



# **Mid-term evaluation Report of Regulation (EU) No 652/2014 on the management of food chain expenditure**

**Valentina Piazza**

**Deputy Head of Unit D4- Food safety programme,  
emergency funding-DG Health and Food Safety**

**Animal health Advisory Committee - 18 December 2017**

## Legal basis

### **Article 42 of Regulation (EU) No 652/2014 - Evaluation**

- Commission mid- term evaluation report to the European Parliament and to the Council
  - Achievement of the general and specific objectives of Reg. (EU) No 652/2014
  - Efficiency of the use of resources
  - EU added value
  - Scope for simplification

#### ***in the four policy/spending areas covered by the evaluation:***

- Animal health
- Plant health
- Official controls
- Food safety



## Commission's mid-term evaluation report

Based on:

- *external supporting study and*
- *internal assessment by the Commission*
- Mid-term evaluation Report (+ Executive summary): on the outcome of the first 3 years of implementation of Reg. (EU) No 652/2014.
- Staff Working Document (SWD): with additional technical data and information complementing the main report
- SWD Synopsis Report: on the findings of the consultations conducted.

**26 September 2017:** Adoption of the Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and to the Council on the mid-term evaluation of Regulation (EU) No 652/2014

## Scope

### Measures:

- veterinary eradication, control and surveillance programmes
- veterinary emergency measures
- phytosanitary survey programmes
- phytosanitary emergency measures
- European Union Reference Laboratories (EURLs) activities
- Better Training for Safer Food (BTSF) programme

### Timeframe:

- 2014, 2015, 2016

### Geo:

- EU28

## Findings (1)

### 1. Animal health – veterinary programmes:

- positive epidemiological trend for all priority diseases (e.g. rabies and bovine brucellosis)
- limited areas of concern: bovine tuberculosis in 1 MS; ovine and caprine brucellosis in 1 MS
- good framework for prioritising budget resources on priority programmes
- progressive reduction of financial resources thanks to improvement of animal health status
- technical and financial support provided by the EU essential to successful results
- effective coordination among MSs and between MSs and third countries

## Findings (2)

### 1. Animal health – veterinary emergency measures:

- key role in achieving a higher animal health status in the EU
- recent epidemics successfully contained
- major economic consequences (e.g. trade restrictions and block of exports) avoided
- effective EU crises-management system
- spending difficult to predict (cyclical reoccurrence of some endemic diseases, climate change, globalisation of vectors, ...)

## Findings (3)

### 2. Plant health - survey programmes:

- implementation at initial phase (started in 2015)
- positive support to detect emerging phytosanitary risks
- EU support facilitates coordination among MSs to survey plant pests with higher economic, environmental and social impact

## Findings (4)

### 2. Plant health - phytosanitary emergency measures:

- focused on four major pests only (Pinewood nematode, *Xylella fastidiosa*, *Anoplophora glabripennis*, *Pomacea insularum*)
- contribution to prevent their further introduction and spread
- contribution to preserving agricultural production through plant health protection, and protection of biodiversity and forests
- difficulties in achieving eradication (population dynamics, lifecycle of pests and their vectors present in forests, parks and plantations, ...)
- containment when not eradication
- spending difficult to predict (climate change, global trade and movement of travellers)

## Findings (5)

### 3. Official controls - EURLs:

- critical to uniform implementation of controls throughout the EU
- successful application of testing methods
- support to National Reference Laboratories (NRLs) thanks to annual workshops
- limited financial impact and 100% EU funded
- EU financial support and coordination essential to achieve results

## Findings (6)

### 3. Official controls - BTSF:

- critical to a common understanding across Member States of their obligations and how best to enforce relevant EU legislation
- helpful and flexible in responding to new needs, notably during crisis events (contribution to both prevention and crises-preparedness)
- limited financial impact and 100% EU funded
- EU financial support and coordination essential to achieve results

## Findings (7)

### 4. Food safety:

- horizontal area/objective (no specific measures to date)
- animal health, plant health, and official control activities contributing to having a high level of safety of food and of food production systems
- fundamental to stable markets, consumers' confidence and prevent economic and human costs of crises
- contribution to global appreciation of EU agri-food productions for their quality and high-level safety standards

## Horizontal issues (1)

### **Simplification:**

- a single piece of legislation replacing the previous legal framework, over-complex and out-of-date
- rationalised funding rates (50%, 75% and 100%)
- aligned procedures in phytosanitary and veterinary fields
- less comitology and Commission Decisions to shorten time for contract and payments
- introduction of unit cost system (veterinary programmes)

## Horizontal issues (2)

### Areas of further consideration:

- no access to the crises reserve
  - large-scale outbreaks with budgetary impact exceeding the ceiling under the present programme
- needed integration between survey programmes and emergency measures
  - difficulties in achieving eradication
  - containment when eradication is not possible
- use of grants
  - inappropriate for non-competitive funding consisting of reimbursement to the Member States
- Sustainable Development Goals
  - (EG: food waste prevention)

## Conclusions

- Regulation (EU) No 652/2014 works well within its policy contest
- Activities receiving EU financial support in this area serve both its general and specific objectives, and the overall Commission's priorities
- Regulation (EU) No 652/2014 has proven to be flexible to address emerging needs for co-financing especially in the occurrence of outbreaks
- Activities funded under Regulation (EU) No 652/2014 contribute to an EU which is safe and secure, prosperous and sustainable, social, and stronger on the global scene



## **Way Forward after 2020**

Given possible budget constraints under the next MFF , a reflection should be carried out on further prioritisations and simplification of activities to be funded in the future (after 2020).



***Thank you for your attention***

**[https://ec.europa.eu/food/funding\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/food/funding_en)**