

## II.VII Checks planned and performed in the reporting period

Fields marked with \* need to be filled in before the form can be submitted to the next level.

### II. Verification of compliance - context and implementation

---

#### II.VII Checks planned and performed in the reporting period

The Enforcement of the EUTR, i.e. taking the effective, dissuasive and proportionate measures against the different duty-holders (operators, traders and monitoring organisations) is only possible, when compliance is verified by the authorities. For operators, the efficiency of compliance verification is supported by the risk based planning of checks. Information on the operators identified as fulfilling one or more risk criteria and thus being at risk of breaching the EUTR and the operators planned to be checked allows to appreciate the challenge faced in relation to the resources and expertise needed and available. The relationship of operators planned to be checked versus operators checked and checks performed informs on possible complications, which cannot be planned, such as substantiated concerns, issues with accessing the premises or documentation needed, or complications like the need to carry out scientific testing. The type of checks performed and the declared countries of origin and types of timber/timber products provide valuable additional information for a better understanding the size and complexity of the compliance verification task.

*The insertion of the number zero (0) in reply to any of the questions in this Tab requires an explanation in the Comment box.*

*For countries, which do not distinguish between operators placing domestic or imported timber on the market, '0' should be introduced in questions 1. and 2. and the combined numbers should be introduced under questions 3. and 4.*

- \* 1 How many of the estimated operators placing **domestic** timber/timber products on the market were identified as fulfilling one or more risk criteria and thus considered **at risk of having breached the EUTR**?

31

- \* 2 How many of these operators were **planned to be checked** under the EUTR?

31

3 How many of the estimated operators placing **imported** timber/timber products on the market were identified as fulfilling one or more risk criteria and thus considered **at risk of having breached the EUTR**?

65

\* 4 How many of these operators were **planned to be checked** under the EUTR?

65

\* 5 How many **traders** of timber/timber products were planned to be **checked** under the EUTR?

80

\* 6 How many **monitoring organisations** were **planned to be checked**?

0

## Operators - domestic timber/ timber products

---

7 Were any **checks based on the EUTR performed** on operators placing **domestic** timber/timber products on the market?

☒ Yes ☐ No

\* 8 How many operators placing domestic timber/timber products on the market were checked?

43

\* 9 How many separate checks (check cases) does this correspond to?

One check (check case) may consist of desk-based work and several onsite visits. For one operator there may be several check cases, e.g. if a check case was closed, but a new concern arises.

43

\* 10 How many of the checks (check cases) remain open?

7

\* 11 How many checks (check cases) were based on substantiated concerns?

13

\* 12 For how many checks (check cases) were there any issues accessing premises or documentation?

0

13 How many checks (check cases) were purely desk-based?

This serves to estimate the workload involved.

0

14 How many checks (check cases) were both desk-based and onsite?

This serves to estimate the workload involved.

43

## Operators – imported timber/timber products

---

\* 15 How many operators placing imported timber/timber products on the market were checked?

67

\* 16 How many separate checks (check cases) does this correspond to?

One check (check case) may consist of multiple desk-based document reviews and several onsite visits, which may include multiple sample takings.

67

\* 17 How many of the checks (check cases) remain open?

11

\* 18 How many checks (check cases) were based on substantiated concerns?

2

\* 19 For how many checks (check cases) were there any issues accessing premises or documentation?

5

20 How many checks (check cases) were purely desk-based?

This serves to estimate the workload involved.

13

21 How many checks (check cases) were both desk-based and onsite?

This serves to estimate the workload involved.

54

\* 22 For how many checks (check cases) was scientific testing used?

6

- \* 23 For how many of these checks (check cases) were mismatches found compared to the declared information?

0

- \* 24 Did the Competent authority record, by check (check case), the declared country/countries of harvest /origin of the timber/timber products on which the check (check case) focused?

☐ Yes ☒ No

- \* 26 Did the Competent authority record, by check (check case), the types of timber/timber product (HS Code /denomination) checked?

☐ Yes ☒ No

## Traders

---

- \* 28 Were any traders of timber/timber products checked on the basis of the EUTR?

☒ Yes ☐ No

- \* 29 How many traders of timber/timber products were checked?

85

- \* 30 To how many separate checks (check cases) does this correspond?

One check (check case) may consist of desk-based work and several onsite visits. For one operator there may be several check cases, e.g. if a check case was closed, but a new concern arises.

85

- \* 31 How many of the checks (check cases) remain open?

0

- \* 32 How many checks (check cases) were based on substantiated concerns?

0

- \* 33 For how many checks (check cases) were there any issues accessing premises or documentation?

0

- 34 How many checks (check cases) were purely desk-based?

This serves to estimate the workload involved.

0

35 How many checks (check cases) were both desk-based and onsite?

This serves to estimate the workload involved.

0

## Monitoring organisations

\* 36 Were any monitoring organisations checked in the reporting period?

☐ Yes ☒ No

## Submission info

40 Reporting period:

2019

41 Country:

- |  |                               |                                     |                                       |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> Austria            | <input type="radio"/> Finland | <input type="radio"/> Latvia        | <input type="radio"/> Portugal        |
| <input type="radio"/> Belgium            | <input type="radio"/> France  | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein | <input type="radio"/> Romania         |
| <input type="radio"/> Bulgaria           | <input type="radio"/> Germany | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania     | <input type="radio"/> Slovak Republic |
| <input type="radio"/> Croatia            | <input type="radio"/> Greece  | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg    | <input type="radio"/> Slovenia        |
| <input type="radio"/> Cyprus             | <input type="radio"/> Hungary | <input type="radio"/> Malta         | <input type="radio"/> Spain           |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Czechia | <input type="radio"/> Iceland | <input type="radio"/> Netherlands   | <input type="radio"/> Sweden          |
| <input type="radio"/> Denmark            | <input type="radio"/> Ireland | <input type="radio"/> Norway        | <input type="radio"/> United Kingdom  |
| <input type="radio"/> Estonia            | <input type="radio"/> Italy   | <input type="radio"/> Poland        |                                       |

42 Location:

Czech Republic

43 Organisation name:

Ministry of Agriculture of the Czech Republic

44 Reference number:

45 Submission ID:

33157

46 Submission status:

SUBMITTED\_TO\_EC

## **Contact**

ENV-DECLARE@ec.europa.eu