



Brussels, 26.9.2017
SWD(2017) 314 final

COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT
Accompanying the document

Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and to the Council

Mid-term evaluation of Regulation (EU) No 652/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council 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, amending Council Directives 98/56/EC, 2000/29/EC and 2008/90/EC, Regulations (EC) No 178/2002, (EC) 882/2004 and (EC) No 396/2005 of the European Parliament and of the Council, Directive 2009/128/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council and repealing Council Decisions 66/399/EEC, 76/894/EEC and 2009/470/EC

{ COM(2017) 546 final }
{ SWD(2017) 315 final }
{ SWD(2017) 316 final }

1. INTRODUCTION

The European Commission provides financial support to a number of measures within the food chain policy, aimed to contribute to a high level of health for humans, animals and plants. The provisions for the management of this expenditure are laid down in Regulation (EU) No 652/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 May 2014. In particular, it covers the spending for food chain, animal health and animal welfare, plant health and plant reproductive material. It entered into force at the end of June 2014 and established a Common Financial Framework (CFF) for all these areas (hereinafter: the "CFF Regulation").

Article 42 of the Regulation provides that the Commission establishes and presents to the European Parliament and to the Council a mid-term evaluation report by 30 June 2017. The Commission Report shall assess whether, in terms of their results and impacts, the measures referred to in Chapters I and II of Title II (respectively, animal health and plant health measures) and in Articles 30 and 31 of Chapter III (respectively, European Union Reference laboratories and training activities) of the Regulation achieve the objectives set out in Article 2(1), as regards the efficiency of the use of resources and its added value, at Union level. The Report shall address the scope for simplification, the continued relevance of all objectives, and the contribution of the measures to the Union priorities of smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. It shall also take into account results on the long-term impact of the predecessor measures.

The present Staff Working Document (SWD) summarises the outcome of the mid-term evaluation based on the results of a study conducted by an external contractor and on an internal assessment performed by the Commission. The mid-term evaluation fully covers the implementation of the above-referred measures for 2014, 2015 and partially 2016, dependant on preliminary data available. It also takes into account results on the long-term impact of the predecessor measures. It provides a qualitative and quantitative overview of the measures implemented under the CFF Regulation, and assesses them against the five evaluation criteria set by the Better Regulation¹ policies in the European Commission: relevance, European added value, effectiveness, efficiency and coherence.

The assessment of the sectorial policies under which the financed measures fall are not in the scope of this evaluation.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. The CFF Regulation

In line with the Communication 'A Budget for Europe 2020'², the CFF Regulation was envisaged in order to improve the functioning of the activities implemented within this area, as well as to focus on EU funding priorities providing real added value. In this view, it aimed

¹ https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/law-making-process/better-regulation-why-and-how_en

² http://ec.europa.eu/budget/library/biblio/documents/fin_fwk1420/MFF_COM-2011-500_Part_I_en.pdf

at modernising and rationalising the pre-existing financial provisions, providing a simplified financial framework covering the whole food safety area.

Most of the spending measures covered by the CFF Regulation used to receive EU financial support under the previous legislation, notably:

- in the veterinary area: eradication, control and surveillance programmes (hereinafter: "veterinary programmes") implemented by the Member States, which are aimed to progressively eliminate animal diseases and zoonoses and to implement disease control measures; and the veterinary emergency measures, which are aimed to timely cope with emergency situations related to animal health: before the entry into force of the CFF, those activities were covered by the so-called "veterinary fund", namely Council Decision 2009/470/EC;
- in the phytosanitary area: emergency measures to timely cope with emergency situations related to plant health, while preventing further spread and introduction into the Union territory; prior to the CFF Regulation, they were co-financed under Directive 2000/29/EC;
- in the area of official controls: the European Union Reference Laboratories (EURLs) activities, which are aimed to ensure high-quality, uniform testing in the EU and to support the Commission activities on risk management and risk assessment in the area of laboratory analysis; and the Better Training for Safer Food (BTSF) programme, which is a training initiative addressing national authority staff involved in official controls in the areas of food and feed law, animal health and welfare and plant health rules: before the CFF they received financial support under Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.

Since the entry into force of the CFF Regulation, all the spending activities listed above have their financial provisions under a single framework, with harmonised procedures, standardised rates, clarified eligible costs and measures. From the operational point of view, they are being implemented in full continuity with the predecessor measures.

The CFF Regulation introduced new measures in the phytosanitary area, namely the possibility to co-finance the implementation of survey programmes concerning the presence of pests in the Union territory. They consist of surveillance measures allowing preventing the introduction into the EU or the spread within the EU of harmful organism.

2.2. Objectives of the CFF Regulation

The general policy objective of the CFF Regulation is to contribute to a high level of health for humans, animals and plants along the food chain and in related areas, by preventing and eradicating diseases and pests and by ensuring a high level of protection for consumers and the environment, while enhancing the competitiveness of the Union food and feed industry and favouring the creation of jobs.

This general objective is crystallised into four specific objectives, one for each of the four spending areas covered by the regulation itself, namely: food safety, animal health and welfare, plant health, official controls.

The specific objectives are accompanied by a number of specific indicators, also set out in the CFF Regulation itself, which provides a preliminary basis to conduct a sectorial evaluation of the measures implemented under each of the four covered spending areas.

Following to the adoption of the CFF Regulation, those specific indicators were further translated by the DG SANTE policy units concerned into 21 operational technical indicators (listed in Annex VI), which were used in the context of the present evaluation.

The CFF general objective, specific objectives, and specific indicators are shown in the table below:

Table 1. CFF objectives and indicators

General objective			
To contribute to a high level of health for humans, animals and plants along the food chain and in related areas, by preventing and eradicating diseases and pests and by ensuring a high level of protection for consumers and the environment, while enhancing the competitiveness of the Union food and feed industry and favouring the creation of jobs			
Specific objectives			
<u>Food safety:</u> to contribute to a high level of safety of food and food production systems and of other products which may affect the safety of food, while improving the sustainability of food production	<u>Animal health and welfare:</u> to contribute to achieving a higher animal health status for the Union and to support the improvement of the welfare of animals	<u>Plant health:</u> to contribute to the timely detection of pests and their eradication where those pests have entered the Union	<u>Official controls and other activities:</u> to contribute to improving the effectiveness, efficiency and reliability of official controls and other activities carried out with a view to the effective implementation of and compliance with the Union rules (referred to in Article 1)

Specific indicators			
A reduction in the number of cases of diseases in humans in the Union which are linked to food safety or zoonoses	An increase in the number of Member States or their regions which are free from animal diseases in respect of which a financial contribution is granted	The coverage of the Union territory by surveys for pests, in particular for pests not known to occur in the Union territory and pests considered to be most dangerous for the Union territory	A favourable trend in the results of controls in particular areas of concern carried out and reported on by Commission experts in the Member States
	An overall reduction of disease parameters such as incidence, prevalence and number of outbreaks	The time and success rate for the eradication of those pests	

To achieve the objectives, the EU funding under the CFF Regulation addresses problems related to three major categories of needs in this area, namely the demands for:

- increased protection, by preventing risks which might affect animals, plants or any step of the food chain;
- proper and timely reaction in case of crisis, by extinguishing the emergency factor or containing its spread;
- healthier animals and plants, and safer food, by eliminating diseases and pests which affect the EU Member States.

The implementation of the CFF activities is articulated in several levels of intervention, and the specific actions implemented vary depending on the degree of presence of the disease or pest concerned in the EU territory.

If a disease or a pest is not present in the EU or in a Member State, but there is a risk that it could enter its territory, a number **prevention** measures are put in place to avoid its introduction. Particularly, these measures concern the so-called "trans-boundary" diseases or pests, which are able to spread and transmit regardless of any geographical barrier. They mainly consist in the funding of monitoring activities to be conducted in a buffer zone in neighbouring third countries or regions. In addition, for some strategic animal diseases, a vaccine stock ("vaccine bank") is also established at EU level, to be immediately used in case of emergency situations.

If a certain disease or pest is more likely to enter or has already entered the EU or a Member State, **surveillance** activities are put in place to, respectively, timely detect its introduction or assess its epidemiological evolution since the initial stages. The early detection is of fundamental importance especially in the case of certain animal diseases and plant which,

once entered, may have a potential devastating effect on animal and crop production and on public health.

In case an outbreak occurs, **early reaction** measures are immediately implemented to prevent the spread of the disease or the pest, and to extinguish the outbreak in a short time, in order to minimize the impact on, for instance, plant and animal production and trade. These emergency interventions include felling of infected trees and phytosanitary treatments, culling of infected animals or, when possible, emergency vaccination, accompanied by movement restrictions.

When an animal disease or a plant pest is endemic or detected in the Union territory, a number of **cure** activities are put in place to progressively eliminate it from the concerned area and prevent its further spread. Particularly, they consist in medium- or long-term eradication programmes implemented by the Member States, with a consequent positive impact for the Union as whole in terms of on public health, animal or plant productions, internal market and trade.

The comprehensive set of measures described above, implemented by the Member States, is complemented by the funding of additional activities aimed to enhance the safety of EU food products in the interest of all European citizens. Particularly, financial support is given for the EU Reference Laboratories (EURLs), which ensures high-quality and uniform testing in the EU, and provides trainings to hundreds of National Reference Laboratories (NRL) in a number of food safety priority areas. Another main element of the EU co-financing for food safety is the initiative "Better Training for Safer Food", aimed at training every year some 7000 officials of national competent authorities involved in official controls.

3. METHOD

The basis for the evaluation was set up in the evaluation roadmap³. The evaluation was supported by an Interservice Steering Group, which oversaw the whole evaluation exercise.

The evaluation focuses on the first three years of implementation of the CFF Regulation, fully assessing 2014 and 2015 and only partially 2016, based on preliminary data available.

As requested by Article 42 of the CFF Regulation, the following domains were addressed:

- Animal health:
 - Emergency measures.
 - Programmes for eradication, control and surveillance of animal diseases and zoonosis (hereinafter: veterinary programmes), where:
 - Eradication programmes aim to result in biological extinction of an animal disease or zoonosis. The final target of an eradication programme shall be to obtain the free or officially free-status of the territory according to Union legislation, where such possibility exists.
 - Control programmes aim to obtain or maintain the prevalence of an animal disease or zoonosis below a sanitary acceptable level.

³ http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/roadmaps/index_en.htm.

- Surveillance programmes refer to activities to collect and record data on specific diseases in defined populations over a period of time, in order to assess the epidemiological evolution of the diseases and the ability to take targeted measures for control and eradication.
- Plant health:
 - Emergency measures.
 - Survey programmes concerning presence of pests.
- Official controls and other activities:
 - European Union Reference laboratories.
 - Training (Better training for Safer Food Initiative).

The above-listed spending measures were firstly assessed using the set of 21 operational technical indicators previously developed and monitored at level, which were shared with the contractor at the very initial stages of the external study supporting the evaluation. The qualitative and quantitative description of those measures was complemented with the gathering of data, which was undertaken in a stepwise approach using the following sources:

- Data sources of the Commission:
 - financial data (e.g. budget implementation), technical data (e.g. operational indicators); annual financial and technical reports covering animal and plant health, implementation of emergency measures by Member States, EURLs and BTSF.
 - indicators on e.g. trade, animal population;
- Literature review: studies, evaluations, conducted either independently or on behalf of the Commission on CFF-related topics;
- Stakeholder consultation, consisting of:
 - Open public consultation: questionnaire published in English during 12 weeks on the European Commission ‘Public consultations’ website that received 5 responses
 - Targeted stakeholder consultation with specific questionnaires for:
 - Competent authorities, stakeholders linked to the industry (including farmers' organisations, veterinary organisations), EU and national associations, international organisations and NGOs.
 - EU Reference Laboratories
 - Better Training for Safer Food initiative
 - In-depth stakeholder interviews: addressing representatives of the European Commission, and other selected stakeholders (Competent authorities, industry representatives, NGOs) in a number of Member States. The aim of the interviews was to identify achievements, good practices, problems and challenges regarding implementation of the CFF Regulation. The main purpose of the interviews was to fill information gaps and check information retrieved from other sources for triangulation.
- Case studies: covering a significant selection of animal diseases and plant pests; based on the assessment of the results from the desk study and questionnaires, several stakeholders were identified to be interviewed for the case studies.

All relevant stakeholders group were reached by the consultation procedure, and most individual stakeholder contacted cooperated in the exercise.

The final report of the external study supporting the evaluation provides an overview of the measures implemented over the three-year period 2014-2016. There are however a number of issues to consider when assessing the strengths of the evidence base used for this study, specifically linked to the limited time available to undertake the evaluation:

- The mid-term evaluation exercise started in the second half of 2016, where complete technical and financial data were only available for the first two years of implementation of the CFF Regulation.
- A number of transitory measures applied during both 2014 and 2015, while the provisions laid down in the CFF Regulation are fully applicable only from 2016.
- The mid-term evaluation has considered the long-term impact of predecessor measures except in the phytosanitary area, notably for the survey programmes which were firstly implemented in the framework of the CFF Regulation.

Moreover, no cost-effectiveness analysis has been developed so far in the CFF area. Whilst a methodological approach to conduct this kind of economic analysis was expected to be delivered in the context of the external study, the task was not investigated as requested. Therefore, a significant instrument to perform the evaluation is missing. These shortcomings have objectively limited the external analysis, which is mostly descriptive and largely based on the opinions of the stakeholders and on the perceptions of the beneficiaries of the CFF financial support. It does not include an in-depth investigation of the causal effects behind the results and impacts achieved by the implementation of the CFF Regulation. The overall evaluation exercise is nevertheless complemented by the internal assessment conducted at EU level, which largely relies on the continuous analysis performed at policy, technical and financial level by the Commission services, including the constant dialogue with all CFF beneficiaries for both scientific and budgetary aspects. The monitoring of the operational technical indicators' values was particularly useful in the context of this evaluation: even if they do not provide cost-effectiveness results, those indicators allow evaluating the achievements and/or the performance of the major activities implemented thanks to the EU funding in the areas covered by the CFF.

4. IMPLEMENTATION STATE OF PLAY

The CFF has a maximum total ceiling for expenditure of EUR 1 891 936 000⁴ over the seven-year period 2014–2020. Table 2 below shows the amounts committed during the period under evaluation, which were substantially in line with the forecasted budget. For the concerned years, it was sufficient to cover the different needs, thanks to the good results achieved in the four spending areas; the positive trend mainly concerned the animal health field, especially eradication programmes, where the successful implementation of long-term measures led to the progressive reduction of the related spending, and veterinary emergency measures, whose ad hoc system of early detection and intervention allowed to timely extinguish or contain the outbreaks occurred in the period under evaluation, therefore limiting the associated costs.

⁴ In current prices

Table 2. Commitments for 2014, 2015 and 2016 CFF activities

	2014	2015	2016
Veterinary programmes and vaccines	172.356.231	164.017.000	161.553.100
Plant health survey programmes	205.500	7.585.000	11.375.400
Animal health and plant health emergency measures	12.662.896	16.111.611	27.376.398
EURLs	15.001.000	15.500.000	16.000.000
BTSF	14.885.000	14.685.000	15.365.000
Total	215.110.627	217.898.611	231.669.898
<i>Forecast budget (in million euro)</i>	<i>253,4</i>	<i>258,5</i>	<i>261,0</i>

The main direct beneficiaries of the EU financial contribution made under the CFF are the competent authorities in the Member States, which receive a compensation for the eligible costs incurred to carry out the eligible measures. Both the eligible measures and the eligible costs are listed in the CFF Regulation.

The Union financial contribution mostly takes the form of grants (the only exception being the voluntary payments to international organizations), with a basic reimbursement of no more than 50% of the eligible costs; under specific conditions, the applicable rate can be increased to 75% or 100%.

4.1. Animal health

The CFF Regulation contribution for animal health covers the implementation of veterinary programmes, which are aimed to implement eradication, control or surveillance activities for animal diseases and zoonoses, and of veterinary emergency measures, carried out to timely intervene in the occurrence of outbreaks or epidemics affecting animals. The diseases eligible for EU financial contribution under veterinary emergency measures and programmes are listed, respectively, in Annex I and in Annex II to the CFF Regulation. The eligible costs (including, for example, the costs of animals slaughtering/culling and the vaccination costs) are also listed in specific articles of the Regulation. Annex III to the CFF Regulation lists the priorities for Union financial support as regards the orientation of veterinary programmes: based on these priorities for funding, and on the annual evaluation of the epidemiological situation and of the most immediate risks identified, 10 out of the 25 diseases listed in Annex II to the CFF Regulation have been identified as priority diseases for the period 2014-2016⁵. Payments for veterinary programmes alone make up almost three quarters of the expenditure under the EU food chain budget. For the 2014 and 2015 programmes, it amounted to, respectively, EUR 136.22 and EUR 147.90 million.

⁵ African swine fever; avian influenza in poultry and wild birds; classical swine fever; rabies; bovine brucellosis; ovine and caprine brucellosis; transmissible spongiform encephalopathies; zoonotic Salmonella; bovine tuberculosis; bluetongue in endemic or high risk areas.

Over the period considered, the programmes addressing five diseases, namely bovine tuberculosis, TSE/BSE/scrapie, rabies eradication, salmonella, and ovine & caprine brucellosis, represented between 84% and 90 % of the payments for veterinary programmes.

The MSs with the highest co-funding of animal health programmes are UK, Spain, Italy, Ireland and Poland. The amounts strongly depend on the type of disease addressed, on the specific measures co-financed and on the epidemiological situation in the Member States concerned.

If the total spending for veterinary programmes is consistent, payments for animal health emergency measures are volatile, depending on the changes in the epidemiological situation over the years. For the measures implemented in 2014 and 2015, they amounted to, respectively, EUR 7.67 and EUR 11.76 million.

During the period considered, about 50% of the budget has gone to emergency payments for avian influenza, followed by African swine fever (17%) and bluetongue surveillance (14%).

4.2. Plant health

The CFF Regulation contribution for plant health covers the implementation of survey programmes, which are aimed to support early detection of pests in the EU territory, and implement phytosanitary emergency measures in case of outbreaks.

The list of pests eligible for EU co-financing under the survey programmes includes hundreds of harmful organisms, which are subject to an annual prioritisation. This list is not integrated in the CFF Regulation, but laid down in the specific plant health legislation. Survey programme were first established and co-financed in 2015, with 17 EU countries presenting a programme in 2015 and 22 in 2016. Payments for 2015 survey amounted to EUR 4.2 million, (payment for 2016 will be finalised by end of 2017).

The implementation of phytosanitary emergency measures are instead developed for a limited number of pests which deserve a more targeted control strategy in order to prevent further spread and introduction into the rest of the Union territory. Among other pests, emergency measures have been developed so far for *Xylella fastidiosa*, *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus* (so called: "Pinewood nematode") *Anoplophora chinensis* and *Anoplophora glabripennis*, *Pomacea*, *Epitrix* spp., whose further spread into the Union territory can cause unacceptable social, environmental and economic consequences. The objective of eradication of plant pests remains a complex objective to achieve due to lack of effective treatment solutions, the high number of susceptible plant species, population dynamics and lifecycle of pests and their vectors present in forests, parks and plantations with high economic, social and environmental value. Very few experience has proven that eradication is possible only if decisive measures are put immediately in place. This was the case in two out of four outbreaks of Pinewood nematode in Spain, two outbreaks of *Anoplophora chinensis* in Denmark and in The Netherlands and two outbreaks of *Anoplophora glabripennis* in Germany and in The Netherlands. However, when the pest is considered to be established in a certain territory and eradication is no longer feasible, containment measures may still provide sufficient guarantees

to prevent further spread of the pests in the Union territory. In this respect, for example, the EU financial support has allowed to successfully containing Pinewood nematode in Portugal since 1999, minimising the risk of further spread to neighbouring Member States, while preserving the functioning of the internal market. Similarly to the animal health area, although very limited in scale, the amount paid in plant health for emergency measures varies substantially between years. For the measures implemented in 2014 and 2015, payments amounted to EUR 7.2 and EUR 0.9 million, respectively. In the period considered, as far as emergency measures are concerned, three pests alone, namely *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus*, *Anoplophora glabripennis* and *Pomacea insularum*, were responsible for almost all payments (91%) for plant health emergency measures.

4.3. Official controls

The main spending measures carried out under the official controls area consist of the activities performed by the EU Reference laboratories, the implementation of the BTSF programme.

EU Reference Laboratories (EURLs) activities are financed at 100% by the EU food chain budget, and are aimed to ensure high-quality and uniform testing in the EU, and to provide trainings to hundreds of National Reference Laboratories (NRL) in a number of food safety priority areas. This ensures that the regulatory framework is applied in a consistent way as regards laboratory analysis and compliance testing used in the context of official control.. Annual payments for EURLs have been increasing over the last years, from EUR 14,01 million for 2014 activities to EUR 14,46 million for 2015 and EUR 16 million for 2016⁶.

The "Better Training for Safer Food" initiative is also financed at 100% by the EU budget, and consists of a training programme aimed to prepare national staff from both EU Member States and third countries in all areas covered by the CFF Regulation. The BTSF training programme has covered, for the three years considered, 52 topics of key importance for the CFF areas, such as: foodborne outbreak investigations, African swine fever outbreaks management. This initiative has trained every year some 7000 officials of competent authorities involved in official controls, promoting a common approach towards the implementation of EU legislation. Annual expenditure for BTSF activities amounted to EUR 15 million for 2014 trainings and to EUR 14,5 million for 2015 trainings.

5. ANSWERS TO EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The mid-term evaluation assessed the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, coherence and EU added value of the CFF Regulation, answering to the twelve evaluation questions addressed in respect to these five evaluation criteria.

⁶ Provisional data

5.1. Relevance

To measure the relevance, questions were asked about the extent to which the objectives of the CFF Regulation are still valid and in accordance with food chain needs in Europe, and on whether new relevant needs have emerged since the adoption of the Regulation itself.

EQ1. To what extent are the CFF objectives still valid and in accordance with food chain needs in the EU?’

The specific objectives set out in the CFF Regulation are mostly valid, and the EU financial supports towards their achievement continue providing a response to the specific EU needs in this field.

In the animal health area, the contribution to a higher animal health status remains the overarching goal, which is being attained through the implementation of both emergency measures and veterinary programmes. Outbreaks of diseases having a high potential impact on human and animal health, as well as from the economic and social points of view, occur every year. As the number of outbreaks and their impact vary substantially between years, it is necessary to keep emergency funding at EU level, with financial resources specifically and immediately available to address crisis events, to ensure a rapid and comprehensive response in those cases. The CFF has also the facility to take action against new emerging diseases (such as LSD), therefore adapting to new needs. Veterinary programmes also remain a funding priority for the achievement of the relevant CFF objectives, especially eradication activities, in the light of the long-term impact of their implementation. Those programmes proved to be successful in most cases, and many of them, such as the programme addressing rabies, can be wound down in the near future due to complete eradication.

As concerns plant health, the objective of the timely detection of pests and their eradication once they have entered the Union remains the key priority for the Union. However, very few experience has proved that eradication of plant pests is achievable and only in case effective measures are implemented at the very earliest stages of the outbreak (Eradication has been successful only in few cases: two out of four outbreaks of Pinewood nematode in Spain; two outbreaks of *Anoplophora chinensis* in Denmark and in The Netherlands; two outbreaks of *Anoplophora glabripennis* in Germany and in The Netherlands. *Vice-versa*, Member States have been able to successfully contain or minimise the risk of further the spread of some pests into the rest of the Union territory (e.g. *Pomacea* in Spain, Pinewood nematode in Portugal). The contribution to the timely detection and to the implementation of strict emergency measures through EU funding is increasingly relevant, particularly when those activities are combined with surveillance programmes to check the presence of harmful organisms.

The complementary activities carried out by the EURLs and in the context of the BTSF programme have been contributing to the effective implementation of and compliance with the Union rules in this area⁷. In fact, such activities - from the tests carried out by the laboratories to the trainings addressing national officials - have supported a uniform

⁷ Mid-term evaluation of Regulation (EU) No. 652/2014 (IBF International Consulting, 2017), pages 92-93

implementation of controls throughout the EU and to a common understanding across Member States of their obligations and how to best enforce relevant EU legislation.⁸ Their importance remains strategic within the overall food chain system, where a major objective is still the improvement of the effectiveness, efficiency and reliability of official controls.

The validity of the horizontal food safety objective is to be framed within the overall implementation of the CFF Regulation, considering that its achievement results from the combination of all sectorial measures financially supported by the CFF. Animal health, plant health, and official control activities all contribute to having a high level of safety of food and of food production systems, in the interest of all EU citizens. The safety of food requires safe and healthy animals, plants and a high-standard system of controls. The European agricultural productions are globally appreciated for their quality as well as for their high-level safety standards, making the EU agri-food industry the largest manufacturing sector in Europe and a leading player worldwide. In this context, the EU food safety budget plays an important role in supporting the specific measures contributing to achieve this objective⁹.

EQ2. Are the needs identified at the time of the adoption of the CFF still relevant or have new needs emerged which necessitate an adjustment of the Regulation?’

The general food chain needs identified at the start of the CFF are still relevant, as they mainly consist of either long-term or permanent issues which have been successfully addressed thanks to the EU financial contribution.

Being situated under the Commission's priority on security and citizenship, the CFF has to be seen within the context of protection of the EU's productions, its industry, as well as each single citizen. This need translates into the food safety policy, which is primarily aimed at protecting human, animal and plant health in the EU. Protection is a solid concept in this policy area: the principle "prevention is better than cure" has been the leading thread since the launch of the EU animal health strategy (AHS), ten years ago, then embraced in the plant health area too. The strengthening of the protective approach is closely related to the continuous enhancement of the crisis preparedness system, which has been a pillar of the EU food safety system for a long time. It consists of a number of measures put in place in view of either avoiding or minimising the sanitary and economic impact of possible future crises, depending on the severity of the situation. The early detection is of fundamental importance especially in the case of certain animal diseases and plant pests which, once entered, may have a potential devastating effect on animal and crop/forests production and on public health. Thanks to early detection and to immediate application of EU co-funded emergency measures the EU has experienced no large-scale food safety crises for almost ten years, and all outbreaks have been successfully contained. Three year after the entry into force of the CFF Regulation, all the above mentioned needs remain fully relevant, and the EU financial intervention to ensure they are adequately covered has to be confirmed, in the interest of all European citizens.

⁸ Mid-term evaluation of Regulation (EU) No. 652/2014 (IBF International Consulting, 2017), page 113

⁹ Mid-term evaluation of Regulation (EU) No. 652/2014 (IBF International Consulting, 2017), page 96

Still, thematic priorities are discussed every year and adjusted to the epidemiological situation which is actually prevailing in the context of the annually approved Commission work programmes: aspects such as the impact on human health, and the potential to generate serious economic consequences are taken into consideration. In this respect, the CFF has shown the flexibility to integrate these needs into the current arrangements, with no need to make adjustment in the general provisions laid down in the legal basis. Besides the prioritization of animal diseases and plant pests, new specific needs have emerged during the very last years, particularly related to the occurrence of new diseases or pests or to their unexpected development. The evolution of diseases such as Peste des Petits Ruminants, LSD and Sheep Pox diseases, for example, which were previously addresses by emergency measures only, has required a more structured support at EU level through the implementation of veterinary programmes; the specific list of eligible diseases was integrated accordingly in 2016, and those programmes will be implemented in the Member States concerned from 2018. This new needs implied specific adjustments in the area of official controls too, where additional EURLs were created in 2016 for each of the three animal diseases mentioned above. The BTSF initiative has also proven flexibility to respond to new needs, notably during crisis events, when it has contributed to both prevention and crises-preparedness. A concrete example is the BTSF training organised in response to the African Swine Fever or to the plant bacterium *Xylella fastidiosa* emergency, as well as the training on foodborne outbreak investigations, which was organised during the three years considered and focused on subjects such as outbreak preparedness, outbreak management, and crisis communication, addressing national teams of public health, veterinary and phytosanitary experts and food safety authorities.

5.2. Effectiveness

Effectiveness had questions on the extent to which the general and specific CFF objectives were achieved and on the impact of the CFF measures implemented.

EQ5. “To which extent have the specific objectives been attained by the CFF? Which factors influenced the results achieved?”

The implementation of veterinary measures represents the largest part of the expenditure under the CFF budget, with the veterinary programmes alone exceeding 75% of the total spending in the three years under evaluation. This budgetary relevance is also reflected in the fact that 12 out of the 21 technical indicators monitored in this context relate to this spending area.¹⁰ The chosen indicators focus on the priority animal diseases and zoonoses; they allow to monitor the geographical evolution of the EU areas which are free from specific animal diseases, and to measure technical parameters such as the prevalence, the incidence and the number of cases. The analysis of these indicators for the period 2014-2016 reveals a positive epidemiological trend for all priority diseases receiving EU financial support under the veterinary programmes, with a growing number of Member States or regions becoming free

¹⁰ See Annex 4

from animal diseases, and an overall reduction in all monitored parameters. A good example is the increased number of Member States free from bovine brucellosis: at the end of 2016, two out of the five Member States having a EU co-funded programme during the period considered, became free of this diseases; in the remaining three Member States, the main performance indicator, monitoring the evolution of herd prevalence, has decreased by 25% over the same period, showing a very positive trend towards the complete eradication of the disease. Among the most remarkable successes, the eradication of several diseases in many Member States, as in the case of Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) in cattle, a disease transmissible to humans from the consumption of contaminated beef products. The long-term EU co-financed measures led to a drop in BSE cases from more than 2000 in 2001 to only 2 cases in 2016.¹¹ The EU response to the BSE crises restored consumer confidence: beef consumption had dropped by up to 40% in late 2000, forcing prices steeply downward and requiring huge expenditure on market support measures at EU level.¹² Another significant example is represented by the EU programmes addressing Rabies: this disease has been almost eradicated in the EU in wildlife (complete eradication is expected by 2020) and the number of cases has fallen from 80 in 2014 to only 18 in 2016¹³, hugely reducing a significant risk to health and enabling free movement of cats and dogs within the EU. Considering a period longer than the evaluation timeframe, another success as well as the reduction of cases of human salmonellosis, dropped by 10% from 2010 to 2015 (latest available data). However, it should be noted that there are still some areas where the situation has not improved as expected, such as the cases of bovine *tuberculosis* (in 1 Member State out of the 5 with a EU co-funded programme) and ovine and caprine *brucellosis* (in 1 Member State and in a few regions of another Member State out of 6 with EU co-funded programmes).

The implementation of emergency measures in the occurrence of veterinary disease outbreaks also plays a key role in achieving a higher animal health status in the EU, as well as to protect the EU economy from a serious and large-scale veterinary crisis. Thanks to early detection and to immediate application of EU co-funded emergency measures, all recent epidemics have been successfully contained, and major economic consequences - such as trade restrictions and the block of exports - have been avoided. A recent example is the fight against the epidemic of LSD. In 2016, this disease affected seven countries in the South East Europe, including Greece, Bulgaria and the Balkan region. All these countries resorted to mass vaccination with the support of a EU LSD vaccine bank, which was set up before the occurrence of the disease in the Union territory to be immediately used in case of emergency. This vaccination campaign resulted in the successful containment of the spread of the disease: no further Member States were affected, and the disease has not reoccurred in the vaccinated area.

While the EU financial support for the implementation of plant health emergency measures has been provided for many years, the funding of plant health surveys programmes is still at an initial phase. Even if the EU Members States have welcomed their introduction through the

¹¹ Data source: Annual technical reports provided by Member States

¹² <http://www.veterinaria.org/revistas/vetenfinf/bse/14Atkinson.html>

¹³ Data source: Annual technical reports provided by Member States

CFF Regulation, their evaluation remains complicated due to the extremely limited timeframe available and the absence of predecessor measures.

To follow up the presence of pests into the Union territory and the results obtained as effect of the implementation of phytosanitary emergency measures, the Commission monitors the number of cases for a selection of priority pests, including some devastating plant bacterium such as the *Xylella fastidiosa*. The achievement of the eradication objective is more complicated than in the animal health area, as in most cases eradication of plant pests is not feasible, due to population dynamics and lifecycle of pests and their vectors present in forests, parks and plantations. However, in cases eradication is not considered a feasible option, a containment approach is still an effective approach in order to prevent further spread of the pest into the rest of the Union territory. This is the case, instead, for the Pinewood Nematode, detected in 1999 in Portugal, where EU financial support is in place to finally contain, since 2014, its further spread to neighbouring Member States.¹⁴ A similar situation concerns *Xylella fastidiosa*, which has affected the olives in a restricted part of an Italian region: in this case too, the implementation of a number of protective measures has led to the successful containment of this pest in a specific part of Apulia region.¹⁵

The EU financial support to the official controls system addresses two major instruments, and covers 100% of the eligible costs incurred: the testing activities carried out by the network of 43 EURLs, and the trainings provided in a number of food safety priority areas by both the EURLs, and in the context of the BTSF initiative. Four operational indicators have been developed to monitor their contribution to ensuring the effective implementation of and the compliance with the Union rules in the areas covered by the CFF.

The EURLs have contributed, inter-alia, to the continuous update of diagnostic tools for the timely identification of pathogens. This is critical to uniform implementation of controls throughout the EU as it ensures confidence in the reliability of test results and a level competitive playing field. An average success rate of 85% by the participating laboratories in the proficiency tests performed by the EURLs network shows the successful application of testing methods of reference laboratories throughout the EU. Through continuous training, with an annual workshop organised by each EURL, National Reference Laboratories (NRLs) involved in the official controls system could upgrade their expertise. The average satisfaction rate of participants, as regards the training contents, was above 87%.

The BTSF training initiative has covered, for the three years considered, 52 topics of key importance for the CFF areas. The programme was considered to be satisfactory by the participants, in both the EU Member States and in third countries, with a satisfaction rate above 90% for all years considered. Also the success rate of the tests performed by the participants after the training is very high, at about 88%. The trainings have provided support to a common understanding across Member States of their obligations and how best to enforce relevant EU legislation. The BTSF programme was considered the by Member State competent authorities to be helpful in responding to new needs, notably during crisis events,

¹⁴ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:02012D0535-20170310>

¹⁵ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:02015D0789-20160514>

https://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/plant_health_biosecurity/legislation/emergency_measures/xylella-fastidiosa/latest-developments_en

when it contributed to both prevention and crises-preparedness.¹⁶ A concrete example is the BTSF training on foodborne outbreak investigations, which was organised during all three years considered and focused on subjects such as outbreak preparedness, outbreak management, and crisis communication, addressing national teams of public health, veterinary and food safety authorities.¹⁷ A particularly appreciated BTSF training on plant health was also organised for the plant bacterium *Xylella fastidiosa* together with EU Member States and Mediterranean non-EU Member States with the aim to transfer knowledge on prevention activities, early detection, management and control of outbreaks.

The achievement of the food safety objective needs to be presented from an integrated perspective, being a horizontal goal resulting from the combination of all measures described above. Animal health, plant health, and official control activities all contribute to having a high level of safety of food and of food production systems, in the interest of all EU citizens. The safety of food requires safe and healthy animals, plants and a high-standard system of controls. There is therefore a direct and binding link with the achievement of a high level of animal health, plant health and official controls to meet this requirement.

The main factors influencing the overall achievement of the CFF objectives relates to both financial and technical aspects. Budget limitations in some Member States, especially those struggling with economic crisis or other constraints, may limit or delay the implementation of measures necessary to contain the outbreak of a disease. Therefore, the EU financial contribution supports the EU crisis-management system in the event of an outbreak. The Union coordination also facilitates the process of prioritisation, which would be extremely difficult to address at individual Member States level. The key importance of the EU governance in the veterinary area is confirmed by a performance audit conducted by the Court of Auditors¹⁸, whose report was published in April 2016. The Report also acknowledged the good design and proper implementation of animal health programmes co-financed at EU level, highlighting that both the Commission and the Member States performed particularly well in this framework.

A third major factor, which also complements the EU coordination in the CFF area, is the continuous and strict dialogue between the Commission and the Member States, from the design of the measures to their actual implementation. This cooperation takes place in institutional fora, like the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed or ad hoc working groups, but also through the constant informal communication between the commission' services and the national competent authorities.

A concrete example of the contribution of the three horizontal aspects mentioned above to the achievement of the CFF objectives is the EU crisis-preparedness and management system in the event of an outbreak. When a disease is suspected or confirmed, a number of prevention and control actions are immediately put in place under to address the emergency measures, including the temporary closing of borders and the regionalisation of the disease. For the covered diseases (namely Foot-and-Mouth disease (FMD), Classical Swine Fever (CSF) and

¹⁶ Mid-term evaluation of Regulation (EU) No. 652/2014 (IBF International Consulting, 2017), page 76

¹⁷ Better Training for safer Food Annual Reports 2014 and 2015

¹⁸ http://www.eca.europa.eu/Lists/ECADocuments/SR16_06/SR_ANIMAL_DISEASES_EN.pdf

LSD), a EU vaccine bank is also available and accessible to all Member States, with an emergency stock of vaccines to be immediately used in the areas affected or at risk. The functioning of such intervention system requires a central level of management and coordination of activities between the Member States, complemented by a strict cooperation of those member States with the European Commission, but also the commitment of significant financial resources that would not be possible without the EU budget support.

EQ6. What has been the impact achieved by EU financial support in terms of food safety, animal health, plant health and official controls?

The CFF Regulation has provided financial support to the measures addressing the achievement of the specific objectives in this area, namely the overall improvement of the animal and plant health status in the EU, as well as of food safety and public health. As illustrated by the evolution of the technical aspects monitored through the operational indicators, as illustrated in the previous section, positive progress have been made in all areas covered by the CFF regulation, perfectly in line with the targets discussed by the Commission with the technical experts from the Member States¹⁹. The EU territory is today a safer place, where the prevention and protection system have proven to work properly and where the safety and quality of food respect the highest international standards. The human cases due to zoonotic diseases have been progressively reducing over the years, and both the frequency and the severity of animal, plant, and food crises have decreased. No large scale outbreaks have occurred for a decade, and all emergencies have been successfully contained and put under control. In the plant health areas, EU funded programmes on surveys have permitted the early detection of new pests on the Union territory, allowing to actively contain some pests to the original outbreak areas (e.g. Pinewood nematode in Portugal) while minimising the risk of further spread into the Union territory.

EQ7. To what extent has the setting of CFF thematic priorities for Union financial support contributed to the achievement of the specific objectives?”

Annex III to the CFF Regulation lists a number of thematic priorities for the implementation of veterinary programmes and of phytosanitary survey programmes. Those overarching priorities, including inter-alia the impact on human health and the potential to generate serious economic consequences, are discussed every year in the context of the preparation of the Commission work programmes. In the light of the major risks identified and on the epidemiological situation which is actually prevailing, priority animal diseases and plant pests are identified accordingly. This system has proven to be flexible enough to respond to the main challenges and the more immediate risks for the EU. The list of animal diseases eligible for EU financial support, for example, has been integrated in order to address the emergence of new epidemiological needs (as in the cases of LSD) and the allocation of the available financial resources could be oriented towards the most significant priorities. The multi-annual

¹⁹ See Annex 4

Commission work programmes covering 2015 and 2016, identified 3 categories; Group 1, for example, listed the diseases having an impact on both human and animal health. Priorities have been revised in the context of the recently adopted work programme for the period 2018-2020, with 4 categories identified, and where Group 1 addresses the major impact on animal health and trade. This flexible system ensures that the specific objectives laid down in the CFF Regulation are pursued and that the specific measures implemented to achieve them comply with the more recent development and needs in this area.

EQ8. To what extent has the implementation of measures co-financed under the CFF contributed to a positive impact on the functioning of the internal market and to the competitiveness of the agri-food industry at global level?

According to the last EUROSTAT data, in 2015, the output of the whole agri-food industry in the EU is estimated at more than EUR 410 billion, representing the largest manufacturing sector in Europe and a leading player worldwide. Overall, this sector provides some 44 million jobs in the EU, of which 22 million people are employed in farms.

The competitiveness of the European food productions depends on their reputation, with the EU food safety budget playing a crucial role in contributing to the safety and quality of European food products. All issues relating to food and to food production are actually a concern for each single EU citizen: all Europeans expect to eat quality food, produced with the highest safety standards and under ethical conditions. It is a matter of fact that healthy food comes from healthy animals and plants. All European consumers therefore expect the EU to protect them and their interests by guaranteeing adequate interventions and controls all along the food chain.

In 2015, the EU financial contribution for all the food safety measures has amounted to some EUR 250 million, notably 0,06 % of the output value of the food industry. The size of the EU food safety budget is therefore limited compared to the scale of the economic sector concerned; this relatively low financial support for food safety provided under the CFF supported the EU legal food and feed framework, which ensures the functioning of the internal market leading to a positive impact on the competitiveness of the EU's agri-food industry at international level.

5.3. Efficiency

The efficiency section included questions on the relationship between resources employed and results achieved, taking into account the financial procedures in place, as well as their contribution to the simplification and rationalisation in the areas covered by the CFF.

EQ9. To what extent has the relationship between resources employed and results achieved been efficient? Could the same results have been achieved with fewer resources?

The improvement of the animal health status is accompanied by a progressive reduction of the financial resources needed in the area, that in the specific case of veterinary programmes dropped by 11 million euro over the three-year period under evaluation.

Less predictable is the spending for emergency measures, which varies from one year to the other as a consequence of factors difficult to anticipate and to control, including climate change and the globalisation of vectors, as well as the cyclical reoccurrence of some endemic diseases.

The already-mentioned special report from the Court of Auditors²⁰, published in April 2016, considers the Commission's strategy for animal diseases to be sound and well-developed, including a good framework for prioritising budget resources on priority programmes. According to its findings, the Member States performed well in managing the resources provided at EU level to co-fund the CFF measures.

The implementation of the survey programmes aims to detect the presence of priority pests in the EU territory. In this view, an increment of the financial resources is needed and expected over the next years, supporting the objective to increase the coverage of the Union territory by those surveys by 2020.

As in the case of veterinary emergency measures, the spending for phytosanitary emergency measures is variable and less predictable. Over the years 2014-2016, it mostly concerned four major pests only: the emergency measures addressing Pinewood nematode and *Xylella fastidiosa*, together with *Anoplophora glabripennis* and *Pomacea insularum*, were responsible for almost all payments (91%). For these emergencies, the EU has provided financial support to early detect new outbreaks and to prevent their further spread into the Union territory.

The EURLs' activities and the BTSF initiative are financed at 100% by the EU, and each have an annual cost of about 15 million euro for the food safety budget. This limited cost has nevertheless allowed the EURLs to perform high-level testing activities and to train annually hundreds of NRLs, while in the context of the BTSF, some 6000 officials of national competent authorities involved in official controls were trained every year. These current funding arrangements, which fully cover the eligible costs, have proven to be a correct approach in motivating the Member States to carry out EU tasks.

For all these measures, Table 2 illustrates that the amounts committed during the period under evaluation were substantially in line with the forecasted budget. The good results achieved in implementing the CFF budget show that the forecast budget for the concerned years was appropriate to cover the different needs. Still, it is very unlikely that the same results could have been achieved with fewer financial resources, for three main aspects already presented in the previous sections.

Firstly, for the long-term nature of many CFF measures, namely eradication activities, which represent a very large share of the food safety budget: considering that the final targets are most of the time achieved after several years of implementation, the specific spending in these area needs to be confirmed during a long period of time without interruptions, both to ensure

²⁰ http://www.eca.europa.eu/Lists/ECADocuments/SR16_06/SR_ANIMAL_DISEASES_EN.pdf

continuity with past activities and to avoid jeopardising mid-term achievements.²¹ Over the three years considered, a considerable part of the CFF budget was invested in those kind of activities, for example for veterinary programmes addressing the eradication of Bovine Tuberculosis, or the surveillance of Avian Influenza.

Secondly, the continuous emergence of new challenges affecting the safety of food, as well as the health of animal and plants, requires that the specific budget is both flexible and sound enough to guarantee that the changing needs in this area are addressed properly and timely.²²

Third aspect, the fact that food crises, as well as outbreaks from animal diseases or plant pests are very difficult to anticipate, and tend to cyclically occur or re-occur affecting the EU territory. Those emergency situations might require significant financial resources, as proved by the past crises of FMD and swine fevers²³.

EQ10. Do the financial procedures in place ensure a swift and resource-saving decision-making process and thus a quick implementation of the interventions? If there are shortcomings what are the reasons for this?

Overall, there are no major limitations and shortcomings for an efficient resource-saving decision-making process and quick implementation, especially in emergency situations. When outbreaks of animal diseases or plant pests occur, the requested technical measures to eradicate or to contain them are implemented immediately, concurrently with the financial procedure, which do not interfere with an efficient decision making progress. Financial commitments are made quickly and also payments to the Member State are timely.²⁴

EURLs can adapt quickly to urgent needs²⁵, for example to provide technical assistance and diagnostic tools or vaccines. Representative from the ASF EURL provided urgent technical assistance to the Member States affected by the first outbreaks of ASF in 2014, in the framework of the Community Veterinary Emergency Team (CVET) tasks. Besides, the ASF EURL provided diagnostic tools to the neighbouring countries, to support them in the early detection of the disease.

In relation to BTSF programmes,²⁶ quick adjustment of training subjects once awarded is quite difficult. However, the possibility to introduce additional training has been used, for example in the case of ASF when this became an urgent threat 2015-2016.

EQ11. To what extent has the entry into force of the CFF, which merges all measures in one single regulation, contributed to the simplification and rationalisation of the Union co-financing in the food chain area?

²¹ Mid-term evaluation of Regulation (EU) No. 652/2014 (IBF International Consulting, 2017), page 15

²² Mid-term evaluation of Regulation (EU) No. 652/2014 (IBF International Consulting, 2017), pages 12-13, 21, 56, 63-68, 82, 148

²³ Mid-term evaluation of Regulation (EU) No. 652/2014 (IBF International Consulting, 2017), page 59

²⁴ Mid-term evaluation of Regulation (EU) No. 652/2014 (IBF International Consulting, 2017), page 117

²⁵ Mid-term evaluation of Regulation (EU) No. 652/2014 (IBF International Consulting, 2017), page 127

²⁶ Mid-term evaluation of Regulation (EU) No. 652/2014 (IBF International Consulting, 2017), page 127

The entry into force of the CFF Regulation provided with a modernised financial framework in the food chain area, introducing a number of adjustments aimed at simplifying and rationalising the pre-existing legislation. Particularly, the CFF Regulation:

- adapted the food safety expenditure to the structure of the EU budget 2014-2020, where its budget lines are not part of the AGRI budget any longer, but belong to Heading III "Security and citizenship";
- simplified the previous legal framework, over-complex and often out-of-date, by replacing it with a single piece of legislation covering the whole food and feed area;
- aligned the financial tools used in these spending area to the new Financial Regulation, especially by introducing some adjustments concerning Title VI, on grants;
- harmonised the procedures in the phytosanitary and veterinary fields;
- standardised the funding rates, providing only three reimbursement rates (50%, 75%, 100%) applicable under specific conditions, instead of the manifold and unclear funding rates used for predecessor measures;
- clearly listed measures and costs eligible for EU co-financing;
- introduced a more transparent division of responsibilities between the Commission and the Member States;
- in its Annex III, lays down priorities for veterinary and phytosanitary programmes, to be adjusted annually or multi-annually.

The implementation of unit costs and ceilings in veterinary programmes is also an example of simplification and rationalisation of the system. It contributes to a lower administrative burden for the Commission as well as for the Member States, facilitating the requests for funding and for reimbursements. It currently covers about 50% of the eligible costs and a further revision of the system is ongoing, in view of extending it to other CFF spending measures.

Current reporting requirements were in some cases considered disproportionate by some Member States, namely for smallest veterinary programmes and emergency measures. However, the principles of transparency and accountability require that a proper justification is given for the way public money is spent, even if the size of the budget concerned is limited. Therefore, some administrative constraints for managing financial files cannot be avoided, in the interest of all EU citizens.

5.4. Coherence

Coherence was about the consistency of the EU spending for food and feed measures with the political priorities in the food safety area.

EQ12. To what extent was the EU spending for food and feed measures consistent with the political priorities in the food safety area?

The food safety political priorities are scattered across the sectorial legislation in each area covered by the CFF Regulation, and then confirmed in the CFF itself. In this context, the CFF Regulation acts as a very technical piece of legislation, where eligible measures and costs for each spending area are formally listed in specific sections. This bounds the possibility to

provide financial support to a range of measures which is quite substantial, but nevertheless clear and limited. Those measures are conceived to explicitly address the political priorities in the areas covered by the CFF, mostly as a result of the long-term experience of the EU spending in the food safety area. In addition, the CFF offers the possibility for providing financial support to additional non-listed measures, in exceptional and duly justified cases. To date, no request in this sense has come from any Member State, as a confirmation of a spending system which has proved to be fully consistent with the overall political priorities in this domain and to properly respond to the overarching food safety needs at both EU and national level.

The absence of any pressure and not even any proposal towards the co-financing of additional measures also confirms the functioning of the complementarity of the CFF Regulation with other related EU programmes, with no extra needs remaining unaddressed by the EU intervention. An example of synergy between programmes covering complementary areas regards the primary agriculture, and more specifically the interaction between the provision of the CFF Regulation and CAP Regulation in the event of an outbreak. While the CFF addresses eligible direct costs incurred to tackle animal diseases and plant pest, such as the compensation to owners, the costs of vaccination, and the slaughtering of animals or the culling of trees, the CAP has provisions to contribute to covering some indirect costs, such as market losses suffered by farmers.

5.5. EU added value

In order to assess whether the EU financial support for food and feed measures added specific value compared to what would have resulted from Member States' intervention only, a comparative analysis was conducted.

EQ3. To which extent has the EU financial support for food and feed measures added specific value to what would have resulted from Member State's intervention only?

The achievement of a higher animal health status was possible thanks to both the technical and financial support provided by the EU to the Member States. On the one hand, budgets of Member States alone, especially of those struggling with economic crisis or other constraints, have difficulties to secure appropriate financial resources to respond to the combination of present and potential challenges. On the other hand, the variety of measures to put in place to tackle animal diseases requires a centralised management system in order to properly coordinate and organise the implementation of specific actions in the Member States. The EU crisis-management system in the event of an outbreak is an excellent example of the added value provided by the EU co-financing in this area. When a disease is suspected or confirmed, a number of prevention and control actions are immediately put in place under the emergency measures system, including the temporary closing of borders and the regionalisation of the disease. A good example of EU governance and coordination is the recent management at EU level of the African swine fever outbreak, which reached the EU from Russia in 2014. Since the very early stages of the epidemics - for which no vaccine is

available - the Commission have proactively promoted a common strategy amongst affected Member States, neighbouring third countries and bordering Member States at risk. In particular, the Commission has given technical and financial support, providing trainings and ad-hoc supporting material in order to enhance their diagnostic capabilities. This coordinated action resulted in the containment of the disease and has limited costs for both the EU and the national budgets. It has also avoided major trade disruption, both within the EU and with non-EU countries. For all programmes, the EU co-funding adds value to the situation in which only national funding would apply.

As in the case of animal health, the EU intervention also supports the management of plant health outbreaks, where the EU provides the financial contribution needed at Member State level to implement emergency measures.

Moreover, the Union support facilitates the coordination of phytosanitary surveillance activities, ensuring their uniform implementation in all Member States.

The EU added value provided by the EURLs activities and the BTSF programmes is linked to the nature of their activities: the network of laboratories ensures that all EU Member States work within a consistent and uniform regulatory framework and the EU training programme promotes a common approach towards the implementation of EU legislation. This contribution towards the harmonisation of rules at Union level and the sharing of knowledge and expertise in the food safety and related areas is a main example of positive interaction within the EU, which could not be achieved through isolated efforts at national level and without the EU financial support.

EQ4. What would be the most likely consequence of stopping or withdrawing the EU co-financing of the measures covered by the CFF?

The most likely consequence of withdrawing the CFF financial support would be that many measures would not be implemented any longer, especially in Member States experiencing budgetary restrictions²⁷. Efforts made to ensure food safety, animal and plant health would therefore be reduced, putting at risk the current status as well as the past achievements in these areas. In the case of trans-boundary diseases and pests, even the continuation of the CFF activities in some Member State managing to confirm the financial resources in this area would be compromised.

Due to the EU dimension of the activities carried out in the framework of the EURLs and of BTSF and of their objectives, those measures would cease completely should Union funding be stopped.²⁸

On top of that, in the event of a food crisis, or of large-scale outbreaks from either animal diseases or plant pests, the economic impact on the national public budgets and on the economic sector concerned might be severe. Many studies have already addressed the topic of the costs of food crises in the EU, especially as concerns some animal diseases whose

²⁷ Mid-term evaluation of Regulation (EU) No. 652/2014 (IBF International Consulting, 2017), page 88-89

²⁸ Mid-term evaluation of Regulation (EU) No. 652/2014 (IBF International Consulting, 2017), page 92-93,

outbreaks have largely affected our productions over the last decades. FMD is an illustrative example of disease which might affect severely the agri-food sector and on the European economy as a whole. To give an idea of the scale of the economic impact of such disease, we can refer to a study focused on the outbreak occurred in UK in 2001 (Economic costs of the FMD outbreak in the United Kingdom in 2001 (Thompson, 2002)), according to which the overall costs on agricultural producers, food industry, consumers and (national) public sector can be estimated at some £ 3,125 billion. For this crisis, the EU allocated about € 571 million to implement emergency measures in UK only. The intervention in the event of a new large-scale FMD outbreak would require the emergency vaccination of the animal population at risk. A massive vaccination campaign at an average current cost of €2.5 per dose (including vaccination costs) to be inoculated twice per year would need to be conducted; considering an official animal population of some 340 million heads (cattle, pigs, sheep and goat), the potential burden of this intervention (up to 1.7 billion euro) would severely threaten both the national budgets. In addition, a large number of animals might be slaughtered. Besides these direct costs, the impact on both trade and the internal market is to be taken into consideration. The block of exports and of the internal movements of food and live animals would hit the producers as well as the whole supply chain, endangering the existence of the largest manufacturing sector in Europe, mostly made of SMEs. Just to give some figures, according to the 2015 EUROSTAT data, the value of export of food and live animals touched 82 billion euro. As concerns intra-EU trade, 40 million animals (considering cattle, pigs, sheep and goats only) were traded within the EU in 2015. This possible scenario might cause the fallout of the sector or the definitive collapse of its weakest segments, representing a dramatic loss for the competitiveness of the EU agri-food productions and of the EU economy as a whole.

6. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the analysis performed, it can be concluded that the CFF Regulation is functioning well in supporting the food and feed policy.

Findings indicated that, to a great extent, the CFF objectives are **relevant** in addressing the needs within the food chain, ensuring a high status of human, animal and plant health, and therefore supporting the safety of the EU food products. The EU funding in this area supports the legal food and feed framework in protecting more than 500 million of European consumers and facilitating the functioning of agri-food supply chains. The competitive position of this sector is supported by high food safety standards, which contribute to a global perception of high quality European products. The CFF has been proven to be flexible to address new needs for co-financing, especially in the emergence or re-emergence of outbreaks from animal diseases such as Avian influenza, LSD, or emerging risks in plant health like *Xylella phastidiosa*.

The majority of the activities covered by the CFF proved to be **effective** in achieving the CFF objectives, and showed progress in the technical operational indicators used to monitor the CFF measures implemented. The consultation showed a large appreciation of the EU financial contribution especially by the CFF direct beneficiaries, who consider both the financial and technical support provided under the CFF to be adequate and to effectively support the implementation of the food chain measures.

In relation to **efficiency** it can be concluded that the procedures in place allow for adequate prioritising of CFF the financial resources and Member States manage the resources well. Still, as previously explained, the absence of cost-effectiveness analysis in the CFF area limits the possibility to demonstrate the extent of the relationship between resources employed and results achieved. As recommended by the Court of Auditors in its previously mentioned performance audit - the Commission is working to develop a cost-effectiveness methodology to be implemented in this area, in order to make the efficiency analysis more robust. As acknowledged by the Court, this kind of analysis is difficult to determine, due to the current lack of available models and to the absence of specific economic indicators at international level. The possibility to develop such methodology, including a set of cost-effectiveness indicators covering all CFF spending areas, is currently being investigated by the Commission in view of the ex-post evaluation of the CFF Regulation, to be conducted by June 2022.

EU spending for food and feed measures is considered to be largely **coherent** with the political priorities in the food safety area, and a positive assessment was also done on its complementarity with other related EU programmes, especially the CAP Regulation.

The CFF has been shown to clearly contribute to achieving and supporting EU **added value**. Member States benefit from the prioritised and targeted implementation of EU co-funded activities, especially for emergency, eradication, control and monitoring measures for animal diseases and plant pest throughout the Union. The financial solidarity that the CFF provides enables Member States to take required actions according to their interests. Otherwise these may have been beyond the financial and operational capacity of an individual Member State. The CFF enables harmonised and robust controls, which satisfy an important need with respect to an effective food safety policy. The findings from the desk study, relevant stakeholders in questionnaires, interviews, and case studies, confirm that the measures co-financed by the CFF strongly contribute to creating EU added value. The added value goes beyond what individual Member States could achieve by implementing national measures without EU support.

Overall, all activities receiving EU financial support in this area have proven to serve the CFF Regulation general and specific objectives, namely the improvement of human, animal and plant health, as well as the overall Commission's priorities, including the functioning of an effective internal market and the support to trade with non-EU countries.

In recent years substantial progress has been made on most of the 21 operational indicators used to monitor the progress and measure the outcome of the CFF implementation.

The EU framework on food safety, animal and plant health has been recognised as uniform and consistent in its application and enforcement in all the Member States. This ensures in turn that both citizens and businesses are confident that this framework is fair and effective in promoting high safety standards in a key sector of the EU economy. The EU investment in surveillance, disease and pest control and eradication, provides the infrastructure on which the safety and trade in the entire food chain is based. The activities funded under the CFF Regulation contribute to an EU which is safe and secure, prosperous and sustainable, social, and stronger on the global scene.

ANNEX 1 – PROCEDURAL INFORMATION

The evaluation was led by Directorate-General for Health and Food safety (DG SANTE). It is included in the Agenda Planning with the reference 2016/SANTE/142.

The evaluation was supported by an external and independent evaluator, under a service contract. The service contract has been implemented via a Framework Contract in accordance to the Financial Rules Applicable to the General Budget of the Union²⁹ and its Rules of Application³⁰.

The evaluation Roadmap was adopted in July 2016³¹.

An Inter-service Steering Group (ISG) including staff from DG SANTE, from the Secretariat-General (SG) and from the Directorates-General for Budget (BUDG), for Agriculture and Rural Development (AGRI), and for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries (MARE), was established in April 2016. The ISG met in 5 occasions: to prepare the Roadmap (April 2016), to have a kick-off discussion with the external evaluator in October 2015, to discuss the Inception Report in November 2016, to discuss the interim report in February 2017, to discuss the draft final report in May 2017. Extensive correspondence between the Steering Committee members was held in between the meetings to follow-up on the evaluation.

The final report was submitted in June 2017.

The evaluation was not submitted to the Regulatory Scrutiny Board.

The evidence base used to conduct the mid-term evaluation of the CFF Regulation included:

- Technical and financial reports prepared and submitted by the CFF beneficiaries on the implementation of the CFF measures.
- The consultation of some 170 stakeholders directly and indirectly involved in the implementation of CFF.
- 12 cases studies.
- A literature review of studies, reports, evaluations, audits and other documents relevant in the context of the CFF evaluation.

Together, the above evidence base provides the evaluation with a valid and rounded set of data covering the main aspects of the CFF evaluation including efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, coherence and added value.

²⁹ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:02012R0966-20160101&from=EN>

³⁰ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:02012R1268-20160101&from=EN>

³¹ http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/roadmaps/docs/2016_sante_142_evaluation_cff_en.pdf

ANNEX 2 – STAKEHOLDERS' CONSULTATION

Three methods of stakeholder consultation have been employed for the evaluation:

1. Open public consultation
2. Targeted stakeholder consultation with specific questionnaires
3. Targeted stakeholder interviews

Each of these is described in the following sections.

- Open public consultation

An open public consultation of all interested parties was conducted using the European Commission 'Public consultations' website (replacing the 'Your Voice in Europe' website) and the DG SANTE 'Consultations and feedback' web page.

The consultation took place from 16 December 2016 until 17 March 2017. A consultation questionnaire was prepared in English, discussed and agreed with DG SANTE and published on the Commission website. After the twelve-week consultation, five replies were submitted on this.

- Targeted stakeholder consultation

Targeted questionnaire surveys have been used to acquire specific information from particular target groups. The stakeholders were identified by the stakeholder mapping exercise.

Targeted questionnaires in English have been developed for the following groups:

1. Competent authorities (CAs) in Member States, stakeholders linked to the industry (including farmers organisations, veterinary organisations), EU and national associations, international organisations and NGOs.
2. EURL stakeholders
3. Better Training for Safer Food stakeholders

The questionnaires were limited in the number of questions and restricted in allowing open responses. As far as possible, the focus was on closed questions, numbering and ranges. Some open questions were used to provide specific comments that cannot easily be captured by closed questions. Open questions were also aimed at gaining insight (i.e. explanations, motivations) on why respondents provided certain answers to specific closed questions. In some cases, respondents were asked to support their answers by providing evidence (there was also a possibility to upload documents as evidence).

The questionnaires include an introduction describing the subject and providing information on matters such as transparency and confidentiality (EU Transparency Initiative, including the option to register in the Transparency Register), protection of personal data and links to relevant reference documents.

The questionnaire for group 1 had a function that presented selected questions to individual respondents on the basis of their role, involvement and expertise. Respondents were asked to identify their individual characteristics and the questions were filtered accordingly. This enabled the use of a general questionnaire for a range of different respondents.

In order to assess the extent to which the CFF has succeeded in achieving its objectives, statements were posed that needed to be answered on a 4-point or 5-point judgement scale.

The targeted respondents received a personalised email, including a link to the online questionnaire and an introduction describing the background and the importance of the evaluation. A Letter of Recommendation provided by DG SANTE was attached to the email. Two reminders were sent. The deadline for submission was extended by three weeks beyond the planned schedule.

Table 4 shows the number of invited respondents, the number of responses and the response rate.

Overall, a high average response of 78 % was realised for the invited stakeholder questionnaires, while there were only five responses to the open consultation.

Table 4. Number of respondents approached to complete questionnaires and response rates

Respondents	Open consultation	Targeted online questionnaires		
		CAs and stakeholders	EURLs	BTSF
Number approached	Public, open to all	81	45	87
Number of responses	5	58	34 + 6*	69
Response rate	Not applicable	72 %	88 %	79 %

* The six EURLs with responsibilities regarding food and feed safety were approached and all responded

- Targeted stakeholder interviews

On the basis of the literature review and the on-line survey, topics were selected for interviews with representatives of the European Commission (DG SANTE and DG AGRI), and with selected stakeholders (competent authorities, industry representatives, targeted NGOs) in a number of Member States.

In-depth interviews were carried out by team members using an interview guide to facilitate uniformity in the way questions are addressed and are answered (avoiding interviewer bias). The aim of the interviews was to identify achievements, good practices, problems and

challenges regarding implementation of the CFF Regulation. The main purpose of the interviews was to fill information gaps that remained after the other stakeholder consultations. Interview notes were sent to the interviewee for conformation.

Based on the assessment of the results from the questionnaires, ten stakeholders were identified for interview. Table 5 provides a list of stakeholders who were interviewed, including a short motivation and example of questions expressing the key interest for information from the interviewees. Complete information is available in Appendix D to the external evaluation study supporting the Mid-term evaluation of Regulation (EU) No. 652/2014.

Table 5. List of main stakeholders interviewed

Stakeholders	Reasons	Main issues
UK (CVO & CPHO)	Key Member States have not answered the questionnaire	Total questionnaire by phone; Unit costs and ceilings; Administrative burden
European Professional Beekeeping Association	A negative reaction to CFF in questionnaire	What doesn't function well? Why? How to solve?
Greece Competent Authority	A positive reaction to CFF in questionnaire	Why does it function well? What can we learn? Unit costs and ceilings; Administrative burden
DG SANTE	CFF Regulation	Choice process with respect to priorities; Interaction with Member States (bargaining, steering); Strengths and weaknesses; Cost-effectiveness evaluation; Unit costs and ceilings; Administrative burden; Options for improvement;

NPPO, the Netherlands	EU added value	Why no added value in your opinion? How can this be changed?
Copa Cogeca,	Important stakeholder	Discussion about the letter sent instead of the questionnaire; Functioning of single market; Plant health issues
Plant health and small programmes	Administrative burden	Possible solutions
DG AGRI	Economic impacts, animal and plant health complementary regulation	Proper functioning of the market; Competitiveness (static and dynamic impacts); Coherence with CAP; Indicators and input/output ratios Coherence (more in-depth); Check if the identified incoherence are correct; Co-operation between DG AGRI & DG SANTE on animal and plant health

ANNEX 3 – METHODOLOGY APPLIED

The methodology used for the mid-term evaluation of the CFF Regulation follows the Commission’s Better Regulation Guidelines³² and accompanying Toolbox³³.

To answer the evaluation questions, a comprehensive set of data covering all CFF spending areas was used as evidence base.

For data collection, the following methods were used:

1. Desk research
2. Stakeholder consultation to collect information and opinions from different stakeholders (data collected by questionnaires and telephone interviews)
3. Case studies to collect evidence and experience on targeted thematic areas

Desk Research was undertaken using reports available at the start and by literature research of scientific publications supplemented with data sources of the Commission, (e.g. budget expenditure, operational indicators, trade data, animal data). In addition, the desk research included annual financial and technical reports covering animal and plant health, implementation of emergency measures by Member States, EURLs and BTSF, and websites. Reports/evaluations/studies, working documents, data on operational technical indicators and financial data were made available to the external contractor. Audit and inspection reports from the DG SANTE Directorate in charge of Health and Food Audits and Analysis, and from the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) were used, as well as documents on food chain funding, country submissions, the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed (PAFF), and task force presentations and reports.

Gathering and assessing information from stakeholders was an important part of the research. The aim is to identify, select and weigh the results obtained from different stakeholders in a systematic way. For this purpose stakeholder mapping was used.

Twelve case studies were undertaken covering the following co-financed measures:

- for food safety: veterinary programmes for salmonellosis and bovine brucellosis;
- for animal health: veterinary programmes for bovine tuberculosis, bovine brucellosis, ovine and caprine brucellosis, rabies, and BSE;
- for animal health: emergency measures for highly pathogenic avian influenza;
- for plant health: surveys concerning pests not known to occur in the Union territory and pests considered to be the most dangerous – for citrus tristeza virus and *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus*;

³² http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/toc_guide_en.htm

³³ http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/toc_tool_en.htm

- for plant health: emergency measures for *Anoplophora glabripennis*;
- for official controls: EURL activities for salmonella, mycotoxins, GMOs and pesticides; Better Training for Safer Food (BTSF) initiative.

The case studies covered the evaluation period (2014-2016) and were evaluated against the operational technical indicators (see Annex IV to the present SWD) and the identified evaluation criteria (relevance, European added value, effectiveness, efficiency and coherence). Each case study was carried out in two ways: a general description of co-funding and analysis in the EU, and an in-depth description and analysis of the implementation of the case in two Member States. The in-depth analysis included interviews with designated stakeholders. At least two interviews were planned for each case study.

For food safety and animal health case studies, technical information has been sourced from the EU plenary task force and the sub-groups that provide tailored technical assistance to Member States. This includes reviews of reports and meeting minutes, and interviews with members of the plenary committee or sub-groups.

For plant health and official controls (EURLs and BTSF), the Official Controls Expert Group was consulted as it has a dialogue between Member State competent authorities and the Commission.

The criteria applied for selecting the case studies were that they:

- cover co-funded activities for the years 2014, 2015 and 2016 (when applicable);
- are co-funded in multiple Member States;
- include Member States with high financial awards;
- have a geographical spread over the EU;
- contribute information related to the overall evaluation criteria;
- may have experienced recognised implementation issues;
- may have strong political or public/industry interest.

The analysis of the case studies involved a similar approach as was chosen for the other parts of the study. It involved the following steps:

- Desk study
- Stakeholder consultation
- Analysis

ANNEX 4 – TECHNICAL OPERATIONAL INDICATORS AND THEIR TARGET VALUES FOR 2017 AND 2020

Operational technical indicator		Baseline 2013	Last available data*	Intermediate Target 2017	Final Target 2020
Food safety measures					
1.1	Reduction in the number of confirmed cases of salmonellosis in humans in Member States where a EU programme is co-funded	82921 human cases	94625 human cases (year 2015)	-2 % per year	-2 % per year
1.2	Reduction in the number of confirmed cases of brucellosis in humans in Member States where a EU programme is co-funded	425 human cases	437 human cases (year 2015)	-2 % per year	-2 % per year
Animal health measures					
2.1	Increase in the number of Member States which are free from bovine tuberculosis in respect of which a financial contribution is granted	IT, PT, UK partly free HR, IE, ES not free	HR free IT, PT, UK partly free IE, ES not free (year 2016)	HR free IT, PT, UK partly free IE, ES not free	HR, PT free IT, ES, UK partly free IE not free
2.2	Increase in the number of Member States which are free from bovine brucellosis in respect of which a financial contribution is	IT, PT, ES, UK, HR, not free	HR, UK free IT, PT, ES partially free (year 2016)	HR, ES, UK free IT, PT partly free	HR, IT, PT ES, UK free

Operational technical indicator		Baseline 2013	Last available data*	Intermediate Target 2017	Final Target 2020
	granted				
2.3	Increase in the number of Member States which are free from ovine and caprine brucellosis in respect of which a financial contribution is granted	IT, PT, ES partially free HR, EL not free	HR free IT, PT, ES partially free , EL not free (year 2016)	HR, ES free IT, PT, partly free EL not free	HR, ES, IT, free PT partly free EL not free
2.4	Increase in the number of Member States which are free from rabies in respect of which a financial contribution is granted	AT, BG, EE, FI, IT, LV, LT free HR, EL, HU, PL, RO, SK, SL not free	AT, BG, EE, FI, EL, HR, IT, LV, LT, SK, SL free HU, PL, RO, not free (year 2016)	AT, BG, HR, EE, FI, EL, HU, IT, LV, LT,SL, SK free; PL, RO not free	AT, BG, HR, EE, FI, EL, HU, IT, LV, LT,SL, SK PL, RO free
2.5	Reduction of disease parameters in bovine tuberculosis in Member States where a Union co-financing is granted: • Reduction of herd incidence • Reduction of herd prevalence	Incidence: HR: 0.14; IE 3.88; IT: 0.84; PT: 0.28; ES: 0.91; UK: 9.12 Prevalence: HR: 0.16; IR: 4.07; IT: 0.97; PT: 0.35; ES: 1.39; UK: 14.49	Incidence: HR free; IE 3.27; IT: 0.61; PT: 0.19; ES: 1.59; UK: 9.12 Prevalence: HR free; IE: 3.59; IT: 0.86; PT: 0.28; ES: 2.87; UK: 14.27 (year 2016)	Incidence: HR free; IE 2.91; IT 0.54; PT 0.20; ES 0.95; UK 6.90 Prevalence: HR free; IE 3.04; IT 0.65, PT 0.27; ES 1.55; UK 10.64	Incidence: HR, PT free; IE, IT, ES, UK not defined Prevalence: HR, PT free; IE, IT, ES, UK not defined
2.6	Reduction of disease parameters in bovine brucellosis in	Incidence: HR: 0; ES: 0.06; UK:	Incidence: HR, UK: free; ES: 0.022; IT:	Incidence: HR, ES, UK	Incidence: HR, IT, PT,

Operational technical indicator		Baseline 2013	Last available data*	Intermediate Target 2017	Final Target 2020
	Member States where a Union co-financing is granted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction of herd incidence • Reduction of herd prevalence 	0.13; IT: 1.38; PT: 0.22 Prevalence: HR: 0; ES: 0.08; UK: 0.14; IT: 1.62; PT: 0.27	1.336; PT: 0.175 Prevalence: HR, UK: free; ES: 0.025; IT: 1.646; PT: 0.215 (year 2016)	free; IT 0.92, PT 0.18; Prevalence: HR, ES, UK free; IT 1.16, PT 0.21	ES, UK free Prevalence: HR, IT, PT, ES, UK free
2.7	Reduction of disease parameters in ovine and caprine brucellosis in Member States where a Union co-financing is granted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction of herd incidence • Reduction of herd prevalence 	Incidence: HR: N/A; 0; EL: 0.2; IT: 1.07; PT: 0.8; ES: 0.1 Prevalence: HR: N/A; CY: 0; EL: 1.41; IT: 1.5; PT: 1.1; ES: 0.17	Incidence: HR: free EL: 0.25; IT: 0.842; PT: 0.462; ES: 0.063 Prevalence: EL: 1.72; IT: 1.206; PT: 0.573; ES: 0.085 (year 2016)	Incidence: HR, ES free; EL 0.275; IT 0.48; PT 0.41; Prevalence: HR, ES free; EL 0.61; IT 0.61; PT 0.62;	Incidence: HR, ES IT, free; EL, ES, PT not defined Prevalence: HR, ES, IT, free; EL, ES, PT not defined
2.8	Reduction in the number of cases of rabies in wildlife in Member States where a Union co-financing is granted	587 cases	18 cases (2016 data)	80 cases	0 cases
2.9	Reduction in the number of classical BSE cases in Member States where a Union co-financing is granted	7 cases	5 cases (2016 data)	< 3 cases	0 cases

Operational technical indicator	Baseline 2013	Last available data*	Intermediate Target 2017	Final Target 2020	
Plant health measures					
3.1	Increase in the number of Member States covered by surveys for pests not known to occur in the Union territory (Category A according to the work programme for 2017-2018 for the implementation of survey programmes for pests)	N/A	78.57% (year 2016)	No intermediate target	80 %
3.2	Increase in the number of Member States covered by surveys for pests considered to be most dangerous for the Union territory (Category B according to the work programme for 2017-2018 for the implementation of survey programmes for pests)	N/A	75% (year 2016)	No intermediate target	80 %
3.3	Reduction in the number of outbreaks for pests covered by specific EU legislation	27 cases (2014 baseline)	18 cases	No intermediate target	22 cases
BTSF activities					
4.1	Success rate of the tests performed by the participants after the training - from	N/A	85%	>70 %	>70 %

Operational technical indicator		Baseline 2013	Last available data*	Intermediate Target 2017	Final Target 2020
	2014: e-learning tool; from 2016: all trainings				
4.2	Overall satisfaction rate of participants attending the training	90.17 %	90.66%	>80 %	>80 %
EURL activities					
5.1	Success rate of proficiency test, including the correct follow-up in cases of underperformance	N/A	85.366%	No intermediate target	>70 %
5.2	Satisfaction rate of participants attending the annual workshop (focus on contents only)	N/A	87.442%	No intermediate target	>80 %

* 2016 data are provisional