



APHIS Considerations on the Identification of Administrative Units for Certain Member States of the European Union

United States Department of Agriculture
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
Veterinary Services
National Center for Import and Export
Regionalization Evaluation Services

June 2005

Executive Summary

Critical to the concept of regionalization for animal diseases is the effectiveness of a region's veterinary infrastructure to detect, control and eradicate animal diseases. Administrative veterinary controls may be effective at a regional, national, or sub-national level. In previous rulemaking regarding the EU, APHIS recognized, with regard to certain Member States, areas of differing risk levels for the same disease within the same Member State. For the purposes of determining how small of a jurisdiction within these Member States to consider a "region," APHIS identified and presented for public comment what it considered to be the smallest jurisdiction that could be demonstrated to have "effective oversight of normal animal movements into, out of, and within that jurisdiction, and that, in association with national authorities, if necessary, has effective control over animal movements and animal diseases locally" [1, 2]. In this document, APHIS is identifying for public comment such "smallest" jurisdictions in certain EU Member States to which, in the event of future animal disease outbreaks, APHIS could regionalize within that Member State. For the sake of convenience, in this document and in any future rulemaking APHIS will refer to the jurisdictions so identified as "administrative units (AUs)."

Based on risk analysis and implemented in rulemaking [1-6]. APHIS recognized effective administrative units at the sub-national level with effective control over classical swine fever (CSF) in four European Union (EU) Member States. These were France (commune), Germany (kreis), Italy (Region) and Spain (comarca).

This document provides information relevant to the identification of the AU in eleven other Member States and a re-evaluation of the AU identified for Italy.¹ Specifically, in this document, APHIS considers that the evidence it has collected to date is sufficient to conclude that the appropriate AU for Austria is the *Bezirk* (district veterinary service); Belgium, the Province; Denmark, the *Amt* (county); Finland, the Provincial veterinary office; Greece, the *Nomos* (prefecture); Ireland, the District Veterinary Office; Italy, the *Aziende Sanitarie Locali* (Local Health Unit); Luxembourg, the entire territory (no sub-national AU recognized); the Netherlands, the compartment; Portugal, the *Divisao de Intervencao Veterinaria* (DIV); Sweden, the *Län*; and the United Kingdom, the County or district.

APHIS recognizes that local authorities in these Member States have effective oversight of normal animal movements into, out of, and within their respective AU; and, in association with national authorities if necessary, have effective control of animal movements and animal diseases locally. In the event of future animal disease outbreaks in the EU, APHIS intends to regionalize Member States to the level of one or more of these identified administrative units (AUs).

¹ Although the AU for Italy has been previously evaluated and identified as the "Region" [1], based on a request by the EC, APHIS is considering in this document to identify a smaller AU for Italy.

Introduction

In order to minimize the risk of introducing an animal disease into the United States, APHIS prohibits or restricts importation of certain animals or animal products from regions where there is a significant risk for outbreak of disease(s) of concern. Critical to the concept of regionalization for animal diseases is the effectiveness of a region's veterinary infrastructure to detect, control and eradicate animal diseases. APHIS has previously evaluated and determined that the EU animal health controls are capable of such [4-6].

Animal health regulations imposed by the EU are harmonized and binding upon all Member States [7-33]. Each Member State transposes these regulations into its national laws obligating compliance at regional and local levels. Although the actions reflect EU regulations, many of these control mechanisms are implemented by authorities at regional and local levels within a Member State. In previous rulemaking regarding the EU, APHIS recognized, with regard to certain Member States, areas of differing risk levels for the same disease within the same Member State. For the purposes of determining how small of a jurisdiction within these Member States to consider a "region," APHIS identified and presented for public comment what it considered to be the smallest jurisdiction that could be demonstrated to have "effective oversight of normal animal movements into, out of, and within that jurisdiction, and that, in association with national authorities, if necessary, has effective control over animal movements and animal diseases locally" [1, 2]. In this document, APHIS is identifying for public comment such "smallest" jurisdictions in certain EU Member States to which, in the event of future animal disease outbreaks, APHIS could regionalize within that Member State. For the sake of convenience, in this document and in any future rulemaking APHIS will refer to the jurisdictions so identified as "administrative units (AUs)." Although addressed in this document in the context of classical swine fever (CSF), the concept of regionalization to the AU level would not be disease-specific.

Prior to creation of this document, APHIS conducted a series of risk analyses and through rulemaking recognized the sufficiency of the EU veterinary infrastructure in regard to control of CSF. As part of this process, APHIS also identified the AU for four Member States (France, Germany, Italy and Spain) [1, 2, 4-6].

Having initially proposed a rule in 1999 [3], APHIS published a final rule in April 2003 that recognized much of the European Union as a region in which CSF is not known to exist [1]. This region included the Member States of Austria, Belgium, Germany (with the exception of Kreis Uckermark in the Land of Brandenburg; Kreis Oldenburg, Kreis Soltau-Fallingb., and Kreis Vechta in the Land of Lower Saxony; Kreis Heinsberg and Kreis Warendorf in the Land of Northrhine-Westphalia; Kreis Bernkastel-Wittlich, Kreis Bitburg-Prüm, Kreis Donnersbergkreis, Kreis Rhein-Hunsruche, Kreis Südliche Weinstrasse, and Kreis Trier-Saarburg in the Land of Rhineland Palatinate; and Kreis Altmarkkreis in the Land of Saxony-Anhalt), Greece, Italy (with the exception of the Island of Sardinia and the Regions of Emilia-Romagna and Piemonte), the Netherlands, and Portugal. During this review, APHIS concluded that Germany and Italy had

sufficient abilities and veterinary infrastructure at sub-national levels to effectively manage disease control. Therefore, in the rule APHIS identified the kreis as the AU in Germany and the Region as the AU for Italy.

This 2003 final rule did not address the CSF status or AUs for the Member States of Denmark, Finland, Republic of Ireland, Sweden, or the United Kingdom (England, Scotland, Wales, Isle of Man, and Northern Ireland). These regions were already recognized as CSF free, and, at the time they were recognized, the concept of AU was not considered. In addition, it did not address the CSF status or AU for the Member States of France, Spain, Luxembourg or CSF status of the German Kreis Uckermark in the Land of Brandenburg; Kreis Oldenburg and Kreis Soltau-Fallingb. in the Land of Lower Saxony; Kreis Heinsberg in the Land of Northrhine-Westphalia; and Kreis Bernkastel-Wittlich, Kreis Bitburg-Prum, Kreis Donnersbergkreis, Kreis Rhein-Hunsruche, Kreis Sudliche Weinstrasse, and Kreis Trier-Saarburg in the Land of Rhineland Palatinate. Although France, Spain, Luxembourg and all German kreis except three (Kreis Vechta in the Land of Lower Saxony; Kreis Warendorf in the Land of Northrhine-Westphalia; and Kreis Altmarkkreis in the Land of Saxony-Anhalt) were initially proposed as free, these regions were excluded from the final recognition of CSF-free status because they experienced CSF outbreaks after publication of the proposed rule. In accordance with the notice-and-comment requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act [34], APHIS did not include them in its final rule. Because the proposed rule had only identified an AU for Germany and Italy and did not identify one for other Member States, the entire territories of France, Spain and Luxembourg were excluded.

Subsequently, APHIS re-evaluated the CSF situation in Spain and France and evaluated AU in these Member States. APHIS released a supplemental risk analysis, *APHIS Risk Analysis for Importation of the Classical Swine Fever Virus in Swine and Swine Products from France and Spain* [6]. A Notice of Availability requesting public comment on this analysis was published in the *Federal Register* on November 24, 2003 [35]. That analysis supports including Spain and France in the EU region recognized in the April 2003 final rule. Included in the analysis was a discussion of appropriate AU identifications for Spain and France. APHIS proposed that the *comarca* be designated the AU for Spain, and the *commune* for France. The comment period closed on January 23, 2004. A final rule was published on April 20, 2004, implementing these changes [2].

Operationally, under its current regulations, APHIS will restrict importation of susceptible animals or animal products from one or more AUs within a Member State where an outbreak of a disease of concern occurred. Although addressed in this document in the context of CSF, the concept of regionalization to the AU level would not be disease-specific.

APHIS considers that the evidence it has collected to date and the results of several analyses support the concept of regionalizing much of the remaining EU to sub-national AUs, as it had done previously for Germany, Italy, France and Spain. If an animal disease outbreak occurs in a Member State for which an AU has not been recognized, then, to remain compliant with requirements under the notice-and-comment rulemaking

process of the Administrative Procedures Act, it would be necessary for APHIS to restrict imports from the entire Member State. Identification of an AU would allow APHIS to prohibit exports at the affected AU level, while allowing exports to continue from the unaffected AUs. This document discusses the appropriate AU structure for Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden, and the United Kingdom.

Objective

The objective of this review is to identify sub-national or administrative units within certain Member States of the European Union to which, in the event of future animal disease outbreaks, APHIS could regionalize that Member State. Although addressed in this document in the context of CSF, the concept of regionalization to the AU level would not be disease-specific. APHIS presents these identifications for public comment.

Main Findings

Austria [36-39]

According to the Austrian Federal Constitution, animal disease control is exclusively a function of the federal government. The Federal Veterinary Services, the central competent authority headed by the Chief Veterinary Officer (CVO), is comprised of three divisions within Section IV (Structural policy, Consumer Health) of the Ministry of Health and Women. These three divisions, headquartered in Vienna, are Meat-Hygiene, Residues, and By-Products (Division 7); Intracommunity Trade with Living Animals, Health Programs, and Veterinary Legislation (Division 8); and Animal Infectious Diseases, Animal Welfare, and Control of Zoonoses (Division 9).

In the event of an outbreak of a notifiable disease, the head of Division 9 coordinates the response through the permanent National Disease Contingency Center according to national contingency plans which have been approved by the EC. By authority granted by the Austrian constitution, this division is responsible for legislation and enforcement of animal infectious disease control.

Division 8 is responsible for management of veterinary border inspection posts; compliance with intra-community trade requirements; conduct of surveillance programs; and the import and export of animals and products.

Division 7 is responsible for meat hygiene and meat inspection, rendering plants, and animal by-products.

Through the actions of these three divisions, the Federal Veterinary Services are responsible for implementing legislation and enforcing animal disease control measures by supervising and directing actions to be taken by provincial and district veterinary services (local administrative units).

Austria is divided into nine federal provinces and further divided into ninety-nine federal districts. Each province has a provincial veterinary service under the control of the Federal Veterinary Service (within the Ministry of Health and Women). The provincial veterinary services supervise the district veterinary services. The district veterinary services, known as *Berzirk*, act as first-responder authorities in the event of an animal disease outbreak according to the Austrian Disease Act. Official veterinarians are

employed by the provincial veterinary service working at either the provincial or district level. While these official veterinarians are employed by the provincial government they are also supervised and given direct orders from the Federal Veterinary Service. In 2003, 238 official veterinarians served either at the provincial level (90) or as district veterinary officers (138). According to the size of the district and its animal density as many as 3 official veterinarians are assigned to a district.

Upon notification of suspicion or an outbreak of a notifiable animal disease, the district veterinary officer visits the suspected premises, examines the suspected animals, takes samples, and sends them to the competent laboratory. The district veterinary officer implements protection and eradication measures in accordance with the national contingency plan that has been approved by the EC in concurrence with the SVC. If more than one district of a province is involved in the outbreak, then the provincial veterinary service is responsible for coordination of the response. Likewise, if more than one federal province is involved, then the response is coordinated by the federal veterinary services.

APHIS considers the appropriate administrative unit for Austria to be the *Berzirk*, the district veterinary service.

Belgium [36, 37, 39, 40]

Established by a Royal Degree on May 16, 2001, the central veterinary authority in Belgium is the Federal Agency for the Safety of the Food Chain (FASFC). Headed by a Chief Executive Officer and located in Brussels, FASFC is organized into four departments (control-policy, control, laboratories and general services). Each department is under the supervision of a Director General. The control-policy department develops animal disease control legislation and policy, while the control department is responsible for implementation and enforcement of animal disease control measures through direct control of veterinary field services.

Belgium is divided into eleven provinces. Within each province, veterinary field services are responsible for the application of animal disease control measures including certification for animal movement. Every province has a staff of fulltime salaried veterinarians. Eleven provincial directors are responsible for the administration of veterinary services in their respective province. The provinces are grouped and managed by two regional directors, one region comprised of the Dutch-speaking provinces of Northern Belgium and the other comprised of the French-speaking southern provinces. The regional directors report to the Director General of the FASFC control department in Brussels.

APHIS considers the appropriate administrative unit for Belgium to be the province.

Denmark [36, 39, 41]

The Danish Veterinary and Food Administration (DVFA) is part of the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries. The DVFA is further subdivided into three units: the Food Department, Veterinary Service and the Administration Department. Regionally, food control and veterinary inspections are handled by eleven Regional Veterinary and Food Control Centres (RVFCCs). To ensure harmonized implementation of national law, the DVFA organizes regular meetings with the RVFCCs.

DVFA is the central competent authority, developing rules and regulations animal disease control in Denmark. It is the responsibility of the DVFA to transpose EU animal control legislation into Danish law.

The Director of Veterinary Services is the Chief Veterinary Officer (CVO). Veterinary Service is responsible for the veterinary contingency capabilities, which includes eradicating livestock diseases and zoonoses and controlling imports and exports of live animals and of products of animal origin. The Service is also responsible for controlling animal welfare and of the use of medicine in livestock production, and the livestock trade.

In the event of an animal disease outbreak, the CVO has the authority to implement disease eradication measures, reporting directly to the Minister of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries while keeping the General Director of DVFA informed. If the CVO is absent, the responsibility is handled by the Deputy CVO who heads Veterinary Service Division for Diseases of Domestic Animals.

The eleven RVFCCs are independent local authorities, established on January 1, 2000, to provide food and animal health controls according to national law within prescribed geographic areas. Each RVFCC covers one or more of the 14 counties (or *amter*, singular is *amt*) and 2 boroughs which are the local political units of Denmark.

The regional veterinary and food control authorities are in charge of direct contact with consumers, businesses, veterinary medical practitioners, and livestock owners in the region. All regional veterinary and food control authorities have the same basic structure. Each authority is headed by a regional director and consists of a food department, a veterinary department, a laboratory and a secretariat.

APHIS considers the appropriate administrative unit for Denmark to be the *amt* (county).

Finland [36, 39, 42]

In Finland, the Department of Food and Health, a division of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, is the central competent authority responsible for the prevention and monitoring of animal diseases. Provincial veterinary officers are responsible for

implementation of legislation in the provinces, and municipal veterinarians and veterinary officers carry out the duties locally.

The Head of the Department of Food and Health serves as the Chief Veterinary Officer (CVO) who has the final authority commanding animal disease control strategies. The CVO is responsible for notifying OIE, the EC and EU Member States of animal disease outbreaks. The CVO has delegated to the Deputy Director General of the Department to head the Unit of Animal Health which forms the National Animal Disease Control Center (NADCC). The NADCC is staffed by 9 veterinarians and 3 support staff. In the event of an outbreak of disease, the NADCC will coordinate the national strategy under the overall direction of the CVO. The National Veterinary and Food Research Institute (EELA) carries out testing and studies related to implementation of legislation.

The chain of command regarding animal disease control is organized at three levels: national, provincial and municipal. Finland is geographically divided into 6 provinces. In each province there are 1 to 4 provincial veterinary offices depending on the size of the province and animal density. There is a total of 13 provincial veterinary offices within Finland under the control of one or more provincial veterinary officers who are directly responsible to the head of the NADCC. Provincial veterinary officers carry out duties related to implementation of legislation in the provinces. Municipal veterinary officers, volunteers having received special training to handle disease outbreaks, carry out the duties locally under the supervision of the provincial veterinary officers.

According to Finnish legislation, all veterinarians under the age of 50, as well as advanced veterinary students, are obligated to participate in combating an outbreak if needed. In the event of an emergency, local police may be required to assist with animal disease control measures.

APHIS considers the appropriate administrative unit for Finland to be the provincial veterinary office

Greece [36, 39, 43]

The Directorate General of Veterinary Services (DGVS), within the Ministry of Agriculture, is the central competent authority for animal health issues. The DGVS is divided into three divisions: Animal Health; Veterinary Care, Drugs and Application; and Veterinary Public Health. The DGVS controls the overall policies of animal disease control. EU animal health legislation has been transposed into Greek law.

Greece is administratively divided into 54 *Nomos* (equivalent to a county in the US). Within each *Nomos*, there is a Prefecture Veterinary Authority (PVA) to which the local response to implement animal health legislation has been delegated. In the event of an animal disease outbreak, each PVA is empowered to take whatever measures are necessary to eradicate or control the disease in compliance with national contingency

plans and national law. The DGVS systematically check on the PVAs to ensure proper implementation of relevant laws and PVAs regularly provide reports to the DGVS.

APHIS considers the appropriate administrative unit for Greece to be the *Nomos*.

Ireland [36, 39, 44]

The Department of Agriculture and Food is the central competent authority responsible for the control of animal health. The Minister of Agriculture and Food delegates authority to manage control of animal disease outbreaks to the Chief Veterinary Officer (CVO). In the event of an animal disease outbreak, the CVO directs the national response strategy.

Ireland is divided into 26 administrative regions called “counties.” Most counties have one local district veterinary office (DVO). The exceptions are Cork and Tipperary, which are large counties with 3 and 2 DVOs respectively, and Wicklow County, which is divided into East and West regions administered by the DVOs of Dublin and Kildare respectively. In total, there are 28 DVOs in Ireland.

In the event of a disease outbreak, the CCA, under the overall direction of the CVO, coordinates the national strategy. Veterinary staffs at the 28 DVOs are responsible for the implementation of control measures in their region, and report to the CVO.

APHIS considers the appropriate administrative unit for the Republic of Ireland to be the District Veterinary Office.

Italy [36, 39, 45]

In the April 2003 final rule, APHIS recognized the “Region” as the appropriate administrative unit for Italy based on information previously submitted by the EU. However, the EC at the request of the Italian government has requested that APHIS review additional information describing the function of the *Aziende Sanitarie Locali* (Local Health Unit) in support of its recognition as the appropriate administrative unit in Italy.

The organization of the animal health system in Italy is characterized by a division of responsibilities among national, regional, and local authorities. At the national level, the Department of Food, Nutrition and Veterinary Public Health within the *Ministero della Salute* is the central competent authority for animal disease control in Italy. The CCA is responsible for the transposition of EU legislation into Italian law; operates the border inspection posts; and assembles national animal disease statistics. The CCA provides guidance, coordination and monitoring of animal health measures implemented at the regional and local levels.

Administratively, Italy is divided into twenty Regions each of which has governments somewhat independent of the national government. The Regional authority is the link between the CCA and local authorities. Regions have the authority to enact laws that are more stringent than those issued by the national government. The Regions have full powers to develop and implement their own policy regarding disease contingency plans. Regions also have influence over budgetary and personnel affairs of the local authorities.

Within each Region, there are a number of Local Health Units, each with a local veterinary authority called *Azienda Sanitaria Locali* (ASL). The ASLs are totally responsible for implementing the animal health control measures (including eradication, surveillance and movement controls) within the geographical area of their Local Health Unit.

While APHIS previously recognized the “Region” as the appropriate administrative unit for Italy, upon review of additional information provided by the EC, APHIS now considers the appropriate administrative unit for the Italy to be the *Aziende Sanitarie Locali* (Local Health Unit).

Luxembourg [39, 46, 47]

For purposes of animal disease regionalization, APHIS considers the entire territory of Luxembourg to be the smallest administrative unit with effective oversight of normal animal movements into, out of, and within that country, and that has the responsibility for controlling animal diseases locally.

The Netherlands [36, 37, 39, 48-51]

The Netherlands is a constitutional monarchy with a central government headed by an appointed prime minister. The country is divided administratively into twelve provinces. In regards to animal health, the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality (LNV), is the central competent authority. The LNV is made up of two parts: the core Ministry and numerous implementing bodies. The core Ministry is subdivided into nine central policy departments, five regional policy departments and six staff departments.

The Department of Veterinary and Food Policy Affairs (VVA), is responsible for transposition of EC legislation and for policy and strategy, giving directives for the implementation of disease prevention and eradication measures. The CVO operates within this directorate.

The National Inspection Service for Livestock and Meat (RVV) is responsible for the implementation of veterinary tasks in relation to animal disease prevention and control, following the directions of the LNV.

Within the LNV, there exists a National Crisis Center (NCC) which stands ready in the event of an animal disease outbreak to activate an emergency response in accordance with EC approved contingency plans. Depending on the nature and extent of the outbreak, the NCC coordinates inter-governmental response by activating one or more departmental coordination centers each responsible for their own areas of authority. The NCC also coordinates with provincial, regional and local crisis centers to provide an integrated and comprehensive emergency response.

In regards to regionalization in the event of an animal disease outbreak, the Netherlands has adopted a compartmentalization approach of which its structure has been legally formalized through the Animal Health and Welfare Act and Commission Decision 2004/67/EC. Rather than following administrative borders, this approach defines 20 fixed compartments based on controllable borders such as highways, main waterways, and country borders.

During normal times when no outbreak of animal disease is occurring, these compartments have no function. However, as soon as an outbreak of an infectious disease occurs, such as OIE List A diseases, 5 to 7 of the compartments will be joined together to form regions for disease control and surveillance. The size, number of compartments included and shape of the region is based on the location of the outbreak, livestock population, and epidemiological information available at the time. Animal movements between compartments would be tightly controlled to contain the spread of disease thus separating animals in “infected” regions from those in “free” regions.

APHIS considers the appropriate administrative unit for the Netherlands to be the compartment.

Portugal [36, 37, 39, 52]

In Portugal, the General Veterinary Directorate (DGV), a department in the Ministry of Agriculture, Rural Affairs and Fisheries, is the central competent authority responsible for matters concerning animal health and welfare, animal production, and meat inspection.

Veterinary Service on mainland Portugal is divided administratively into seven regions each with its own regional veterinary service (DRA). Each DRA is further sub-divided into administrative units referred to as *Divisao de Intervencao Veterinaria* (DIV). In total there are 24 DIV's each under the direction of an official veterinarian. The DIV's are coordinated by a DRA in accordance with policy set by the DGV.

The DIV's are responsible for the sanitary control of the livestock populations in their areas, implementing measures related to the prevention against animal diseases, and animal protection and welfare in accordance with national legislation.

Portugal also includes the autonomous island regions of Madeira and the Azores. The veterinary infrastructure on these islands is slightly different. Each island in the Azores has a local veterinary structure which is a component of the Agrarian Development Service which is under the direction of the DGV. On Madeira, there is a Veterinary Services Directorate that also is under the supervision of the DGV.

APHIS considers the appropriate administrative unit for Portugal to be the *Divisao de Intervencao Veterinaria* (DIV).

Sweden [36, 39, 53-55]

In Sweden, the Swedish Board of Agriculture (*Jordbruksverket*) reports to the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs and is the Government's specialized entity in the field of agriculture. While the Board is an independent administrative department, its authority originates from, and it is legally bound to follow the Government's instructions under the Order on State Boards (1995:1322) and the Order on Duties of the State Agriculture Board (1998:415). The Board is the central competent authority responsible for implementing measures to prevent and control epizootic diseases.

The pertinent legal documents regulating the prevention and control of animal diseases include the Law on Epizootic Diseases (1999:657) and its implementing instruments, including the Order on Epizootics (1999:659) and the State Agriculture Board's Rules and Regulations (SJVFS 2002:98).

The Board has the authority and responsibility to control the movement of animals and their products as well as implement control measures related to movement of persons and vehicles. The Board also issues regulations and decisions concerning slaughtering, safe disposal, disinfection, tests and other measures to prevent and control animal diseases. The Board may delegate to the county (*län*) administrative boards certain powers to declare, and declare an end of, an outbreak, designate the movement control zones and quarantine zones, and to commandeer the use of slaughtering facilities, processing plants, equipment, plant and personnel for preventing or controlling animal diseases.

Other government agencies, such as the National Food Administration (*Livsmedelsverket*), the National Veterinary Institute (*Statens Veterinärmedicinska anstalt*) as well as county (*län*) administrative boards, are required to develop contingency plans there are in agreement with the Agriculture Board's policies outlining measures and actions to be implemented in the event of an animal disease outbreak.

Sweden is comprised of 21 counties (*län*). Each county has a county executive authority which serves as a regional government authority whose duties are regulated by the Order on the Duties of the County Administrative Boards (2002:864). The county administrative boards report to the Ministry of Finance. The county executives include veterinarians responsible for veterinary matters and measures to deal with animal diseases at the county level. The county executives have detailed contingency plans for

dealing with an animal disease outbreak, including plans for setting up local animal disease control centers. Through these local control centers the Agriculture Board, in collaboration with the county administrative board and other concerned authorities, manages and organizes the Governments response to animal disease outbreaks.

Sweden has about 2200 professional veterinarians. About 300 of them are employed by the Board as official local veterinarians staffing around 80 district veterinary centers. The district veterinarians are responsible for the daily operation of animal disease surveillance. In the event of an outbreak, the Board has the ability to redeploy some of the district veterinarians to reinforce the number of veterinarians in a given region.

Veterinarians who are not official local veterinarians are obligated by law to assist in animal disease control if called upon by the Board.

APHIS considers the appropriate administrative unit for Sweden to be the county (*län*).

United Kingdom [36, 39, 56]

The United Kingdom consists of the countries England, Scotland, and Wales (collectively known as Great Britain), and Northern Ireland.

For Great Britain, the central competent authorities for the control and monitoring of animal diseases are the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) in England, the Scottish Executive Environment and Rural Affairs Department (SEERAD) in Scotland, and the Welsh Assembly Government Agriculture and Rural Affairs Department in Wales. By agreement of these three authorities, the State Veterinary Service (SVS), which is a part of DEFRA, provides a national veterinary service for the whole of Great Britain. The UK's Chief Veterinary Officer is DEFRA's Director General Animal Health and Welfare who is head of SVS.

In Northern Ireland, responsibility for animal health and welfare lies with the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (DARD). Northern Ireland has its own Veterinary Services and Chief Veterinary Officer.

Great Britain is divided into 74 administrative units (Counties, Metropolitan Districts and Unitary Authorities) according to local authority boundaries. In Scotland, Wales, and in parts of England, a single council is responsible for all the local authority functions. The remainder of England has a two-tier system in which two separate councils (County and District) divide the responsibilities. With either arrangement, DEFRA can place animal control restrictions on one or more of these administrative units.

Northern Ireland is divided into 26 Borough or District Councils, each representing local administrative divisions. DARD can place animal control restrictions on one or more of these administrative units.

While the central competent authorities retain responsibility for the establishment and maintenance of control policies, the enforcement of the legislation, including movement controls placed upon restricted areas, is the responsibility of local authorities.

APHIS considers the appropriate administrative unit for the United Kingdom to be the County or District or their equivalent.

Summary Conclusions

APHIS evaluated information provided by EC officials and considers that local authorities in AUs in the following Member States have effective oversight of normal animal movements into, out of, and within their respective jurisdiction; and, in association with national authorities if necessary, have the effective control over animal movement and animal diseases locally. In the event of future animal disease outbreaks in the EU in Member States for which AUs were not previously identified, APHIS intends to regionalize these Member States to the level of one or more AUs as listed below.

MEMBER STATE	ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT
Austria	<i>Bezirk</i> (district veterinary service)
Belgium	Province
Denmark	<i>Amt</i> (county)
Finland	Provincial veterinary office
Greece	<i>Nomos</i> (prefecture)
Ireland, Republic of	District Veterinary Office
Italy	<i>Aziende Sanitarie Locali</i> (Local Health Unit)
Luxembourg	Entire territory (no sub-national AU identified)
The Netherlands	Compartment
Portugal	<i>Divisao de Intervencao Veterinaria</i> (DIV)
Sweden	<i>Län</i>
United Kingdom	County or district

References

1. Recognition of Animal Disease Status of Regions in the European Union; Final Rule. Federal Register, Monday, April 7, 2003. 68(66): p. 16922-16941
2. Classical Swine Fever Status of France and Spain; Final Rule. Federal Register, Tuesday, April 20, 2004. 69(76): p. 21042-21047.
3. Recognition of Animal Disease Status of Regions in the European Union; Proposed Rule. Federal Register, Friday, June 25, 1999. 64(122): p. 34155-34168.
4. Biological Risk Analysis: Risk assessment and management options for imports of swine and swine products from the European Union - June 2, 1999. United States Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Veterinary Services, Policy and Program Development, <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/vs/ncie/reg-request.html>
5. Risk Analysis for Importation of Classical Swine Fever Virus in Swine and Swine Products from the European Union - December 2000. United States Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Veterinary Services, <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/vs/ncie/reg-request.html>
6. APHIS Risk Analysis for Importation of the Classical Swine Fever Virus in Swine and Swine Products from France and Spain, November, 2003. United States Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Veterinary Services, <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/vs/ncie/reg-request.html>
7. Council Directive 2001/89/EC of 23 October 2001 on Community measures for the control of classical swine fever. Official Journal of the European Communities, December 1, 2001. L 316: p. 5 - 35. http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2001/l_316/l_31620011201en00050035.pdf
8. Commission Decision 2002/106/EC of 1 February 2002 approving a Diagnostic Manual establishing diagnostic procedures, sampling methods and criteria for evaluation of the laboratory tests for the confirmation of classical swine fever. Official Journal of the European Communities, February 9, 2002. L 39: p. 71-88. http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2002/l_039/l_03920020209en00710088.pdf
9. Council Directive 90/425/EEC of 26 June 1990 concerning veterinary and zootechnical checks applicable in intra-Community trade in certain live animals and products with a view to the completion of the internal market. Official Journal of the European Communities, August 18, 1990. L 224: p. 29-41. http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=EN&numdoc=31990L0425&model=guichett
10. Council Directive 90/429/EEC of 26 June 1990 laying down the animal health requirements applicable to intra-Community trade in and imports of semen of domestic animals of the porcine species. Official Journal of the European Communities, August 18, 1990. L 224: p. 62 - 72. http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=EN&numdoc=31990L0429&model=guichett
11. Commission Decision [2000/39/EC] of 16 December 1999 amending Annex B to Council Directive 90/429/EEC laying down the animal health requirements applicable to intra-Community trade in and imports of semen of domestic animals of the porcine species. Official Journal of the European Communities, January 19, 2000. L 13: p. 21. http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2000/l_013/l_01320000119en00210021.pdf

12. Directive 2002/33/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2002 amending Council Directives 90/425/EEC and 92/118/EEC as regards health requirements for animal by-products. Official Journal of the European Communities, November 19, 2002. L315: p. 14-15. http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2002/l_315/l_31520021119en00140015.pdf
13. Commission Decision [2002/199/EC] of 30 January 2002 concerning animal health conditions and veterinary certification for imports of live bovine and porcine animals from certain third countries. Official Journal of the European Communities, March 13, 2002. L 71: p. 1-35. http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2002/l_071/l_07120020313en00010035.pdf
14. Commission Decision [2002/578/EC] of 10 July 2002 amending Decision 2002/199/EC concerning animal health conditions and veterinary certification for imports of live bovine and porcine animals from certain third countries. Official Journal of the European Communities, July 12, 2002. L 183: p. 62-63. http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2002/l_183/l_18320020712en00620063.pdf
15. Corrigendum to Council Directive 2001/89/EC of 23 October 2001 on Community measures for the control of classical swine fever. Official Journal of the European Communities, June 27, 2002. L 168: 59. http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2002/l_168/l_16820020627en00590059.pdf
16. Commission Decision [2003/859/EC] of 5 December 2003 amending Decision 2002/106/EC as regards the establishment of a classical swine fever discriminatory test. Official Journal of the European Union, December 11, 2003. L 324: p. 55-56. http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2003/l_324/l_32420031211en00550056.pdf
17. Commission Decision [2003/623/EC] of 19 August 2003 concerning the development of an integrated computerized veterinary system known as Traces. Official Journal of the European Union, August 28, 2003. L 216: p 58-59. http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2003/l_216/l_21620030828en00580059.pdf
18. Council Directive 82/894/EEC of 21 December 1982 on the notification of animal diseases within the community. Official Journal of the European Communities, December 31, 1982. L 378: p. 58-62. http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=EN&numdoc=31982L0894&model=guichett
19. Council Directive 64/432/EEC of 26 June 1964 on animal health problems affecting intra-Community trade in bovine animals and swine. Official Journal of the European Communities, July 29, 1964. L 121: p. 1977 - 2012. http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=EN&numdoc=31964L0432&model=guichett
20. Council Directive 72/461/EEC of 12 December 1972 on health problems affecting intra-Community trade in fresh meat. Official Journal of the European Communities, December 31, 1972. L 302: p. 24 - 27. http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=EN&numdoc=31972L0461&model=guichett
21. Council Directive 85/511/EEC of 18 November 1985 introducing Community measures for the control of foot- and-mouth disease. Official Journal of the European Communities, November 26, 1985. L 315: p. 11 - 18. http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=EN&numdoc=31985L0511&model=guichett

22. Council Directive 92/119/EEC of 17 December 1992 introducing general Community measures for the control of certain animal diseases and specific measures relating to swine vesicular disease. Official Journal of the European Communities, March 15, 1993. L 62: p. 69 - 85.
http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=EN&numdoc=31992L0119&model=guichett
23. Council Directive 2002/60/EC of 27 June 2002 laying down specific provisions for the control of African swine fever and amending Directive 92/119/EEC as regards Teschen disease and African swine fever. Official Journal of the European Communities, July 20, 2002. L 192: p. 27 - 46.
http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2002/l_192/l_19220020720en00270046.pdf
24. Commission Decision 91/42/EEC of 8 January 1991 laying down the criteria to be applied when drawing up contingency plans for the control of foot-and-mouth disease, in application of Article 5 of Council Directive 90/423/EEC. Official Journal of the European Communities, January 29, 1991. L 023: p. 29 - 30.
http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=EN&numdoc=31991D0042&model=guichett
25. Commission Decision 98/139/EC of 4 February 1998 laying down certain detailed rules concerning on-the-spot checks carried out in the veterinary field by Commission experts in the Member States. Official Journal of the European Communities, February 12, 1998. L 038: p. 10 - 13. http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/1998/l_038/l_03819980212en00100013.pdf
26. Council Directive 89/662/EEC of 11 December 1989 concerning veterinary checks in intra-Community trade with a view to the completion of the internal market. Official Journal of the European Communities, December 30, 1989. L 395: p. 13 - 22.
http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=EN&numdoc=31989L0662&model=guichett
27. Commission Decision 93/455/EEC of 23 July 1993 approving certain contingency plans for the control of foot-and-mouth disease. Official Journal of the European Communities, August 24, 1993. L 213: p. 20.
http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=EN&numdoc=31993D0455&model=guichett
28. Commission Decision 95/194/EC of 30 May 1995 amending Decision 93/455/EEC approving certain contingency plans for the control of foot-and-mouth disease. Official Journal of the European Communities, June 7, 1995. L 124: p. 38.
http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=EN&numdoc=31995D0194&model=guichett
29. Commission Decision 2001/96/EC of 18 January 2001 amending for the second time Decision 93/455/EEC approving certain contingency plans for the control of foot-and-mouth disease. Official Journal of the European Communities, February 6, 2001. L 35: p. 52.
http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/pri/en/oj/dat/2001/l_035/l_03520010206en00520052.pdf
30. Commission Decision 96/553/EC of 6 September 1996 laying down the rules for technical and scientific measures concerning the control of classical swine fever and the financial contribution from the Community. Official Journal of the European Communities, September 20, 1996. L 240: p. 15 - 17.
http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=EN&numdoc=31996D0553&model=guichett
31. Council Directive 92/102/EEC of 27 November 1992 on the identification and registration of animals. Official Journal of the European Communities, December 5, 1992. L 355: p. 32 - 36.

- http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=EN&numdoc=31992L0102&model=guichett
32. Commission Decision 94/34/EC of 24 January 1994 on the implementation of the Animo computerized network. Official Journal of the European Communities, January 26, 1994. L 021: p. 22.
http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=EN&numdoc=31994D0034&model=guichett
33. Council Directive 96/93/EC of 17 December 1996 on the certification of animals and animal products. Official Journal of the European Communities, January 16, 1997. L 013: p. 28 - 30.
http://europa.eu.int/smartapi/cgi/sga_doc?smartapi!celexapi!prod!CELEXnumdoc&lg=EN&numdoc=31996L0093&model=guichett
34. Administrative Procedure Act. United States Code, Part I, Chapter 5, Subchapter II.
35. Classical Swine Fever; Availability of Risk Analysis Related to the Importation of Swine and Swine Products From France and Spain. Federal Register, Monday, November 24, 2003. 68(226): p. 65869-65871.
36. Checchi Lang, A., European Commission. Personal communication: Correspondence regarding EC/US Veterinary Agreement Animal Health Technical Working Group - EU Administrative Units for regionalization purposes, October, 2003. <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/vs/ncie/reg-request.html>
37. Checchi Lang, A., European Commission. Personal communication: Correspondence regarding EC/US Veterinary Agreement Animal Health Technical Working Group - EU Administrative Units for regionalization purposes, April, 2004. <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/vs/ncie/reg-request.html>
38. Final report of a mission carried out in Austria from 5 to 9 May 2003 in order to evaluate the disease contingency plans for epizootic diseases (in particular foot and mouth disease & classical swine fever). European Commission, Health & Consumer Protection Directorate-General, Directorate F - Food and Veterinary Office, July 15, 2003.
http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/inspections/vi/reports/austria/vi_rep_oste_9079-2003_en.pdf
39. Regionalization requests, Internet web page. United States Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Veterinary Services, <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/vs/ncie/reg-request.html>
40. Final report of a mission carried out in Belgium from 16 to 18 March 1999 to evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of the foot-and-mouth disease contingency plan and the preparedness of the authorities for an emergency. European Commission, Health & Consumer Protection Directorate-General, Directorate F - Food and Veterinary Office, June 18, 1999.
http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/inspections/vi/reports/belgium/vi_rep_belg_1019-1999_en.pdf
41. Final report of a mission carried out in Denmark from 16 to 20 June 2003 in order to evaluate the disease contingency plans for epizootic diseases (in particular foot and mouth disease & classical swine fever). European Commission, Health & Consumer Protection Directorate-General, Directorate F - Food and Veterinary Office, September 4, 2003.
http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/inspections/vi/reports/denmark/vi_rep_denm_9101-2003_en.pdf
42. Final report of a mission carried out in Finland from 2 to 6 June 2003 in order to evaluate the disease contingency plans for epizootic diseases (in particular foot and mouth disease & classical swine fever). European Commission, Health & Consumer Protection Directorate-General,

- Directorate F - Food and Veterinary Office, August 27, 2003.
http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/inspections/vi/reports/finland/vi_rep_finl_9100-2003_en.pdf
43. Final report of a mission carried out in Greece from 17 to 21 November 2003 in order to evaluate the disease contingency plans for epizootic diseases (in particular foot and mouth disease, classical swine fever & bluetongue). European Commission, Health & Consumer Protection Directorate-General, Directorate F - Food and Veterinary Office, March 26, 2004.
http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/inspections/vi/reports/greece/vi_rep_gree_9185-2003_en.pdf
44. Final report of a mission carried out in Ireland from 28 October to 5 November 2003 in order to evaluate the disease contingency plans for epizootic diseases in particular foot and mouth disease, classical swine fever, Newcastle disease and avian influenza. European Commission, Health & Consumer Protection Directorate-General, Directorate F - Food and Veterinary Office, April 2, 2004. http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/inspections/vi/reports/ireland/vi_rep_irel_9193-2003_en.pdf
45. Final report of a mission carried out in Italy from 17 to 21 February 2003 in order to review action taken by the competent authorities with regard to the contingency plans for foot-and-mouth disease, classical swine fever and bluetongue. European Commission, Health & Consumer Protection Directorate-General, Directorate F - Food and Veterinary Office, June 10, 2003.
http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/inspections/vi/reports/italia/vi_rep_ital_9078-2003_en.pdf
46. Ministere de l'Agriculture, de la Viticulture et du Developpement Rural Administration des Services Veterinaires. Personal communication: Information provided by Luxembourg officials to APHIS during site visit, February 2003. <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/vs/ncie/reg-request.html>
47. Besch, Arthur, Ministere de l'Agriculture, de la Viticulture et du Developpement Rural Administration des Services Veterinaires. Personal communication: Information about the CSF outbreaks in Luxembourg in 2002 to Anne Goodman, APHIS, January 15, 2003.
<http://www.aphis.usda.gov/vs/ncie/reg-request.html>
48. Final report of a mission carried out in the Netherlands from 17 to 21 June 2002 to evaluate the measures introduced to give effect to the contingency plans for foot-and-mouth disease and classical swine fever. European Commission, Health & Consumer Protection Directorate-General, Directorate F - Food and Veterinary Office, September 24, 2002.
http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/inspections/vi/reports/netherlands/vi_rep_neth_8535-2002_en.pdf
49. Final report of a mission carried out in the Netherlands from 1 to 5 May 2003 concerning avian influenza. European Commission, Health & Consumer Protection Directorate-General, Directorate F - Food and Veterinary Office, September 1, 2003.
http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/inspections/vi/reports/netherlands/vi_rep_neth_9174-2003_en.pdf
50. Final report of a mission carried out in the Netherlands from 8 to 12 December 2003 in order to evaluate the disease contingency plans for epizootic diseases (in particular foot and mouth disease & classical swine fever). European Commission, Health & Consumer Protection Directorate-General, Directorate F - Food and Veterinary Office, March 22, 2004.
http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/inspections/vi/reports/netherlands/vi_rep_neth_9196-2003_en.pdf
51. Checchi Lang, A., European Commission. Personal communication: Correspondence regarding EC/US Veterinary Agreement Animal Health Technical Working Group - EU Administrative Units for regionalization purposes, November, 2003. <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/vs/ncie/reg-request.html>

-
52. Final report of a mission carried out in Portugal from 30 June to 4 July 2003 in order to evaluate the disease contingency plans for epizootic diseases in particular foot and mouth disease and classical swine fever. European Commission, Health & Consumer Protection Directorate-General, Directorate F - Food and Veterinary Office, October 1, 2003.
http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/inspections/vi/reports/portugal/vi_rep_port_9102-2003_en.pdf
53. Final report of an animal health mission to Sweden carried out from 6 March to 10 March 2000 to examine the measures introduced to give effect to the contingency plans for foot-and-mouth-disease and classical swine fever. European Commission, Health & Consumer Protection Directorate-General, Directorate F - Food and Veterinary Office, June 23, 2000.
http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/inspections/vi/reports/sweden/vi_rep_swed_1108-2000_en.pdf
54. *Jordbruksverket* - The Swedish Board of Agriculture. Internet site (<http://www.sjv.se/home.4.7502f61001ea08a0c7fff125607.html>), 2005.
55. Comments to the "Notice of Availability of Draft Document Concerning the Identification of EU Administrative Units" [Docket No. 04-081-1]. European Communities, June 20, 2005.
<http://www.aphis.usda.gov/vs/ncie/reg-request.html>
56. Final report of a mission to the United Kingdom from 4 to 8 November 2002 to evaluate the measures introduced to give effect to the contingency plans for foot-and-mouth disease and classical swine fever. European Commission, Health & Consumer Protection Directorate-General, Directorate F - Food and Veterinary Office, January 20, 2003.
http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/inspections/vi/reports/united_kingdom/vi_rep_unik_8545-2002_en.pdf