



**COUNCIL OF
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

Brussels, 17 September 2012

13458/12

**Interinstitutional File:
2011/0229 (COD)**

**CODEC 2061
AGRILEG 124
AGRIORG 134
AGRIFIN 149
VETER 56
PE 378**

INFORMATION NOTE

from: General Secretariat
to: Permanent Representatives Committee/Council
Subject: Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 as regards electronic identification of bovine animals and deleting the provisions on voluntary beef labelling
- Outcome of the European Parliament's first reading
(Strasbourg, 10 to 13 September 2012)

I. INTRODUCTION

The Rapporteur, Mrs Sophie AUCONIE (EPP - FR), presented a report consisting of 42 amendments to the proposal for a Regulation, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety. In addition:

- the Greens/EFA political group tabled two amendments (amendments 43-44);
- the EPP, ALDE and ECR political groups tabled three amendments (amendments 45-47); and
- the S&D, EUL/NGL and EFD political groups tabled three amendments (amendments 48-50).

II. DEBATE

The Rapporteur opened the debate, which took place on 10 September 2012, and:

- explained that she had brought the proposal to the plenary in order to resolve a number of inconsistencies which had arisen in the text approved by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety. Three further amendments (amendments 45 - 47) were needed to resolve these inconsistencies;
- stated that amendment 46 would set 1 January 2014 as the date for the entry into force of the simplification of the voluntary labelling procedure. These voluntary labellings would have to be objective, verifiable by the competent authorities and understandable for consumers;
- emphasised that the voluntary labelling statements were different from the mandatory labelling of the origin of meat. The former concern commercial information used by operators and it makes sense to simplify the rules on this;
- stated that there is general agreement on the need to move towards electronic identification of cattle, but that there is no question of imposing electronic identification on the farming sector in the immediate future. The sector is currently under economic pressure and unable to bear further costs. There is no public health dimension to this issue. The idea is simply to use electronic identification to improve traceability of cattle. This can be introduced over time. She therefore called for a review in five years to see whether the technology is reliable and whether the sector is ready. The economic situation might also have improved by then; and
- stressed the fact that there was no question of putting an end to voluntary labelling. The intention was to simplify the system and procedures.

Commissioner REDING:

- welcomed the Parliament's support for the Commission's proposal;
- argued that electronic identification would make the current system more accurate and faster, thus enhancing food safety and the management of disease outbreaks. It would also reduce the administrative burden on farmers; and

- stated, with regard to voluntary beef labelling, that horizontal EU legislation has already been developed which covers beef in the same way as all other meat. There is therefore no need to maintain a specific authorisation procedure for voluntary beef labelling. Operators who respect the existing horizontal provisions would still be free to provide additional information on their labels, provided that this did not mislead consumers and that it could be verified by the competent authorities.

Speaking on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development, Mrs Julie GIRLING (ECR - UK) referred to her own recent experience with electronic identification of sheep. This had been imposed on farmers in her constituency despite their strong opposition. Enough time has now passed for it to be clear that it does not work efficiently. Some farmers do find it useful for internal flock management, but it is not sufficiently reliable to be used as a primary system for stock movements. The Commission had itself acknowledged the unreliability of the technology when it granted more time for the United Kingdom to embed the system. These problems should be resolved before the system is extended to cattle. Furthermore, the system should not be extended on a mandatory basis unless it is first demonstrated that it will deliver benefits. She frequently meets farmers who are terrified of failing to achieve cross-compliance and thereby having their single farm payments withdrawn.

Speaking on behalf of the EPP political group, Mrs María del Pilar AYUSO GONZÁLEZ (EPP - ES) expressed her full support for the Commission's proposal on electronic labelling, but opposed bringing an end to voluntary labelling which had greatly contributed to consumer awareness. The current system is familiar to those directly concerned and works well.

Speaking on behalf of the S&D political group, Mrs Dagmar ROTH-BEHRENDT (S&D - DE):

- disagreed with the Rapporteur, arguing that there was a public health issue at stake;
- argued that farmers should be able to provide further information on a voluntary basis; and
- opposed the abolition of the current system because, without a formal system, it would not be possible for competent authorities to monitor the situation.

Speaking on behalf of the ALDE political group, Mrs Riikka MANNER (ALDE – FI):

- called for greater clarity so that consumers would know what they are purchasing; and
- noted that not all Member States had established a voluntary system.

Speaking on behalf of the ECR political group, Mr Janusz WOJCIECHOWSKI (ECR - PL):

- argued that electronic identification systems should be voluntary, particularly because they are costly for small producers; and
- called for the compulsory labelling of meat from cloned animals.

Speaking on behalf of the EFD political group, Mr Oreste ROSSI (EFD – IT) questioned how one can justify the abolition of a voluntary labelling system by arguing that it is administratively burdensome.

Mr Horst SCHNELLHARDT (EPP - DE):

- called for the retention of the current voluntary labelling system because it helps to protect consumers; and
- argued that the single market requires a single electronic system.

Mr Kriton ARSENIS (S&D - GR) supported the retention of the current voluntary labelling system.

Mrs Britta REIMERS (ALDE - DE) argued that the electronic system should remain temporary for the time being until all practical problems have been resolved.

Mr John BUFTON (EFD – UK):

- argued that the electronic system should be introduced on a voluntary basis;
- opposed the idea of a review after five years to see whether it should be made compulsory. The system currently in place in the United Kingdom already works well in practice and should therefore not be changed; and
- recalled practical problems which had arisen when sheep tagging was introduced and expressed his concern that the same might occur if compulsory tagging were to be introduced for cattle.

Mr Claudiu TĂNĂSESCU (S&D - RO) acknowledged that electronic identification might well be costly for smaller farmers, but argued that the answer lies not in leaving the system voluntary but instead in providing such farmers with financial and other support.

Dr Peter LIESE (EPP - DE) argued that consumer protection should be the top priority. He could accept voluntary labelling, but stressed the need for it to be verifiable.

Mr James NICHOLSON (ECR – UK) and Mrs Diane DODDS (NI - UK):

- supported a voluntary rather than a compulsory basis for electronic identification of bovine animals. It might be possible to review this in the future;
- recalled the practical problems which had arisen in the sheep sector; and
- stressed the need to ensure that European farmers' global competitiveness should not be needlessly impaired.

Commissioner REDING once more took the floor and:

- recalled that the Commission had submitted the current proposal in response to a Parliament resolution calling on the Commission to reduce administrative burdens;
- noted that voluntary beef labelling contains information related to quality but not necessarily to health. Health and traceability are ensured by mandatory beef labelling and not by voluntary beef labelling; and
- argued that the development of electronic labelling would ultimately increase system reliability and reduce costs for smaller farmers.

The Rapporteur once more took the floor and:

- stated that there was no question of consumer health being compromised;
- insisted that there was no question of the current non-electronic but highly effective beef identification procedure being compromised;
- acknowledged that there was genuine concern regarding the reliability of the technology underlying electronic identification of sheep. Only once the sheep electronic identification system has proven to be reliable can it be made obligatory;

- stated her readiness to accept as part of an overall compromise the idea of a review in five years to ensure that the technology has been improved to the necessary standard;
- emphasised the economic challenges facing the farming sector and the costs for farmers of introducing an electronic identification system. The farming sector should therefore be given time to adopt the new technology. Granting sufficient time to farmers would not jeopardise consumer health;
- stated that she had no intention or desire to abolish the current voluntary labelling system. The aim is merely to simplify the system and procedure;
- stated that all the information related to public health is set out in the compulsory labels. No changes are proposed to this;
- stated that there would be no legal vacuum regarding labelling because the horizontal Regulation 1169/2011 would continue to apply; and
- declared that she was still aiming at a first-reading agreement. She would therefore propose, following the vote on the amendments the following day, that the vote on the legislative resolution be postponed to a later plenary. This would leave the way open for trilogue negotiations with a view to securing an agreement in first reading.

III. VOTE

On 11 September 2012, the Parliament voted to adopt 38 amendments (amendments 2, 4-12, 14-35, 40, 42-43 and 45-47) to the Commission's proposal. The vote on the legislative resolution was postponed to a later session, thereby not closing the first reading. The matter was then referred back to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety for reconsideration, pursuant to Rule 57(2) of the European Parliament's Rules of Procedure.

Electronic identification of bovine animals ***I

Amendments adopted by the European Parliament on 11 September 2012 on the amended proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 as regards electronic identification of bovine animals and deleting the provisions on voluntary beef labelling (COM(2012)0162 – C7-0114/2012 – 2011/0229(COD))¹

(Ordinary legislative procedure: first reading)

Amendment 43

Proposal for a regulation Title 1

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Amended proposal for a
REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN
PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL
amending Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000
as regards electronic identification of
bovine animals and *deleting the provisions
on voluntary beef labelling*

Amended proposal for a
REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN
PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL
amending Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000
as regards electronic identification of
bovine animals and *the labelling of beef*

Amendment 2

Proposal for a regulation Recital 4

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(4) Tracing of beef to source via
identification and registration is a
prerequisite for origin labelling throughout
the food chain *ensuring* consumer
protection and public health.

(4) Tracing of beef to source via
identification and registration is a
prerequisite for origin labelling throughout
the food chain. *Those measures ensure*
consumer protection and public health *and
promote consumer confidence.*

Amendment 4

¹ The matter was referred back to the committee responsible for reconsideration pursuant to Rule 57(2), second subparagraph (A7- 0199/2012).

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 6

Text proposed by the Commission

(6) The use of electronic identification systems would potentially streamline traceability processes through automated and more accurate reading and recording into the holding register. It would enable also automated reporting of animal movements into the computerised data base and thus improve speed, reliability and accuracy of the system.

Amendment

(6) The use of electronic identification systems would potentially streamline traceability processes through automated and more accurate reading and recording into the holding register. It would enable also automated reporting of animal movements into the computerised data base and thus improve speed, reliability and accuracy of the system. ***It would improve the management of direct payments paid to farmers per animal head through better controls and reduced risk of payment errors.***

Amendment 5

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 7

Text proposed by the Commission

(7) Electronic identification systems based on radio frequency identification have considerably improved in the last *ten* years. That technology allows a faster and more accurate reading of individual animal identity codes directly into data processing systems resulting *on* a reduction of time needed to trace potential infected animals or infected food, saving labour costs but at the same time increasing equipment costs.

Amendment

(7) Electronic identification systems based on radio frequency identification have considerably improved in the last *10* years, ***even though International Organisation for Standardisation (ISO) standards still need to be applied, and they need to be tested for bovines.*** That technology allows a faster and more accurate reading of individual animal identity codes directly into data processing systems resulting *in* a reduction of time needed to trace potential infected animals or infected food, ***leading to improved databases and an increased capacity to react promptly in the event of disease outbreaks,*** saving labour costs but at the same time increasing equipment costs. ***If the electronic identification is faulty, the failure of the technology must not result in penalty payments being imposed on farmers.***

Amendment 6

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 9

Text proposed by the Commission

(9) Given the technological advances in EID, several Member States have decided to start to implement bovine EID on a voluntary basis. Those initiatives are likely to lead to different systems to be developed in individual Member States or by stakeholders. Such a development would impede later harmonisation of technical standards within the Union.

Amendment

(9) Given the technological advances in EID, several Member States have decided to start to implement bovine EID on a voluntary basis. Those initiatives are likely to lead to different systems to be developed in individual Member States or by stakeholders. Such a development would impede later harmonisation of technical standards within the Union. ***It should be ensured that the systems introduced in the Member States are interoperable and consistent with ISO standards.***

Amendment 7

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 16

Text proposed by the Commission

(16) Making EID mandatory throughout the Union may have economically adverse effects on certain operators. It is therefore appropriate that a voluntary regime ***for the introduction of EID*** is established. ***Under*** such a regime, EID ***would*** be chosen by keepers that are likely to have ***immediate*** economic benefits.

Amendment

(16) Making EID mandatory throughout the Union may have economically adverse effects on certain operators. ***Furthermore, there are practical problems which continue to hinder the effective operation of EID, especially with regard to the accuracy of the technology. Experience of implementing mandatory electronic identification for small ruminants demonstrates that due to faulty technology and practical difficulties it is frequently impossible to achieve 100 % accuracy.*** It is therefore appropriate that a voluntary regime is established. Such a regime ***would enable*** EID ***to*** be chosen ***only*** by keepers that are likely to have ***rapid*** economic benefits.

Amendment 8

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 17

Text proposed by the Commission

(17) Member States have very different husbandry systems, farming practices and

Amendment

(17) Member States have very different husbandry systems, farming practices and

sector organisations. Member States should therefore be allowed to make EID compulsory on their territory only when they deem it appropriate, after considering all those factors.

sector organisations. Member States should therefore be allowed to make EID compulsory on their territory only when they deem it appropriate, after considering all those factors, ***including any negative impact on small farmers, and following consultation with organisations representing the beef industry.***

Amendment 9

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 18

Text proposed by the Commission

(18) Animals entering the Union from third countries should be subject to the same identification requirements that apply to animals born in the Union.

Amendment

(18) Animals ***and meat*** entering the Union from third countries should be subject to the same identification ***and traceability*** requirements that apply to animals born in the Union.

Amendment 10

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 19

Text proposed by the Commission

(19) Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 provides that the competent authority is to issue a passport for each animal which has to be identified in accordance with that Regulation. This causes a considerable administrative burden for the Member States. The computerised databases established by Member States sufficiently ensure traceability of domestic movements of bovine animals. Passports should therefore be issued only for animals intended for intra-Union trade. Once the data exchange between national computerised databases is operational, the requirement of issuing such passports should no longer apply for animals intended for intra-Union trade.

Amendment

(19) Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 provides that the competent authority is to issue a passport for each animal which has to be identified in accordance with that Regulation. This causes a considerable administrative burden for the Member States. The computerised databases established by Member States ***should*** sufficiently ensure traceability of domestic movements of bovine animals. Passports should therefore be issued only for animals intended for intra-Union trade. Once the data exchange between national computerised databases is operational, the requirement of issuing such passports should no longer apply for animals intended for intra-Union trade.

Amendment 11

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 19 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(19a) So far, there is no specific legislation on cloning. However, opinion polls show that this issue is of great interest to the European public. It is therefore appropriate to ensure that beef derived from cloned animals or their descendants is labelled as such.

Amendment 12

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 20

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(20) Section II of Title II of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 lays down rules for a voluntary beef labelling system which provide for the approval of certain labelling specifications by the competent authority of the Member State. ***The administrative burden and the costs incurred by Member States and economic operators in applying this system are not proportionate to the benefits of the system. That Section should therefore be deleted.***

(20) Section II of Title II of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 lays down rules for a voluntary beef labelling system which provide for the approval of certain labelling specifications by the competent authority of the Member State. ***In view of developments in the beef sector since the above Regulation was adopted, the beef labelling system needs to be revised. Since the system of voluntary beef labelling is neither effective nor useful, it should be deleted, without compromising the right of operators to inform consumers through voluntary labelling. Consequently, as for any other sort of meat, information which goes beyond mandatory labelling, this means in this particular case what is required by Articles 13 and 15 of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000, and is extremely important to consumers and farmers, for example breed, feed and husbandry, will have to respect the current horizontal legislation, including Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2011 on the provision of food information to consumers¹. Beyond this, the deletion is also balanced by the formulation, in this Regulation, of general rules ensuring consumer***

protection.

¹ OJ L 304, 22.11.2011, p. 18.

Amendments 14 and 45

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 22

Text proposed by the Commission

(22) In order to ensure that the necessary rules for the proper functioning of the identification, registration and traceability of bovine animals and beef are applied, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission in respect of requirements for alternative means of identification of bovine animals, special circumstances in which Member States may extend the maximum periods for the application of the means of identification, data to be exchanged between the computerised databases of the Member States, the maximum period for certain reporting obligations, the requirements for means of identification, the information to be included in the passports and in the individual registers to be kept on each holding, the minimum level of official controls, the identification and registration of movements of bovine animals ***when put out to summer grazing in different mountain areas***, rules for labelling certain products which should be equivalent to the rules laid down in Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000, the definitions of minced beef, beef trimmings or cut beef, ***the specific indications that may be put on labels, the labelling provisions related to the simplification of the indication of origin***, the maximum size and composition of certain groups of animals, the approval procedures related to labelling conditions on packaging of cut meat and the administrative sanctions to be applied by the Member States in cases of non-compliance with Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000. It is of particular importance

Amendment

(22) In order to ensure that the necessary rules for the proper functioning of the identification, registration and traceability of bovine animals and beef are applied, the power to adopt acts in accordance with Article 290 of the Treaty should be delegated to the Commission in respect of requirements for alternative means of identification of bovine animals, special circumstances in which Member States may extend the maximum periods for the application of the means of identification, data to be exchanged between the computerised databases of the Member States, the maximum period for certain reporting obligations, the requirements for means of identification, the information to be included in the passports and in the individual registers to be kept on each holding, the minimum level of official controls, the identification and registration of movements of bovine animals ***during different types of seasonal transhumance***, rules for labelling certain products which should be equivalent to the rules laid down in Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000, the definitions of minced beef, beef trimmings or cut beef, the maximum size and composition of certain groups of animals, the approval procedures related to labelling conditions on packaging of cut meat and the administrative sanctions to be applied by the Member States in cases of non-compliance with Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000. It is of particular importance that the Commission carry out appropriate consultations during its preparatory work, including at expert level. The Commission, when preparing and drawing-up such

that the Commission carry out appropriate consultations during its preparatory work, including at expert level. The Commission, when preparing and drawing-up such delegated acts, should ensure a simultaneous, timely and appropriate transmission of relevant documents to the European Parliament and to the Council.

delegated acts, should ensure a simultaneous, timely and appropriate transmission of relevant documents to the European Parliament and to the Council.

Amendment 15

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 23

Text proposed by the Commission

(23) In order to ensure uniform conditions for the implementation of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 with respect to the registration of holdings making use of alternative means of identification, technical characteristics and modalities for the exchange of data between the computerised databases of Member States, the format and design of the means of identification, technical procedures and standards for the implementation of EID, the format of the passports and of the register to be kept on each holding, rules concerning the modalities for the application of the sanctions imposed by the Member States on holders pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000, corrective actions to be taken by the Member States to ensure proper compliance with Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000, in cases where on-the-spot checks so justify, implementing powers should be conferred on the Commission. Those powers should be exercised in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 182/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 2011 laying down the rules and general principles concerning mechanisms for control by Member States of the Commission's exercise of implementing powers.

Amendment

(23) In order to ensure uniform conditions for the implementation of Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000 with respect to the registration of holdings making use of alternative means of identification, technical characteristics and modalities for the exchange of data between the computerised databases of Member States, ***the declaration that the data exchange system between Member States is fully operational***, the format and design of the means of identification, technical procedures and standards for the implementation of EID, the format of the passports and of the register to be kept on each holding, rules concerning the modalities for the application of the sanctions imposed by the Member States on holders pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000, corrective actions to be taken by the Member States to ensure proper compliance with Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000, in cases where on-the-spot checks so justify, ***and the necessary rules to ensure proper compliance in particular as regards controls, administrative sanctions, and various maximum periods laid down in this Regulation***, implementing powers should be conferred on the Commission. Those powers should be exercised in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 182/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 2011 laying down the rules and general principles concerning mechanisms

for control by Member States of the Commission's exercise of implementing powers.

Amendment 16

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 23 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(23a) The implementation of this Regulation should be monitored. Consequently, no later than five years after the entry into force of this Regulation, the Commission should submit to the European Parliament and to the Council a report dealing both with the implementation of this Regulation and with the technical and economic feasibility of introducing mandatory electronic identification everywhere in the Union. If this report concludes that electronic identification should become mandatory, it should, if appropriate, be accompanied by an appropriate legislative proposal. That legislation would remove risks of distortion of competition within the internal market.

Amendment 17

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – point 1 a (new)

Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000

Article 2

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(1a) In Article 2, the following definition is added:

" "cloned animals" means animals produced by means of a method of asexual, artificial reproduction with the aim of producing a genetically identical or nearly identical copy of an individual animal,".

Amendment 18

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – point 1 b (new)

Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000

Article 2

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(1b) In Article 2, the following definition is added:

" "descendants of cloned animals" means animals produced by means of sexual reproduction, in cases in which at least one of the progenitors is a cloned animal,".

Amendment 19

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – point 3

Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000

Article 4 – paragraph 1 – subparagraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

1. All animals on a holding shall be identified by at least two individual means of identification authorised in accordance with Articles 10 and 10a and approved by the competent authority.

1. All animals on a holding shall be identified by at least two individual means of identification authorised in accordance with Articles 10 and 10a and approved by the competent authority. ***The Commission shall ensure that identifiers used in the Union are interoperable and consistent with ISO standards.***

Amendment 20

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – point 3

Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000

Article 4 – paragraph 1 – subparagraph 2

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

The means of identification shall be allocated to the holding, distributed and applied to the animals in a manner determined by the competent authority.

The means of identification shall be allocated to the holding, distributed and applied to the animals in a manner determined by the competent authority. ***This shall not apply to animals born before 1 January 1998 and not intended for intra-Union trade.***

Amendment 21

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – point 3

Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000

Article 4 – paragraph 1 – subparagraph 3

Text proposed by the Commission

All means of identification applied to one animal shall bear the same unique identification code, which makes it possible to identify the animal individually together with the holding on which it was born.

Amendment

All means of identification applied to one animal shall bear the same unique identification code, which makes it possible to identify the animal individually together with the holding on which it was born. ***By way of derogation, in cases where it is not possible for the two individual means of identification to bear the same unique identification code, the competent authority may, under its supervision, allow for the second means of identification to bear a different code provided that full traceability is ensured and individual identification of the animal, including the holding on which it was born, is possible.***

Amendment 22

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – point 3

Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000

Article 4 – paragraph 2 – subparagraph 2

Text proposed by the Commission

The Member States that make use of this option shall provide the Commission with the text of such national provisions.

Amendment

The Member States that make use of this option shall provide the Commission with the text of such national provisions. ***The Commission shall then supply the other Member States, in a language which is readily understandable by those Member States, with a summary of the national rules governing the movement of animals to Member States that have opted for compulsory EID and shall make them publicly available.***

Amendment 23

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – point 4

Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000

Article 4a – paragraph 1 – subparagraph 1 – point b

Text proposed by the Commission

(b) 60 days for the second means of identification.

Amendment

(b) 60 days for the second means of identification, ***for reasons related to the physiological development of the animals.***

Amendment 24

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – point 4

Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000

Article 4a – paragraph 1 – subparagraph 2

Text proposed by the Commission

No animal may leave the holding where it was born before the two means of identification have been applied.

Amendment

No animal may leave the holding where it was born before the two means of identification have been applied ***except in case of force majeure.***

Amendment 25

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – point 4

Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000

Article 4a – paragraph 2 – subparagraph 1 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

The first subparagraph shall not apply to animals born before 1 January 1998 and not intended for intra-Union trade.

Amendment 26

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – point 4

Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000

Article 4b – paragraph 2 – subparagraph 2

Text proposed by the Commission

That period shall not exceed 20 days following the veterinary checks referred in

Amendment

That period shall not exceed 20 days following the veterinary checks referred in

paragraph 1. In any event, the means of identification shall be applied to the animals before they leave the holding of destination.

paragraph 1. *By way of derogation, for reasons related to the physiological development of the animals, that period may be extended by up to 60 days for the second means of identification.* In any event, the means of identification shall be applied to the animals before they leave the holding of destination.

Amendment 27

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – point 4

Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000

Article 4c – paragraph 2 – subparagraph 2

Text proposed by the Commission

The maximum period referred to in point (b) shall not exceed 20 days from the date of arrival of the animals on the holding of destination. In any event, the means of identification shall be applied to the animals before they leave the holding of destination.

Amendment

The maximum period referred to in point (b) shall not exceed 20 days from the date of arrival of the animals on the holding of destination. *By way of derogation, for reasons related to the physiological development of the animals, that period may be extended by up to 60 days for the second means of identification.* In any event, the means of identification shall be applied to the animals before they leave the holding of destination.

Amendment 28

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – point 4

Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000

Article 4c – paragraph 2 – subparagraph 2 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Notwithstanding the third subparagraph of Article 4(1), in cases where it is not possible to apply an electronic identifier with the same unique identification code to the animal, the competent authority may, under its supervision, allow for the second means of identification to bear a different code provided that full traceability is ensured and that individual identification of the animal, including the holding on which it was born, is possible.

Amendment 29

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – point 4

Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000

Article 4d

Text proposed by the Commission

No means of identification *may* be removed or replaced without the permission and without the control of the competent authority. Such permission may only be granted where the removal or replacement do not compromise the traceability of the animal.

Amendment

No means of identification *shall* be ***modified***, removed or replaced without the permission and without the control of the competent authority. Such permission may only be granted where the ***modification, the*** removal or replacement do not compromise the traceability of the animal.

Amendment 30

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – point 5

Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000

Article 5 – paragraph 2 – subparagraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

Member States may exchange electronic data between their computerised databases from the date when the Commission recognises the full operability of the data exchange system.

Amendment

Member States may exchange electronic data between their computerised databases from the date when the Commission recognises the full operability of the data exchange system. ***This must be done in such a way that data protection is guaranteed and any abuse prevented in order to protect the interests of the holding.***

Amendment 31

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – point 6

Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000

Article 6 – point c a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(ca) in the case of animals exported to third countries, the passport shall be surrendered by the last keeper to the competent authority at the place where the animal is exported.

Amendment 32

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – point 7 – point b

Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000

Article 7 – paragraph 5 – point b

Text proposed by the Commission

(b) enters up-to-date information directly into the computerised database within **twenty-four hours** of the occurrence of the event.

Amendment

(b) enters up-to-date information directly into the computerised database within **72 hours** of the occurrence of the event.

Amendment 33

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – point 8

Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000

Article 9a

Text proposed by the Commission

Member States shall ensure that any person responsible for the identification and registration of animals receives instructions and guidance on the relevant provisions of this Regulation and of any delegated and implementing acts adopted by the Commission on the basis of Articles 10 and 10a, and that appropriate training courses are available.

Amendment

Member States shall ensure that any person responsible for the identification and registration of animals receives instructions and guidance on the relevant provisions of this Regulation and of any delegated and implementing acts adopted by the Commission on the basis of Articles 10 and 10a, and that appropriate training courses are available. ***This information shall be supplied, at no cost to the recipient, every time a change is made to the relevant provisions and as often as necessary. Member States shall share best practices in order to ensure good quality of training and information sharing across the Union.***

Amendment 34

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – point 9

Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000

Article 10 – paragraph 1 – point e

Text proposed by the Commission

(e) the identification and registration of movements of bovine animals **when put**

Amendment

(e) the identification and registration of movements of bovine animals **during**

out to summer grazing in different mountain areas.

different types of seasonal transhumance.

Amendment 35

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – point 11 – point b a (new)

Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000

Article 13 – paragraph 5 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(ba) The following paragraph is added:

"5a. As from *, operators and organisations shall also indicate on their labels where the beef is derived from cloned animals or descendants of cloned animals."

**** OJ: please insert the date: six months from the date of entry into force of this Regulation.***

Amendment 46

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 –point 14

Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000

Title II – section II

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

14) Articles 16, 17 and 18 are deleted.

14) Starting from 1 January 2014, the heading of section II of title II shall be replaced by the words 'Voluntary labelling', Articles 16, 17 and 18 are deleted, and Article 15a shall be inserted into section II of title II:

'Article 15a

General rules

Information other than that specified in part I of this Title which is added to labels by operators or organisations marketing beef must be objective, verifiable by the relevant authorities and comprehensible to consumers.

Moreover, voluntary beef labelling has to respect the current horizontal legislation on labelling and Regulation (EU) No

1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2011 on the provision of food information to consumers.

The competent authority shall verify the truthfulness of the voluntary information. In the event of a failure on the part of operators or organisations marketing beef to comply with these obligations, the sanctions set down in Article 22(4) will be applied.'

Amendment 51

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – point 15

Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000

Article 19 – point b

Text proposed by the Commission

(b) the specific indications that may be put on labels;

Amendment

(b) *definition of and requirements for* the specific indications that may be put on labels;

Amendment 40

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – point 17 – point a

Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000

Article 22 – paragraph 1 – subparagraph 3

Text proposed by the Commission

The Commission shall, *by means of implementing acts, lay down* the necessary rules, including transitional measures required for their introduction, concerning the procedures for the application of the sanctions referred to in the second subparagraph. *Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 23(2).*

Amendment

The Commission shall *be empowered to adopt delegated acts, in accordance with Article 22b, laying down* the necessary rules, including transitional measures required for their introduction, concerning the procedures for the application of the sanctions referred to in the second subparagraph.

Amendment 47

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – point 18

Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000

Text proposed by the Commission

1. The power to adopt delegated acts is conferred on the Commission subject to the conditions laid down in this Article.
2. The **delegation of** power referred to in Articles 4(5) and 4a(2), **and** in Articles 5, 7, 10, 14 and 19 and in Article 22(4a) shall be conferred on the Commission for **an indeterminate** period of **time** from*.
3. The delegation of power referred to in Articles 4(5) and 4a(2), **and** in Articles 5, 7, 10, 14 and 19 and in Article 22(4a) may be revoked at any time by the European Parliament or by the Council. A decision of revocation shall put an end to the delegation of the power specified in that decision. It shall take effect the day following the publication of the decision in the official Journal of the European Union or at a later date specified therein. It shall not affect the validity of any delegated acts already in force.
4. As soon as it adopts a delegated act, the Commission shall notify it simultaneously to the European Parliament and to the Council.
5. A delegated act adopted pursuant to Articles 4(5) and 4a(2), **and** Articles 5, 7, 10, 14, and 19 and in Article 22(4a) shall enter into force only if no objection has been expressed either by the European Parliament or the Council within a period of two months of notification of that act to the European Parliament and the Council or if, before the expiry of that period, the European Parliament and the Council have both informed the Commission that they will not object. That period shall be extended by two months at the initiative of the European Parliament or the Council."

****[date of entry into force of this Regulation or from any other date set by***

Amendment

1. The power to adopt delegated acts is conferred on the Commission subject to the conditions laid down in this Article.
2. The power **to adopt delegated acts** referred to in Articles 4(5) and 4a(2), in Articles 5, 7, 10, 14 and 19, **in Article 22(1) third subparagraph** and in Article 22(4a) shall be conferred on the Commission for a period of **five years** from*.
3. The delegation of power referred to in Articles 4(5) and 4a(2), in Articles 5, 7, 10, 14 and 19, **in Article 22(1) third subparagraph** and in Article 22(4a) may be revoked at any time by the European Parliament or by the Council. A decision of revocation shall put an end to the delegation of the power specified in that decision. It shall take effect the day following the publication of the decision in the official Journal of the European Union or at a later date specified therein. It shall not affect the validity of any delegated acts already in force.
4. As soon as it adopts a delegated act, the Commission shall notify it simultaneously to the European Parliament and to the Council.
5. A delegated act adopted pursuant to Articles 4(5) and 4a(2), Articles 5, 7, 10, 14, and 19, **Article 22(1) third subparagraph** and in Article 22(4a) shall enter into force only if no objection has been expressed either by the European Parliament or the Council within a period of two months of notification of that act to the European Parliament and the Council or if, before the expiry of that period, the European Parliament and the Council have both informed the Commission that they will not object. That period shall be extended by two months at the initiative of the European Parliament or the Council."

****OJ: please insert date of entry into force***

the legislator].

of this Regulation.

Amendment 42

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – point 19 a (new)

Regulation (EC) No 1760/2000

Article 23 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(19a) The following Article is inserted:

"Article 23a

Report and legislative developments

No later than five years after the entry into force of this Regulation, the Commission shall submit to Parliament and the Council a report dealing both with implementation of this Regulation and with the technical and economic feasibility of introducing mandatory electronic identification everywhere in the Union. If this report concludes that electronic identification should become mandatory, it shall be accompanied by an appropriate legislative proposal."