EUROPEAN COMMISSION
HEALTH AND CONSUMERS DIRECTORATE-GENERAL

Directorate F - Food and Veterinary Office

DG(SANCO) 2010-8409 - MR FINAL

FINAL REPORT OF A MISSION

CARRIED OUT IN

THE UNITED KINGDOM

FROM 07 TO 17 SEPTEMBER 2010

IN ORDER TO EVALUATE THE ANIMAL HEALTH CONTROLS IN RELATION TO AQUACULTURE ANIMALS

Executive Summary

This report describes the outcome of a mission carried out by the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (UK), from 7 to 17 September 2010.

The overall objective of the mission was to assess the implementation of national measures, aimed at the control of animal health requirements for aquaculture animals and products thereof, and on the prevention and control of certain diseases in aquatic animals, as laid down in Council Directive 2006/88/EC and associated legislation implementing some of the provisions contained therein.

In terms of scope, the assessment carried out was aimed in particular at verifying:

- *Whether laws, regulations and administrative provisions have been adopted and published as necessary to comply with Directive 2006/88/EC;*
- *Whether competent authorities (CA) have been designated for the purposes of the said Directive and operate and perform their duties in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 882/2004;*
- *Whether the CA have access to adequate laboratory services and state of- the-art know-how in risk analysis and epidemiology as applied to diseases of aquatic animals;*
- *Conditions for authorisation and registration of aquaculture production businesses (APB) according to provisions laid down in the said Directive;*
- *Organisation and implementation of official controls carried by the CA on APB;*
- *Application by the CA of a a risk-based animal health surveillance scheme in all farms and mollusc farming areas, as appropriate for the type of production;*
- *Measures in place for control of diseases of aquatic animals, including c ontingency planning for emerging and exotic diseases ;*
- *Compliance with animal health requirements for placing on the market and introducing into the European Union (EU) aquaculture animals and products thereof.*

Overall, the report concludes that the CA of the UK have set up a satisfactory system for prevention, control and eradication of aquatic animal diseases in accordance with requirements on aquatic animal health laid down in Directive 2006/88/EC , in particular:

- *The CA have adequate expertise in risk analysis and epidemiology as applied to diseases of aquatic animals and an excellent laboratory network to carry out their diagnostic tasks in accordance with EU and international standards;*
- *APB have been authorised or registered as appropriate and the system of official controls adequately verifies their levels of compliance, according to the risks they pose of contracting or spreading disease;*
- *Current levels of aquatic animal health surveillance and prevention, including import controls and preparedness to respond in the event of a disease outbreak, are sufficient to maintain the high health status of the aquatic animal populations in the UK.*

Table of Contents

Abbreviations and definitions used in this report

Abbreviation	Explanation
AAHR	Aquatic Animal Health Regulations 2009
AFBI	Agri-food and Biosciences Institute
APB	Aquaculture production businesses
BKD	Bacterial kidney disease
BMP	Biosecurity measures plan
CA	Competent Authorities
CEFAS	Centre for Environment, Fisheries & Aquaculture Science
DARD	Department of Agriculture and Rural Development of Northern Ireland
DEFRA	Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
EU	European Union
FHI	Fish Health Inspectorate
FVO	Food and Veterinary Office
GS	Infection with *Gyrodactylus salaris*
IHN	Infectious haematopoietic necrosis
IPN	Infectious pancreatic necrosis virus
ISA	Infectious salmon anaemia
KVD	koi herpes virus disease
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MS	Member States of the EU
MSC	Marine Scotland
NRL	National Reference Laboratory
SVC	Spring viraemia of carp
UK	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
UKAS	UK accreditation service
VHS	Viral haemorrhagic septicaemia

1 Introduction

The mission took place in the UK from 7 to 17 September 2010. The mission was undertaken as part of the planned mission programme of the FVO and visited England, Scotland and Northern Ireland.

The mission is part of a series of on-the-spot inspections, including audits, initiated by the FVO in 2010, carried out in cooperation with the CA of the Member States of the EU (MS), and aimed at verifying the uniform application of Directive 2006/88/EC.

The mission team comprised two inspectors from the FVO. The team was accompanied during the whole mission by representatives of the relevant CA with responsibilities within the scope of this mission, as appropriate depending on the country visited (see 5.2.1 for details).

2 Objectives Of The Mission

The overall objective of the mission was to assess the implementation of national measures, aimed at the control of animal health requirements for aquaculture animals and products thereof, and on the prevention and control of certain diseases in aquatic animals, as laid down in Directive 2006/88/EC and associated legislation implementing some of the provisions contained therein.

In terms of scope, the assessment carried out was aimed in particular at verifying:

- Whether laws, regulations and administrative provisions have been adopted and published as necessary to comply with Directive 2006/88/EC;
- Whether CA have been designated for the purposes of the said Directive and operate and perform their duties in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 882/2004;
- Whether the CA have access to adequate laboratory services and state of- the-art know-how in risk analysis and epidemiology as applied to diseases of aquatic animals;
- Conditions for authorisation and registration of APB according to provisions laid down in the said Directive;
- Organisation and implementation of official controls carried by the CA on APB;
- Application by the CA of a a risk-based animal health surveillance scheme in all farms and mollusc farming areas, as appropriate for the type of production;
- Measures in place for control of diseases of aquatic animals, including c ontingency planning for emerging and exotic diseases ;
- Compliance with animal health requirements for placing on the market and introducing into the EU aquaculture animals and products thereof.

In pursuit of the mission objectives, the following meetings were held and sites visited:

Visits/meetings	n	Comments
Competent authorities	4	Opening and closing meetings with the CA of England&Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland Additional meetings with the CA of Scotland and of Northern Ireland
Aquaculture production businesses	12	Ten APB keeping fish (including salmonids, cyprinids and other species) and two keeping molluscs (oysters)
Laboratories	3	Designated laboratories in England, Scotland and Northern Ireland. The two in England and Scotland are National Reference Laboratories

3 Legal Basis for the Mission

The mission was carried out under the general provisions of EU legislation, and in particular:

- Article 45 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules;
- Article 58, paragraph 1, of Directive 2006/88/EC on animal health requirements for aquaculture animals and products thereof, and on the prevention and control of certain diseases in aquatic animals.

A full list of the legal instruments referred to in this report is provided in the Annex and refers, where applicable, to the last amended version.

4 Background

4.1 Summary of previous FVO missions

The only previous mission carried out in the UK on aquatic animal health was in May 2000 and it was undertaken in relation to outbreaks of infectious salmon anaemia (ISA) that had occurred in Scotland since 1998. Consequently, this mission is the first on-the-spot inspection carried out in the UK in order to evaluate application of animal health requirements laid down in Directive 2006/88/EC for aquaculture animals and products thereof .

4.2 Aquaculture industry in the UK

The aquaculture industry in England and Wales is dominated by rainbow trout production for food (some 4 900 tonnes) and for restocking (2 500 tonnes). Brown trout production is smaller and mostly for restocking (400 tonnes). There are also about 185 APB producing common carp species for restocking (170 tonnes), and significant numbers of other coarse fish and goldfish, koi and other ornamentals are also produced (approximately 7.1 million fish). Interest has been increasing recently in production of other species, such as sea bass or warm water exotic species, e.g. tilapia and barramundi.

Concerning shellfish, there are currently 128 shellfish farms and production reached 15 449 tonnes in 2006, the main species cultivated being mussels (14 553 tonnes) and oysters (880 tonnes).

Scotland is the largest producer of salmonids in the UK (95%,), and this includes Atlantic salmon, mainly produced in marine cages , with some 128 000 tonnes produced in 2008; and rainbow trout (more than 7 600 tonnes, mainly for the table with some 11% for restocking). To a much lesser extent other species are also produced, such as brown trout (some 300 tonnes).

Scotland also has a significant shellfish sect or. The predominant shellfish species farmed are mussels (some 6 300 tonnes in 2009) and oysters (some 2 900 tonnes). In total, at the end of 2009, there were 168 active shellfish APB operating 319 producing sites placing molluscs on the market.

The aquaculture industry in Northern Ireland has developed significantly in recent years, particularly the shellfish sector. There are currently 81 APB (covering 100 sites) of which 48 are shellfish farms and 33 are fish farms. The current estimated production of the aquaculture sector in 2009 was over 8 000 tonnes of mussels and 282 tonnes of oysters, 695 tonnes of trout (mainly rainbow trout), more than 35 million trout ova and 407 tonnes of Atlantic salmon.

4.3 Health status

Commission Decision 2009/177/EC implements Directive 2006/88/EC as regards surveillance and eradication programmes and disease-free status of MS, zones and compartments, and provides lists

of:

- MS, zones and compartments subject to surveillance or eradication programmes approved in accordance with Article 44(1) and (2), respectively, of the said Directive; and
- MS for which disease-free status has been approved in accordance with Article 49(1) and zones and compartments f or which disease-free status has been approved in accordance with Article 50(3) of the said Directive .

Commission Decision 2010/221/EU approves national measures for limiting the impact of certain diseases in aquaculture animals and wild aquatic animals in accordance with Article 43 of Directive 2006/88/EC, in particular:

- Lays down a list of MS and parts thereof in the second and fourth column of the table in Annex I thereto that shall be regarded as free of the diseases listed in the first column of that table (disease-free areas); and
- Approves the eradication programmes adopted by the MS listed in the second column of the table in Annex II thereto for the diseases listed in the first column of that table, in respect of the areas listed in the fourth column thereof (eradication programmes).

4.3.1 Diseases of fish

All continental and coastal areas within Great Britain and Northern Ireland are currently recognised as free from viral haemorrhagic septicaemia (VHS) and infectious haematopoietic necrosis (IHN), i.e. with a category I health status according to Part A of Annex III to Directive 2006/88/EC. The same applies to infectious salmon anaemia (ISA) except for the South West Shetland Islands in Scotland, where there is an approved eradication programme in place. Concerning the latter, according to representatives of the CA in Scotland, the several measures implemented since 2009 on all farms present in the affected area, including an inspection and sampling programme designed to demonstrate disease freedom, and agreed upon with the Commission and the MS, should enable the area to recover the free status by the end of 2011.

At the time of the mission, there was no surveillance or eradication programme approved in accordance with Article 44 of Directive 2006/88/EC for infection with koi herpes virus (KHV); nonetheless, according to the CA:

- Great Britain has recently decided an eradication programme would not be undertaken for KHV in England & Wales and Category V status has been assumed for this disease in accordance with Part A of Annex III to Directive 2006/88/EC . Active surveillance for KHV takes place on APB as a national diseas e control measure, with passive surveillance elsewhere. According to Article 39 of the said Directive, measures to control the spread of the disease from infected sites are implemented, with eradication or containment measures taken where appropriate; which had been the case in 12 sites so far in 2010 where outbreaks have occurred.
- Northern Ireland has declared Category II status for this disease and will undertake targeted surveillance and annual testing of APB holding KHV susceptible species in accordance with Article 44(1) of Directive 2006/88/EC .
- Two sites in England and Wales had pursued disease free status with regard to KHV, one of which has completed a thorough clearance and disinfection programme, and the other which has been subject to targeted surveillance is due for submission to the Commission in the near f uture for its approval in accordance with Article 50(3) of the said Directive. Likewise, i n Northern Ireland, three ornamental facilities have achieved disease free status for KHV by undertaking a cleaning, disinfecting and fallowing process.

Great Britain and Northern Ireland have national controls for infection with Gyrodactylus salaris (GS), spring viraemia of carp (SVC), and bacterial kidney disease (BKD) in accordance with Article 43 of Directive 2006/88/EC, but have chosen not to have national measures with respect to infectious pancreatic necrosis (IPN). Accordingly, in Decision 2010/221/EU:

- In Annex I, Northern Ireland is regarded as free of these three diseases and Great Britain is recognised as being free from GS. For all these cases, the CA advised the mission team that a passive surveillance system is in place in all areas of the UK with an active targeted surveillance programme in wild fish;
- In Annex II, Great Britain is listed with approved e radication programmes for SVC and BKD. According to the CA, concerning the former, f ollowing implementation of the active targeted surveillance and eradication programme, Great Britain is free from SVC, and a submission has been made through the Commission services for recognition of this status. With regards to BKD, the programme in place in Great Britain is currently under review and it is possible that measures for eradication of this disease, and consequently the other trade related measures contemplated in Article 43 of Directive 2006/88/EC, will be withdrawn in the near future.

4.3.2 Diseases of molluscs

The whole coastline of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have a disease-free status with regards to t he infection with *Marteilia refringens* . However, there are a number of infected compartments for *Bonamia ostreae* in England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. None of these is under a surveillance or eradication programme approved in accordance with Article 44(1) or (2), respectively, of Directive 2006/88/EC; nonetheless, active targeted surveillance is undertaken in areas that are considered free from this infection in accordance with Article 52 of Directive 2006/88/EC in order to maintain their disease-free status .

4.3.3 Diseases of crustaceans

Concerning crustacean diseases, the situation with regard to white spot disease in the UK is unknown; however, passive surveillance is undertaken for this disease. In addition, a two year survey in order to inform the decision on the appropriate status for this disease is being undertaken, and to date there is no evidence for the presence of this virus in decapod crustacean stocks.

5 Findings And Conclusions

5.1 Legislation

5.1.1 Legal requirements

Article 65 of Directive 2006/88/EC require MS to adopt and publish, not later than 1 May 2008, the laws, regulations and administrative provisions necessary to comply with this Directive. They shall apply those provisions from 1 August 2008.

Article 60 of Directive 2006/88/EC require MS to lay down the rules on penalties applicable to infringements of the national provisions adopted pursuant to this Directive and shall take all measures necessary to ensure that they are implemented. The penalties provided for must be effective, proportionate and dissuasive.

5.1.2 Findings

EU aquatic animal health requirements are transposed in the UK legislation in the 2009 Aquatic

Animal Health Regulations (AAHR), of which there are three, one for England and Wales, one for Scotland and one for Northern Ireland. The AAHR provide powers to inspect and place controls on inland waters and farms on aquatic animal health grounds and they implement Directive 2006/88/EC on aquatic animal health. They have applied, in general, since March 2009, with some provisions having entered into force in August 2009.

Additional legal instruments that cover some of the areas further regulated by the AAHR had already been put in place for years by the four administrations in relation to the aquaculture sector, and they continue to apply in one way or another; the more relevant are:

- The Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Act 1975, in England and Wales, which lays down requirements o n i ntroductions of fish into the wild ;
- The Import of Live Fish (England and Wales) Act 1980;
- The Animal and Animal Products (Import and Export) Regulations; of which there are four, one per administration;
- The Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007; laying down requirements o n introductions of fish into the wild;
- The Fisheries Act (Northern Ireland) 1966.

The AAHR incorporate provisions on penalties applicable to infringements of the provisions contained therein. According to representatives of the CA, there are few cases where action need to be taken in case of non-compliance, identification of risks related to transmission of diseases or management of disease outbreaks, but they confirmed that with the AAHR and the other legal instruments at hand they were sufficiently empowered to act effectively in all those cases. The mission team was provided with some examples for the above mentioned cases that demonstrated that the CA can take effective measures, as appropriate.

5.1.3 Conclusions

The CA of the UK have adopted and published the laws, regulations and administrative provisions necessary to comply with Directive 2006/88/EC in accordance with Article 65 therein.

The CA of the UK have satisfactorily addressed the requirements of Article 60 of Directive 2006/88/EC by: a) laying down rules on penalties applicable to infringements of the national provisions adopted pursuant to the said Directive; and b) taking measures to ensure that they can be effectively implemented.

5.2 COMPETENT AUTHORITIES

5.2.1 Legal requirements

Article 54 of Directive 2006/88/EC require that MS:

- to designate their CA for the purposes of this Directive. The CA shall operate and perform their duties in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 882/2004;
- to ensure that effective and continuous cooperation based on the free exchange of information relevant to the implementation of this Directive is established between the CA they designate for the purposes of this Directive and any other authorities involved in regulating aquaculture, aquatic animals, and food and feed of aquaculture origin;
- to ensure that the CA have access to adequate laboratory services and state-of-the-art know-how in risk analysis and epidemiology, and that there is a free exchange of any information relevant to the implementation of this Directive between the CA and laboratories.

Articles 56 and 57 of Directive 2006/88/EC require MS:

- to arrange for the designation of a national reference laboratory (NRL) for diagnosis of diseases of fish, molluscs and crustaceans and ensure that the NRL liaises with the EU reference laboratories in those areas;
- to ensure that any NRL on their territory is adequately equipped and staffed with the appropriate numbers of trained personnel to carry out the laboratory investigations required in accordance with this Directive and to comply with the functions and duties laid down in Part II of Annex VI thereto;
- to ensure that laboratory examinations for the purposes of this Directive are carried out only in laboratories designated for such purpose by the CA and that they comply with the functions and duties laid down in Part III of Annex VI thereto.

5.2.2 Findings

5.2.2.1 Organisation

The CA responsible for aquatic animal health in the UK are:

- The Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA); which is the CA responsible for the overall coordination of aquatic animal health policy in the UK and for developing and implementing the relevant AAHR in England and Wales. Concerning the latter, w ithin DEFRA, an aquatic animal health team is responsible for developing aquatic policy in partnership with the Welsh Assembly Government. Both CA have delegated all official control tasks stemming from those legal requirements to the Fish Health Inspectorate of the Centre for Environment, Fisheries & Aquaculture Science (FHI-CEFAS), which acts as an executive agency of DEFRA.
- In Scotland, Marine Scotland (MSC), as a Directorate of the Scottish Government, is the CA responsible for developing and implementing the relevant AAHR in Scotland. Within its organisation, t here is one unit responsible for policy aspects of aquatic animal health (including developing legislation) and the Fish Health Inspectorate of its Science Division (FHI-MSC) is responsible for all official control tasks.
- In Northern Ireland, the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (DARD) i s the CA responsible for developing and implementing the relevant AAHR. A fish health administration unit is responsible for fish health policy and administration and the Fish Health Inspectorate (FHI-DARD) is responsible for monitoring an enforcement of aquatic animal health.

According to representatives of the CA met, in delivering their responsibilities on aquatic animal health, the three FHIs work closely with stakeholders in the aquaculture industry, the ornamental fish trade, fishery managers and their relevant trade associations. They provide an advisory service to the industry and the general public aimed at increasing the effectiveness of national aquatic animal health controls. The mission team could verify in all APB visited that this was the case and that extensive, frequent and effective contacts between the relevant FHI and the operators had taken place.

Inspectors of the three FHIs are authorised by the relevant CA to be inspectors for the purposes of the AAHR. Their main activities include statutory inspection, sampling and testing programmes of fish, shellfish and crustacean farms, investigation of disease outbreaks in wild and traded fish, shellfish and crustacean stocks, enforcement of statutory disease controls and implementation of

controls on the import and export of live fish, shellfish and crustaceans.

Staff of the three FHIs met had a satisfactory level of expertise and experience in aquatic animal health that enables them to effectively fulfil their tasks. The accumulated knowledge since they started their operation many years ago has built up an extensive set of tools and resources that further facilitate the training of new recruits (required to have previous expertise in the field anyway) and the implementation of their tasks in a consistent and harmonised manner.

Staff of the three FHIs are not permitted to have any involvement or business interest in the industries for which they have any regulatory responsibilities. All staff are required to disclose any potential conflict of interest between their role and any personal business.

The work of the three FHIs, in particular for the FHI-CEFAS and FHI-MSC because of the size of the industries under their remits, is supported by diagnostic services (see 5.2.2.3), research departments and epidemiology expertise. In addition, the mission team could verify that cooperation between the three FHI is extensive and frequent, and it is mainly aimed at ensuring a consistent approach throughout the UK to disease investigation and control.

5.2.2.2 Documentation and controls

In accordance with requirements on the organisation of official controls by MS laid down in Regulation (EC) 882/2004, details on the organisation of aquatic animal health controls within the scope of this mission in the UK are contained in the 'Single Integrated National Control Plan for the UK' covering the period from 2007 to 2011. This can be accessed through the following link:

http://www.food.gov.uk/multimedia/pdfs/uknationalcontrolplan.pdf

The above mentioned control plan includes provisions for documenting of regular official controls, and their implementation is further summarised through the annual reports on the implementation of the multi annual plan as required by Regulation (EC) 882/2004.

The mission team could verify that reports on all site inspections, sampling and testing results are recorded on the databases kept by the three FHIs. Reporting templates and inspection check lists were available to inspectors of the three FHIs, as well as detailed instructions on how to use them and fill them out according to the findings of the inspections.

The three FHIs provide APB operators with copies of the reports of the inspections they carry out. APB operators are also sent copies of all farm data held on the respective databases to check any amendments made following inspections (see 5.3.2.1, on the authorisation process).

5.2.2.3 Laboratory services

The diagnostic testing service for the FHI-CEFAS is provided by the CEFAS laboratories in Weymouth. For each financial year a service level agreement is produced between the FHI and the diagnostic functions to define delivery of testing services for screening and confirmation of listed and non listed diseases of fish, bivalve molluscs and crustaceans. In particular the service level agreement prescribes the diagnostic test capabilities required, including the test protocols to be followed, and the time scales for completion of tests and reporting of test results.

The CEFAS laboratories have achieved accreditation by UKAS under the standard ISO:17025 for various methods, including virological, histopathological and molecular tests for the diagnosis of several fish and shellfish diseases, including VHS, IHN, KHV, SVC, GS, and infections with *Marteilia refringens* and *Bonamia ostreae.* Further accreditation is pending to complete all of the EU diagnostic testing requirements for all diseases listed in Part II of Annex IV to Directive 2006/88/EC. In addition to the diagnostic functions, the CEFAS laboratories has been designated as NRL for many of the diseases of fish, shellfish and crustaceans; for the latter, it also plays the role

of EU reference laboratory. As a NRL, the CEFAS laboratories regularly organise proficiency tests in the UK and as a designated laboratory and a NRL, undertake annual participation in other tests run by the NRL of MSC and ring trials organised by the EU reference laboratories for fish and shellfish diseases.

The FHI-MSC is served by the diagnostic laboratories of MSC in Aberdeen, which are also part of the MSC Science division. They are accredited by UKAS to ISO:17025 standard for various methods, including virological, histopathological and molecular tests for the diagnosis of the most relevant fish and shellfish diseases, such as VHS, ISA, IHN, SVC or infections with *Marteilia refringens* and *Bonamia ostreae* . The laboratory has been designated as NRL for some of the diseases and as such has organised several proficiency tests; in addition, it has participated in other tests organised by the NRL in CEFAS or by the EU reference laboratories for fish and shellfish diseases. The mission team was provided with numerous examples of these testing carried out since 2007 on the most relevant diseases that consistently showed satisfactory results.

In Northern Ireland the Fish Diseases Unit of the Agri-food and Biosciences Institute (AFBI) in Belfast is the laboratory of the CA. An annual work programme is agreed between FHI-DARD and the AFBI. The AFBI has ISO 9001:2008 certification covering services provided in respect of diagnostic testing requirements for diseases listed in Part II of Annex IV to Directive 2006/88/EC. These activities are monitored by an independent Quality Assurance Unit and supported by participation in external proficiency testing schemes run by either of the NRL or by a EU reference laboratory. The mission team could verify examples of this testing carried out for the previous year on the most relevant diseases that had concluded that the AFBI had showed a satisfactory performance.

The AFBI had started the process of achieving accreditation under the ISO:17025 standard for molecular diagnostic assays for ISA, VHS and IHN and dossiers in this respect were in preparation for submission to UKAS this year, with additional dossiers on molecular and cell culture-based diagnostics planned for 2011.

During the visits to the three laboratories the mission team could also verify that the laboratories were adequately equipped and staffed with the appropriate numbers of trained personnel to carry out the laboratory investigations required in accordance with EU requirements and, concerning the two NRLs, to comply with the functions and duties laid down in Part II of Annex VI to Directive 2006/88/EC.

5.2.2.4 Verification and auditing

The FHI-CEFAS works under the direction of DEFRA through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), an annually reviewed agreement that sets out roles and responsibilities, objectives and targets. In addition, the majority of the work that the FHI-CEFAS does on behalf of DEFRA is documented in detail in Standard Operating Procedures. The FHI-CEFAS produces quarterly and annual reports to DEFRA, outlining progress against targets established in the MOU. Senior inspectors are responsible for monitoring progress of particular areas of work, and make reports at monthly meetings to advise inspectors of any need to re-assess progress or to target particular areas of work. Individual inspector's performance is assessed through checks on paperwork, reporting and samples submitted to the laboratory for data inputting and testing respectively.

The FHI-MSC is accredited by the UK Accreditation Service (UKAS) to ISO:17020 standard as an inspection body for inspection and sampling of fish farm sites in accordance with Directive 2006/88/EC and Decision 2010/221/EU. UKAS carry out an annual assessment of the FHI-MSC including both administration tasks and inspections to ensure that the requirements of the standard are met. As part of the requirements of the accreditation, the FHI-MSC has had to put in place a programme of internal audits to assess competency of inspectors. Every inspector is audited on completion of training, prior to undertaking unaccompanied visits. Following the initial audit, inspectors are audited, as a minimum, every second year. All completed cases are reviewed by a second inspector to ensure that sufficient detail is included in the case to enable a visit to be repeated if necessary and to check for accuracy.

The activities of the FHI-DARD are part of the annual Business Plan of the DARD Fisheries Division, setting out clear objectives and targets and subject to quarterly review of progress against targets and re-prioritisation where required . DARD Fisheries Division is regularly audited by both an internal DARD audit team and the Northern Ireland Audit Office. In addition, a staff performance verification system is in place that starts from a full on-the-job supervision for the first four months for all inspectors and a programme of related in house training. Formal staff assessment is undertaken on an annual basis evaluating past performance and defining future objectives and targets. This evaluation identifies any shortfall in competences or training needs which are addressed in a personal development plan.

5.2.3 Conclusions

The CA of the UK have satisfactorily addressed the requirements of Article 54 of Directive 2006/88/EC by:

- designating CA for the purposes of this Directive that operate and perform their duties in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 882/2004;
- ensuring that effective and continuous cooperation based on the free exchange of information relevant to the implementation of this Directive is established between the CA it designates for the purposes of this Directive and any of its other authorities involved in regulating aquaculture, aquatic animals, and food and feed of aquaculture origin;
- ensuring that the CA have access to adequate laboratory services and state-of-the-art know-how in risk analysis and epidemiology, and that there is a free exchange of any information relevant to the implementation of this Directive between the CA and laboratories.

The CA of the UK have satisfactorily addressed the requirements of Articles 56 and 57 of Directive 2006/88/EC by:

- designating NRLs for diagnosis of diseases of fish, molluscs and crustaceans and ensure that they liaise with the EU reference laboratories in those areas;

- ensuring that the designated NRLs are adequately equipped and staffed with the appropriate numbers of trained personnel to carry out the laboratory investigations required in accordance with this Directive and to comply with the functions and duties laid down in Part II of Annex VI thereto;
- ensuring that laboratory examinations for the purposes of this Directive are carried out only in laboratories designated for such purpose by the CA and that they comply with the functions and duties laid down in Part III of Annex VI thereto.

5.3 AUTHORISATION AND REGISTRATION OF AQUACULTURE PRODUCTION BUSINESSES

5.3.1 Legal requirements

Article 4 of Directive 2006/88/EC requires MS to ensure that each APB is duly authorised by the CA in accordance with Article 5 therein. They may require, under certain conditions, only the registration by the CA of certain categories of APB. In doing so, MS shall ensure that the activity in question would not pose an unacceptable risk of spreading diseases to other aquaculture animals or to wild stocks of aquatic animals.

Article 5 of Directive 2006/88/EC lays down the authorisation conditions for APB, including requirements to be fulfilled by them as laid down in Articles 8 to 10 therein, and requires MS to ensure that APB operators submit all relevant information in order to allow the CA to assess that the conditions for authorisation are fulfilled, including the information required in accordance with Annex II to the said Directive.

Article 6 of Directive 2006/88/EC requires MS to establish, keep up to date and make publicly available a register of APB containing at least the information set out in Annex II to the said Directive. Moreover, Article 2 of Commission Decision 2008/392/EC establishes that MS shall establish an Internet-based information page to make available information on farms or mollusc farming areas of APB which are authorised and, as appropriate, registered and that corresponds with that included in the above mentioned register.

Article 7 of Directive 2006/88/EC requires that, in accordance with Article 3 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, official controls on APB shall be carried out by the CA. These official controls shall at least consist of regular inspections, visits, audits, and where appropriate, sampling, for each APB, taking account of the risk the APB poses in relation to the contracting and spreading of diseases. Recommendations for the frequencies of such controls, depending on the health status of the concerned zone or compartment, are laid down in Part B of Annex III to the said Directive.

Article 10 of Directive 2006/88/EC requires MS to ensure that a risk-based animal health surveillance scheme is applied in all farms and mollusc farming areas, as appropriate for the type of production. In addition:

- Part B of Annex III to the said Directive lays down recommendations for the frequencies of such animal health surveillance schemes, depending on the health status of the concerned zone or compartment; and
- The Annex to Commission Decision 2008/896/EC sets out general guidelines to be taken into account by MS for the purpose of applying the risk-based animal health surveillance schemes.

5.3.2 Findings

5.3.2.1 Conditions for authorisation and requirements for registration

The three AAHR require the authorisation of all APB by the FHI-CEFAS, FHI-MSC and the FHI-DARD, as appropriate. Authorisation requires the APB operator to meet minimum standards for biosecurity and record keeping, with the goal of preventing the introduction and limiting the spread of infectious disease within the UK. In all three cases, it is a condition of an authorisation that the APB must:

- keep a record of:
    - the movement of any aquaculture animal or any aquaculture animal product into or out of the APB premises, as well as records on transport means including aspects such as the origin and place of discharge of the water used and mortality observed during transport;
    - the number of any aquaculture animals that have died in each epidemiological unit within the premises;
    - the results of any surveillance carried out by the APB; and
    - the results of any surveillance carried out by the CA which have been notified to the APB;
- follow good hygiene practice, on the basis of a biosecurity plan that has been drawn up in cooperation and agreed upon with the relevant FHI in compliance with minimum standards; and
- comply with any surveillance requirement imposed by the CA.

All AAHR also provide that fisheries stocked with aquaculture animals or fish brought from other sites for angling purposes only (e.g. put-and-take fisheries) and other APB in which aquatic animals are kept with no intention of placing them on the market (i.e. non-commercial installations) must be registered with the relevant FHI. Registration requires a named person to take responsibility for the waters. That person must report any fish mortalities and provide all reasonable help and access to the FHI in the event of a fish mortality problem.

Non-commercial installations or put-and-take fisheries may be required to be authorised if the relevant FHI considers that this is necessary to prevent or limit the spread of disease and serves the operator with a written notice to that effect. Registration is mainly relevant in England and Wales, where put-and-take fisheries and other non-commercial installations are very common (more than 10 000), but it also happens in Scotland and Northern Ireland. In England and Wales there are a number of waters that are not operated as put-and-take fisheries but are used sometimes for harvesting fish stocks for introduction into other waters. These waters are termed cropping waters and are usually registered; however, as explained above, cropping waters that remove fish on a regular basis become authorised as APB should the disease risk be such that a higher level of official control is necessary.

According to representatives of the three FHIs, this area has been tackled satisfactorily thanks to:

- extensive advertising, press notices, articles in journals and magazines, and engagement with stakeholder groups, to ensure that the legislative requirement to register was made known; and
- additional environmental requirements in England and Wales whereby all waters from which fish are removed, and waters into which fish are stocked, excluding rivers and canals, must be registered with the relevant FHI, as a condition for the relevant environmental authority to grant permission for that activity.

In addition, Northern Ireland differs from the rest of the UK in that it already had an aquaculture regulatory system in place under Section 11 of the Fisheries Act 1966 which requires any person operating a fish farm to obtain a fish culture licence from DARD. The impact of the AAHR on fish farms in Northern Ireland was therefore less significant than in other areas of the UK and the authorisation required under the AAHR runs concurrently with any fish culture licences already in place subject to the fish farm meeting the conditions of authorisation laid down in the AAHR. According to representatives of DARD, administration of the authorisation process will be integrated with the fish culture licensing process as far as practicable.

The three FHIs have developed Websites containing comprehensive information on all issues related to aquatic animal health, including conditions for authorisation and registration, the publicly available registers of APB, details on animal health statuses, requirements and application forms for all sorts of movements and extensive sources of advisory documentation on aquatic animal health. The relevant links are:

- For FHI-CEFAS: http://www.efishbusiness.co.uk/default.asp
- For FHI-MSC: http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI
- For FHI-DARD: http://www.dardni.gov.uk/index/fisheries-farming-and-food/fisheries/fish-health.htm

I n all cases, APB are issued with an authorisation document that details the authorisation conditions. APB that were already in operation before the AAHR applied were automatically granted a new authorisation under the new regime; however, they were required to fulfil additional conditions in relation to good hygiene practice; and they were given a transitional period of time to introduce a biosecurity plan that had to be approved by the relevant FHI. For instance, in England and Wales, all registered fish and shellfish farms were inspected in 2008 by the FHI-CEFAS, and data collected on the APB being authorised.

According to representatives of the three FHIs, the level of compliance had been steadily increasing since March 2009 and this requirement has been smoothly implemented by APB, in particular in the fish sector, and only some additional efforts were necessary in relation to some APB producing molluscs.

At the moment, a ll new APB are required to apply for authorisation before commencing operation and all of them are subject to inspection prior to authorisation (and licensing in Northern Ireland). Evidence of compliance with legislative requirements, including submission of an adequate biosecurity measures plan for the APB that needs to be approved by the FHI, is a condition for the process.

The mission team verified on-the-spot that the level of compliance with authorisation conditions, including drawing up and implementation of biosecurity plans, was satisfactory; and that this had been facilitated by extensive and frequent cooperation between APB operators and staff of the relevant FHI.

Each APB has a unique authorisation number, and appears on the public register of APB kept by the relevant CA and published on the Websites above mentioned, as required in accordance with Article 2 of Commission Decision 2008/392/EC. The three public registers contain at least the information set out in Annex II to Directive 2006/88/EC.

5.3.2.2 Official controls and animal health surveillance schemes

Official controls and animal health surveillance carried out by FHI-CEFAS and FHI-MSC comprising regular compliance inspections, disease surveillance (and sampling where appropriate) take place through a risk based approach using epidemiological models based on the principles

outlined in Decision 2008/896/EC. Similar semi-quantitative models have been developed by both FHI to assess production sites within England and Wales, and Scotland, respectively, with regards to the risk of becoming infected and spreading pathogens. A risk-assessment process was carried out by both FHI, whereby routes of pathogen introduction and spread were identified taking the views of fish health expert veterinarians and industry experts, ending up in an approach to ranking farms with regards to pathogen transmission risks. Th e output of the models allow the allocation of the respective surveillance efforts to be risk based. They also provide APB operators with information of how they can reduce their risk score by improving biosecurity. In both cases, t he methods for combining likelihoods of introduction and spread of disease have followed guidelines included in Annex IV to Decision 2008/896/EC. In addition, the routes and weightings are revised periodically, in the light of new information (e.g. results of compliance visits or on disease outbreaks).

In Northern Ireland, prior to implementation of the AAHR, all fish farms were inspected annually to ensure compliance with Fish Culture Licence conditions. Annual inspection of all APB is continuing to ensure compliance with both that licensing and the new authorisation conditions. As a consequence, according to representatives of the FHI-DARD, t hese system of official controls and animal health surveillance, consisting for each APB of annual inspections, other visits and sampling (in all APB every 18 months or annually in case of molluscs farming areas), does not need to differentiate, strictly speaking, the levels of risk that APB pose in relation to the contracting and spreading of diseases. They added that, by visiting them annually for a thorough inspection as explained above, together with many other visits related to each and every movement of aquaculture animals or products thereof that the APB carries out, their system addresses the recommendations for the frequencies of such controls, as laid down in Part B of Annex III to Directive 2006/88/EC.

The representatives from FHI-DARD advised the mission team that the above mentioned system, coupled with the high health status of Northern Ireland (see 4.3), also allowed them to comply with surveillance requirements contained in the same Annex for the maintenance of the disease-free status in accordance with Article 52 of the said Directive (e.g. For VHS, IHN or the infection with *Bonamia ostreae*) , for the targeted surveillance implemented in the case of the infection with KHV, in accordance with Article 44(1) therein, and for the reporting in relation to maintenance of the disease-free status required by Article 4 of Decision 2010/221/EU concerning SVC, BKD and GS .

The mission team could verify both on-the-spot and by checking the database that the FHI-DARD keeps with all data on the visits and inspections carried out in each APB, including sampling carried out and the results of the analyses performed, that these are very frequent as explained and that, when any problem or non-compliance is found, or any additional investigation is needed in relation to increased mortality or suspicion of any disease, the frequency of visits and sampling were increased accordingly.

5.3.3 Conclusions

The CA of the UK have satisfactorily addressed the requirements of Article 4 of Directive 2006/88/EC and can ensure that APB are duly authorised by fulfilling the conditions laid down in Article 5 therein, or registered, as appropriate. Moreover, authorisation is only granted after the CA has ensured that the activities in question do not pose an unacceptable risk of spreading diseases to other aquaculture animals or to wild stocks of aquatic animals.

The CA of the UK have satisfactorily addressed the requirements of: a) Article 6 of Directive 2006/88/EC by establishing, keeping up to date and making publicly available a register of APB containing at least the information set out in Annex II to the said Directive; and b) Article 2 of Commission Decision 2008/392/EC by establishing an Internet-based information page to make available information on farms or mollusc farming areas of APB which are authorised and, as

appropriate, registered and that corresponds with that included in the above mentioned register.

The CA of the UK have satisfactorily: a) addressed the requirements of Article 7 of Directive 2006/88/EC and official controls are planned and carried out for each APB, taking account of the risk the APB poses in relation to the contracting and spreading of diseases; and b) followed recommendations for the frequencies of such controls, depending on the health status of the concerned zone or compartment, as laid down in Part B of Annex III to the said Directive.

The CA of the UK have satisfactorily addressed the requirements of Article 10 of Directive 2006/88/EC by ensuring that a risk-based animal health surveillance scheme is applied in all farms and mollusc farming areas, as appropriate for the type of production, with a frequency that depends on the health status of the concerned zone or compartment. In doing so, the CA have followed general guidelines for that purpose set out in the Annex to Commission Decision 2008/896/EC.

5.4 Measures for control of diseases of aquaculture animals

5.4.1 Legal requirements

Chapter V of Directive 2006/88/EC establishes notification and minimum measures for control of diseases of aquatic animals, including amongst others:

- Obligations for notification of: a) suspicion or confirmation of a disease listed in part II of Annex IV to the said Directive, to the CA; b) increased mortality in aquaculture animals, to the CA or a private veterinarian for further investigations;
- Initial control measures and conditions for epizootic investigations to be carried out in case of suspicion of exotic and non-exotic diseases;
- Minimum control measures in the case of confirmation of exotic and non-exotic diseases;
- Control measures in case of emerging diseases.

Article 47 of Directive 2006/88/EC requires each MS to draw up a contingency plan specifying the national measures required to maintain a high level of disease awareness and preparedness and to ensure environmental protection. Contingency plans shall comply with the criteria and requirements laid down in Annex VII to the said Directive and shall be implemented in the event of an outbreak of emerging diseases and of exotic diseases listed in Part II of Annex IV thereto.

5.4.2 Findings

5.4.2.1 Notification, suspicion and confirmation of diseases

There is a general obligation, under the three AAHR to notify immediately the suspicion of a listed disease or increased mortality by APB operators, transporters of aquatic animals, and veterinarians and other professionals involved in aquatic animal health services, and persons with an occupational relationship to aquatic animals.

The three FHIs have similar operational procedures in case of suspicion of a listed disease; inspectors will place an initial 'designation notice' on the affected site, which will immediately stop any movement in and out of the site, and will advise the other CA in the UK, and other departments and relevant bodies (environmental authorities in particular), as appropriate, that this action has been taken. All three FHIs take advantage of their respective databases to initiate traceability exercises to identify as soon as possible other sites that could have been infected from the site under suspicion; the mission team could verify that this can be done promptly and very accurately.

Once the results are obtained from the relevant laboratory, in case of a positive result for a listed disease the relevant FHI will place a 'confirmed designation notice' on the affected site and will

send the confirmation to the other CA. The relevant FHI must ensure that the APB operator is notified immediately and is advised of the action to be taken. All 'confirmed designation notices' are published on the relevant Website.

The mission team could verify that those procedures are in place and that they are used, with examples of investigations on notifications of increased mortalities and in confirmed cases of infection with KHV and infection with Ostreid herpesvirus 1 µvar in an oysters farm .

5.4.2.2 Contingency planning for emerging and exotic diseases

The mission team was provided with several examples of contingency plans that the three FHIs have developed for exotic and emerging diseases; this also included plans for diseases such as SVC, BKD or GS. In the case of the FHI-CEFAS and the FHI-MSC , there is a generic contingency plan for all aquatic diseases in England or Scotland, and plans along similar lines to those are currently under preparation by the Welsh Assembly Government for Wales. The FHI-DARD have developed independent plans for different diseases but all share very similar operational manual arrangements.

The examples checked by the mission team largely follow the criteria and requirements laid down in Annex VII to Directive 2006/88/EC and in several cases, representatives of the FHIs advised the mission team that they were under review to be, for instance, updated with the latest diagnostic tools available for confirmation of the diseases or to incorporate additional epidemiological investigation facilities recently incorporated to their services.

Examples of the application of two contingency plans could be checked for the outbreaks of ISA in Scotland in 2008/2009 and in the case of a recent outbreak in England of infection with Ostreid herpesvirus 1 µvar in an oysters farm. In both cases the epidemiological investigations carried out and the measures taken to prevent the diseases from further spread were according to the available plans. In the former case, the contingency plan had been updated to reflect the experience obtained during outbreaks in 1998/99 and the most recent one in 2008/09 .

5.4.3 Conclusions

The CA of the UK have satisfactorily addressed the requirements of Chapter V of Directive 2006/88/EC by:

- making obligatory the notification of: a) suspicion or confirmation of a disease listed in part II of Annex IV to the said Directive, to the CA; b) increased mortality in aquaculture animals, to the CA or a private veterinarian for further investigations;
- setting up an effective system whereby immediate control measures can be imposed and early epizootic investigations can be carried out in case of suspicion of exotic and non-exotic diseases;
- establishing effective procedures for deploying control measures in the case of confirmation of exotic and non-exotic diseases, and when an emerging disease appears.

The CA of the UK have satisfactorily addressed the requirements of Article 47 of Directive 2006/88/EC by drawing up contingency plans for exotic and emerging diseases, that are based on the criteria and requirements laid down in Annex VII to the said Directive and that, in some cases, have proved to be effectively implemented.

5.5 Placing on the market and introduction of aquaculture animals and products thereof

5.5.1 Legal requirements

According to Article 12 of Directive 2006/88/EC, MS shall ensure that the placing on the market of

aquaculture animals and products thereof does not jeopardise the health status of aquatic animals at the place of destination with regard to the diseases listed in Part II of Annex IV to the said Directive.

Chapter III of Directive 2006/88/EC lays down detailed rules on the movement of aquaculture animals, in particular relating to movements between MS, zones and compartments with different health statuses, as referred to in Part A of Annex III to the said Directive.

Chapter III of Regulation (EC) 1251/2008 lays down:

- animal health conditions for the placing on the market of: a) ornamental aquatic animals either originating from or intended for closed ornamental facilities (Article 4 therein); and b) aquaculture animals intended for farming, relaying areas, put and take fisheries, open ornamental facilities and restocking in MS and parts thereof with national measures approved by Commission Decision 2010/221/EU (Article 8a therein);
- animal health certification requirements for the placing on the market of aquaculture animals and products thereof, including those intended for human consumption (Articles 5 to 8 therein);

Chapter IV of Regulation (EC) 1251/2008 lays down animal health conditions and animal health certification requirements for import into the EU of aquaculture animals and products thereof, including those intended for human consumption, and ornamental aquatic animals intended for closed ornamental facilities.

5.5.2 Findings

5.5.2.1 Placing of aquaculture animals on the market

The UK receives few consignments from other MS:

- concerning aquatic animals or products thereof for farming or restocking, most trade is covered by salmon eggs coming from Ireland and rainbow trout eggs from Denmark and Ireland; and some goldfish coming from Portugal and sea bass from Greece;
- concerning ornamentals, some suppliers from the Czech Republic sent tropical ornamental fish to the UK.

All APB receiving aquatic animals or products thereof from other MS must be specifically authorised for that activity by the relevant FHI, except those only involved in trade for human consumption. P re-notification rules apply for all consignments except those going to closed ornamental sites (non-susceptible, tropical species).

The main certified trade from the UK to other MS are cyprinids, salmon eggs and oysters to Ireland and oysters to France and Spain. The main base for the certification procedures, when necessary, is the high health status of the aquatic populations in the UK, and specific checks on the APB requesting the certification which include on-the-spot inspections to verify the health status of the animals kept on site and those, or products thereof, to be part of the consignment.

The mission team could verify examples of consignments and certificates accompanying them that confirmed that conditions and certificates related to trade were in accordance with provisions of Directive 2006/88/EC.

5.5.2.2 Import controls and introduction of aquaculture animals in the EU

The majority of aquaculture animals introduced in the UK arrive from some 30 third countries:

- Imports of fish for farming or restocking take place from less than 20 farms. The main

imports are salmon eggs for the Scottish industry from Norway, rainbow trout eggs, and to a lesser extent carps and goldfish.

- Imports of ornamental fish take place for tropical species for closed ornamental facilities and to a much lesser extent for cold water species for open ornamental facilities (mainly goldfish and some koi carp). These imports come from some 30 third countries and some 90-100 suppliers. A specific surveillance programme, based on sampling and testing, is in place for the cold water species.
- According to the CA, there is no import of live fish for human consumption.

The three FHIs have in place specific programmes to detect and prevent any breaches of UK aquatic animal health legislation in respect of the illegal importation of fish by working in close co-operation with other involved CA and stakeholders. An example of the effectiveness of this system was shown to the mission team that detected an illegal import of one tonne of large carp from France in 2006.

In addition, the FHIs provide extensive advice on import certification and the issue of movement documents and health certificates for exports of live fish and shellfish to the aquaculture and related industries and to the general public as required. A comprehensive advisory service is operated in support of this function, in which the Websites above mentioned play an integral role.

Import controls in the UK are carried out by staff at the designated border inspection posts in three airports in England. These staff have the continuous support, if necessary, of specialised staff of FHI-CEFAS. The mission team was advised about the additional risk management measures in place such as quarantine of imported consignments of susceptible fish and sampling that are carried out in cases where a higher risk or an unreliable certification are detected.

5.5.3 Conclusions

The CA of the UK have satisfactorily addressed the requirements of Article 12 of Directive 2006/88/EC and have set up a control and surveillance system in place for the aquaculture sector that largely ensures that the placing on the market of aquaculture animals and products thereof does not jeopardise the health status of aquatic animals at the place of destination with regard to the diseases listed in Part II of Annex IV to the said Directive.

The CA of the UK are in a position to ensure compliance with animal health conditions and certification requirements for the placing on the market of aquaculture animals and products thereof laid down in Chapter III of Regulation (EC) 1251/2008.

The CA of the UK have set up an effective import control system in order to ensure compliance with requirements of Chapter IV of Regulation (EC) 1251/2008 laying down animal health conditions and animal health certification requirements for import into the EU of aquaculture animals and products thereof, including those intended for human consumption, and ornamental aquatic animals intended for closed ornamental facilities.

6 Overall Conclusions

The CA of the UK have set up a satisfactory system for prevention, control and eradication of aquatic animal diseases in accordance with requirements on aquatic animal health laid down in Directive 2006/88/EC, in particular:

- The CA have adequate expertise in risk analysis and epidemiology as applied to diseases of aquatic animals and an excellent laboratory network carry out their diagnostic tasks in accordance with EU and international standards;

- APB have been authorised or registered as appropriate and the system of official controls adequately verify their levels of compliance, according to the risks they pose of contracting or spreading disease;
- Current levels of aquatic animal health surveillance and prevention, including import controls and preparedness to respond in the event of a disease outbreak, appear fit for the purpose to maintain the high health status of the aquatic animal populations in the UK.

7 Closing Meeting

A closing meeting was held on 17 September 2010 with representatives of the CA. At this meeting, the inspection team presented the main findings and preliminary conclusions of the mission. The CA did not express any major disagreement with the findings of the mission.

8 Recommendations

(**No recommendations are necessary**)

N°.	**Recommendation**

The competent authority's response to the recommendations can be found at:

http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/ap/ap_gb_2010-8409.pdf

Annex 1 - Legal References

Legal Reference	Official Journal	Title
Dir. 2006/88/EC	OJ L 328, 24.11.2006, p. 14-56	Council Directive 2006/88/EC of 24 October 2006 on animal health requirements for aquaculture animals and products thereof, and on the prevention and control of certain diseases in aquatic animals
Reg. 1251/2008	OJ L 337, 16.12.2008, p. 41-75	Commission Regulation (EC) No 1251/2008 of 12 December 2008 implementing Council Directive 2006/88/EC as regards conditions and certification requirements for the placing on the market and the import into the Community of aquaculture animals and products thereof and laying down a list of vector species
Dec. 2001/183/EC	OJ L 67, 9.3.2001, p. 65-76	2001/183/EC: Commission Decision of 22 February 2001 laying down the sampling plans and diagnostic methods for the detection and confirmation of certain fish diseases and repealing Decision 92/532/EEC
Dec. 2003/466/EC	OJ L 156, 25.6.2003, p. 61-73	2003/466/EC: Commission Decision of 13 June 2003 establishing criteria for zoning and official surveillance following suspicion or confirmation of the presence of infectious salmon anaemia (ISA)
Dec. 2008/946/EC	OJ L 337, 16.12.2008, p. 94-101	2008/946/EC: Commission Decision of 12 December 2008 implementing Council Directive 2006/88/EC as regards requirements for quarantine of aquaculture animals
Dec. 2008/392/EC	OJ L 138, 28.5.2008, p. 12-20	2008/392/EC: Commission Decision of 30 April 2008 implementing Council Directive 2006/88/EC as regards an Internet-based information page to make information on aquaculture production businesses and authorised processing establishments available by electronic means
Dec. 2008/896/EC	OJ L 322, 2.12.2008, p. 30-38	2008/896/EC: Commission Decision of 20 November 2008 on guidelines for the purpose of the risk-based animal health surveillance schemes provided for in Council Directive 2006/88/EC

Legal Reference	Official Journal	Title
Dec. 2009/177/EC	OJ L 63, 7.3.2009, p. 15-39	2009/177/EC: Commission Decision of 31 October 2008 implementing Council Directive 2006/88/EC as regards surveillance and eradication programmes and disease-free status of Member States, zones and compartments
Reg. 175/2010	OJ L 52, 3.3.2010, p. 1-13	Commission Regulation (EU) No 175/2010 of 2 March 2010 implementing Council Directive 2006/88/EC as regards measures to control increased mortality in oysters of the species Crassostrea gigas in connection with the detection of Ostreid herpesvirus 1 μvar (OsHV-1 μvar)
Dec. 2010/221/EU	OJ L 98, 20.4.2010, p. 7-11	2010/221/EU: Commission Decision of 15 April 2010 approving national measures for limiting the impact of certain diseases in aquaculture animals and wild aquatic animals in accordance with Article 43 of Council Directive 2006/88/EC