 9 of Regulation (EU) No 142/2011 requires that operators of processing plants and other establishments under their control comply with relevant hygiene and processing requirements, as set out in Annex IV to the Regulation.

Article 10 of Regulation (EU) No 142/2011 requires that operators of biogas plants shall ensure that establishments and plants under their control comply with the requirements for the transformation of animal by-products and derived products into biogas as set out in Annex V to the Regulation.

Article 32 (3) of Regulation (EU) No 142/2011 requires that the competent authority carries out official controls, as referred to in Article 45(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009, in accordance with the requirements set out in Annex XVI thereto.

Findings

The mission team visited a processing plant for ABP category 3 material of fish origin. The company produced salmon oil and salmon meal. The raw material was sourced from local aquaculture processing establishments, collected daily from each establishment in stainless steel tanks or transported in plastic tubs with inner plastic wrapping and on ice. Procedure for cleaning were seen in place, records of cleaning checked and cleaning area for transport units inspected. Temperature of raw material was checked for all incoming material. The company had established a HACCP system and used processing method 7. It was noted that particle size had not been identified as a critical control point and that no checks were done on particle size defined to be 22 mm. Records of final product analysis were seen and calibration records provided.

A processing plant for wild fish for human consumption was visited. The company produced fish ensilage, both from minced in-house ABP category 3 material and also from ABP category 2 material received by boats from the local aquaculture industry in 1000 l plastic tubs where acid had been added to minced whole fish, already by the providers of the raw material. The company was approved as an ABP category 2 and 3 intermediate plant. It was noted that the own check system and the HACCP system was poorly developed and results of measurement for the main control point (pH) to be checked at several steps in the process, according to the company hazard analysis, was not registered. In the last inspection report from NFSA in February 2016 it was identified that pH controls were not satisfactory, that commercial documents were not used and that containers for raw materials were not correctly labelled. The mission team noted that the limit for pH was not indicated in the documents seen and the company explained that they aimed at a pH 4.3 as an upper pH limit for the processing of ensilage which is above the set limit of pH 4 for the method used.

The mission team visited a biogas plant receiving municipal sewage, fish waste and food waste. The company had a system in place regarding own controls and procedures based on the HACCP principles although specific description of monitoring of critical control points was not available during the visit. The company used processing method 1 and it was noted by the mission team that the sterilisation process was monitored through measurement of pressure only and no measurements on temperature was done. It was explained that the incoming material particle size was reduced to 12 mm in two steps but there were no records available or checks done by the company regarding particle size. It was also explained by the company representatives that new pressure gauges were installed annually but otherwise no calibration on pressure gauges was done. No records regarding validation of the process could be provided by the company or NFSA.

The mission team visited a processing plant for ABP category 3 material also approved as an intermediate plant for ABP category 1. It was noted by the mission team that the plant was approved for using processing method 1 and also processing method 4 for the same processing line. It was also explained that new sterilisers were installed in 2016. Records and documents regarding process validation could not be provided to the mission team by the company or NFSA representative. Calibration protocol for temperature and pressure gauges was available. Regarding particle size two measurements were done twice a year and also daily visual checks described however with no records kept.

The mission team visited a processing plant for ABP category 1 and 3, also receiving ABP category 1 and 2 carcasses. There were two processing lines for ABP category 3, one used for mixed species material, including blood, using processing method 1 and the other using processing method 4 for processing of ABPs from sheep and pigs with seasonal variation.

The processing plant had been recently approved for using processing method 4. The company had provided some documentation to the respective NFSA officer that had issued a formal approval for the use of the method but only limited documentation regarding the validation of the process could be provided to the mission team (see chapter 5.4). It was noted that the company's HACCP system did not define the operational limits for processing method 4. Particle size was recorded twice a year and visually controlled daily.

Conclusions

It is mostly ensured that general conditions of hygiene, efficacy of own checks and effective implementation of procedures based on the HACCP principles in processing plants are in line with requirements of Article 25, Article 28 and Article 29 of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009. Compliance with requirements of Section 2 of Chapter I of Annex XVI of Regulation (EU) No 142/2011 regarding validation procedures was not ensured.

5.3.4 Controls for trade between EEA states

Legal Requirements

Article 48(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 requires that where an operator intends to dispatch Category 1 material, Category 2 material and meat-and-bone meal or animal fat derived from Category 1 and Category 2 materials to another EEA State, it shall inform the competent authority of the EEA State of origin and the competent authority of the EEA State of destination. The competent authority of the EEA State of destination shall take a decision upon application by the operator, within a specified time period.

Article 48(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 requires that the competent authority of the EEA State of origin shall inform the competent authority of the EEA State of destination, by means of the Traces system in accordance with Decision 2004/292/EC, of the dispatch of each consignment sent to the Member State of destination, of (a) animal by-products or derived products referred to in paragraph 1; (b) processed animal protein derived from Category 3 material. When informed of the dispatch, the competent authority of the EEA State of destination shall inform the competent authority of the EEA State of origin of the arrival of each consignment by means of the Traces system.

Findings

According to information provided by Norway in its reply to the pre-mission document of the Authority, the number of consignments notified in the Traces system as sent to Norway were 169 in 2015 and 454 in 2016. The NFSA did not inform the competent authority of the EEA State of origin of the arrival of any of the consignment by means of the Traces system.

According to information provided by Norway in its reply to the pre-mission document of the Authority, the number of consignments notified in the Traces system as sent from Norway were 2304 in 2015 and 2957 in 2016. The NFSA was informed by the competent authority of the EEA State of destination of the arrival of approximately 50% of these consignments by means of the Traces system. The mission team was informed that when remarks were inserted in Traces by the competent authority of the EEA State of destination regarding consignments from Norway, this was not followed by any response, feedback or actions by NFSA.

The mission team visited two plants processing land animal ABPs and belonging to the same company. The responsible staff had access to the Traces system and notified relevant consignments delivered to other EEA states. Commercial documents and Traces documents were mainly filled correctly although the mission team noted that the description of the commodity and the processing method used was not always correct. It was further noted that consignments of category 3 PAPs containing ruminant material, were declared in Traces as being pet food and dispatched to a trader in another EEA state. The final destination of these products could not be confirmed and it was not known if they were subsequently exported from the EU. The mission team noted that commercial documents were not used at all for consignments of category 1 oil traded to Denmark but NFSA's responsible official explained that intra trade certificate for animal and animal products was issued for every consignment.

The mission team visited an ABP category 3 processing plant trading within the EEA meal and oil produced from raw material from the aquaculture industry. It was noted that the company representatives did not have access to the Traces system. It was explained to the mission team that a trader handled commercial issues. It was later confirmed by NFSA central staff that the respective trader did not notify any consignments in the Traces system. The company prepared manually a Traces replicate commercial document and printed 3 copies which accompanied the consignment. The responsible NFSA officials were not aware of this practice by the company.

When preparing for the mission it was noted that Norway had issued a RASFF notification regarding a Norwegian company producing cod liver fish oil that had been traded to other EEA states, though the company was not approved by NFSA. When requesting further information from NFSA regarding what had been done with the recalled fish oil, it was noted by the mission team that the recalled consignments had been returned to the company of origin in Norway. It was later dispatched, as category 2 fish oil for technical use, via a trader in Norway to a company in Spain and to a company in France. Regarding the trade to the French company it was confirmed by NFSA that the consignment had not been notified in Traces. Furthermore, in the commercial documents provided to the mission team, an approval number not recognized by NFSA, had been inserted. According to information provided after the mission, further follow-up was planned by NFSA, including informing the respective competent authorities in receiving States in order to trace the consignments and gather information on the use.

In general, the mission team noted a lack of control and overview by NFSA regarding which operators or traders have been granted the right to notify consignments in the Traces system in Norway and also NFSA officials met expressed limited knowledge regarding the specific obligations and use of the Traces system.

Conclusions

Official controls do not ensure sufficient overview of operators' use of Traces for relevant consignments dispatched to other EEA States. It is not ensured that the competent authority informs the competent authorities of other EEA States, by means of the Traces system, of the dispatch or arrival of relevant consignments sent to or received from other EEA states, as required by Article 48(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009.

5.4 Registration and approval of operators, establishments and plants

Legal Requirements

Articles 23 and 24 of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 lay down the specific requirements for the registration of ABP operators, establishments or plants and approval of ABP plants.

Article 44 of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 lays down procedures for the approval of ABP establishments or plants.

Annex XVI, Chapter I, Section 2 of Regulation (EU) No 142/2011 lays down specific requirements regarding validation of processing plants prior to issuing an approval and when significant alterations are made to a process in an approved plant.

Article 47 of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 lays down requirements regarding a list of establishments, plants and operators which have been approved or registered in accordance with the Regulation within the territory of each EEA state.

Article 32(5) of Regulation (EU) No 142/2011 requires that the competent authority shall draw up the lists of establishments, plants and operators referred to in Article 47(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 in accordance with the format set out in Chapter II of Annex XVI hereto.

Findings

According to information provided by Norway in its reply to the pre-mission document of the Authority, the procedures for approval/registration of ABP operators and plants are not up to date due to ongoing work regarding updating legal requirements in MATS related to Regulations (EC) No 1069/2009 and Regulation (EU) No 142/2011.

The NFSA has established general procedures for business operators to follow when applying for approval (or registration) of their activities. Approvals are issued by NFSA regional offices but the mission team noted that there is limited guidance from NFSA central level to the regions and local officials regarding taking into account the specific requirements related to Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 and Regulation (EU) No 142/2011 in the approval process. The mission team also noted that there are no procedures established to ensure that already approved operators comply with relevant requirements when introducing new equipment, changing layout or construction.

The mission team visited two processing plants, recently approved for the use of method 4 and where critical equipment (had been recently changed in one of the plants, belonging to the same company. It was noted that no documentation regarding the validation of the processes could be provided to the mission team. The mission team visited a biogas plant and noted that limited documentation regarding validation of the process could be provided to the mission team (see chapter 5.3.3).

According to information provided by Norway in its reply to the pre-mission document of the Authority, the list of approved ABPs plants is publicly available on the website of

NFSA. The mission team noted that in December 2016, NFSA issued a detailed guideline[5] regarding the different types of ABP establishments and processing methods to facilitate the work of NFSA officials handling approvals and registrations.

The mission team noted several discrepancies between the activities indicated in the official ABP list and the actual activity of the respective operator. It was also noted that the official ABP list did not include traders of ABPs, and included only limited numbers of transporters. In a visited approved establishment, it was noted that the official ABP list only indicated that the plant was approved for receiving Category 2 material only although it was also receiving Category 3 material. It was explained by the respective official that it was not fully clear how to register product types for such a company (preparing fur feed for distribution to fur farms) and the officer was not aware of relevant guidelines issued by NFSA and available on NFSA's intranet.

Conclusions

In Norway, procedures are mostly in place for the approval and registration of ABP operators, establishments or plants. It is however not ensured that a validation of processing plants has been carried out, prior to issuing an approval, and that validation procedures are repeated periodically and in any case each time any significant alterations are made to a process as required by Annex XVI, Chapter I, Section 2 of Regulation (EU) No 142/2011.

Norway has drawn up and made publicly available the lists of ABP establishments, plants and operators. It is not fully ensured that the list includes all operators, such as traders and transporters of ABPs, and further that the list includes the relevant information and codes laid out in the technical specifications published by the European Commission, as required by Annex XVI, Chapter II of Regulation (EU) No 142/2011.

5.5 Removal, identification and disposal of SRM

Legal Requirements

Article 8 of Regulation (EC) No 999/2001 laying down rules for the prevention, control and eradication of certain transmissible spongiform encephalopathies lays down that the specified risk material (SRM) shall be removed and disposed of in accordance with Annex V to this Regulation.

Annex V of Regulation (EC) No 999/2001 defines SRM and lays down rules concerning removal, identification and disposal of SRM.

Findings

According to information provided by NFSA in its reply to the pre-mission document of the Authority, removal of SRM is verified as part of general and targeted official controls in the respective establishments. The central NFSA has issued an official guideline on SRM[6] in

[5] https://www.mattilsynet.no/om_mattilsynet/gjeldende_regelverk/veiledere/oversikt_over_typer_biproduktvirksomheter_og_behandlingsmetoder.24684/binary/Oversikt%20over%20typer%20biproduktvirksomheter%20og%20behandlingsmetoder

[6] https://www.mattilsynet.no/om_mattilsynet/gjeldende_regelverk/veiledere/retningslinje_spesifisert_risikomateriale_srm.2280/binary/Retningslinje%20spesifisert%20risikomateriale%20(SRM)

connection with official controls related to prevention, control and eradication of TSEs. The guideline was last updated in December 2015, describing in detail relevant provisions aimed at informing NFSA officers how to perform official controls.

In the visited slaughterhouses the mission team noted active official control systems in place concerning SRM although setup of controls varied between the establishments based on individual risk assessments. In one of the visited slaughterhouse, SRM controls were planned on monthly bases as a part of specific controls related to ABPs. In this region a standardised checklist was used for these controls and the summary of results was reported to the respective establishments and regional office. In both slaughterhouses visited, the SRM was removed, stained and disposed of in a satisfactory way.

Conclusions

Requirements of Article 8 and Annex V to Regulation (EC) No 999/2001 are complied with.

6 Final meeting

A final meeting was held on 22 February 2017 in Oslo with representatives from NFSA, the Ministry of Health and Care Services, the Ministry of Agriculture and Food and the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Fisheries. At this meeting, the mission team presented its main findings and some preliminary recommendations of the mission.

7 Recommendations

In order to facilitate the follow-up of the recommendations hereunder, Norway should notify the Authority no later than 1 October 2017, of additional corrective actions planned or taken other than those already indicated in the reply to the draft report of the Authority. The Authority should be kept continuously informed of all changes made to the already notified corrective actions and measures, including changes of the deadlines indicated for completion and also the completion of the measures included in the timetable.

No	Recommendation
1	Norway should notify to the Authority national rules on penalties applicable to infringements of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009, as required by Article 53 of the same Regulation.
2	Norway should ensure that official controls related to animal by-products and derived products are carried out on a risk basis as required by Article 3(1) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.
3	Norway should ensure that measures to control the entire chain of animal by-products and derived products, as referred to in Article 4(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009, are taken as required by Article 32 of Regulation (EU) No 142/2011.
4	Norway should ensure that animal by-products and derived products are accompanied during transport by a commercial document as required by Article 21(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 and that requirements regarding commercial documents, identification, the collection and transport of animal by-products and traceability, as required by Article 17 of Regulation (EU) No 142/2011, are fulfilled.

5	Norway should ensure that raw materials destined for the production of gelatine or collagen for human consumption are accompanied by a model document as laid out in Appendix to Annex III of Regulation (EC) 853/2004, as required by Section XIV, Chapter II, point 1 and Section XV, Chapter II, point 1 of Annex III to the said Regulation.
6	Norway should ensure that a validation of processing plants has been carried out, prior to issuing an approval, and that validation procedures are repeated periodically and in any case each time any significant alterations are made to a process as required by Annex XVI, Chapter I, section 2 of Regulation (EU) No 142/2011.
7	Norway should ensure that the official ABP list include all operators, such as traders and transporters of ABPs, and further that the list includes the relevant information and codes laid out in the technical specifications published by the European Commission, as required by Annex XVI, Chapter II of Regulation (EU) No 142/2011.
8	Norway should ensure that other EEA States are informed, by means of the Traces system, of relevant consignments sent to or received from other EEA States, as required by Article 48(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009.

Annex 1 - List of abbreviations and terms used in the report

ABP	Animal by-products not intended for human consumption
Authority	EFTA Surveillance Authority
EC	European Community
EEA	European Economic Area
EEA Agreement	Agreement on the European Economic Area
HACCP	Hazard analysis and critical control points
MBM	Meat and bone meal
MANCP	Multi annual national control plan
MATS	NFSA electronic database
NFSA	Norwegian Food Safety Authority
PAP	Processed animal protein
RASFF	Rapid alert system for food and feed
SRM	Specified risk material
TRACES	Trade control and expert system
TSE	Transmissible spongiform encephalopathies

Annex 2 - Relevant legislation

The following legislation has been taken into account in the context of this mission:

a) The Act referred to at point 9b of Part 7.1 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 laying down health rules as regards animal by-products and derived products not intended for human consumption and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002* as corrected and amended, and as adapted to the EEA Agreement by the sectoral adaptations referred to in Annex I to that Agreement;

b) The Act referred to at point 9c of Part 7.1 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Commission Regulation (EU) No 142/2011 of 25 February 2011 implementing Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down health rules as regards animal by-products and derived products not intended for human consumption and implementing Council Directive 97/78/EC as regards certain samples and items exempt from veterinary checks at the border under that Directive* as corrected and amended, and as adapted to the EEA Agreement by the sectoral adaptations referred to in Annex I to that Agreement;

c) The Act referred to at point 11 of Part 1.1 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *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*, as amended and adapted to the EEA Agreement by the sectoral adaptations referred to in Annex I to that Agreement;

d) The Act referred to at point 17 of Part 6.1 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 laying down specific hygiene rules for food of animal origin*, as corrected, amended and as adapted to the EEA Agreement by the sectoral adaptations referred to in Annex I to that Agreement;

e) Act referred to at Point 12 of Subchapter 1.1 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *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*, as amended and as adapted to the EEA Agreement by the sectoral adaptations referred to in Annex I to that Agreement;

f) The Act referred to at point 12 of Part 7.1 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Regulation (EC) No 999/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 May 2001 laying down rules for the prevention, control and eradication of certain transmissible spongiform encephalopathies*, as amended and as adapted to the EEA Agreement by the sectoral adaptations referred to in Annex I to that Agreement;

g) The Act referred to at point 32d of Annex XX to the EEA Agreement, *Council Directive 1999/31/EC of 26 April 1999 on the landfill of waste*, as amended and as adapted to the EEA Agreement by the sectoral adaptations referred to in Annex XX to that Agreement;

h) The Act referred to at point 31m of Chapter II of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Regulation (EC) No 183/2005 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 January 2005 laying down requirements for feed hygiene*, as amended and as adapted to the EEA Agreement by the sectoral adaptations referred to in Annex I to that Agreement.

Annex 3 - Statistics on production and trade

(As provided by Norway)

ABP generated from land animals in tons in 2016	*Category 1*	*Category 2*	*Category 3*	*Sum*
From farms to rendering industry	22 216			22 216
From slaughterhouses to rendering industry	26 443		143 878	170 321
From slaughterhouses to fur animal collection centers		60 309		60 309
From slaughterhouses to Pet Food			22 441	22 441
From slaughterhouses - wool			4 208	4 208
From slaughterhouses - hides and skins			16 831	16 831
From slaughterhouses - Bedding/manure from animal transport		16 831		16 831
From slaughterhouses - Former food stuffs			421	421
From Poultry - Egg products			1 403	1 403
From dairy production			100 000	100 000
Total	**48 659**	**77 140**	**289 180**	**392 763**

Reference: Data from industry (also based on figures for 2015)

Meal and oil produced from fish originating in Norway 2016 (tons) *(Reference: SINTEF Ocean and industry)*	*Category*	*Wild fish*	*Farmed fish*	*Sum*
Fish meal (from catch of pelagic species)	3	78 000		78 000
Fish meal (cuts and trimmings)	3	64 138	67 688	131 862
Total fish meal		**142 138**	**67 688**	**209 826**
Fish oil (from catch of pelagic species)	3	17 000		17 000
Fish oil (from guts and trimmings)	3	24 163	77 868	102 031
Total fish oil		**41 163**	**77 868**	**119 031**

Other main use of fish ABPs originating in Norway 2016 (tons) *(Reference: SINTEF Ocean and industry)*	*Category*	*Wild fish*	*Farmed fish*	*Sum*
Fish ABP (raw) and derived products for fur animal feed	3 and 2	21 700	4 760	26 460
Fish ABP (raw) and derived products for heating and biogas	2	0	84 212	84 212
Total		**21 700**	**88 972**	**110 672**

EEA-trade and import/export of ABP in 2016, in tons (animal by-products and derived products)

From Norway **EEA trade and exports** *Reference:* *Statistics Norway*	Land animal origin		Aquatic animal origin		Other/mixed products		Sum (tons)
	to EEA-countries	3rd countries	to EEA-countries	3rd countries	to EEA-countries	3rd countries	
Animal products	43 686	455	85 872	3 715			133 727
Animal fat and oil	140	20	59 812	26 377	17 022	922	104 295
Hides and skins and tanned leather	10 272	3 823					14 095
Total	**54 099**	**4 298**	**145 684**	**30 092**	**17 022**	**922**	**252 117**

To Norway **EEA trade and imports** *Reference:* *Statistics Norway*	Land animal origin		Aquatic animal origin		Other/mixed products		Sum (tons)
	EEA-countries	3rd countries	EEA-countries	3rd countries	EEA-countries	3rd countries	
Animal products	2 098	599	20 254	8 058			31 009
Animal fat and oil	894	0	92 657	99 404	14	952	193 921
Hides and skins (incl. tanned leather	2 601	1 269					3 870
Total	**5 593**	**1 868**	**112 911**	**107 462**	**14**	**952**	**228 800**

Animal products

(animal by-products and derived products (not fat/oils/hides)

Main trade to EEA countries	2016 (tons)
DK Denmark	106 906
FI Finland	14 235
SE Sweden	5 325
Main exports to 3rd countries	2016 (tons)
RU Russia	24
CN China	19
CA Canada	18
Total export and EEA trade from Norway	*133 727*

Main trade from EEA-countries	2016 (tons)
FO Faroe Islands	13 592
IS Iceland	5 180
DK Denmark	1 359
Main imports from 3rd countries	2016 (tons)
TW Taiwan	15,0
CN China	10,8
AR Argentina	10,0
Total imports and EEA trade to Norway	*31 009*

Animal fat and oils

Main trade to EEA-countries	2016 (tons)
DK Denmark	22 401
GR Greece	15 753
NL Netherlands	9 860
Main exports to 3rd countries	2016 (tons)
TR Turkey	21 442
US United States	2 769
TH Thailand	777
Total export and EEA trade from Norway	*104 295*

Main trade from EEA-countries	2016 (tons)
DK Denmark	52 081
IS Iceland	35 458
DE Germany	5 164
Main imports from 3rd countries	2016 (tons)
PE Peru	35 778
US United States	30 097
MR Mauritania	9 327
Total import and EEA trade to Norway	*193 921*

Hides and skins and tanned leather – derived products

Main trade to EEA-countries	2016 (tons)
IT Italy	7 703
SE Sweden	1 381
PT Portugal	366
Main exports to 3rd countries	2016 (tons)
TR Turkey	75
CN China	56
HK Hong Kong	41
Total exports and EEA trade from Norway	*14 095*

Main trade from EEA-countries	2016 (tons)
SE Sweden	1 960
IT Italy	516
PL Poland	43
Main imports from 3rd countries	2016 (tons)
BR Brazil	768
CN China	233
IN India	136
Total import and EEA trade to Norway	3 870

Annex 4 - Plan for corrective measures and actions provided by Norway

No. 1	Norway should notify to the Authority national rules on penalties applicable to infringements of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009, as required by Article 53 of the same Regulation.

Norway will notify to the Authority national rules on penalties applicable to infringements of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009, as required by Article 53 of the same Regulation.

Deadline for completion: August 31st 2017.

No. 2	Norway should ensure that official controls related to animal by-products and derived products are carried out on a risk basis as required by Article 3(1) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.

The NFSA has established a working group on horizontal issues with regard to risk-based controls. The working group is to develop a concept for how to ensure risk-based controls in the different sectors within the NFSA, including animal by-products. The working group will deliver a report within 31st of May 2017.

Norway will provide ESA with a more detailed plan to ensure that official controls related to animal by-products and derived products are carried out on a risk basis.

Deadline for completion: December 31st 2017.

No. 3	Norway should ensure that measures to control the entire chain of animal by-products and derived products, as referred to in Article 4(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009, are taken as required by Article 32 of Regulation (EU) No 142/2011.

In light of the recent findings by ESA, Norway will ensure that measures to control the entire chain of animal by-products and derived products are taken.

Deadline for completion: April 30th 2018.

No. 4	Norway should ensure that animal by-products and derived products are accompanied during transport by a commercial document as required by Article 21(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009 and that requirements regarding commercial documents, identification, the collection and transport of animal by-products and traceability, as required by Article 17 of Regulation (EU) No 142/2011, are fulfilled.

The fulfilling of ABP requirements regarding commercial documents, identification, the collection and transport of animal by-products and traceability will be part of all NFSA coordinated ABP controls and trainings in 2017. We will examine the results of controls and do follow-up of non-compliance.

Deadline for completion: April 30th 2018.

No. 5	Norway should ensure that raw materials destined for the production of gelatin or collagen for human consumption are accompanied by a model document as laid out in Appendix to Annex III of Regulation (EC) 853/2004, as required by Section XIV, Chapter II, point 1 and Section XV, Chapter II, point 1 of Annex III to the said Regulation.

The adequate use of the model document attached will be included in NFSA meat controls in 2017, supported by prioritized and coordinated ABP-controls in land animal slaughterhouses.

Deadline for completion: September 30th 2017.

No. 6	Norway should ensure that a validation of processing plants has been carried out, prior to issuing an approval, and that validation procedures are repeated periodically and in any case each time any significant alterations are made to a process as required by Annex XVI, Chapter I, section 2 of Regulation (EU) No 142/2011.

Both validation of processing plants prior to approval and controlling their validation procedures will be obligatory control points in

- Renewed ABP approval procedures now being implemented in the NFSA Controls system MATS
- Prioritized and coordinated ABP-controls on processing plants, including planned training of inspectors

We will examine the results of controls and do follow-up of non-compliance.

Deadline for completion: April 30th 2018.

No. 7	Norway should ensure that the official ABP list include all operators, such as traders and transporters of ABPs, and further that the list includes the relevant information and codes laid out in the technical specifications published by the European Commission, as required by Annex XVI, Chapter II of Regulation (EU) No 142/2011.

Norway will ensure that the official ABP list is complete with relevant information and codes.

Deadline for completion: April 30th 2018.

No. 8	Norway should ensure that other EEA States are informed, by means of the Traces system, of relevant consignments sent to or received from other EEA States, as required by Article 48(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1069/2009.

Norway will ensure that other EEA States are informed of relevant consignments as required and by means of the TRACES.

Adequate use of TRACES will be highly prioritized in the follow-up of ESA recommendations.

The corrective measures will include:

- Implementing guidelines on use of TRACES within NFSA emphasizing the responsibilities of personnel in both regions and head office
- Training of inspectors operating TRACES using the interregional forum
- Making TRACES an obligatory control point in all ongoing ABP-controls when relevant

Deadline for completion: September 30th 2017.