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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Port of Rotterdam</th>
<th>10.8 mln TEU</th>
<th>Porthlength: 40 km</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>407 Mln metric tons</td>
<td>Quaylenght: 74 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.895 ships</td>
<td>Portarea: 10,500 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Veterinary import control

EU legislation 97/78:
– Activities take place in the BIP’s Border Inspection Posts
– BIP are designated by the EU
– Based on guarantees by veterinary authorities from 3rd countries
– Control on all products
  o Live animals 100%
  o Percentage depends on EU risk assessment ....
– At least D- and I-check
– At the most followed by Physical check and laboratory testing
Definitions:

**Documentary check**
The examination of documents that accompany the consignment,

**Identity check**
Visual inspection to ensure that certificates/ CVED accompanying the consignment tally with the labelling & content of the consignment

**Material/Physical check**
Check on the product itself to verify compliance with feed or food law (organoleptic, sampling for analysis and laboratory testing and any other check necessary)
Activities BIP

At least D- and I-check, at the most followed by Physical check and laboratory testing
Laboratory checks

• Safeguard measures: e.g. heavy metals fishery products Indonesia
• Reinforced measures: art. 24 97/78
• Monitoring plan: residues and micro biology
Results of Checks (NL 2005-2007)

• Total number of consignments: 166,104
• Volume: 2,670,884 tons
• Number of refused consignments: 707 (0.4%)
• Main reasons for refusal: no/invalid health certificate, wrong labelling/no certainty that consignment matches with certificate, hygiene problems
• Main 3rd countries where refused products came from: BR, CN, US, TH, KR, NV, IN, PE, MA, SG, SR
## Results of Checks (NL 2005-2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>fresh meat</th>
<th>fresh poultry</th>
<th>fishery products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number of consignments</td>
<td>30,982</td>
<td>34,974</td>
<td>46,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of physical checks</td>
<td>9,943</td>
<td>17,805</td>
<td>17,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of refusals</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>failing physical check</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of laboratory checks</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>2,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive lab. Results</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do these results justify severe checks? What are the real risks?

• Need for scientific research: what are real risks to be checked at border controls?
• Need for in-depth analysis of results of past years on import checks.
882/2004: Import of food, risk based approach

- Based upon: Notifications received from the Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed (RASFF);
- Reports received from the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO);
- Quantity of products introduced into the European Community;
- Reports received from third countries;
- Communication between Member States, European Commission and European Food Safety Authority (EFSA);
- Scientific assessment, where appropriate;
- Any other relevant information.
New approach: 882/2004 art 15.5

• Questions to be answered: are all products of animal origin to be treated as ‘high risk’ products as is the case now. Do all these checks have to be performed at the border?
• For animal health reasons all checks are to be performed at the point of entry.
New approach: 882/2004 art 15.5

• Challenging our creativity: Based on the results of EC working groups or an advise from EFSA in a standing committee meeting it can be decided that certain products are not longer high risk products (Canned products like corned beef);
• Less controls have to be done at the points of entry, even if the amount of shipments are growing each year;
• We follow the risk based principles as set out in 882/2004.
Food for thought?
Import of food (PNOAO)

- Risk assessment as seen on a previous sheet;
- Obligatory checks (D 504/2006);
- Increased level of official controls (near future list of art. 15.5 products);
- Monitoring (other high/medium risks).

**ANNEX I**

**Feed and food of non-animal origin subject to an increased level of official controls at the designated point of entry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feed and food (intended use)</th>
<th>CN code</th>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>Frequency of identity and physical checks 1 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groundnuts (peanuts) and derived products (feed and food)</td>
<td>1202 10 90; 1202 20 00; 2008 11;</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Aflatoxins</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PNOAO: highest reject at import

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Peanuts, Pistachios, ... from a.o. Argentina, Brazil, China, USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Estimation of the incoming volume of high risk products**

**trade value**: € 600 million
Figures: Food (NOAO) figures 2006

- **Signals:** ca. 14,300 risky consignments
  May consist out of more than 1 container
  ca. 30% non food, ca 70% food

- **Physical checks:** ca. 1,600 consignments
  Mostly on mycotoxins

- **Non compliant:** ca. 300 consignments
  equivalent of ca 13,365,000 Kg