

Brussels, 9 December 2013
Case No: 73793
Event No: 690400

Final report

EFTA Surveillance Authority mission to Iceland

from 9 to 13 September 2013

regarding application of EEA legislation concerning

animal by-products not intended for human consumption

Please note that comments from the Icelandic competent authorities to the draft report and information on the corrective actions already taken and planned by the Icelandic competent authorities are included in Annex 3 in the report and referred to in footnotes in *underlined italic print* in the body of the report.

Executive Summary

This report describes the outcome of a mission carried out by the EFTA Surveillance Authority in Iceland from 9 to 13 September 2013.

The objective of the mission was to verify that official controls in Iceland related to animal by-products (ABPs) not intended for human consumption were carried out in compliance with the European Economic Area (EEA) legislation with particular focus on available infrastructure, the general organization of official controls and the verification by competent authorities of the categorization, collection, processing and final destination of certain ABPs.

The mission team found that in Iceland it is not ensured that all animal by-products are handled and processed in line with legal requirements.

Although the relevant EEA legislation included in the scope of this mission has been made part of the Icelandic internal legal order, national legislation was, at the time of the mission, not in line with the EEA agreement since certain ABPs are in Iceland considered as waste and therefore fall outside the scope of the Icelandic legislation.

Many of the mission findings regarding collection, transport and disposal of ABPs, are considered heavily linked to the uncertainty of responsibility for ABP specific official controls in Iceland as the Regulation IS No 108/2010, incorporating Regulation (EC) 1774/2002, excludes from its scope ABPs that are to be considered as waste and the competent authorities responsible for collection transport and disposal of waste do not consider requirements for ABPs as laid down in the same Regulation within the scope of their control activities.

Iceland, has not ensured that adequate arrangements are in place and sufficient infrastructure exists to ensure that ABPs are disposed of in accordance with EEA legislation and unprocessed ABPs are in general directly disposed of at landfills.

It was confirmed during this mission that Iceland does not comply with requirements concerning removal of bovine specified risk material (SRM), as laid down in EEA legislation. The Authority has already initiated infringement proceedings in relation to this matter.

Iceland has a derogation from EEA legislation concerning the ban of the use of fishmeal in ruminant feed. This derogation takes into account the absence of production and importation of meat and bone meal in Iceland. It was noted during this mission that there is production of meat and bone meal in Iceland.

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

Table of Contents	Page
1 INTRODUCTION.....	4
2 SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE MISSION	4
3 LEGAL BASIS FOR THE MISSION	5
4 BACKGROUND	6
5 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	6
5.1 NATIONAL LEGISLATION	6
5.2 COMPETENT AUTHORITIES	7
5.2.1 Designation of competent authorities – organisation and responsibilities.....	7
5.2.2 Coordination and cooperation between and within competent authorities	8
5.2.3 Official controls.....	9
5.2.4 Personnel and training of staff.....	10
5.3 CHAPTERS I AND II OF REGULATION (EC) NO 1774/2002.....	10
5.3.1 Categorisation, identification, collection and storage of ABPs	10
5.3.2 Commercial documents, health certificates and records.....	11
5.3.3 National system for disposal of ABPs.....	12
5.4 CHAPTERS III, IV, V AND VI OF REGULATION (EC) NO 1774/2002.....	13
5.4.1 Approval, registration and list of approved ABP plants	13
5.4.2 Plants own-check systems and official controls in ABPs plants	16
5.5 ARTICLE 8 AND ANNEX V TO REGULATION (EC) NO 999/2001	17
5.5.1 Removal, identification and disposal of SRM.....	17
6 FINAL MEETING	17
7 RECOMMENDATIONS	18
ANNEX 1 - LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND TERMS USED IN THE REPORT	20
ANNEX 2 - OTHER RELEVANT EEA LEGISLATION	21
ANNEX 3 - REPLY FROM ICELAND TO THE DRAFT REPORT	23

1 Introduction

The mission took place in Iceland from 9 to 13 September 2013. The mission team comprised two inspectors from the EFTA Surveillance Authority (the Authority) and a national expert.

The opening meeting was held on 9 September with representatives of the Icelandic Food and Veterinary Authority (MAST), the Ministry of Industries and Innovation (MoII) and the Icelandic Environment Agency (UST). On the meeting the mission team confirmed the objectives and the itinerary of the mission and the Icelandic representatives provided additional information to that set out in the reply to the Authority's pre-mission document.

Throughout the mission, the mission team was accompanied by a representative of MAST's head office and met with officers of the relevant competent authorities, in charge of official control in the facilities visited.

The final meeting was held on 13 September 2013 with representatives of MAST, MoII, UST and one Municipal Environmental Health and Protection Office (LCA), (representative from LCA Reykjavík).

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

2 Scope and objectives of the mission

The main scope of the mission was to evaluate the implementation of requirements concerning animal by-products (ABPs), as laid down in:

Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 3 October 2002 laying down health rules concerning animal by-products not 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.

The main objective of the mission was to assess the application in Iceland of the above mentioned EEA act and other relevant EEA legislation, with particular focus on the general organization of relevant official controls and the verification by competent authorities of the categorization, collection, processing and final destination of certain ABPs.

This assessment was carried out based on the above mentioned legal act and other relevant EEA legislation referred to in Annex 2 to this report. The assessment was also based on Iceland's reply to the pre-mission document of the Authority.

Table 1: Competent authorities and establishments/sites visited during the mission

Competent authorities	An initial meeting and a final meeting between the mission team and representatives of MAST, MoII, UST and LCA, (one representative from LCA Reykjavik present in the final meeting). Several meetings with officers of the relevant competent authorities in charge of official controls in the facilities visited or otherwise involved in official controls related to ABPs (staff of two LCA offices and two MAST district offices. Several UST and MAST central office officials and staff of the MAST import/export office).	
Establishments visited	Number	Comments
Slaughterhouses	2	Both slaughterhouses approved for slaughtering several species, including ovine and bovine animals, and approved as ABP storage plants.
ABP processing plants	2	A plant producing meat and bone meal from category 2 and category 3 ABPs. A company running a compost plant and also involved in collection and transport of ABPs.
ABP technical plants	2	A plant processing raw wool and a plant salting and tanning skins and hides.
ABP transporter	1	A company involved in collecting fallen stock, home slaughtering waste and other ABPs.
Landfills	3	One of the landfills was visited without a site representative being present. The visit had been pre-approved by UST central office who is responsible for issuing approvals and official control of landfills.
Pet food plant	1	A plant producing pet food from ABP category 3 material.
Incinerator	1	A company incinerating <i>inter alia</i> category 1 ABPs.

3 Legal basis for the mission

The legal basis for the mission was:

- 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 27 of Commission Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 3 October 2002 laying down health rules concerning animal by-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;*

Other legislation relevant for the mission is listed in Annex 2.

4 Background

A preparatory mission on animal by-products (ABPs) was carried out in October 2009 before Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 entered into force in Iceland. The final report from that mission was sent to Iceland in January 2010 but not made publically available by the Authority. As this was a preparatory mission, no follow-up of recommendations or corrective actions notified by Iceland was carried out.

In Iceland removal of bovine specified risk material (SRM), as laid down in Annex V of Regulation (EC) No 999/2001 is not fully respected at present and current practices concerning removal of bovine SRM were confirmed during this mission. The Authority has already initiated infringement proceedings in relation to this matter.

According to the Joint Committee Decision No 133/2007 of 26 October 2007, Iceland has a derogation from Article 7 and Annex IV to Regulation (EC) No 999/2001 concerning the use of fishmeal in ruminant feed. This derogation takes into account *inter alia* on “*the absence of production and importation of meat and bone meal in Iceland*”. It was noted during this mission that there is production of meat and bone meal in Iceland. The Authority sent a separate letter concerning this matter to Iceland on 30 September 2013.

5 Findings and conclusions

5.1 National legislation

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 Icelandic internal legal order.

Findings:

According to information provided by Iceland in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 was incorporated in Iceland by IS Regulation No 108/2010, entering into force on 1 March 2010, except for the provisions on ABPs from terrestrial animals, which entered into force on 1 November 2011. The legal basis for IS Regulation No 108/2010 is IS Act No 22/1994 on control of Feed, Fertilisers and Seeds, IS Act No. 96/1997 on Slaughtering and Slaughter Products and IS Act No 25/1993 on Animal Diseases and Preventive Measures Against Them. Iceland has not informed the Authority of any transitional measures or derogations pursuant to Article 23 or 24 of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002, consequently the Regulation should be applied as such in Iceland.

According to information provided by Iceland in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, legislation on waste management in Iceland is based on IS Act No 55/2003 on waste management and the following main regulations have been issued to implement *inter alia* Directive 1999/31/EC on the landfill of waste and Directive 2000/76/EC on the incineration of waste; IS Regulation No 737/2003 on treatment of waste, IS Regulation No 738/2003 on land filling of waste and IS Regulation No 739/2003 on incineration of waste. Iceland has not implemented Directive 2008/98/EC on waste and the Authority has on 26 June 2013 sent a reasoned opinion to Iceland concerning this matter.

It was noted by the mission team that IS Regulation 108/2010, incorporating Regulation (EC) 1774/2002, excludes from its scope ABPs that are to be considered as waste and the competent authorities responsible for official controls on collection, transport and disposal of waste do not consider requirements for ABPs as laid down in Regulation (EC) 1774/2002 to be within the scope of their control activities. (see chapter 5.2.1). This state of play was confirmed during the mission meetings with respective officials and also confirmed at the final meeting with present representatives from The Icelandic Food and Veterinary Authority (MAST), The Icelandic Environment Agency (UST), and The Ministry of Industry and Innovation (MoII).

Conclusions:

The relevant EEA legislation included in the scope of this mission has been made part of the Icelandic internal legal order. However, the national legislation was, at the time of the mission, not in line with the EEA agreement since certain ABPs are in Iceland considered as waste and therefore fall outside the scope of the Icelandic legislation.

5.2 Competent authorities

5.2.1 Designation of competent authorities – organisation and responsibilities

Legal requirements

Article 4(1) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires Member States to designate the competent authorities responsible for the official controls set out in the Regulation.

Article 4(2)(e) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires the competent authorities to ensure that they have the legal powers to carry out official controls and to take the measures provided for in the Regulation.

Findings:

According to information provided by Iceland in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, MoII is responsible for implementation and application of EEA acts related to the monitoring and control of animal by-products with MAST as the competent authority and responsible for enforcement measures. According to article 7 of IS Regulation No 108/2010, MAST may intervene and order that appropriate corrective actions are taken in cases of infringements. In case of serious incidences, repeated infringements or failure to implement the required corrective action within time limit imposed, MAST has legal powers to revoke issued approvals.

According to information provided by Iceland in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, the Ministry of Environment is responsible for implementation and application of EEA acts related to waste management with UST acting as the central competent authority *inter alia* responsible for issuing approvals for landfills and incinerators and responsible for enforcement measures. According to information provided by Iceland in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, Municipal Environmental Health and Protection Offices (LCAs) are responsible for official controls related to collection, handling and treatment of waste and enforcement measures related to these activities.

During visits and meetings with UST and LCA officials responsible for official controls it was noted that ABP specific issues were only in a very limited way included in their control activities. According to the competent authorities responsible for collection

transport and disposal of waste, requirements for ABPs as laid down in Regulation (EC) 1774/2002 are not considered to be within the scope of their control activities since ABPs that are to be considered as waste are excluded from the scope of the IS regulation 108/2010.

Conclusions:

Iceland has in principle designated competent authorities responsible for the official controls falling within the scope of this mission in line with the requirements laid down in the Article 4(1) and Article 4(2)(e) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, however, in practice not all designated competent authorities include requirements, as laid down in Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002, in their official controls. Accordingly, certain ABPs and related activities fall outside the scope of the responsibilities of the different designated competent authorities.

5.2.2 Coordination and cooperation between and within competent authorities

Legal requirements:

Article 4(3) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires efficient and effective coordination and cooperation between competent authorities.

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:

The mission team observed different approaches and understanding by MAST officials concerning ABP related official controls in the slaughterhouses visited. A centrally issued ABP specific checklist was in use in one slaughterhouse but in the other slaughterhouse different checklists were used that did not include ABP specific items. Also in one slaughterhouse it was noted that routine official controls related to ABPs were restricted to activities that took place within the slaughtering premises but not for activities in facilities where ABPs were stored or processed. Some MAST officials met by the mission team expressed lack of instructions on how to conduct official controls in ABP plants and expressed to the mission team that it was not always clear when official controls were the responsibility of the MAST district officials or MAST central officials.

According to information provided by Iceland in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority and information received during the mission, MAST has no role in relation to the work of LCAs and UST has very limited focus on harmonization of LCA work in relation to ABP controls.

According to information provided by Iceland in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority and information received during the mission, procedures have been issued to describe the different roles of MAST, UST and LCA's regarding the disposal of animal waste in the case of disease outbreaks. The mission team noted that the guideline made no reference to current ABP legislation but made reference to an Icelandic regulation that has been repealed.

Conclusions:

Efficient and effective coordination and cooperation between and within competent authorities, in line with the requirements of Article 4(3) and Article 4(5) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, could not always be ensured.

5.2.3 Official controls

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 by the business.

Article 26(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 requires that the competent authority shall at regular intervals carry out inspections and supervision at plants approved in accordance with this Regulation and Article 26(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 requires that if the inspection carried out by the competent authority reveals that one or more of the requirements of this Regulation are not being met, the competent authority shall take appropriate action.

Findings:

The mission team noted that inspection reports were drawn up by MAST although detailed guidelines for inspections in technical and processing plants had not been issued for all types of establishments. Further it was noted that approvals for these establishments were not always issued based on documented procedures and even establishments were seen having operated in periods without a valid approval (see chapter 5.4.1).

The mission team was provided with a list of ABP related non-compliances identified in several slaughterhouses, indicating active control for this type of establishments. In the ABP processing and technical plants visited and also under MAST supervision, there were indications of weak official controls and follow up of non-compliances to ensure that all relevant ABP requirements were fulfilled such as for process parameters, validation of methods and analysis and marking of products (see chapter 5.4.2).

According to information provided by Iceland in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, all waste management facilities approved by UST are regularly inspected. All reports from the inspections are made available on the website of the agency (www.ust.is). A list of non compliances for approved landfills was provided by UST to the mission team. It was noted that for a landfill visited during this mission, UST had in June 2012 identified several non-compliances, such as limited restriction of access, presence of uncovered ABPs (tissue, bones and whole carcasses) and signs of contaminated surface water. According to information provided to the mission team the operator had submitted a plan of corrective actions to UST and the plan subsequently been approved by UST. When the mission team visited the landfill, there was no physical access restriction in place and ABPs of ovine origin, including Category 1 material, was present uncovered in the landfill.

Conclusions:

Full compliance with Article 8(1) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 could not always be ensured since no documented procedure was in place for the approval of all ABPs plants.

Full compliance with Article 26(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 could not always be ensured since appropriate action is not always taken by the competent authorities if the inspections carried out reveal that relevant requirements are not being met.

5.2.4 *Personnel 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 Iceland in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, some MAST officials have attended specialized courses on ABPs and matters related to ABPs have also been included in regular training courses for district veterinary officers, official veterinarians and other control officials. Events and meetings have been held for the industry concerning the legal framework and general handling of ABPs. Representatives of MAST informed the mission team that training of official veterinarians in slaughterhouses included handling of ABPs. The mission team noted that the UST and LCA officials met had received very limited if any ABP specific training.

Conclusions:

It is not always ensured that relevant staff receives appropriate training related to ABPs in accordance with Article 6 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.

5.3 Chapters I and II of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002

5.3.1 *Categorisation, identification, collection and storage of ABPs*

Legal requirements:

Animal by-products shall be categorized according to Articles 4, 5 and 6 of Regulation (EC) 1774/2002.

Article 7 of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 lays down requirements for the collection, transport and identification of ABPs and processed products.

Article 7(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 requires that Member States shall ensure that adequate arrangements exist to guarantee the collection, identification and transportation of Category 1 and 2 material in accordance with Annex II to that Regulation.

Findings:

The mission team noted that categorisations of ABPs in the slaughterhouses visited were found generally in order according to IS legislation although the IS legislation does not take into account SRM from bovines as required by EEA legislation (See chapter 5.5.1). The mission team also noted that not all ABPs were identified as such by the establishments visited when collecting and dispatching this material. This applied for example to sludge generated in pre-treatment of waste water from the food producing establishments visited. In the technical plants visited not all ABPs generated were considered as ABPs and therefore not handled accordingly (remains of animal tissue when processing raw hides/skin and dust/wool mix generated in pre treatment of raw wool). In all the establishments visited the mission team found to various degrees containers that were used to store ABPs that were not leak proof or correctly identified.

According to information provided by Iceland in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, municipalities are responsible for setting up a system of collection, handling and treatment of municipal waste in their municipality. The mission team visited a company collecting home slaughtering waste and fallen stock. This system had not been implemented to ensure correct collection and transport of ABPs at the request of any of the competent authorities responsible for official controls of ABPs, but rather at the initiative of the respective municipality. According to information provided by Iceland in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, home slaughter is permitted for own household consumption, however, there is no national system for collection of this waste and the same applies for collection of fallen stock, with exceptions in a few areas with dense animal population.

Concerning collection of ABPs, the mission team noted, that there seems to be in general very limited official controls conducted with focus on ABP related requirements (containers leak proof and correctly labelled, cleaning of vehicles and containers, traceability and commercial documents accompanying the transported ABPs). It was noted by the mission team that not all transporters transporting ABPs had been identified and therefore not controlled by any competent authority.

Conclusion:

ABPs were not always categorized according to Article 4, 5 and 6 of Regulation (EC) 1774/2002.

Iceland does not ensure, as required by Article 7(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002, that adequate arrangements exist to guarantee the collection and transportation of Category 1 and 2 material in accordance with Annex II of the Regulation.

5.3.2 Commercial documents, health certificates and records.

Legal requirements:

Article 7(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 requires that ABPs and processed products shall be accompanied, during transportation, by a commercial document or, when required by the Regulation, a health certificate.

Article 8 of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 lays down the conditions for dispatch of certain ABPs and processed products to other EEA states. Regarding trade of processed animal protein between EEA States, the competent authority of the place of origin shall inform the competent authority of the place of destination of each consignment by means of the TRACES system, or by another method by mutual agreement. When informed of its dispatch the competent authority of the place of destination shall inform the competent authority of the place of origin of the arrival of each consignment by the same means.

Article 9 of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 requires any person consigning, transporting or receiving animal by-products to keep a record of consignments as specified in Annex II.

Findings:

The mission team noted that none or limited records were kept of ABPs received at, or dispatched from, the visited establishments, except the slaughterhouses. Furthermore, the category of the ABPs and processed products could not always be identified by the label or from the commercial documents, if such a document was accompanying the product at all or available at the point of dispatch and disposal.

According to information provided by Iceland in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, the dispatch of ABPs and processed products for transportation within the EEA is overseen by the approved establishment itself and the products are accompanied by commercial documents. The dispatch of ABPs and processed products to third countries is supervised by MAST veterinary officers. With regard to trade of fishmeal to other EEA states, the mission team met with the MAST office of export and import. Iceland trades fishmeal with other EEA states and it was noted by the mission team that no evidence that the EEA States of destination had authorised the receipt of such consignments could be provided. It was also noted that the TRACES system, or any other means of communication, is not used for communication between Iceland and the State of destination for this trade or any other trade of ABPs from Iceland.

Conclusion:

Full compliance with Article 7(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002, could not be ensured since commercial documents do not accompany all ABPs and if they do accompany the ABPs, not all required information is included in the commercial documents.

Full compliance with Article 8 of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 could not be ensured since no authorisation for the receipt of Category 1 or 2 ABPs and processed products derived thereof or processed animal protein is received from the EEA state of destination. Furthermore, a procedure to ensure that the competent authority of the place of destination informed the competent authority at the place of origin of the arrival of each consignment was not in place.

Full compliance with Article 9 of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 could not be ensured since not all places where ABPs are dispatched or received keep records in line with the requirements of Annex II for all ABPs handled.

5.3.3 National system for disposal of ABPs

Legal requirements:

Article 3(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 requires that ABPs and products derived there from shall be disposed of in accordance with the Regulation.

Article 3(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 requires Member States to ensure that adequate arrangements are in place and that a sufficient infrastructure exists to ensure compliance with the requirements for, amongst others, disposal of ABPs.

Findings:

According to information provided by Iceland in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority and during the mission, Article 3 of the Icelandic Regulation No 108/2010 that incorporates Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 into Icelandic law excludes from its scope animal by-products that are to be considered as waste under Icelandic law. Icelandic Act No 55/2003 on waste management defines 'waste' as "*materials or objects that the generator or possessor of the waste decides to dispose of or is inclined to dispose of in a certain manner, and that are listed in a regulation on waste according to Article 29 of this Act.*"¹ Icelandic Regulation No 738/2003, adopted on the basis of Act No 55/2003, includes *inter alia* animal carcasses in its definition of 'agricultural waste'.

¹ The Authority's unofficial translation.

It was noted during the mission that although ABPs were generally correctly categorised and collected in the slaughterhouses visited, when dispatched the same products were considered as waste and often directly disposed of at landfills without any prior processing taking place. During the mission it was discovered that, in practice, a number of ABPs, including for example category 1, 2 and 3 material slaughter waste dispatched from slaughterhouses, and fallen stock, that pursuant to Article 2(1)(a) of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 should be considered as Category 1 material, are in Iceland considered as waste and directly disposed of as such in landfills. The visited landfills were of variable standards. From well managed sites with control on incoming waste and restrictions on categories to be received, to a site visited where slaughtering waste, including Category 1 material, was disposed of directly on the landfill, and without access restrictions and poor hygienic standards. According to information provided by Iceland in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, the burial of fallen stock (Category 1 material) on farms is a common practice. The mission team noted that there is very limited focus on where dead animals and slaughter waste in most cases end up, except in the cases of disease outbreaks, and no information concerning the quantities disposed of in this manner is available.

According to information provided by Iceland in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, information regarding the quantity of all ABPs produced in Iceland is not collected by any authority in a systematic way and an overview of what categories of ABPs are disposed of at all UST approved landfills, including information concerning the quantity disposed at each landfill, is not available. As previously mentioned the competent authorities responsible for the official controls of the collection, transport and disposal of waste, as defined by Icelandic law, explained to the mission team during meetings that they do not consider the requirements for ABPs as laid down in Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 to be within the scope of their control activities (See chapter 5.2).

Conclusions:

Iceland, has not ensured that adequate arrangements are in place and sufficient infrastructure exists to ensure that ABPs are disposed of in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 as required by Article 3(3), cf. Article 3(1), of the Regulation.

5.4 Chapters III, IV, V and VI of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002

5.4.1 Approval, registration and list of approved ABP plants

Legal Requirements:

Articles 10 to 15, 17 and 18 of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 lay down the specific requirements for the approval of the different types of ABP plants (e.g. storage plants, incineration plants, Category 1 and 2 oleochemical and processing plants, composting plants, and pet food and technical plants) and require that an approval shall be suspended immediately if the conditions under which it was granted are no longer fulfilled.

Article 26(4) of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 requires that a list of approved plants is drawn up, that each plant shall be assigned an official number identifying the nature of its activities and that an updated list shall be sent to the Authority and made available to other EEA States.

Findings:

According to information provided by Iceland in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, MAST is one of the competent authorities issuing approvals for ABP plants and food producing establishments where ABPs are generated. Legal provisions regarding MAST approval of these establishments are stated in IS Act No 25/1993 on Animal Diseases and Preventive Measures Against Them, IS Act No 22/1994 on Control of Feed, Fertilizers and Seeds, Act No 96/1997 on Slaughtering and Slaughter Products and Regulation IS 108/2010 incorporating Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002.

According to information provided by Iceland in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, prior to approval the plants are to submit to MAST various information including plant layout, equipment, through-put and other information MAST considers necessary as a part of the approval procedure. In the slaughterhouses visited the mission team noted that approval and inspection procedures were in place and that issues related to categorization, storage and handling of ABPs were generally addressed in a satisfactory manner.

The mission team visited an ABP processing plant producing meat and bone meal and rendered fat. According to information provided to the mission team, by the plant management and MAST officials present, the plant was last inspected by MAST in April 2010. At that time the plant was in operation without a formal approval but was granted a temporary approval in May 2010 valid until September 2010. According to information provided by the plant management no specific inspection was conducted on behalf of MAST in relation to issuing of the current valid approval issued in April 2011 and no more recent inspection reports could be provided to the mission team.

The mission team visited a composting plant receiving household waste and catering waste. It was noted that MAST had issued a temporary approval in March 2013 to be valid for three months. The approval document indicated that the plant was approved for receiving ABPs, without stating which categories of ABPs could be processed although according to the MAST official approval list, the plant is approved for composting Category 2 material.

The mission team visited two technical plants. One of the plants was approved for processing hides and skins and operating on a temporary approval issued in February 2013 and valid until December 2013. The previous approval issued for the plant was also a temporary approval, issued in February 2012 and valid until May 2012. The plant had therefore been operating without an approval in the period from 1 November 2011, when Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 entered into force in Iceland, until February 2012 and also in the period from May 2012 until February 2013. It was noted that commercial documents had been issued for trade with EEA States during these periods. The other technical plant visited by the mission team had not been approved at all. The mission noted that another establishment, belonging to the same company, had been approved and was listed by MAST as an ABP technical plant although the only APB related activity of that plant was, according to representatives of the company, seasonal collection of greasy wool to be dispatched and processed in the other company plant visited which was currently without an approval. According to information from the company management, seasonal collection of greasy wool was organized at various points located around the country where the greasy wool was temporarily stored before final transport to the production facilities. The mission team noted that the list of ABP plants available in Iceland does not include any such ABP storage plants.

The mission team visited a pet food plant receiving Category 3 material. The company was listed as approved for production of processed pet food and dog chews on the MAST official approval list available on the MAST website. The mission team noted very limited indications of official control in the plant and a copy of an approval or inspection reports were not provided to the mission team.

In general, the mission team noted a lack of adequate application forms where e.g. relevant processing method and parameters are presented, and lack of documented procedures to be followed during the validation process prior to approval of ABPs plants when relevant. The mission team requested to see examples of the information submitted to MAST and inspection reports issued in relation to the approval process, however, limited evidence of such information being submitted and inspection reports were presented to the mission team. However, MAST approval and inspection procedures were being upgraded and according to information provided to the mission team, there is emphasis on finalizing this work to include all types of establishments where MAST is responsible for official controls related to ABPs.

According to information provided by Iceland in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, ABP plants also have to get an official approval from the LCAs in accordance with IS Regulation No 785/1999. According to the Regulation, LCAs are responsible for issuing permits for all waste treatment other than land filling and incineration (collection, transport, sorting, baling, recycling etc.). The LCA officials met expressed uncertainty concerning competences and responsibilities regarding requirements of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 and the mission team noted that the relevant requirements of the Regulation were not included in LCA approval procedures or inspection of relevant companies under their official controls.

According to information provided by Iceland in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, UST approves incineration plants. Responsible UST officials explained that they did not consider requirements of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 relevant when approving or inspecting such plants.

An updated list of MAST approved ABP plants is available on the MAST website (<https://skyrslur.mast.is/establishment>). According to information provided by Iceland in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, LCAs issue permits related to collection and transport of ABPs and are responsible for registration of waste sorts and amounts. A complete list for issued permits for ABP related activities in the LCAs could not be provided to the mission team.

Conclusions:

All types of ABP plants were not approved according to the specific requirements in Articles 10 to 15, 17 and 18 of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002, and establishments were seen operating without valid approvals.

MAST has drawn up and made publicly available a list of approved plants in line with the requirements laid down in Article 26(4) of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002, however not all ABP plants in Iceland are listed.

5.4.2 *Plants own-check systems and official controls in ABPs plants*

Legal requirements

Article 25 of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 requires operators and owners of intermediate and processing plants to put in place a procedure developed in accordance with the principles of the system of hazard analysis and critical control points (HACCP), including establishing and implementing methods to monitor and check critical control points and take representative samples to check relevant compliance to requirements.

According to Article 26(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 inspections and supervision carried out by the competent authorities at plants approved in accordance with the Regulation must take place in accordance with Annex V, Chapter IV to the Regulation. Furthermore, processing plants shall be validated in accordance with Annex V, Chapter V to the Regulation.

Findings

The mission team visited a processing plant producing meat and bone meal and rendered fat. An own-check system was established by the plant management although the mission team noted that the in-house control system of critical process parameters did not ensure full compliance with the set parameters for the processing method to be used. The mission team noted that no checks were done concerning level of impurities in the fat produced and no marking of end products (Glyceroltriheptanoate) was done to ensure control in relation to the feed ban. No indication was provided to the mission team that inspecting officials had addressed this issue with the plant management and the mission team noted that the plant management was not aware of these requirements. In the most recent inspection reports provided to the mission team, from April 2010, several non-compliances were indicated such as lack of information concerning the categories for all received ABPs; that regular validation and calibration of measuring equipment was not performed and unsatisfactory separation of processing and storage facilities. It was noted by the mission team that validation of processes had not been performed by any competent authority.

The mission team visited a composting plant receiving household waste and catering waste. According to a MAST inspection report, dated 22 November 2012, the plant was at that time operating without sufficient systems to monitor and record critical process parameters (particle size, temperature and pressure). The most recent MAST inspection took place on 27 June 2013 and confirmed that the situation had not improved with regard to the system of monitoring critical process parameters and also several other non-compliances were documented. The mission team noted that validation of processes had not been performed by any competent authority and that the plant management was not familiar with all relevant legal requirements and even stated that the required critical process parameters could not be met by the composting system currently in use. The mission team noted sampling for microbiological analysis of the final product was not done.

For the ABP plants visited it was noted in general that very limited official sampling had been performed where relevant, and no indications of process validation being performed, by any competent authority, was presented to the mission team. In general the mission team noted limited evidence of assessment of processing parameters during official controls.

Conclusion:

Full compliance with Article 25 of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 could not be ensured since not all plants had put in place, implemented and maintained a permanent procedure developed in accordance with the HACCP principles, including establishing and implementing methods to monitor and check critical control points and take representative samples to check relevant compliance to requirements.

Full compliance with Article 26(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 could not be ensured since inspections and supervision of processing plants do not take place at regular intervals and are not carried out fully in accordance with Annex V, Chapters IV and Chapter V to the Regulation.

5.5 Article 8 and Annex V to Regulation (EC) No 999/2001

5.5.1 Removal, identification and disposal of SRM

Legal requirements:

Article 8 of Regulation (EC) 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 Iceland in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, Regulation (EC) No 999/2001 has been incorporated in the national legislation with IS Regulation No 41/2012, which entered into force on 5 January 2012. The Regulation is enforced by MAST. Iceland has not incorporated Regulation (EC) No 722/2007 (amending Regulation (EC) No 999/2001) and the Authority delivered a reasoned opinion to Iceland in September 2012. As the legislation has not been fully incorporated in Iceland, the classification of ABPs is not in line with the provision regarding SRM from bovines. In Iceland the use of colour to identify SRM is generally not practiced.

Conclusion:

In Iceland SRM is not defined according to Annex V of Regulation (EC) No 999/2001 and therefore all SRM is not removed, identified and disposed of in accordance with Annex V as required by Article 8 of Regulation (EC) No 999/2001.

6 Final meeting

A final meeting was held on 13 September at MAST Head Office in Selfoss with representatives of MAST, MoII, UST and a representative from LCA Reykjavík. At this meeting, the mission team presented its main findings and preliminary conclusions of the mission.

In the meeting it was highlighted that many of the mission findings regarding collection transport and disposal of ABPs, are considered heavily linked to the uncertainty of responsibility for ABP specific official controls as the Regulation IS No 108/2010, incorporating Regulation (EC) 1774/2002, excludes from its scope ABPs that are to be considered as waste and the competent authorities responsible for collection transport and

disposal of waste do not consider requirements for ABPs as laid down in Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 within the scope of their control activities. In light of the above Iceland has been invited with a separate letter dated 26 September 2013 to submit its observations on these issues by 31 October 2013. After that date, the Authority will consider, in light of any observations received from the Icelandic Government, whether to initiate infringement proceedings in this matter in accordance with Article 31 of the Agreement between the EFTA States on the Establishment of a Surveillance Authority and Court of Justice.

In the final meeting a representative of MoII announced that a working group concerning this issue would be formed, involving MoII, The Ministry of Environment and officials from all competent authorities involved. No timeline or mandate for the working group was indicated.

During the mission a scheduled meeting with a LCA representatives was cancelled with a notice of a few hours. The reason given for the cancellation was that the respective LCA had not been informed in time and needed more time for preparation for such a meeting. The mission team considered that internal misunderstanding between MAST and the respective LCA was to blame but stressed at the final meeting that this was very unfortunate and to be avoided for future missions.

7 Recommendations

Iceland should notify the Authority, within two months of receiving the final report, by way of written evidence, of the corrective actions taken and a plan for corrective measures and actions, including a timetable for completion of measures still outstanding, relevant to all the recommendations hereunder. The Authority should also be kept informed of the completion of the measures included in the timetable.

No	Recommendation
1	Iceland should ensure that its national legislation is in line with the EEA Agreement.
2	Iceland should ensure that all competent authorities designated for the official controls on ABPs, falling within the scope of this mission, include requirements, as laid down in Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002, in their official controls.
3	Iceland should ensure effective co-operation between and within competent authorities as required by Article 4(3) and 4(5) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.
4	The competent authorities should ensure that documented procedures are in place when carrying out all official controls in accordance with Article 8(1) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 and that appropriate actions are taken by the competent authorities if the inspections carried out reveal that relevant requirements are not being met.
5	The competent authorities should ensure that its staff receive appropriate training related to ABPs in accordance with Article 6 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.
6	Iceland should ensure that all ABPs are categorized according to Article 4, 5 and 6 of Regulation (EC) 1774/2002 and that collection, identification and transportation of animal by-products are in accordance with Annex II.
7	Iceland should ensure, as required by Article 7(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002, that adequate arrangements exist to guarantee the collection and

	transportation of ABPs in accordance with Annex II.
8	The competent authorities should ensure that all ABPs are accompanied by commercial document or, when required by Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002, a health certificate, during transport as required by Article 7(2) of the Regulation.
9	The competent authorities should ensure that dispatch of relevant ABPs and processed products to, and introduction from, other EEA countries is carried out in accordance with the requirements laid down in Article 8 of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002.
10	The competent authorities should ensure, that any person consigning, transporting or receiving ABPs keep a record of consignments in accordance with Article 9 and Annex II of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002.
11	Iceland should ensure that ABPs are disposed of in accordance with Article 3(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 and ensure that adequate arrangements are in place to guarantee the disposal of ABPs in accordance with the Regulation as required by Article 3(3).
12	Iceland should ensure that all types of ABP plants are approved according to the specific requirements in Articles 10 to 15, 17 and 18 of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002.
13	Iceland should ensure that a complete list is drawn up and made publicly available of all approved plants in line with the requirements laid down in Article 26 of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 and that all approved establishments are listed
14	The competent authorities should ensure that operators of processing plants establish own-check systems in accordance with the requirements of Article 25, and ensure that representative samples, to check relevant compliance to requirements are taken, and that official controls are carried out in line with the requirements of Article 26(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 and in accordance with Annex V, Chapter IV and V.
15	Iceland should ensure that all SRM is removed, identified and disposed of in accordance with Annex V of Regulation (EC) No 999/2001 as required by Article 8 of the same Regulation.

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

ABPs	Animal by-products not intended for human consumption as defined in Article 2 of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002
Authority	EFTA Surveillance Authority
Category 1 material	ABPs as defined in Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002
Category 2 material	ABPs as defined in Article 5 of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002
Category 3 material	ABPs as defined in Article 6 of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002
EC	European Community
EEA	European Economic Area
EEA Agreement	Agreement on the European Economic Area
HACCP	Hazard analysis and critical control points
LCA	Municipal Environmental Health and Protection Offices
MAST	Icelandic Food and Veterinary Authority
MBM	Meat and bone meal
MoII	Ministry of Industry and Innovation
SRM	Specified risk material as defined in Annex V of Regulation (EC) No 999/2001
Total feed ban	The prohibition of feeding products of animal origin to farmed animals and exemptions applicable to this ban as laid down in Article 7 and Annex IV of Regulation (EC) No 999/2001
TRACES	EC Trade Control and Expert System
UST	The Environment Agency

Annex 2 - Other relevant EEA legislation

The following legislation has also to be taken into account in the context of this mission:

- a) The Act referred to at Point 1.1.11 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 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 6.1.17 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 sectoral adaptations as referred to in Annex I to that Agreement;
- c) The Act referred to at Point 7.1.12 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;
- d) The Act referred to at Point 7.2.36 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Commission Regulation (EC) No 811/2003 of 12 May 2003 implementing Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the intra-species recycling ban for fish, the burial and burning of animal by-products and certain transitional measures*;
- e) The Act referred to at Point 7.2.38 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Commission Regulation (EC) No 878/2004 of 29 April 2004 laying down transitional measures in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 for certain animal by-products classified as Category 1 and 2 materials and intended for technical purposes*, as amended;
- f) The Act referred to at Point 7.2.39 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Commission Regulation (EC) No 92/2005 of 19 January 2005 implementing Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards means of disposal or uses of animal by-products and amending its Annex VI as regards biogas transformation and processing of rendered fats*, as amended;
- g) The Act referred to at Point 7.2.40 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Commission Regulation (EC) No 1192/2006 of 4 August 2006 implementing Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards lists of approved plants in Member States*;
- h) The Act referred to at Point 7.2.41 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Commission Regulation (EC) No 2007/2006 of 22 December 2006 implementing Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the importation and transit of certain intermediate products derived from Category 3 material intended for technical uses in medical devices, in vitro diagnostics and laboratory reagents and amending that Regulation*;
- i) The Act referred to at Point 7.2.42 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Commission Decision 2004/407/EC of 26 April 2004 on transitional sanitary and certification rules under Regulation (EC) No*

1774/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards imports from certain third countries of photographic gelatine, as corrected and amended;

- j) The Act referred to at Point 7.2.43 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Commission Regulation (EC) No 79/2005 of 19 January 2005 implementing Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the use of milk, milk-based products and milk-derived products, defined as Category 3 material in that Regulation;*
- k) The Act referred to at Point 7.2.44 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Commission Regulation (EC) No 181/2006 of 1 February 2006 implementing Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 as regards organic fertilisers and soil improvers other than manure and amending that Regulation;*
- l) The Act referred to at Point 7.2.45 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Commission Regulation (EC) No 197/2006 of 3 February 2006 on transitional measures under Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 as regards the collection, transport, treatment, use and disposal of former foodstuff, as amended;*
- m) 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;*
- n) The Act referred to at Point 32f of Annex XX to the EEA Agreement, *Directive 2000/76/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 4 December 2000 on the incineration of waste.*
- o) The Act referred to in Point 31m of Chapter II of Annex I to the Agreement on the European Economic Area (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 adapted;*

**ACTS OF WHICH THE EFTA STATES AND THE EFTA SURVEILLANCE AUTHORITY
SHALL TAKE DUE ACCOUNT**

- p) The Act referred to at Point 42 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Commission Decision 2003/322/EC of 12 May 2003 implementing Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the feeding of certain necrophagous birds with certain category 1 materials, as amended;*
- q) The Act referred to at Point 43 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Commission Decision 2003/324/EC of 12 May 2003 as regards a derogation from the intra-species recycling ban for fur animals under Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council, as amended.*

Annex 3 - Reply from Iceland to the draft report

No	Recommendation	Reaction of Icelandic authorities	Date of compliance	Comment/ attachment
1	Iceland should ensure that its national legislation is in line with the EEA Agreement.	An ad hoc working group has been established with participants from the Ministry of Industries and Innovation as well as the Ministry of the Environment.		
2	Iceland should ensure that all competent authorities designated for the official controls on ABPs, falling within the scope of this mission, include requirements, as laid down in Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002, in their official controls.	The ad hoc group mentioned under point 1 will among other things put forward recommendations for amendments of the national legislation and division of tasks between CAs in order to ensure correct implementation and effectiveness of the provisions of the ABP legislation.		
3	Iceland should ensure effective co-operation between and within competent authorities as required by Article 4(3) and 4(5) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.	<p>Measures will be taken to clarify the role of MAST/UST/LCA regarding ABP controls and coordinate official controls.</p> <p>The centrally issued ABP specific checklist has been taken into use in all slaughterhouses. Instructions and checklists regarding official control for ABP facilities will be made to harmonize the work of MAST officials.</p> <p>ABP facilities will be registered in Ísleyfur, MAST's database for companies under the official control of MAST to ensure harmonization.</p> <p>It is foreseen that parallel to the implementation of regulation 1069/2009/EC into Icelandic legislation an ABP working group with representatives from MAST/UST/LCAs will be formed to work together towards a coordinated implementation and definition of different tasks and cooperation between the authorities. .</p>	30/12/2014	
4	The competent authorities should ensure that documented procedures are in place when carrying out all official controls in accordance with	<p>Written procedures for official control will be published in MAST's quality handbook for all types of ABP facilities.</p> <p>The database Ísleyfur will be used for documenting official controls which will ensure active control of the facilities.</p>	30/12/2014	

No	Recommendation	Reaction of Icelandic authorities	Date of compliance	Comment/ attachment
	Article 8(1) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 and that appropriate actions are taken by the competent authorities if the inspections carried out reveal that relevant requirements are not being met.			
5	The competent authorities should ensure that its staff receive appropriate training related to ABPs in accordance with Article 6 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.	MAST's specialist in ABP and the Chief of meat inspection attended a BTSF course for ABP in November 2013 and 4 other members of MAST's staff will attend the same course in 2014. Seminars will be held for other members of MAST staff who carry out official control in ABP facilities as well as cooperation with UST/LCA in similar training for their relevant staff.	30/12/2014	
6	Iceland should ensure that all ABPs are categorized according to Article 4, 5 and 6 of Regulation (EC) 1774/2002 and that collection, identification and transportation of animal by-products are in accordance with Annex II.	MAST will take notice of this when preparing written procedures for official control in ABP related facilities. Correct collection at all stages of handling of ABP as well as labelling, storing and importance of correct containers will have a special emphasis in upcoming seminars.	30/12/2014	
7	Iceland should ensure, as required by Article 7(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002, that adequate arrangements exist to guarantee the collection and transportation of ABPs in accordance with Annex II.	Where activities fall under the scope of regulation no 108/2010/IS, MAST will take notice of this when preparing written procedures for official control. See also point 2.		
8	The competent authorities should ensure that all ABPs are accompanied by commercial document or, when required by Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002, a health certificate, during	First steps have been taken in official control at MAST where officers emphasize on commercial documents in ABP facilities under their supervision. Information will be provided for the establishments which will, among other things, emphasize the	30/12/2014	

No	Recommendation	Reaction of Icelandic authorities	Date of compliance	Comment/ attachment
	transport as required by Article 7(2) of the Regulation.	importance of commercial documents and records for all consignments of ABPs. The same information will be made available to UST/LCAs as well as cooperation with UST/LCAs in the official control regarding commercial documents.		
9	The competent authorities should ensure that dispatch of relevant ABPs and processed products to, and introduction from, other EEA countries is carried out in accordance with the requirements laid down in Article 8 of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002.	MAST will set up a procedure for dispatch/ introduction of POAO to and from other EEA countries.	30/02/2014	
10	The competent authorities should ensure, that any person consigning, transporting or receiving ABPs keep a record of consignments in accordance with Article 9 and Annex II of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002.	See point 8 above.	30/12/2014	
11	Iceland should ensure that ABPs are disposed of in accordance with Article 3(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 and ensure that adequate arrangements are in place to guarantee the disposal of ABPs in accordance with the Regulation as required by Article 3(3).	See point 2 above.		
12	Iceland should ensure that all types of ABP plants are approved according to the specific requirements in Articles 10 to 15,	The first step has been taken by MAST by opening for electronic application for permits for ABP facilities. Currently there is one application for all facilities but it will be narrowed down to categories of	30/12/2014	

No	Recommendation	Reaction of Icelandic authorities	Date of compliance	Comment/ attachment
	17 and 18 of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002.	ABP facilities providing specific application forms for the operators. Written procedures will as well be made for approvals of ABP plants.		
13	Iceland should ensure that a complete list is drawn up and made publicly available of all approved plants in line with the requirements laid down in Article 26 of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 and that all approved establishments are listed	The list of approved plants is drawn from approved companies registered in Ísleyfur. All ABP plants will be listed in Ísleyfur. Operators and categories of ABP plants will be defined in the database so that the list is detailed.	30/12/2014	
14	The competent authorities should ensure that operators of processing plants establish own-check systems in accordance with the requirements of Article 25, and ensure that representative samples, to check relevant compliance to requirements are taken, and that official controls are carried out in line with the requirements of Article 26(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 and in accordance with Annex V, Chapter IV and V.	Written procedures for official control will be published in MAST's quality handbook for all types of ABP facilities which will cover own check systems in ABP facilities.	30/12/2014	
15	Iceland should ensure that all SRM is removed, identified and disposed of in accordance with Annex V of Regulation (EC) No 999/2001 as required by Article 8 of the same Regulation.	Iceland is aware of the issue and has applied for an adaptation text to the EU legislation concerning the removal of SRMs. The issue is under discussion within the Institutions of the EEA.		