

Mid-term evaluation of Regulation (EU) No 652/2014 on food and feed expenditure

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

INTRODUCTION

Consultation Period

The consultation runs for 13 weeks from 16/12/2016 to 17/03/2017.

Objective of the consultation

This public consultation is designed to support the mid-term evaluation of the [Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council](#) establishing a [Common Financial Framework](#) which covers the spending for animal health measures, plant health measures, official controls and other activities. The mid-term evaluation focuses on the activities undertaken under Reg. (EU) No 652/2014 during the period of 2014-2016.

The objective of this open consultation is to ensure that, in addition to the organisations and individuals directly involved in or benefitting from the activities of Reg. (EU) No 652/2014, wider stakeholder groups and the general public are provided with possibility to express their opinion about the financial instrument and its future priorities.

The results of this consultation will be combined with the other evidence to evaluate the EU Regulation for animal health, plant health and food safety expenditure. Besides assessing the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and the EU added-value, the results will shape the future food and feed programme.

Language

The questionnaires are in **English** only, though responses can be submitted in any EU official language.

Transparency and confidentiality (European Transparency Initiative)

Your contribution received from this survey, together with your identity will be published on the European Commission's website, unless you object to publication of the personal data on the grounds that such publication would harm your legitimate interests. In this case, the contribution will be published in an anonymous form.

*Is the entity on whose behalf you are replying registered in the EU Transparency Register?

☒ Yes

☐ No

*Please indicate the registration number in the Transparency Register in the box below:

██████████

Contact details

European Commission, Directorate General for Health and Food Safety
B - 1049 Brussels, Belgium

PRIVACY STATEMENT

- * ☒ I certify that I have read the [privacy statement](#) and confirm that I give consent to the processing of my personal data in the framework of this consultation according to Article 5(d) of Regulation No 45 /2001.

I. INFORMATION ABOUT RESPONDENT

This section consists of questions about the respondent. We would like to know who our respondents are in order to better understand their perspective, expectations and needs regarding [Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014](#) relating to food chain, animal and plant health expenditures.

***1.1. I am responding as**

- ☐ An individual
☒ On behalf of an organization/institution

***Name of the organization**

International Federation for Animal Health - Europe AISBL

*1.2 Country of Residence

- ☐ Austria
- ☒ Belgium
- ☐ Bulgaria
- ☐ Croatia
- ☐ Cyprus
- ☐ Czech Republic
- ☐ Denmark
- ☐ Estonia
- ☐ Finland
- ☐ France
- ☐ Germany
- ☐ Greece
- ☐ Hungary
- ☐ Ireland
- ☐ Italy
- ☐ Latvia
- ☐ Lithuania
- ☐ Luxembourg
- ☐ Malta
- ☐ Netherlands
- ☐ Poland
- ☐ Portugal
- ☐ Romania
- ☐ Slovak Republic
- ☐ Slovenia
- ☐ Spain
- ☐ Sweden
- ☐ United Kingdom

1.3 Sector of employment

Animal Health

*1.4 E-mail address

[REDACTED]

1.5. How familiar are you with [Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014](#) relating to food chain, animal and plant health expenditures?

- ☐ Very familiar
- ☐ Quite familiar
- ☒ Somewhat familiar
- ☐ Not very familiar
- ☐ Not at all

***1.6. Please indicate if you have work experience regarding Regulation (EU) No 652/2014 in any of these areas (more than one answer possible)**

- ☒ Animal health measures
- ☒ Veterinary emergency measures
- ☐ Phytosanitary survey programmes
- ☐ Phytosanitary emergency measures
- ☐ European Union Reference laboratories activities
- ☐ Better training for safer food
- ☐ None of them
- ☐ Other

***1.7. Please indicate your preference for the publication of your response on the Commission's website:**

- ☒ I consent to publication of all information in my contribution, including my personal data
- ☐ I do not consent to the publication of my personal data as it would harm my legitimate interests. My contribution may be published in an anonymous form
- ☐ I prefer to keep my contribution confidential. (it will not be published, but will be used when analysing the results of the consultation)

(Please note that regardless of the option chosen, your contribution may be subject to a request for access to documents under Regulation 1049/2001 on public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents. In this case the request will be assessed against the conditions set out in the Regulation and in accordance with applicable data protection rules.)

*1.8. Copyright

Any submission made by you on this website represents an agreement that the data you submitted will be used by the European Commission for the purposes of the mid-term evaluation of Regulation (EU) No 652/2014 (meaning that your contributions may be published individually or be part of a synthesis and referred to as meaningful example). Following your submission you understand that you authorise the European Commission to reproduce, print, publish and make available your contributions in print and electronic version, permit others to use the content of parts of it in other words, in the form of summaries, translated in other languages, published on other websites, printed etc.

- ☒ I took note of the above copyright clearance conditions and I agree with it
- ☐ I don't agree, please keep my contribution only for internal use in the Commission

II. RELEVANCE

This section consists of questions to assess the extent to which the [Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014](#) objectives are valid and in accordance with food chain needs in your Member State (MS) and the EU.

*2.1. In your opinion, should co-funding for food safety, animal and plant health expenditures be an EU priority?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

*Please specify:

In the interest of animal health, we consider co-funding opportunities for animal health to be an essential tool to ensure disease prevention and the timely and efficient handling of animal diseases.

2.2. To which extent do you think the [Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014](#) objectives are valid and in accordance with the current food chain needs (safer food, improved animal and plant health, effective official controls) in your Member State (MS)?

2.2.1. Animal health EU co-funded measures for the prevention of transmissible diseases in animals and of zoonoses address the needs to ...

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
*prevent transmissible diseases in animal and zoonoses.	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
*prevent the occurrence of outbreaks of animal diseases and zoonoses which pose a risk to human and animal health.	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
*support your MS to become and stay free from animal diseases and zoonoses.	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
*reduce the number of outbreaks of animal diseases and zoonoses which pose a risk to human and animal health.	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2.2.2. Animal health EU co-funded emergency measures (eradication, control and surveillance) address the needs to...

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know

*cope with exceptional circumstances related to animal health.						
*compensate costs of emergency vaccination campaign.						
*compensate costs of emergency eradication measures.						
*implement enhanced biosecurity measures during outbreaks.						
*distract and transporting of carcasses.						
*control the presence of transmissible diseases in animal and zoonoses.						

2.2.3. Plant health EU co-funded survey measures concerning certain pests address the needs to...

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
*timely detect pests and their eradication.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
*support Member States in actions on plant health control, prevention or eradication.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

2.2.4. EU co-funded plant health emergency measures address the needs to ...

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
*protect free trade in plants and plant products within the EU	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
*protect free trade in plants and plant products between the EU and third countries.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
*cope with exceptional circumstances related to plant health.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
*immediately eradicate outbreaks of quarantine pests.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

2.2.5. Control: The EU co-funded measures concerning to trainings for safer food (BTSF) address the needs to ...

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
*provide training on food safety related subjects	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
*keep staff of competent authorities involved in official control activities up-to-date with all aspects of community law.	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
*ensure that controls are carried out in a uniform manner in all Member States.	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
*ensure that controls are carried out in an objective manner in all Member States.	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
*ensure that controls are carried out in an adequate manner in all Member States.	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

2.2.6. Control: The EU co-funded measures regarding the EU Reference Laboratories (EURLs) address the needs to...

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
*harmonise the testing procedures across the EU.	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
*harmonise the testing capacities (skills, knowledge) across the EU.	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

2.2.7. Additional question

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
*The Regulation is flexible enough to adopt to technical and scientific progress (e.g. development of new vaccines or new survey programmes)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

2.3. Are there any other relevant needs that are covered by [Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014](#) that are not mentioned above?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☒ Do not know

2.4. Are there any other needs identified or emerged that [Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014](#) should cover and are not yet been addressed?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ Do not know

III. EU ADDED VALUE

This section consists of questions to detect the extent to which [Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014](#) creates benefits that are additional to the value that would have otherwise been created by Member States intervention only.

3.1. Compared to what could be achieved without the intervention of [Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014](#), to what extent do you think [Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014](#), has improved the functioning of animal health measures, plant health measures and official control activities.

3.1.1. EU co-funded measures for the prevention of transmissible diseases...

	Fully	To a large extent	To some extent	Not at all	NA / Do not know
*further improve prevention of transmissible diseases in animal and zoonoses.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
*further reduce the number of outbreaks of animal diseases and zoonoses which pose a risk to human and animal health.	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

3.1.2. Animal health emergency measures further...

	Fully	To a large extent	To some extent	Not at all	NA / Do not know

*improve actions to cope with exceptional circumstances related to animal health.					
*improve the Member State action on animal health control, prevention or eradication.					
*improve and harmonise contingency plans that prevents an emergency to become a crisis.					
*improve cooperation and coordination in the rapid response network by appropriate and timely communication.					
*support Member States to conduct emergency vaccination campaign.					
*enhance biosecurity measures in case of disease outbreaks.					
*improve the control transmissible diseases in animal and zoonoses.					
*improve the actions in distraction and transport of carcasses during eradication programmes.					

3.1.3. EU co-funded survey measures concerning pests further ...

	Fully	To a large extent	To some extent	Not at all	NA / Do not know
*fasten the timely detection of certain plant pest detection.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
*support Member States to take harmonised actions on plant health control, prevention or eradication.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

3.1.4. Measures for plant health emergency measures further ...

	Fully	To a large extent	To some extent	Not at all	NA / Do not know
*enhance implementation of biosecurity measures in case of plant pests.					
*enhance sustainable use of pesticides.					
*speed up the eradication when an outbreak of plant diseases takes place.					
*contribute Member States to take harmonised action on plant health control, prevention or eradication.					
*improve the capacity (skills and facilities) to cope with exceptional circumstances related to plant health.					

3.1.5. BTSF programmes financed by the Regulation ...

	Fully	To a large extent	To some extent	Not at all	NA / Do not know
*improve the skills and knowledge of officials from competent authorities	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
*increase awareness regarding the control in animal health and plant health related issues	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
*improve the harmonisation of control systems of animal health and plant health related issues	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

3.1.6. EURLs programmes co-financed by the Regulation ...

	Fully	To a large extent	To some extent	Not at all	NA / Do not know
*improve early detection animal diseases and pests	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
*improve the harmonisation of tests across EU	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

3.1.7. What do you think could be the most likely consequence(s) if Regulation (EU) No 652/2014 stops or withdraws the EU co-financing? (more than one response possible).

- ☐ Same measures will be implemented and fully paid by the Member States
- ☐ New measures will be implemented
- ☐ Measures will be implemented more efficiently because there will be less administrative burden at EU level
- ☒ Less measures will be implemented by the Member States because of shortage of financial resources
- ☒ Uniformity of measures among Member States will decrease in the short term
- ☒ Uniformity of measures among Member States will decrease in the long term
- ☐ Other

3.2. Please provide any other comments on the EU added value of [Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014](#)

IV. EFFECTIVENESS

This section consists of questions to assess the extent to which [Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014](#) has moved towards its objectives in the period of 2014-2016.

4.1. Does [Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014](#) have a positive impact or makes a valuable contribution towards the following objectives:

	Fully	To a large extent	To some extent	Not at all	NA / Do not know
*functioning of the internal food market	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
*competitiveness of the agro-food industry at EU level	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
*competitiveness of the agro-food industry at global level	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
*trade between and within Member States	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
*trade between EU and non-EU countries	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
*consumer confidence in food	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

4.2. To which extent do you expect EU co-funded measures that are put in place to achieve the specific objectives of [Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014](#).

4.2.1. EU co-funded measures for the prevention of transmissible diseases contribute to ...

	Fully	To a large extent	To some extent	Not at all	NA / Do not know
*reducing the number of cases of diseases in humans linked to zoonoses					
*increasing the number of Member States or Regions free from animal diseases					
*overall reducing the incidence, prevalence and number of outbreaks					
*reducing the transmissible diseases in animal and zoonoses.					
*effectively controlling transmissible diseases in animal and zoonoses.					
*preventing the occurrence of outbreaks of animal diseases and zoonoses which pose a risk to human and animal health.					

4.2.2. EU co-funded animal health emergency measures contribute to ...

	Fully	To a large extent	To some extent	Not at all	NA / Do not know
*preventing outbreak to become a crisis	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
*effectively controlling the presence of transmissible diseases in animals and zoonoses	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐

4.2.3. EU co-funded survey measures concerning pests contributes to ...

	Fully	To a large extent	To some extent	Not at all	NA / Do not know
*enhanced biosecurity in case of disease outbreaks.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
*enhanced biosecurity measures in case of plant pests.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
*sustainable use of pesticides.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
*control, prevention or eradication relating to plant health.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

4.2.4. EU co-funded plant emergency measures contribute to....

	Fully	To a large extent	To some extent	Not at all	NA / Do not know
*timely detection of the presence of certain plant diseases	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
*immediate eradication of outbreaks of plant diseases.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

4.2.5. EU co-funded measures with respect to EU reference laboratories, BTSF (trainings) and controls contribute to ...

	Fully	To a large extent	To some extent	Not at all	NA / Do not know
*increase awareness in food safety related subjects	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
*harmonised approach to official controls and other official activities.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
*uniform, objective, and adequate controls in all Member States.	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
*harmonised and robust test procedures across the EU (related to EURLs).	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
*better understanding of the EU law regarding animal and plant health by public inspection officers	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

*4.3. Please mention the most important positive impact and/or valuable contribution from [Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014](#) intervention in terms of food safety, animal health, plant health and official control?

Some valuable contributions include funding for the eradication, control and surveillance of (the listed) animal diseases and zoonoses; allowing for additional emergency measures related to the listed animal diseases; compensation for vaccination campaigns.

***4.4. Which factors played an important role in achieving these results?**

No comment provided

***4.5. Please mention the most important negative impact from CFF intervention in terms of food safety, animal health, plant health and official control?**

No comment provided.

***4.6. Which factors played an important role in achieving these results?**

No comment provided.

V. EFFICIENCY

This section consists of questions to assess the extent to which the employed resources of [Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014](#) programmes have been optimally used to achieve the desired results.

Table (Planned) expenditure of Regulation (EU) No 652/2014 funding in million euros for different programmes

Year	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Eradication programmes and other veterinary measures	180.0	178.5	177.0	175.0	171.5	171.5	171.0
Plant health survey and seeds	5.0	10.0	14.0	19.0	25.0	28.5	30.5
Animal health and plant health emergency measures	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0
Controls	45.7	47.4	50.4	53.6	57.5	60.0	62.2
Support/administrative measures	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7
Total	2267.4	2273.6	2280.1	2287.3	2294.7	2301.7	2306.4

***5.1. In your opinion was the overall budget provided in 2014 and 2015 sufficient to undertake the (necessary) actions (required):**

- ☐ Yes
☒ No
☐ Do not know

*** In case you think that the budget was not sufficient, please explain the reasons (how this impacted the actions to be undertaken)**

Funding for veterinary measures and animal health emergency measures need to be retained and in cases increased to maintain and augments the overall animal health status in Europe.

***5.2. In your opinion, the allocation of the budget over different programs:**

- ☒ Is appropriate
☐ Needs to be changed because:

*** 5.3. Please explain your response and provide at least 2 reasons for your choice.**

We would encourage greater awareness and appreciation for the programmes in Europe, including greater information-sharing or transparency surrounding the expenditure and impact of the programmes. Perception and appreciation of the programmes is moderate, and at times inaccurate.

5.4. Please indicate how efficient [Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014](#) operates relating to the following aspects

	Very efficient	Somewhat efficient	Neutral	Somewhat inefficient	Inefficient	NA / Do not know
*exceptional circumstances related to animal health.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
*emergency vaccination campaign.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
*emergency eradication measures.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
*preventing transmissible diseases in animal and zoonoses.	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

*preventing the occurrence of outbreaks of animal diseases and zoonoses which pose a risk to human and animal health.						
*reducing the number of outbreaks.						
*enhanced biosecurity measures during outbreaks.						
*controlling the presence of transmissible diseases.						
*food safety and food production systems.						
*exceptional circumstances related to plant health.						
*immediate eradication of outbreaks of quarantine pests.						

*a timely detections of pests and their eradication.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
*training on food safety related subjects.	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
*harmonised control system.	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
*harmonised results of tests across the EU.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

*5.5. Are you familiar with the predecessor programmes of [Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014](#)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No
- ☐ Do not know

5.6. Please indicate how efficient [Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014](#) procedures operate relative to the previous funding arrangements (before 2014).

	Very efficient	Somewhat efficient	Neutral	Somewhat inefficient	Inefficient	NA / Do not know
*A quick implementation of the interventions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
*Simplification of the Union co-financing in the food chain	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
*Rationalisation of the Union co-financing in the food chain	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

*5.7. Are there shortcomings in implementation of [Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014](#) procedures?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☒ Do not know

5.8. The procedural changes introduced in [Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014](#) have boosted/increased efficiency by:

	Very efficient	Somewhat efficient	Neutral	Somewhat inefficient	Inefficient	NA / Do not know
*simplifying the legal framework, by replacing it by one legislation covering the whole food and feed area						
*aligning the financial tools with the new EU Financial Regulation, notably in relation to grants						

5.8.1. optimizing and harmonising the financial procedures and financial management tools with respect to ...

	Very efficient	Somewhat efficient	Neutral	Somewhat inefficient	Inefficient	NA / Do not know
*aligning phytosanitary to veterinary procedures	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
*harmonising deadlines for programmes	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
*the setting of clear objectives and indicators	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
*the rationalization of funding rates.	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐

VI. COHERENCE

This section consists of questions to assess the extent to which the EU spending for food and feed measures are consistent with the political priorities in the food safety area. You are asked to answer the questions by indicating the degree of coherence (e.g. complementarity, synergy), neutrality (measures do not interact with each other) or incoherence (e.g. compete, conflict).

6.1. In your opinion, to which extent [Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014](#) is coherent with respect to national policy measures of your Member State?

	Synergy	Complementary	Neutral	Compete	Contradict	NA
*Animal health policies						
*Plant health policies						
*Official controls: measures to detect diseases timely						
*Official controls: Reference laboratories						
*State aid related to emergencies						

6.2. In your opinion, to which extent [Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014](#) is coherent with respect to other EU policies?

	Synergy	Complementary	Neutral	Compete	Contradict	NA
*Animal Welfare policy	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
*General Food Law	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐
*Environmental policy	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
*Public Health policy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

*EU trade policy (e.g. phytosanitary measures, economic border measures such as tariffs, trade bans)						
*Common Agricultural Policy (CMO; e.g. marketing standards, producer organisations, emergency fund)						

*Common Agricultural Policy (RDP; e. g. quality schemes, farm management and relief services, restoring agricultural production potential damaged by natural disasters and catastrophic events, risk management)						
--	---	---	---	---	---	---

***6.3. Please provide here any other national or EU programme that contradict / compete / overlap / complement/ create synergy with programmes supported by [Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014](#). (maximum 2000 characters)**

No comment provided

Useful links

[Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014 laying down provisions for the management of expenditure relating to the food chain, animal health and animal welfare, and relating to plant health and plant reproductive material \(http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32014R0652\)](#)

[Regulation \(EU\) No 652/2014 - factsheet \(https://ec.europa.eu/food/sites/food/files/safety/docs/cff_food-chain_factsheet_en.pdf\)](#)

[Common Financial Framework \(https://ec.europa.eu/food/funding_en\)](#)

[Funding of Animal Health Measures \(https://ec.europa.eu/food/funding/animal-health_en\)](#)

[Funding of Plant Health Measures \(https://ec.europa.eu/food/funding/plant-health_en\)](#)

[Funding of Official Controls \(https://ec.europa.eu/food/funding/official-controls_en\)](#)

[Questions and answers on Common Financial Framework for the Food Chain 2014-2020 \(https://ec.europa.eu/food/sites/food/files/safety/docs/cff_food-chain_question-answers_en.pdf\)](#)

Background Documents

[consultation 20161213 food-and-feed-exp_privacy-statement.pdf \(/eusurvey/files/ac49b8c4-5867-44dc-8dcf-c877b0b41a04\)](#)

Contact

Geoffrey.CARDOEN@ext.ec.europa.eu
