

Final report

EFTA Surveillance Authority mission to

NORWAY

from 3 to 12 October 2011

regarding application of EEA legislation related to

identification, registration and movements of live bovine

animals and labelling of beef and beef

products

Please note that comments from the Norwegian competent authorities to factual errors in the draft report have been included in *underlined italic print* in the body of the report. Comments and information on the corrective actions already taken and planned by the Norwegian competent authorities are included in Annex 4 and referred to in footnotes in *underlined italic print*.

Table of contents

1 INTRODUCTION 4

2 SCOPE AND OBJECTIVE OF THE MISSION 5

3 LEGAL BASIS FOR THE MISSION 5

4 BACKGROUND 6

 4.1 GENERAL 6

 4.2 INFORMATION ON PRODUCTION AND TRADE 6

5 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS..... 6

 5.1 LEGISLATION AND IMPLEMENTING MEASURES 6

 5.2 HOLDING REGISTRATION..... 7

 5.3 IDENTIFICATION AND REGISTRATION OF BOVINE ANIMALS 8

 5.4 TRACEABILITY SYSTEM..... 19

 5.5 COMPULSORY EEA BEEF LABELLING SYSTEM..... 21

 5.6 VOLUNTARY BEEF LABELLING SYSTEM..... 23

6 FINAL MEETING 24

7 RECOMMENDATIONS 25

ANNEX 1 – LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND TERMS USED IN THE REPORT 27

ANNEX 2 – RELEVANT LEGISLATION 28

ANNEX 3 – FIGURES FOR THE PRODUCTION AND TRADE..... 30

Executive Summary

This report describes the outcome of a mission carried out by the EFTA Surveillance Authority in Norway from 3 to 12 October 2011.

The objective of the mission was to evaluate and to verify that the official control in Norway, related to the systems for holding registration, ear tagging of bovine animals including registrations and reporting, labelling and traceability of beef and beef products, and follow-up of non-conformities, was carried out in compliance with the relevant European Economic Area (EEA) legislation.

The EEA requirements on bovine animal identification and movement control of bovines are put in place to guard animal and public health. The legislation lays down four main pillars to guarantee the identity of each animal; ear tags, passports for bovine animals, computerised database and individual registers on the holdings. The mission team found that the system in place in Norway on registration of bovine holdings and the identification of bovine animals meets in general the requirements of the EEA legislation. However, the mission team identified shortcomings on identification and movement control of bovine animals, as not all animals observed were correctly tagged, the registers did not always include the required information, and the computerised database was not up to date as events were registered too late into the database. Norway has determined that a passport is to be issued only for animals intended for intra-EEA trade.

Although the number of holdings inspected on a yearly basis exceeded the requirements of the EEA legislation, the official controls carried out on the farms did not always consider all the obligations put on animal keepers. In addition, the use of sanctions was inadequate. Furthermore, not all appropriate criteria were taken into account for the selection of holdings to be inspected for correct application of EEA legislation for identification of bovine animals.

The processing establishments visited had traceability systems in place and were in general satisfactory. However, in several retail outlets visited, incorrect labelling missing key information undermined a reliable traceability.

The competent authorities did not carry out effective official controls on the compulsory labelling of beef products and had no overview of voluntary beef labelling systems in Norway. Several non-compliances on the implementation of the EEA requirements were identified by the mission team in relation to the compulsory and voluntary labelling of beef.

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

1 Introduction

The mission took place in Norway from 3 to 12 October 2011 as part of the EFTA Surveillance Authority's (the Authority) planned mission programme. The mission team comprised two inspectors from the EFTA Surveillance Authority.

The opening meeting was held with representatives of the Norwegian Food Safety Authority (NFSA) on Monday 3 October 2011 at the head office of the NFSA in Sandnes. The meeting was arranged as a video conference, allowing the head office of the NFSA located in Oslo and the Ministry of Agriculture and Food to participate.

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 questionnaire.

Throughout the mission, representatives of the NFSA head office accompanied the mission team. The itinerary was prepared taking into account the possibility to carry out visits without prior warning.

A final meeting was held with representatives of the NFSA and the Ministry of Agriculture and Food in Oslo on Wednesday 12 October 2011.

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

The meetings with the competent authorities and the visits to establishments and other premises during the mission are listed in Table 1.

Table 1: Competent authorities and sites visited during the mission

Meetings/sites visited		Comments	
Competent authority	central	2	Opening and final meeting. In addition, representatives from the relevant regional offices and district offices of the NFSA accompanied the mission team during the visits to the different sites
	regional	2	Regional offices of the NFSA
	Local	4	District offices of the NFSA
Central database		3	Meetings with the two private companies running the different databases and the representative of the NFSA responsible for the official central database
Farms		3	Two combined beef/dairy farms and one beef farm
Slaughterhouses and cutting plants		3	One slaughterhouse and two cutting plants
Collection centre		1	A holding situated in the surrounding area of a slaughterhouse which is used from time to time as collection centre
Supermarkets		7	Four out of seven supermarkets were visited without prior warning

2 Scope and objective of the mission

The scope of the mission was the following main European Economic Area (EEA) Acts and related EEA legislation:

- a) The Act referred to at Point 1.1.7.c of Chapter I of Annex I to the European Economic Area (EEA Agreement), *Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 July 2000 establishing a system for the identification and registration of bovine animals and regarding the labelling of beef and beef products and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 820/97*, as amended;
- b) The Act referred to at Point 1.1.2 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Council Directive 90/425/EEC of 26 June 1990 concerning veterinary and zootechnical checks applicable in intra-Community trade in certain live animals and products with a view to the completion of the internal market*, as amended and as adapted to the EEA Agreement by the sectoral adaptations referred to in Annex I to that Agreement.

The objective of the mission was to assess the Norwegian competent authorities' application of the relevant EEA legislation referred to in Chapter 3 and Annex 2 to this report. A particular focus was put on the systems for holding registration, ear tagging of bovine animals including registrations and reporting, labelling and traceability of beef and beef products, and on the competent authorities' official controls and follow-up of non-conformities.

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 (Surveillance and Court Agreement);
- b) Point 4 of the Introductory Part of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement;
- c) Article 45 of the Act referred to at Point 1.1.11 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules*, as amended and corrected in the EEA Agreement;
- d) Article 22 of *Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 July 2000 establishing a system for the identification and registration of bovine animals and regarding the labelling of beef and beef products*, and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 820/27, as amended;
- e) The Act referred to at Point 1.2.74 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *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*.

4 Background

4.1 General

On 5 February 2003 the Authority recognised the fully operational character of the Norwegian database for bovine animals by Authority Decision 17/03/COL. The Decision lays down 15 requirements to be fulfilled by the Norwegian authorities in order for the database to be considered fully operational. Following the Authority Decision and in accordance with the first paragraph of Article 6(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000, the Norwegian authorities determined the use of passport only for animals intended for intra-EEA trade.

This was the first mission carried out by the Authority in Norway since the entry into force of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000.

4.2 Information on production and trade

See Annex 3 for figures provided by the NFSA in its reply to the Authority's pre-mission questionnaire for the production and movements of bovine animals in Norway and the EEA. Statistics on official controls carried out by the NFSA are also available in Annex 3 together with information on meat production.

5 Findings and Conclusions

5.1 Legislation 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.

Findings:

According to information provided by the NFSA in its reply to the pre-mission document of the Authority, the legal basis for the legislation related to animal identification and registration, labelling of beef and beef products and veterinary and zootechnical checks applicable in intra-EEA trade in animals and animal products is the Food Act of 19 December 2003 No 124. Proposals for amendments to the Food Act would be drafted by the Ministries. Any amendments have to be decided by the Parliament.

Power to issue regulations within defined areas within the scope of the Food Act is given to the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, the Ministry of Health and Care Services and the Ministry of Fisheries and Coastal Affairs according to delegation of 19 December 2003 No 1790 and to the Norwegian Food Safety Authority according to delegation of 5 May 2004 No 884. Proposals of new regulations or changes to existing regulations would be drafted by the NFSA.

According to information provided by the NFSA in its reply to the pre-mission document of the Authority, the relevant EEA legislation has been transposed into the Norwegian law.

The mission team noted that only the requirements of Article 2 of Commission Decision 2006/28/EC, and not the other relevant requirements provided for by that Decision, are included in the Norwegian Regulation No 1131/2010.

Conclusions:

The national legislation in place in general correctly transposed and fulfilled the relevant EEA requirements within the scope of this mission. However, not all the relevant requirements provided for by Commission Decision 2006/28/EC had been implemented in Norwegian legislation as only Article 2 of the Decision was included in the Norwegian Regulation No 1131/2010.

5.2 Holding registration

5.2.1 Holding registration system in place

Legal requirements:

According to Article 5 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000, the competent authorities of the Member States shall set up a computerised database in accordance with Articles 14 and 18 of Council Directive 64/432/EEC.

Article 14(3)C of Council Directive 64/432/EEC requires that each holding has to be registered in the computerised database with at least an identification number consisting of not more than 12 figures and the name and address of the holder.

Article 2 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 defines as “holding” any place in which animals are held, kept or handled.

Findings:

Bovine holdings in Norway are registered in a computerized database with a unique identification number consisting of *ten* digits.

According to information provided by the NFSA and included in the Country Profile for Norway, the central domestic animal database contains, inter alia, a register of all bovine herds. The database is a part of the NFSA’s quality control system (MATS). Anyone keeping cattle is obliged to register. A herd-number is allocated to each herd of bovine animals. The herd number is also the registration number of a holding and is linked to an animal keeper’s identity. Slaughterhouses and collecting centres/markets are also allocated a holding registration number.

The mission team did not find any evidence of animals being kept at places not registered as holdings. However, that representatives of the NFSA confirmed in the opening meeting that summer grazing areas do not have a specific registration code in the central database and that the movement of bovine animals to the summer grazing areas are not reported into the database.

Conclusions:

Holdings are registered according to the requirements of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 and Council Directive 64/432/EEC with a unique number and the address and name of holder. However, some places where animals are kept, such as summer grazing areas, are

not defined in accordance with Article 2 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000, and therefore not registered as required by Article 14(3)C of Council Directive 64/432/EEC.

5.2.2 *Official controls on the holding registration system*

Legal requirements:

According to Article 22 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 Member States are required to ensure compliance with this Regulation.

Findings:

The personnel of the NFSA have access to the holding register at any time through intranet. A pilot project has been running for some time comparing data in the holding register with data sent in by animal keepers claiming production aid.

The representatives of the NFSA met during the mission informed the mission team that a number of registered holdings had no animals and that sorting out actual holdings was an ongoing challenge for the NFSA. One of the district offices visited had sent out a letter in December 2010, requesting feedback from the animal keepers on withdrawal of their registration. The letter was targeted at animal keepers which had not sought production aid in 2010 but were registered in the holding register. At the time of the mission a follow-up on the letter had not been carried out.

Conclusions:

The NFSA is ensuring compliance with Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 by actively verifying the correctness of the register of holdings.

5.3 Identification and registration of bovine animals

Legal requirements:

Article 1 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 requires that each Member State shall establish a system for the identification and registration of bovine animals. The four elements of the system for identification and registration of bovine animals are described in Article 3 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000.

Findings:

According to information included in the Country Profile of Norway, bovine identification includes: ear tagging; on-farm register and the cattle movement registration in a central computerised database. Norway has exempted animal keepers from requirements on animal passports for bovine animals not intended for intra-EEA trade in accordance with Article 6(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000. The mission team verified on the spot the reliability of this information.

Conclusions

Norway has established a system for the identification and registration of bovine animals comprising the required elements in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000.

5.3.1 *Ear tags to identify animals individually*

Legal requirements:

Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 specifies the requirements for the identification from birth of individual bovine animals with double ear tags; for the identification of imported animals; for the removal and replacement of ear tags; as well as for derogations from certain requirements.

Further provisions concerning ear tags are laid down in Articles 1 to 5 of Regulation (EC) No 911/2004.

Commission Decision 2006/28/EC on extension of the maximum period for applying eartags to certain bovine animals, introduces the possibility to extend the maximum period for the tagging of calves for up to six months. Criteria for making use of this derogation are given in Articles 2 to 5 of the Decision. According to Article 2(3) Member States applying the Decision should notify the Authority.

According to Article 4(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000, no animals may be moved from a holding unless it is identified in accordance with the provisions of Article 4 of that Regulation.

Findings:

Under Norwegian legislation, animal keepers are obliged to tag bovines within 20 days of birth with a unique identification number issued by the NFSA.

Bovines are required to be identified by two ear tags. *The ear tags can be of any colour except white or salmon red.* National rules are in place to regulate the trade in ear tags.

The head office has delegated the legal competence for approval of ear tags to the regional office of Rogaland and Agder. The mission team was provided with a list of ear tags approved in Norway according to the national criteria. Ear tags shall also have passed the International Committee for Animal Recording (ICAR) test for ear tags. Before 2007 other standards were also accepted as for instance the British PAS 44:2009.

Three new types of ear tags were approved so far in 2011 and one in 2010. Some ear tags approved before 2003 were withdrawn from the market because of problems with the ink used and readability.

In addition to the two ear tags, bovines coming from another holding in Norway or another EEA State should be marked with a white ear tag in one ear. According to representatives of the NFSA, this additional requirement is to be abandoned in 2012¹. Bovines imported from third countries should be identified with a yellow ear tag in one ear and a salmon red in the other at the holding of destination within seven days of arrival at the holding.

The mission team observed on the farms visited during the mission that:

- On one farm five animals were missing one ear tag. The farmer had not ordered replacement ear tags.
- On a farm with 20 animals all bovines were correctly tagged.

¹ See point 5.3.1 of Annex 4 for comments from the NFSA.

- On another farm visited one bovine was without ear tags, another one missing one ear tag and one missing one part of one of the ear tags. The farmer had not ordered replacement ear tags.

The mission team noted also that two of the animal keepers visited during the mission ordered ear tags every other year and one ordered ear tags every year but had a stock of white ear tags sufficient for several years use.

Calves are required to be tagged within 20 days of birth and the birth should be reported to the central database within seven days of tagging. According to Article 4 of the Norwegian Regulation No 1131/2010, implementing Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 Norway allows for authorisation of extension of the period for tagging of animals up to six months for some holdings. Norway has not notified the Authority of the use of this possibility. The mission team noted that procedures were not in place for reporting into the database the holdings making use of this derogation, and for each holding with the derogation the animals falling under the derogation. The district offices visited had not formally given derogation although a representative of one of the district offices informed that some holdings made use of this rule. Procedure for a yearly inspection on those farms was not in place.

Conclusions:

Compliance with Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 was not ensured as in two of three farms visited animals were incorrectly identified. The criteria for approval of ear tags correspond to the requirements laid down in Regulation (EC) No 911/2004. However full compliance with Article 1(5) of Regulation (EC) No 911/2004 could not be ensured since it was possible to order ear tags exceeding the need for one year's use.

Compliance with the requirements of Commission Decision 2006/28/EC was not ensured and more specifically Articles 1, 2, 4 and 5.

5.3.2 *Computerised database*

Legal requirements:

According to Article 5 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000, the competent authorities of the Member State shall set up a computerised database in accordance with Articles 14 and 18 of Council Directive 64/432/EEC. Article 14(3)C of Council Directive 64/432/EEC specifies the minimum information to be contained in the database for each animal and for each holding as well as the data to be supplied at any time.

The Authority Decision 17/03/COL lays down 15 requirements to be fulfilled in order for the Norwegian database to be considered fully operational².

According to Article 7(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 animal keepers shall report all movements to and from the holding and all births and deaths of animals on the holding, along with the dates of these events, within a period fixed by the Member State of between three and seven days of the event occurring.

Article 4(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 stipulates the time limit for tagging of newborn animals on a holding.

² See Annex 4 for comments from the NFSA.

Article 9 of Regulation (EC) No 911/21004 gives Member States the possibility to use the date when the animal is tagged instead of the date of birth as the starting point for the period of reporting birth, provided that no risk of confusion between those dates shall ensue in any record.

Findings:

Operation of the central database

According to information provided by the NFSA in its reply to the Authority's pre-mission questionnaire, the time limit for reporting events into the central database is seven days. In addition, Norway has decided that the starting point for the period for reporting birth is the date when the animal is tagged instead of the date of birth.

According to information provided by the NFSA in the reply to the pre-mission questionnaire, the database was integrated in MATS in 2009. It is administered by the section for supervision and development of the department of controls of the NFSA. Specially trained officers (super users) are located at some of the district offices to advise and help colleagues with questions on the functionality of the database. In addition two staff members of the head office located at the regional office Hedmark Oppland are assigned special tasks related to the central database by giving assistance to stakeholders and staff of the NFSA. These specially trained staff members have special authorisation to correct errors discovered in the database. The database is available to the personnel of the NFSA.

The NFSA informed in the reply to the pre-mission questionnaire that the database records the origin, identity, movement and disposal of all cattle, using input from: cattle birth and movement data, livestock markets, slaughterhouses and export points for live animals.

Reporting to the central database

Animal keepers can report events into the database through different channels. All animal keepers can use a special web portal, the "ALTINN", for reporting directly into the database via a login linked to their personal identity number. Dairy and beef cattle farmers can report through their farmers' organisations electronically or manually. In addition, the district offices provide a service to farmers inserting data into the system. Slaughterhouses, assembly centres and ear tag producers/sellers have a direct access to the database.

Bovine animals sent for slaughter are reported by the slaughterhouse at slaughter. However the mission team noted in one of the farms visited that time limits for reporting the movement to the database when animals were sent to slaughter were not always complied with. Data showed up to five months' delay in the reporting. Furthermore, according to information received on the spot in one of the slaughterhouses visited, reporting into the central database can be related to the payment from the slaughterhouse to the farmers which can sometimes take place more than seven days after slaughter.

At a slaughterhouse the official veterinarian informed that two correctly ear tagged bovines not found in the central database had been slaughtered and were at the time of the visit in arrest awaiting identification. The mission team observed several food chain information documents where the individual number had not been filled in prior to slaughter, including the two animals under arrest.

According to the reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, Norway has no special rules for the movement of bovine animals for summer grazing. At the opening meeting the representatives of the NFSA informed the mission team that summer grazing is organised in several different ways, but often a few farmers have a common area where their animals are kept for summer grazing. Movements to and from these areas are not registered in the database as the grazing areas are not considered as a special holding and therefore do not have a holding number. The representatives informed that in some areas animals could be moved for around 50 km for summer grazing for up to three months. Norway has not requested a derogation from reporting movement of animals to summer grazing.

A representative of the beef cattle farmers' consultancy services visited was not aware of any time limits for the registration into the cattle database, but usually the information was registered the same day as it arrived and was automatically transferred to the cattle database simultaneously

In one holding visited, the keeper reported events through the dairy farmers' association. The mission team noted that not all births and movements to and from the holding were registered in the database within the seven-day limit stipulated, even though the farmer sent the information to the dairy farmers' association within the time limit and:

- According to the database 93 animals were on the farm, however, the mission team counted 101 animals;
- Eight ear tagged bulls of around 14 months of age observed on the holding were not reported into the database;
- Of the newborn calves, the 11 youngest were not yet reported to the database;
- Adding the figures, it is apparent that 11 animals registered in the database as being on the farm were not on the farm;

In one farm visited the mission team noted that events reported into the database in January 2011 were still pending at the time of the visit in October 2011. This was according to the farmer because the buyer did not report the event into the system. The representatives of the district office informed the mission team that the district office did not get any warning of discrepancies in the registration in the database and that they had to actively seek on farm level for discrepancies. Therefore they did not have any overview on inconsistency/discrepancy in the reporting to the database.

Data made available to the mission team during the mission showed that:

- In one of the farms visited the reporting of three movements to another farm in April and May 2010 and four from August to October 2010 were still pending as the keeper had not been able to report it to the database. The representatives of the NFSA explained this as a technical problem;
- In another farm visited during the mission, 49 of 99 events within the last 12 months were not reported within the time limits or had some inconsistencies in the reporting;
- In one municipality nine keepers out of 46 reported events in a given period within the time limits;
- In a farm visited 43 events of 103 reported within the last year were timely reported;

- All keepers visited tagged newborn animals the same day they were born. Reporting of the event was, however, rarely completed within the seven days time limit.

Searches available in the database and presented to the mission team during the mission showed that up to 77% of events on holdings were reported later than seven days after the event occurred. However, the personnel working with the database informed that these figures were not fully reliable as there were still errors in the data imported from the old database which biased the outcome.

Evaluation of the requirements of Authority Decision 17/03/COL

In relation to the requirements of Authority Decision 17/03/COL the mission team observed that:

- Not all types of movements were reported into the database. For instance auctions were held without the movement being registered. The representatives of the NFSA confirmed that the main movements reported in the database were sale, slaughter, death and lost animals. In addition it was possible to insert special remarks on individual animals such as move to auction. The mission team observed that not all personnel of the NFSA were aware of this possibility. The mission team noted that a bull registered on a holding visited had been rented out and moved to another holding through a dealer without the movement being registered;
- The mission team noted that the slaughterhouses and assembly centres of the same company were registered under the same holding number, although with different remarks if animals were sold or sent for slaughter. Representatives of the NFSA informed that there were still problems in assuring the correctness of information related to movement to and from assembly centres. All movements were recorded as if the animals went through the assembly centre although most of them were transported directly from holding to holding;
- Although administrative procedures were in place for sanctions, they were rarely used and not to their full extent. The mission team observed in the farms visited several breaches where representatives of the district office did not use sanctions, including movement restrictions, available in the legislation and specified in the guidelines of the NFSA;
- The use of the information in the database for control purposes is being developed and new search functions are being introduced and further development of searches is ongoing to assist the NFSA inspectors in their tasks. Two staff members at central level have been assigned special tasks with correcting errors and assisting inspectors with their tasks;
- Information on restrictions on movements is available in the database. However, no warning is issued to other stakeholders when holdings are placed under restrictions. The mission team verified this by having a simulation exercise carried out during the mission. The exercise showed that it was possible to move animals from a holding under restrictions and that this action did not initiate any warning on the status of the holding. Representatives met during the mission informed that routines were not in place to check whether holdings were placed under restrictions before entering data on movements into the database;

- Procedures for controlling the overall system for notifications of events was under development, but according to the representatives of the NFSA not yet reliable as errors originating from converting from the old system were still existing in the dataset;
- Procedures were established for verification of the data as, according to internal guidelines, 5% of farms shall be inspected per year and a pilot project comparing data in the central database with data in the register for subsidies was being carried out;
- Procedures aiming at minimising erroneous reporting, such as educational and training activities and meetings, were organized on a regular basis;
- Certain functions were available to the staff of the NFSA to control that time limits were respected. These were, however, seldom used in planning which holdings that were to be inspected;
- Animal keepers can access their information in the database on the internet. No measures had, however, been put in place by the NFSA to inform all animal keepers about the information recorded in the database.

Conclusions:

The NFSA has established a computerised database in accordance with Articles 14 and 18 of Directive 64/432/EC. However, the mission team found that compliance with points 2, 3, 6, 8, 13 and 14 of the preambles to the Authority's Decision 17/03/COL was not fully ensured.

The movement of animals to summer grazing areas and auctions without registering the movement into the central database is not in line with the requirements of Article 7(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000. Concerning movements to summer grazing areas, Norway has not made use of the possibility to request derogation from reporting these movements as provided for in the above mentioned Article.

Compliance with Article 7(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 was not ensured as according to data collected during the mission and observed on the holdings visited only a small percent of the events on holdings was reported within the time limits of seven days.

5.3.3 *Animal passports*

Legal requirements:

The requirements for issuing cattle passports and their return to the competent authority in case of death, intra-EEA trade or export are laid down in Article 6 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000. Whenever an animal is moved, it shall be accompanied by its passport.

Article 6(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 opens for a derogation from the use of passports as Member States whose computerised database is deemed to be fully operational may determine that a passport is to be issued only for animals intended for intra-EEA trade. Provisions concerning the passport are laid down in Articles 6 and 7 of Regulation (EC) No 911/2004.

The computerised database of Norway was considered fully operational by the Authority in 2003 by Authority Decision 17/03/COL.

Findings:

Norway has determined that passports shall only be issued for animals intended for intra-EEA trade as the central database was by the Authority Decision 17/03/COL considered fully operational.

The mission team noted that passports are issued for bovine animals intended for intra-EEA trade. Passports of animals from other EEA Member States are handed in to the NFSA on arrival. The passports issued by the NFSA contain information based on the computerised database.

Conclusions:

Passports are issued in accordance with the provisions of Regulations (EC) No 1760/2000 and No 911/2004. Norway has derogated from the use of passports for bovine animals moved within its territory in accordance with Article 6(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000.

5.3.4 *Individual registers kept on each holding*

Legal requirements:

Each animal keeper with the exception of transporters must keep up-to-date registers meeting the requirements of Article 7 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000. Further provisions concerning the register are laid down in Articles 8 and 9 of Regulation (EC) No 911/2004.

Article 7(4) of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 requires the competent authority to approve a format for holding registers and Article 10 of Regulation (EC) No 911/2004 requires the competent authority to inform the EFTA Surveillance Authority and other EEA States about the format of the holding register.

Article 8(e) of Regulation (EC) No 911/2004 requires that official inspectors sign the registers on the farms when checked.

Findings:

According to information provided by the NFSA in its reply to the Authority's pre-mission questionnaire and confirmed at the opening meeting by the representatives of the NFSA, Norway has not approved any specific format for a holding register. Accordingly, the registers used on the farms visited were not kept on an approved format, nor has other EEA States and the Authority been informed of an approved format for the holding registers.

The registers observed by the mission team contained different information from holding to holding. The information included in the holding registers was mainly targeted at the requirements of the farmers' organisations and the production concerned. One of the animal keepers used a printout from the central database as individual register together with health charts for each animal. The registers available were, however, not signed by the NFSA inspectors after their visits.

Conclusions:

Compliance with Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 and in particular Article 7(4) thereof could not be fully ensured since the NFSA had not approved a format for the holding

registers. Furthermore, compliance with Article 10 of Regulation (EC) No 911/2004 could not be ensured since Norway has not informed the Authority and other EEA States about an approved format of the register.

Compliance with Regulation (EC) No 911/2004 and in particular Article 8(e) thereof could not be ensured since the official inspectors are not signing the registers on the farms when checked.

5.3.5 *Official controls on the identification and registration of bovine animals*

Legal requirements:

According to Article 22 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 Member States are required to ensure compliance with this Regulation.

Regulation (EC) No 1082/2003 lays down the requirements for the minimum level of controls to be carried out in the framework of the system for the identification and registration of bovine animals.

Findings:

The head office of the NFSA has issued guidelines on official controls of ear tagging, registration and reporting of cattle which is accessible for the staff of the NFSA on the intranet. An updated version was sent out in August 2011 and contains detailed descriptions on action to be taken in case of non-compliances. The personnel met during the mission were not fully aware of the content of the guidelines. Representatives of some of the district offices informed the mission team this was due to substantial changes introduced in the latest update and therefore the offices were not so familiar with the application of the updated guidelines.

According to the guidelines the NFSA shall inspect at least 5% of bovine holdings annually. The inspection shall comprise all cattle on the holding. A possibility is given to derogate from this requirement by random check of animals but at least 2/3 of the animals must always be inspected.

The guidelines further stipulate that holdings to be inspected should be identified based on a risk analysis, using the following criteria:

- Producers with more than 10% difference in the number of animals in the cattle database and number of cattle applied for subsidies for;
- The number of animals on the holding, including details of all the animals present and animals identified on the holding;
- Public and animal health considerations, and in particular the existence of previous outbreaks of disease;
- Significant changes in comparison with situations in previous years;
- Results of checks conducted in earlier years;
- The proper keeping of the holding register;
- Proper communication of the data to the competent authority;
- Any other information accessible in MATS on restrictions on movement or other non-compliances found in other inspections.

The district offices visited except one informed that there was a focus on the identification of bovines and therefore identification was taken as part of many of the inspections carried out in the district. In one district 84 of 462 bovine holdings had been inspected for compliance with the requirements of identification. In addition, the registration into the central database was controlled by the official veterinarian at the slaughterhouse visited in that district. However, non-compliances detected at the slaughterhouse had only in a few cases resulted in an on-the-spot inspection of the holding.

In one district the representative of the district office informed the mission team that they doubted they had reached the minimum level of control as laid down in the EEA legislation.

In all regions visited, the mission team noted that the criteria for risk assessment given in the guidelines were not used for selecting inspection targets. Many of the representatives of the district offices of the NFSA informed the mission team that often non-compliances in animal welfare issues were observed in holdings with poor registration and therefore animal welfare issues were sometimes used as criteria for deciding which holdings to inspect for animal identification. However, the representatives of the NFSA informed that many of the holdings inspected were not chosen based on the criteria laid down in the guidelines and that it was difficult to extract the necessary information from the database. The mission team observed that searches carried out by the staff in the NFSA did not take into account all the factors to be used in carrying out the risk analysis for deciding on the holdings to be inspected.

The head office had also recently issued guidelines destined primarily for the district offices with official controls in slaughterhouses on how to react to incorrect identification of bovine animals. A notification system was introduced where the official veterinarian at the slaughterhouse is to inform the relevant district office which is then responsible for the follow-up.

Conclusion:

Compliance with Regulation (EC) No 1082/2003, in particular Article 2 thereof, could not be fully ensured since the selection of holdings to be inspected was in practice often not based on a risk analysis.

5.3.6 *Use of enforcement measures*

Legal requirements:

Commission Regulation (EC) No 494/98 laying down detailed rules as regards the application of minimum administrative sanctions in the framework of the system for the identification and registration of bovine animals. Articles 1, 2 and 4 specify how sanctions shall be imposed.

Findings:

The following table gives an overview of the sanctions imposed by the NFSA in the last three years.

Table 2: Sanctions imposed for non-compliances related to animal identification

	2008	2009	2010

Total number of sanctions imposed related to:			
a) Article 1 of Commission Regulation (EC) No 494/98	64	36	20
b) Article 2	122	464	0
c) Article 4	0	0	0

The mission team noted on the farms visited a varying degree of enforcement measures taken by personnel of the NFSA when non-compliances were observed. In one holding personnel of the NFSA placed an immediate movement restriction on animals incorrectly identified (one animal without ear tags and another with one ear tag). However, in that same farm events were not reported within the time limit. This did not lead to any sanctions or restrictions.

In the farm visited where eight animals were not registered in the database, five animals had one ear tag only and time limits were not respected for reporting of events into the database, the district office did not establish any restrictions on movement to and from the farm. In an inspection report issued after the visit the keeper was requested to correct the non-compliances. In none of the cases observed were any fines considered. According to information provided in the reply to the pre-mission questionnaire one fine for non-compliance had been issued in the last three years.

The mission team requested documentation on official controls on a farm under movement restrictions. Inspection reports made available to mission team showed that the farm was inspected on 10 December 2009. The report stated that on several occasions non-conformities had been observed on the holding related to identification of bovine animals. The officials of the NFSA observed many bovine animals on the holding in addition to the eight animals registered in the database. Around 20 animals were without any ear tags. In light of these observations the officials of the NFSA placed restrictions on the movement of animals from 15 December 2009.

The NFSA informed the mission team that normal procedures for placing movement restrictions on holdings were in steps, the first step being a letter of warning and that immediate restrictions were hardly ever imposed. In one district visited an official of the NFSA informed that sometimes farmers were advised orally to correct the non-conformity identified without any written warning.

At a slaughterhouse visited a representative of the NFSA informed that an animal arriving at the slaughterhouse with one ear tag was considered as a minor breach. In another slaughterhouse visited the official veterinarian informed that animal keepers which sent animals for slaughter with one ear tag only were warned that animals not complying with the identification requirements would not be accepted for slaughter.

Conclusions:

Compliance with Regulation (EC) No 494/98 and in particular Article 1 and 2 thereof was not fully ensured since the NFSA did not always take appropriate measures when animals not complying with the requirements of Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 were observed at the holdings visited during the mission, or when arriving at a slaughterhouse.

Compliance with Regulation (EC) No 494/98 and in particular Article 4 thereof could not be ensured since the NFSA did not take appropriate measures when keepers failed to respect the deadline set out in Article 7(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000.

5.4 Traceability system

5.4.1 *Traceability of beef and beef products*

Legal requirements:

According to Article 18 of Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 the traceability of food and food-producing animals and any other substance intended to be incorporated into a food shall be established at all stages of production, processing and distribution. In addition to the general requirements laid down in Article 18 of Regulation (EC) No 178/2000, more specific traceability requirements for beef are laid down in Articles 11 to 15 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000.

Findings:

All the three processing establishments visited by the mission team had a traceability system in place; this is a common system conceived for all the establishments belonging to the same company. In the slaughterhouse inspected by the mission team, lairage facilities where animals are kept before slaughtering were in sound condition allowing the identification of each animal by the official veterinarian in charge. In the two cutting plants visited a good traceability system was in place; however, in one of them the mission team observed 2,5 pallets with unidentifiable products.

During the visits to the two cutting plants, representatives of the company explained the mission team how the production chain is organised in order to set up a reliable traceability system; in particular the indication on the label of a batch number using the code L and a digit identifying the date of production (year+week+day) allowing the company to establish the link between the meat and the animal or group of animals in a maximum period of three hours. In the two cutting plants visited several simulation exercises to check the validity of their traceability system were organised during the year.

During the visits to several retail outlets, the mission team asked the management to trace back the origin of beef exposed and on sale in the shelves. The food business operators were not able to confirm the origin and the quantity of beef on sale.

Beef prepared from pieces of cut meat, packed and placed on sale in the same retail outlets were labelled without the basic relevant information indicating the slaughterhouse and cutting plant where the related operations took place.

Conclusion:

Traceability systems were in place in the processing establishments visited. However, in several retail outlets visited the registration system in place was not comprehensive and could not ascertain with confidence the trace-back of beef to the establishments of origin in accordance with Article 18 of Regulation (EC) No 178/2002, which jeopardise the traceability system in place.

5.4.2 *Official controls on the traceability of beef and beef products*

Legal requirements:

According to Article 22 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 Member States are required to ensure compliance with this Regulation.

According to Article 17(2) of Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 Member States shall monitor and verify that the relevant requirements of food law are fulfilled by food and feed business operators at all stages of production, processing and distribution.

Article 4(6) of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 requires verification of compliance with traceability requirements in all establishments approved in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 853/2004.

Findings:

At the slaughterhouse visited, bovine animals were checked on arrival for the presence of individual identification.

In one of the two cutting plants visited (annexed to a slaughterhouse) the official veterinarians used a checklist for individual identification of animals and proper tagging. No internal checklists were available for the verification of traceability in establishments and after the preparation of carcasses. The mission team was informed by the official veterinarians that traceability is checked from the arrival of the animals to the point where carcasses are prepared. No official checks had been carried out to verify the traceability system from carcasses to the final products and no checks on the reference number or reference code ensuring the link between the meat and the animal or group of animals were performed by the official veterinarians. A particular attention to traceability and labelling was nevertheless paid by the official veterinarians when sampling is carried out in the context of the residues programme or when treatments with drugs are reported (two animals in the last five years). The mission team verified that the information available on the labelling of the carcasses included several details allowing a full traceability to the farm of origin.

In another cutting plant (also annexed to slaughterhouse), the official veterinarian amended in 2008 a checklist used for inspections (taking place two-three times a week) allowing the issuing of a weekly report; in the same checklist the proper application of labelling on the final product was also mentioned. Also in this second cutting plant the official veterinarian confirmed that they had not carried out any checks to verify the internal traceability system of the company.

In both the cutting plants visited by the mission team, no inspection reports from the official veterinarians in relation to the traceability of beef from carcasses to final products were available.

In relation to official controls at retail outlets' level, representatives of the NFSA informed the mission team that very few guidelines have been issued since the implementation of the Food Hygiene Package in Norway. In relation to traceability the mission team was informed that the guidelines available for the official inspectors were dated 2001.

The official inspectors interviewed by the mission team stated that no inspection reports on traceability were available for the retail outlets under their control as the inspectors paid more attention, during their inspections, to the hygiene requirements.

The same NFSA representatives informed the mission team that no training sessions on the requirements of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 in relation to traceability and labelling had taken place.

In some of the retail outlets visited by the mission team, the registration system at various stages of the placing on the market of beef products was not comprehensive and did not ensure a link between the identification of the meat and the animal or animals concerned and/or did not maintain links between documentation at the arrival of the meat at the retail outlets and documentation within the retail outlets.

Conclusion:

Compliance with Article 22 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000, Article 17(2) of Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 and Article 4(6) of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 could not be ensured since the official controls did not verify that all requirements related to traceability of beef were fulfilled.

5.5 Compulsory EEA beef labelling system

5.5.1 Compulsory beef labelling system in place

Legal requirements:

Article 3 of Directive 2000/13/EC sets out the particulars of the labelling of foodstuffs to be delivered to the ultimate consumer. More specific requirements for labelling of minced meat intended to be eaten cooked are set out in Article 6 of Regulation (EC) No 2073/2005.

The compulsory indications on the label for beef of EEA or third country origin are described in Article 13 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000. Derogations from the compulsory labelling system by way of simplification or adding information are provided in Articles 14 and 15 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000.

Findings:

During the visits to two cutting plants belonging to the same company, the mission team had the possibility to verify that all products leaving the establishment of production were sealed in plastic bags bearing a labelling containing all relevant information. However, at retail outlets' level, the mission team observed that several products placed on the market, including products imported from third countries, did not fulfil the requirements related to compulsory labelling.

Examples of incorrect labelling observed were related to:

- Lack of information on “slaughtered in”, “cutting in” and/or “origin” (e.g. cut products stating *slaktet* (slaughtered) Norge but no origin or cutting in; products bearing only an oval stamp with approval number of the establishment but not information concerning the origin, the establishments of slaughtering and cutting, etc.)
- No indication of a reference number or reference code ensuring the link between the meat and the animal or animals;
- Lack of approval number for the relevant establishments;
- Products where the “best by date” was the only indication on the labels;
- Confusing information as regard origin in Norway and/or other countries (e.g. minced meat reporting *opprinnelse* (origin) as Norsk/Nordisk/Tysk (German));

- In general for minced meat, the date on which the minced meat is packed (*pakkedato*) was mentioned instead of the date on which the meat was prepared;
- Incorrect use of country names (e.g. the use of different wording for the origin such as Norsk, Nordisk, or the ISO Code NO instead of the name of the Member State);
- Incorrect order of the information given on the labels.

Specific to beef imported from third countries, the following was also observed:

- Beef imported from third countries with labels containing confusing indications not in conformity with the requirements (e.g. origin NO UE (where NO could be mislead with Norway considering the use of NO for Norway in other part of the label));
- In a supermarket wrong labelling mentioning establishments of slaughtering and cutting different from the real establishment concerned were observed together with the name of a third country of origin not approved for export of beef meat into the EEA market; the management justified the above as being due to human errors preparing the labels.

Conclusion:

The compulsory beef labelling systems in place revealed a consistent number of non-compliances related to the incorrect implementation of the requirements laid down in the EEA legislation, in particular Article 13 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000.

5.5.2 Official controls on the compulsory beef labelling system

Legal requirements:

According to Article 22 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 Member States are required to ensure compliance with this Regulation.

Article 5(2) of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 requires that health marking of carcasses of domestic ungulates, as well as half-carcasses, quarters and wholesale cuts shall be carried out in slaughterhouses by, or under the responsibility of, the official veterinarian when official controls have not identified any deficiencies that would make the meat unfit for human consumption.

Provisions for the identification marking of a product of animal origin are made in Article 5 and Annex II, Section I to Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 and verification of compliance with these requirements is foreseen by Article 4(6) of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004.

Findings:

The official veterinarian in charge of one of the slaughterhouse/cutting plants visited explained to the mission team that no checklist was available on the requirements concerning labelling of the final products. The official veterinarian was not familiar with those requirements and did not verify if the proper information concerning labelling was implemented by the company. No official reports on the inspections carried out by the NFSA in order to verify the validity of beef labelling were available in the first cutting plant visited. In the second cutting plant visited, the official veterinarian in charge explained that in the checklist in use for inspections, a box mentioning labelling was

mainly used to confirm that labels were applied on the packed beef without going into the details related to the compulsory requirements.

No guidelines have been prepared by the NFSA to be used by the official inspectors or by the food business operators in relation to compulsory labelling; however a document (FACTA) was issued by the NFSA in 2007 repeating the requirements laid down in Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 related to compulsory labelling.

The NFSA inspectors responsible for the official controls of supermarkets/retail outlets interviewed by the mission team stated that no specific attention was paid during their inspections to the compulsory beef labelling because priority was given to the hygiene requirements; therefore no inspection reports on compulsory labelling were available for the food business operators under their control. The deficiencies identified by the mission team during the visits to supermarkets/retail outlets were not pointed out by the NFSA officials.

Conclusion:

Compliance with Article 22 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 and Article 4(6) of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 could not be ensured since official controls did not verify and ensure compliance with the compulsory labelling requirements, in particular at retail level.

5.6 Voluntary beef labelling system

5.6.1 Voluntary beef labelling system in place

Legal requirements:

Article 16 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 sets out the general rules for approval of voluntary beef labelling systems. Article 16 also establishes the procedure for approval of voluntary beef labelling systems if beef production and/or sale take place in two or more Member States.

According to Article 17 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000, the food business operator may label beef produced, in full or in part, in a third country, with information other than compulsory labelling, if they have obtained for their specifications the approval of the competent authority designated for that purpose by each of the third countries concerned. The validity within the Community of an approval granted by a third country shall be subject to prior notification by the third country to the Commission of the criteria set in Article 17(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000.

Findings:

According to information provided by the NFSA in its reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority no voluntary labelling systems have been approved by the NFSA and there was no knowledge of any beef-labelling systems approved by competent authorities in third countries which are applied in Norway. The mission team noted that the competent authorities did not pay particular attention to the voluntary beef labelling system. Examples of voluntary labelling were identified by the mission team which was not known nor considered by the NFSA, e.g.:

- Products providing additional information on the breed (Limousine, Tiroler Grauvieh, Charolais);

- Products reporting voluntary indications on the labels (level of tenderness, *naturell*, type of farm production etc.);
- Labels on products included wording not related to product information (e.g. *ny deklarasjon*) placed immediately below the description of the meat products;
- Products imported from third countries mentioning the geographic area of provenance and the breed; from other third countries mentioning the type of production (finest meat *aturkjøtt*, raised in open fields).

Conclusion:

The NFSA had no overview of voluntary labelling systems in use in Norway and in third countries.

Specifications of labels containing indications other than those provided for by Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 were not approved by the competent authorities as required by Article 16 of the Regulation. Furthermore, the competent authorities did not know if voluntary labelling systems applied on third country products were approved in accordance with Article 17 of the Regulation.

5.6.2 *Official controls on the voluntary beef labelling system*

Legal requirements:

According to Article 22 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 Member States are required to ensure compliance with this Regulation.

Findings:

According to information provided by the NFSA representatives on the spot and evidence pointed out by the mission team during the several visits at retail outlets' level, official controls over the voluntary beef labelling system are not carried out in Norway as also explained in the previous point 5.6.1.

Conclusion:

Official controls on the voluntary beef labelling system is not carried out in Norway (national production or imported).

6 Final meeting

The final meeting was held at the NFSA head office in Oslo with representatives of the NFSA and the Ministry of Agriculture on 12 October 2011. At this meeting, the mission team presented its main findings and some preliminary conclusions of the mission. At the meeting the mission team also explained that, based on a more detailed assessment of the information received during the mission, additional conclusions and recommendations could be included in the report.

The Norwegian representatives did not indicate any disagreement with the observations and preliminary conclusions presented by the mission team.

7 Recommendations

Norway 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
	<i>Legislation</i>
1	Norway should ensure that all the relevant requirements provided for by Commission Decision 2006/28/EC is implemented in Norwegian legislation.
	<i>Holding registration</i>
2	Norway should ensure that all places where animals are kept are defined in accordance with Article 2 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000, and registered as required by Article 14(3)C of Council Directive 64/432/EEC .
	<i>Ear tags to identify animals individually</i>
3	Norway should ensure that all bovine animals are correctly identified at all times in accordance with Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000.
4	Norway should ensure that it is only possible to order ear tags for one year's use as laid down in Article 1(5) of Regulation (EC) No 911/2004.
5	Norway should ensure that derogations for extending the time limit for tagging of certain animals are in accordance with the requirements of Commission Decision 2006/28/EC and should inform the Authority if it applies Commission Decision 2006/28/EC.
	<i>Computerised database</i>
6	Norway should ensure that the established computerised database meets all the requirements of the Authority's Decision 17/03/COL.
7	Norway should ensure that all movements of bovine animals are reflected in the central database, including movements to summer grazing areas and auctions, as laid down in Article 7(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000.
8	Norway should ensure the timely reporting of all events into the central database in accordance with Article 7(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000.
	<i>Individual registers kept on each holding</i>
9	The NFSA should approve a format for the holding register to be used on bovine holdings and ensure that official inspectors sign the registers on the farms when checked in accordance with Article 7(4) of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 and Article 8(e) of Regulation (EC) No 911/2004.
10	Norway should inform the Authority and other EEA States about the approved format of the register in accordance with Article 10 of Regulation (EC) No 911/2004.
	<i>Official controls on identification and registration of bovine animals</i>
11	Norway should ensure that the selection of holdings to be inspected is risk based in accordance with Article 2 of Regulation (EC) No 1082/2003.
	<i>Use of enforcement measures</i>
12	Norway should ensure that sanctions are imposed when discrepancies are identified in accordance with the requirements laid down in Regulation (EC) No

	494/98.
	<i>Traceability system</i>
13	<p>The competent authority should ensure that traceability systems are correctly established in accordance with Article 18 of Regulation (EC) No 178/2000 and Articles 11 to 15 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000.</p> <p>The competent authority should ensure that official controls are carried out in accordance with Article 22 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000, Article 17(2) of Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 and Article 4(6) of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004.</p>
	<i>Compulsory EEA beef labelling systems</i>
14	Norway should ensure that the labelling of beef and certain beef products, including beef of third country origin contain all compulsory labelling requirements as laid down in Section I of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000; the competent authority should also ensure that relevant controls are carried out in accordance with the same regulation and Article 4(6) of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004.
	<i>Voluntary beef labelling systems</i>
15	Norway should ensure that each operator or organisation using labels containing indications other than those provided for in Section I of Regulation (EC) 1760/2000 sends a specification for approval to the competent authority in line with the requirements of Section II of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000. The competent authority should also ensure that official controls are carried out in accordance with Article 22 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000.

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

Authority	EFTA Surveillance Authority
EEA	European Economic Area
EEA Agreement	Agreement on the European Economic Area
Food Act	The Norwegian Food Act of 19 December 2003 No 124.
ISO	International Standard Organisation
Food Hygiene Package	<p>A term that refers to a group of European Regulations that represent a significant reorganisation of the regulatory framework for food and feed hygiene and safety. The package builds on general food law basis established by <i>Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 of the European Parliament and the Council laying down the general principles and the requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Safety Authority and laying down procedures for matters of food safety.</i></p> <p>The Food Hygiene package includes several Regulations, <i>inter alia</i>, Regulations (EC) No 852/2004, 853/2004, 854/2004 and 882/2004.</p>
MATS	NFSA's quality control system
NFSA	Norwegian Food Safety Authority

Annex 2 – Relevant legislation

Legislative acts

- a) The Act referred to at Point 1.2.20 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Commission Decision 93/317/EEC of 21 April 1993 concerning the content of the code to be used on bovine ear marks*, as amended and as adapted to the EEA Agreement by the sectoral adaptations referred to in Annex I thereto;
- b) The Act referred to at Point 1.2.76 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Commission Regulation (EC) No 494/98 of 27 February 1998 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 820/97 as regards the application of minimum administrative sanctions in the framework of bovine animals*, as amended;
- c) The Act referred to at Point 1.2.86a of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Commission Regulation (EC) No 509/1999 of 8 March 1999 concerning an extension of the maximum period laid down for the application of ear-tags to bison (*Bison bison* spp.)*;
- d) The Act referred to at Part 1.2.118 of Chapter I to the Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Commission Decision 2004/292/EC of 30 March 2004 on the introduction of the Traces system and amending Decision 92/486/EEC*, as amended;
- e) The Act referred to at Point 1.2.140 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Commission Regulation (EC) No 1082/2003 of 23 June 2003 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the minimum level of controls to be carried out in the framework of the system for the identification and registration of bovine animals*, as amended;
- f) The Act referred to at Point 1.2.141 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Commission Regulation (EC) No 911/2004 of 29 April 2004 implementing Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards eartags, passports and holding registers*, as amended and adapted to the EEA Agreement by the sectoral adaptations referred to in Annex I thereto;
- g) The Act referred to at Point 4.1.1 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Council Directive 64/432/EEC of 26 June 1964 on health problems affecting intra-Community trade in bovine animals and swine*, as amended and as adapted to the EEA Agreement by the sectoral adaptations referred to in Annex I thereto;
- h) The Act referred to at Point 7.1.13 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 laying down the general principles and requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Safety Authority and laying down procedures in matters of food safety* as amended and adapted to the EEA Agreement by the sectoral adaptations referred to in Annex I thereto;
- i) The Act referred to at Point 6.2.52 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Commission Regulation (EC) No 2073/2005 of 15 November 2005 on microbiological criteria for foodstuffs*, as corrected and amended;

- j) 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 amended and adapted to the EEA Agreement by the sectoral adaptations referred to in Annex I thereto;
- k) The Act referred to at Point 1.1.12 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 laying down specific rules for the organisation of official controls on products of animal origin intended for human consumption*, as amended and adapted to the EEA Agreement by the sectoral adaptations referred to in Annex I thereto; and
- l) The Act referred to at point 18 of Chapter XII of Annex II to the EEA Agreement, *Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 March 2000 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to labelling, presentation and advertising of foodstuffs*, as corrected by OJ L 124, 25.5.2000, p.66, as amended and adapted to the EEA Agreement by the sectoral adaptations referred to in Annex II thereto.

EFTA Surveillance Authority Decisions

- a) Decision No 17/03/COL of 5 February 2003 recognising the fully operational character of the Norwegian database for bovine animals

Annex 3 – Figures for the production and trade

Table 3: Information on holdings and animals

Bovine animals	2008	2009	2010
Total number of bovine holdings	20448	19297	24027
Total number of bovine born	214 427	316 093	316 942
Total number of bovine slaughtered	323 018	310 828	304 828

Table 4: Statistical information on number of bovine holdings and on official control carried out

	2008	2009	2010
Total number of holdings registered	20448	19297	24027
Total number of holdings inspected	969	1485	1931
Total number of inspections carried out	1080	1594	2259
Total number of bovine livestock	915200	900567	884327
Total number of bovines inspected	44237	57500	107785
Types of inspections carried out:			
a) physical checks	1080	1594	2259
b) documentary checks	1080	1594	2267
c) checks on delayed notification	1080	1594	2259

Table 5: Information linked to non-compliances found

	2008	2009	2010
Total number of non-compliances found related to:			
a) physical checks	2678 animals	1548 animals	341 animals
b) documentary checks	904 animals	1683 animals	156 animals
c) checks on delayed notification	4779 notifications	1897 notifications	855 notifications

Table 6: Domestic trade

	2008	2009	2010
Bovine animals moved from one holding to another:	75543	97398	100434

Table 7: Import from other EEA countries and third countries

	2008	2009	2010
Bovine animals imported from other EEA countries and third countries:	7	0	0

Country of origin: Germany.

Table 8: Export to other EEA countries and third countries:

	2008	2009	2010
Bovine animals exported to other EEA countries and third countries:	16	2	47

Countries of destination: Hungary, England and Lithuania.

Table 9: Livestock slaughtered (number of animals)

	2008	2009	2010
a) cattle	306 054	296 499	290 748
b) calves/veal	16 964	14 329	14 080

Table 10: Meat production (tons, excluding condemnments)

	2008	2009	2010
a) beef	84 214	82 863	81 559
b) calves	1 807	1 628	1 576

Annex 4 – Reply from the NFSA to the draft report



EFTA Surveillance Authority
Rue Belliard 35
B-1040 BRUSSELS
Belgium

Your ref
C No 69990 Ev No 613504

Our ref
A 201001542/ADO
desk 46

Date
19.12.2011

Subject: EFTA Surveillance Authority mission to Norway 3-12 October 2011 regarding application of EEA legislation related to identification, registration and movements of live bovine animals and labelling of beef and beef products
· **Response to draft report**

Please find enclosed the Norwegian Food Safety Authority's response to the draft report from the mission regarding identification, registration and movements of live bovine animals and labelling of beef and beef products.

Yours sincerely,


Cathrine Steinland
Acting Deputy Director General


Anne Felde Doser
Adviser

Copy:
Ministry of Health and Care Services

Enclosure 1

Postal address PO Box 8097 Dep 0090 Oslo	Office address Akersgt. 59	Telephone +47 22 24 90 90 Org. no.: 972 417 874	Department of Food Policy Telefax +47 22 24 95 59	Our officer Anne Felde Doser +47 22 24 91 39
--	-------------------------------	--	---	--

EFTA Surveillance Authority
Rue Belliard 35
B 1040 Brussels

Case no: 68890
Your ref: Event no: 608968
Our ref:
Date: 15.12.2011
Org.nr: 985 399 077

Statens tilsyn for planter, fisk, dyr og næringsmidler



EFTA SURVEILLANCE AUTHORITY - MISSION TO NORWAY 3 TO 12 OCTOBER 2011 REGARDING IDENTIFICATION, REGISTRATION AND MOVEMENT OF LIVE BOVINE ANIMALS AND LABELLING OF BEEF AND BEEF PRODUCTS - DRAFT REPORT

We have received the draft report from the mission to Norway 3-12 October regarding the application of EEA legislation related identification, registration and movement of live bovine animals and labelling of beef and beef products.

Comments on the draft report

Norway has a few comments on the factual content of the draft report. The comments follow below. In addition we also have some suggestion to change the COL decision of 5 February 2003 recognising the fully operational character of the Norwegian database for bovine animals.

5.2.1

Bovine holdings in Norway are registered in a computerized database with a unique identification number consisting of eight digits. This should be changed to: Bovine holdings in Norway are registered in a computerized database with a unique identification number consisting of ten digits.

5.3.1

Bovines are required to be identified by two yellow ear tags. This should be changed to: Bovines are required to be identified by two ear tags. The ear tags can be of any colour except white or salmon red.

In addition to the two yellow ear tags, bovines coming from another holding in Norway or another EEA State, should be marked with a white ear tag in one ear. According to representatives of the NFSA, this additional requirement is to be abandoned in 2012. NFSA just received information from the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, that this additional requirement will not be abandoned until 1.1.2013.

Norwegian Food Safety Authority
Head Office

Saksbehandler: Hege B. Bysheim
Tlf: 0047 51 58 43 48
Besøksadresse:
E-post: postmottak@mattilsynet.no
(Husk mottakers navn)

Postadresse:
Felles postmottak, Postboks 383
2381 Brumunddal
Telefaks: 23 21 66 01

www.mattilsynet.no

Adjustments to the COL decision from 5. February 2003.

It was mentioned during the inspections that NFSA could comment on changing some of the requirements laid down in the decision. We suggest following adjustments:

7: Since the Central Database now is an integrated part of the quality management system (MATS) and it is the NFSA that operates this database, this requirement should be withdrawn from the decision.

9: NFSA wish to remove this requirement from the decision. The Central Database is designed so that all required information can be registered on each holding. However it is not possible to verify that all required information is registered by each farmer.

12: NFSA suggest that the wording in this requirement is changed to:
A procedure shall be put in place in order to verify the information entered into the cattle database. Measures for rapid correction of errors on the farm and in the database revealed by the verifying process shall be included in the procedure.

14: NFSA suggest that this requirement is withdrawn. All farmers have access to the information registered in the database regarding their own holding, through logging onto NFSA's web portal.

Yours sincerely,

Kristina Landsverk
Director
Dep. of Control