

Brussels, 30 January 2017  
Case No: 79900  
Document No: 828588

**ORIGINAL**

ORIGINAL

EFTA SURVEILLANCE  
AUTHORITY

## IN THE EFTA COURT

### APPLICATION

submitted pursuant to Article 31 (2) of the Agreement between the EFTA States  
on the Establishment of a Surveillance Authority and a Court of Justice by

### THE EFTA SURVEILLANCE AUTHORITY

represented by Carsten Zatschler and Maria Moustakali,  
acting as Agents,

### AGAINST

### ICELAND

Seeking a declaration that by maintaining in force (i) an authorisation system for the import of raw eggs and raw egg products such as the one laid down in Article 10 of Act No 25/1993 and Articles 3 (e) and 4 of Regulation (IS) No 448/2012; (ii) an authorisation system for the import of unpasteurised milk and dairy products processed from unpasteurised milk and additional requirements, such as laid down in Article 10 of Act No 25/1993 and Articles 3 (f), 4 and 5 of Regulation (IS) No 448/2012, and a prohibition of the marketing of imported dairy products processed from unpasteurised milk, such as laid down in Article 7a of Regulation (IS) No 104/2010; and (iii) an administrative practice of requiring importers to make a declaration and obtain an approval for the import of treated egg and dairy products, such as the one established in the context of the application of Regulation (IS) No 448/2012, Iceland has failed to fulfil its obligations arising from the Act referred to at Point 1.1.1 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Council Directive 89/662/EEC of 11 December 1989 concerning veterinary checks in intra-Community trade with a view to the completion of the internal market as amended and as adapted to the EEA Agreement by Protocol 1 thereto and by the sectoral adaptations in Annex I thereto, and in particular Article 5 of that directive.*

## Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION.....	3
2	LEGAL FRAMEWORK .....	4
2.1	EEA Law .....	4
2.2	National law .....	6
3	PRE-LITIGATION PROCEDURE .....	10
4	THE INFRINGEMENTS.....	13
4.1	Introduction.....	13
4.2	The Icelandic legal framework regarding imports of raw eggs and raw egg products is in breach of Directive 89/662/EEC.....	14
4.3	The Icelandic legal framework regarding imports of unpasteurised milk and dairy products processed from unpasteurised milk is in breach of Directive 89/662/EEC .....	15
4.4	The Icelandic legal framework regarding imports of treated egg and dairy products is in breach of Directive 89/662/EEC.....	17
5	CONCLUSION .....	17
6	SCHEDULE OF ANNEXES .....	19

## 1 INTRODUCTION

1. By the present Application, the EFTA Surveillance Authority (“ESA”) seeks a declaration that Iceland has breached its obligations under Directive 89/662/EEC on veterinary checks in intra-Community trade<sup>1</sup> by (i) maintaining in force an authorisation system for the import of raw eggs and raw egg products; (ii) maintaining in force an authorisation system for the import of unpasteurised milk and dairy products processed from unpasteurised milk and additional requirements and a prohibition of the marketing of imported dairy products processed from unpasteurised milk; and (iii) maintaining in force an administrative practice of requiring importers to make a declaration and obtain an approval for the import of treated egg and dairy products.
2. The Icelandic legislation imposes restrictions on the importation to Iceland of animal products such as untreated raw eggs, raw eggshells and raw egg products as well as unpasteurised milk and dairy products processed from unpasteurised milk. The importation of such products that may carry infectious agents which cause diseases for humans and animals is not permitted. An exception to that rule is granted only by the Food and Veterinary Authority (“MAST”),<sup>2</sup> if it is considered proven that they will not transmit infectious agents that can cause diseases in humans and animals in conjunction with the fulfilment of further conditions.
3. As will be explained in further detail below, ESA submits that the rules concerning the intra-EEA trade of products of animal origin and veterinary checks are harmonised at EEA level. Council Directive 89/662/EEC regulates veterinary checks in intra-EEA trade of products of animal origin. Its main objective is to eliminate veterinary checks at the EEA’s internal borders while reinforcing the checks carried out at the point of origin. Moreover, products of animal origin will only be placed on the market if they comply with the requirements laid down in the EEA law acts comprising the so-called “Hygiene Package” as well as the

---

<sup>1</sup> Act referred to at Point 1.1.1 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, incorporated into the EEA Agreement (*Council Directive 89/662/EEC of 11 December 1989 concerning veterinary checks in intra-Community trade with a view to the completion of the internal market*).

<sup>2</sup> Authorisation was formerly granted by the Minister of Fisheries and Agriculture but, upon the amendment of Article 10 paragraph 2 of Act No 25/1993 by Act No 71/2015, the approval is now granted by MAST.

relevant animal health and welfare rules applicable in the EEA. The competent authorities of the EEA State of destination may only check, by means of non-discriminatory spot-checks, compliance with the relevant EEA legislation.

4. By maintaining in force the measures enumerated in paragraph 1 above, Iceland imposes additional requirements, which are not allowed by the harmonised framework of veterinary checks. The EFTA Court, in its judgment in Case E-17/15 - *Ferskar kjötvörur ehf. v the Icelandic State* ("the *Ferskar kjötvörur ehf.* judgment" or "the judgment in Case E-17/15 *Ferskar kjötvörur ehf.*"),<sup>3</sup> concerning the restrictions on the importation of raw meat into Iceland, has already recognised the non-compliance of such requirements with EEA law. Similar restrictions concerning egg- and dairy products are laid down in the Icelandic legislation.
5. It is for those reasons that ESA challenges in the present proceedings the requirements imposed by Iceland concerning the importation of egg- and dairy products.

## 2 LEGAL FRAMEWORK

### 2.1 EEA Law

6. *Council Directive 89/662/EEC of 11 December 1989 concerning veterinary checks in intra-Community trade with a view to the completion of the internal market*<sup>4</sup>, as adapted to the EEA Agreement aims to regulate veterinary checks in intra-EEA trade of products of animal origin. Its main objective is to eliminate veterinary checks at the EEA States' internal borders while reinforcing those carried out at the point of origin. It defines and harmonises the type of controls that can be performed within the EEA on products of animal origin.
7. Under Article 1 of Directive 89/662/EEC, veterinary checks to be carried out on products of animal origin covered by that directive, which are intended for trade between EEA States, are (subject to the provisions of Article 6 on products from third countries) no longer to be carried out at frontiers within the EEA, but are to take place in accordance with the provisions of Directive 89/662/EEC.
8. Article 2 of Directive 89/662/EEC specifies that the term "veterinary check" within the meaning of the directive "means any physical check and/or administrative formality

---

<sup>3</sup> Not yet reported.

<sup>4</sup> Act referred to at Point 1.1.1 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement.

*which applies to the products covered by the directive and which is intended for the safeguarding, direct or otherwise, of public or animal health”.*

9. Chapter I of that directive, entitled “Checks at origin”, consists of Articles 3 and 4 which regulate veterinary checks in the EEA State of dispatch.
10. Under the first of those two provisions, the EEA State of dispatch is to ensure that the only products intended for intra-EEA trade are those which have been obtained, checked, marked and labelled in accordance with EEA rules for the destination in question and which are accompanied to the final consignee by the certificates required by the EEA veterinary rules.
11. In practice, this means that products of animal origin can only be placed on the market if they comply with the requirements laid down in the applicable EEA legislation, i.e. in particular the so-called “hygiene package” as well as the relevant animal health and welfare rules applicable in the EEA. Products of animal origin, including egg- and dairy products, are subject in particular to the harmonised requirements of *Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 laying down specific hygiene rules for food of animal origin*<sup>5</sup> (“Regulation (EC) No 853/2004”), of *Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 laying down specific rules for the organisation of official controls on products of animal origin intended for human consumption*<sup>6</sup> and *Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules*<sup>7</sup>.
12. Then, Article 4(1) of Directive 89/662 provides that:
 

*“Member States of dispatch shall take the necessary measures to ensure that operators comply with veterinary requirements at all stages of the production, storage, marketing and transport of the products referred to in Article 1 [...]”*
13. Chapter II of Directive 89/662/EEC, entitled “Checks on arrival at the destination”, consists of Articles 5 to 8.
14. Article 5 defines – restrictively – the types of checks that can be carried out by the competent authority at the place of destination and states in particular in its paragraph 1 (a) that:

*“Member States of destination shall implement the following measures:*

---

<sup>5</sup> Act referred to at Point 6.1.17 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement.

<sup>6</sup> Act referred to at Point 1.1.12 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement.

<sup>7</sup> Act referred to at Point 1.1.11 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement.

*The competent authority may, at the places of destination of goods, check by means of non-discriminatory veterinary spot-checks that the requirements of Article 3 have been complied with; it may take samples at the same time.*

*Furthermore, where the competent authority of the Member State of transit or of the Member State of destination has information leading it to suspect an infringement, checks may also be carried out during the transport of goods in its territory, including checks on compliance as regards the means of transport."*

15. It follows from these provisions that competent authorities of the EEA State of destination may only check, by means of non-discriminatory veterinary spot-checks, compliance with the relevant EEA legislation.
16. Articles 7 and 8 of Directive 89/662/EEC lay down the measures to be taken and the procedure to be followed if, during a check carried out at the place of destination of a consignment, the competent authority establishes the existence of an epizootic disease, any new serious and contagious disease or other cause likely to constitute a serious hazard to animals or to human health.
17. Article 9 of Directive 89/662/EEC provides that, in cases of an outbreak in its territory of any zoonoses, disease or other cause likely to constitute a serious hazard to human or animal health, Member States may adopt safeguard measures<sup>8</sup>.
18. Finally, it should be mentioned that, concerning dairy products, Regulation (EU) No 853/2004 provides in its Article 10.8 that:  
*"A Member State may, of its own initiative and subject to the general provisions of the Treaty, maintain or establish national rules:*  
*(a) prohibiting or restricting the placing on the market within its territory of raw milk or raw cream intended for direct human consumption;*  
*or*  
*(b) permitting the use, with the authorisation of the competent authority, of raw milk not meeting the criteria laid down in Annex III, Section IX, as regards plate count and somatic cell count of the manufacture of cheeses with an ageing or ripening period of at least 60 days, and dairy products obtained in connection with the manufacture of such cheeses, provided that this does not prejudice the achievement of the objectives of this Regulation."*

## 2.2 National law

19. Article 10 of Act No 25/1993 on animal diseases and preventive measures against them, as amended, provides that:  
*"To prevent animal diseases from reaching the country it is prohibited to import the following types of goods:*

---

<sup>8</sup> Directive 89/662/EEC was incorporated into the EEA Agreement with an adaptation to Article 9, according to which this provision does not apply and any reference to it must be read as a reference to paragraph 3 of the Introductory Part of Annex I, Chapter I thereto, which concerns safeguard and protective measures.

- a. *raw and lightly salted slaughter products, both processed and non-processed, raw eggs, non-disinfected raw skins and hides, feed for food producing animals (in Icelandic: alidýraáburður) and (rotmassi) mixed with feed for food producing animals,*
- b. *meat meal, bone flour, blood meal, and fat that is distilled from the production of these materials,*
- c. *hay and straw,*
- d. *any type of used packaging, saddlery, machinery, device, instruments, and other objects that have been in contact with animals, animal products or animal waste,*
- e. *any type of equipment used for angling.*

*Despite the provision of paragraph 1, the Food and Veterinary Authority is authorised to allow the import of the products mentioned in items a-e, if it is considered proven that they will not transmit infectious agents that can cause animal diseases. The Minister can decide by regulation that paragraph 1 shall not apply to certain categories of the products listed therein, if the product is disinfected in production or a special disinfection is performed before importation and the product is accompanied with a satisfactory certificate of origin, processing and disinfection, in the case of producers outside of the European Economic Area. The Minister is authorised to prohibit by regulation the import of products, irrespective of their origin, which carry the risk of transmitting contaminating agents that could cause danger to the health of animals.[...]"*

20. The above text reflects the Icelandic provision as it currently stands. The first sentence of paragraph 2 above reflects an amendment introduced by Act No 71/2015, which entered into force on 20 July 2015.
21. Upon the amendment of Article 10 paragraph 2 of Act No 25/1993 by Act No 71/2015, the approval is now granted by MAST and not by the Minister, as the case was previously.
22. Icelandic Regulation (IS) No 448/2012 of 23 May 2012 on measures to prevent the introduction of animal diseases and contaminated products to Iceland provides detailed provisions on the implementation of Article 10 of Act No 25/1993.
23. Article 3 of Regulation (IS) No 448/2012 provides that:
 

*"The importation to Iceland of the following animal products and products that may carry infectious agents which cause diseases in animals and humans is not permitted, cf. however, further details in Chapter III.*

*(...)*

  - e. *Untreated raw eggs, raw eggshells and raw egg products, which have not been treated by heating so that the product has been heated to 65°C for 5 minutes, or received other comparable treatment in the assessment of MAST.*
  - f. *Unpasteurised milk and dairy products processed from unpasteurised milk. However, up to 1 kg of cheese processed from unpasteurised milk from approved establishments in the European Economic Area may be imported for personal use; however, the Minister may authorise the import of a larger quantity for the same purpose."*

24. Article 4 of Regulation (IS) No 448/2012 provides that:

*“The Minister of Fisheries and Agriculture is authorised to allow the import of products mentioned in Article 3, cf. Article 10 of [Act No 25/1993] and subsequent amendments, having received recommendations from the Food and Veterinary Authority, if it is considered proven that they will not transmit infectious agents that can cause diseases in animals and humans, and the conditions imposed for the import have been fulfilled, see however Article 7.*

*When an application is submitted for the first time to import a raw or unsterilized product as referred to in the first paragraph, an importer must provide the Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture with the necessary information on the product for consideration and approval before the product is dispatched from the country of export.*

*An importer of raw products shall in all cases apply for a permit to the Minister of Fisheries and Agriculture and submit, for the consideration of MAST, an import declaration, information on the country of origin and production, the type of product and producer, and the required certificates, as provided for in Article 5.”*

25. In practice, when the initial application has been processed, the importer has to apply for permission for the import of each individual consignment. This is satisfied by submitting all the necessary documentation to the office of import and export at MAST, where an evaluation of conformity takes place. If conformity is established, the documents are sent to MAST for final approval, as upon the amendment of Article 10 paragraph 2 of Act No 25/1993 by Act No 71/2015, the approval is now granted by MAST, as mentioned above. Upon such final approval, the importer may submit the documents to the customs authorities and have the consignments released.

26. Moreover, Article 5 of Regulation (IS) No 448/2012 provides that:

*“Imported foods which are listed under classifications (CN Codes) 0202, 0203, 0204, 0207, 0208, 0210, 1601 and 1602,<sup>9</sup> cf. Appendix I to the Customs Act, No 88/2005, which the Minister has authorised for import to Iceland as referred to in Article 4 and which have not received satisfactory heat treatment must be accompanied by the following certificates:*

- a. an official certificate of origin and health, in the case of products from producers outside the European Economic Area;*
- b. an official certificate confirming that the animals from which the products derive were not given growth-promoting substances during rearing, in the case of products from producers outside the European Economic Area;*
- c. a certificate confirming that the products have been stored at a temperature of at least -18°C for a month prior to customs clearance;*
- d. an official certificate confirming that the animals from which the products derive were slaughtered in slaughterhouses and the products processed in processing plants authorised*

---

<sup>9</sup> Description of the CN Codes: 0202: Meat of bovine animals, frozen, 0203: Meat of swine, fresh, chilled or frozen ; 0204: Meat of sheep or goats, fresh, chilled or frozen ; 0207: Meat and edible offal, of the poultry of heading 0105, fresh, chilled or frozen ; 0208: Other meat and edible meat offal, fresh, chilled or frozen ; 0210: Meat and edible meat offal, salted, in brine, dried or smoked; edible flours and meals of meat or meat offal ; 1601: Sausages and similar products, of meat, meat offal or blood; food preparations based on these products ; 1602: Other prepared or preserved meat, meat offal or blood.



*in the European Economic Area, in the case of products from producers outside the European Economic Area;*

*e. an official certificate confirming that the products are free of salmonella bacteria;*

*f. animal meat products and by-products, dairy products and raw eggs shall conform to the appropriate provisions of the current Regulation on food contaminants;*

*g. the product shall be labelled in conformity with current rules on labelling, advertising and promotion of foodstuffs.*

*[...] Imported cheese in customs classifications (CN Codes) 0406.2000 and 0406.3000<sup>10</sup> must have received appropriate treatment so that the cheese has been heat treated at least to 48°C, the product must have been stored for at least 6 months at a temperature of not less than 10°C and a humidity of less than 36%. The product must be accompanied by an official certificate of origin and health, in the case of producers outside of the European Economic Area, and confirmation that the product has received appropriate treatment."*

27. ESA considers that Article 10 of Act No 25/1993 and Articles 3 and 4 of Regulation (IS) No 448/2012 read together, impose a system of import authorisation for raw eggs and raw egg products and for unpasteurised milk and dairy products processed from unpasteurised milk, based on the production of certain documents. Article 5 of Regulation (IS) No 448/2012 further requires operators to confirm, for the import of certain cheeses, that they have received a specific heat treatment and have been stored for at least 6 months at a temperature of not less than 10°C and a humidity of less than 36%.
28. ESA understands that the products concerned are principally eggs and egg products, milk and dairy products. These products are defined and covered by Regulation (EC) No 853/2004<sup>11</sup>.
29. Furthermore, Article 7a of Regulation (IS) No 104/2010 on the incorporation of Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 laying down specific hygiene rules for food of animal origin provides that:

*"In accordance with the provisions of Regulation No. 853/2004/EC, as amended, the following provisions shall apply with regards to the placing on the market of raw milk and raw cream, intended for distribution on the market, for direct human consumption: Milk that is distributed to consumers, shall be pasteurised and packaged in consumer packaging. Dairy products shall be produced from pasteurised milk. (...)"*

<sup>10</sup> Description of the CN Codes: 0406.2000 - grated or powdered cheese of all kinds; 0406.3000 - processed cheese, not grated or powdered.

<sup>11</sup> Annex I of Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 (act referred to at Point 6.1.17 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement) defines „raw milk“ as “milk produced by the secretion of the mammary gland of farmed animals that has not been heated to more than 40 °C or undergone any treatment that has an equivalent effect”; „eggs“ as “eggs in shell – other than broken, incubated or cooked eggs – that are produced by farmed birds and are fit for direct human consumption or for the preparation of egg products”; „dairy products“ as “processed products resulting from the processing of raw milk or from the further processing of such processed products” and “egg products” as “processed products resulting from the processing of eggs, or of various components or mixtures of eggs, or from the further processing of such processed products”.

30. The Icelandic Government has specified that this prohibition of marketing for direct human consumption was applying to imported dairy products processed from unpasteurised milk with exceptions, in particular cheeses complying with the requirements of Regulation (IS) No 448/2012. ESA understands that this provision applies to imported dairy products processed from unpasteurised milk except for those that have been authorised according to Regulation 448/2012.
31. Finally, the Icelandic Government has also specified that, for treated egg and dairy products (i.e. complying with the heat treatments mentioned in Article 3 (e) and (f) respectively of Regulation (IS) No 448/2012), importers had to make a declaration and obtain the approval of MAST in order to get customs clearance. ESA understands that this administrative practice results from the application of Article 3 of Regulation (IS) No 448/2012.

### 3 PRE-LITIGATION PROCEDURE

32. In the context of the proceedings in a complaint case against Iceland concerning imports of raw meat, ESA noted that the Icelandic legislation imposing restrictions on the import into Iceland of meat products was imposing similar restrictions on certain other products, in particular on egg and dairy products.
33. On 21 October 2015, ESA's Internal Market Affairs Directorate sent a pre-Article 31 letter to Iceland,<sup>12</sup> in which it presented its preliminary conclusion that:

- by maintaining in force an authorisation system for the import of raw egg and dairy products and additional requirements and a prohibition of the marketing for direct human consumption of imported dairy products processed from unpasteurised milk, as well as an administrative practice of requiring importers to make a declaration and obtain the approval of the Icelandic Food and Veterinary Authority (MAST) for the import of treated egg and dairy products, Iceland has failed to comply with Directive 89/662/EEC, in particular Article 5 thereof;
- Alternatively, these requirements are in breach of Article 18 of the EEA Agreement.

34. On 10 February 2016, ESA sent a letter to Iceland,<sup>13</sup> in which it invited it to inform ESA of how it intended to comply with the EFTA Court's judgment of 1 February 2016 in Case E-17/15 *Ferskar kjötvörur ehf.*, in view of the conclusions concerning the incompatibility with Directive 89/662/EEC of the Icelandic authorisation system for raw meat imports.

<sup>12</sup> Document No. 757580. Annex A.1 to this Application.

<sup>13</sup> Document No. 792343. Annex A.2 to this Application.

35. On 9 March 2016, the Icelandic Government sent a reply to that letter,<sup>14</sup> in which it stated in particular that it was in the process of evaluating possible adjustments to this authorisation system.
36. On 20 April 2016, ESA sent a letter of formal notice to Iceland in which it maintained its main conclusion.<sup>15</sup>
37. By a letter dated 21 June 2016, the Icelandic Government requested an extension of the deadline to reply to ESA's letter of formal notice of 20 April 2016.<sup>16</sup> By a letter dated 23 June 2016,<sup>17</sup> ESA granted the Icelandic Government an extension of the deadline until 1 July 2016. By a letter dated 4 July 2016,<sup>18</sup> the Icelandic Government requested an additional extension of the deadline to reply to the letter of formal notice. By letter dated 5 July 2016,<sup>19</sup> ESA granted the Icelandic Government an additional extension of the deadline until 11 July 2016.
38. On 13 July 2016,<sup>20</sup> the Icelandic Government sent a reply to ESA's letter of formal notice of 20 April 2016.
39. In its reply, the Icelandic Government first referred, concerning the import authorisation system, to its legal arguments presented in its reply to ESA's letter of formal notice in the meat ban case and the EFTA Court's judgment in Case E-17/15 - *Ferskar kjötvörur ehf.* It considered that, following the Advisory Opinion, it should wait for the procedure before the District Court of Reykjavík to be concluded before it takes further steps concerning the import system.
40. Then, concerning requirements relating to food contaminants and labelling foreseen in Article 5 (f) and (g) of Regulation (IS) No 448/2012, the Icelandic Government stated that these provisions did not impose additional requirements but were merely intended to reaffirm that importers must ensure that foodstuffs fulfil the rules on food contaminants and labelling. According to the Icelandic Government's interpretation, it follows from Article 5 of the said regulation that Iceland cannot demand certificates related to food contaminants or labelling from

---

<sup>14</sup> Document No. 796940. IS ref. BRU15070011/89.A.410JBB. Annex A.3 to this Application.

<sup>15</sup> Document No. 793185. Annex A.4 to this Application.

<sup>16</sup> Document No. 809405. IS ref. ANR15110013/20.5. Annex A.5 to this Application.

<sup>17</sup> Document No. 809423. Annex A.6 to this Application.

<sup>18</sup> Document No. 811054. IS ref. ANR15110013/20.5. Annex A.7 to this Application.

<sup>19</sup> Document No. 811072. Annex A.8 to this Application.

<sup>20</sup> Document No. 812328. IS ref. ANR15110013/20.5. Annex A.9 to this Application.

importers. In view of the above, ESA did not pursue the infringement relating to Article 5 (f) and (g) of Regulation (IS) No 448/2012 in its reasoned opinion.

41. Furthermore, concerning the Icelandic prohibition on marketing of dairy products processed from raw milk, the Icelandic Government stated in particular that in its view Article 10 (8) (a) of Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 cannot be understood as merely applying to raw milk, and not to dairy products produced from raw milk. As will be outlined below, ESA does not agree.
42. On 14 September 2016, ESA delivered a reasoned opinion, maintaining its main conclusions in the letter of formal notice.<sup>21</sup> Pursuant to the second paragraph of Article 31 of the Surveillance and Court Agreement ("SCA"), ESA required Iceland to take the measures necessary to comply with the reasoned opinion within two months following the notification, that is, no later than 14 November 2016.
43. By a letter dated 14 November 2016,<sup>22</sup> the Icelandic government requested an extension of the deadline to reply to ESA's reasoned opinion of 14 September 2016.
44. ESA granted an extension until 14 December 2016 by letter dated 15 November 2016.<sup>23</sup> It is accordingly that date – 14 December 2016 – at which the infringement has to be assessed.
45. On 18 November 2016, the District Court of Reykjavík handed down its judgment in the case in the main proceedings in Case E-17/15 Ferskar Kjöttvörur. The District Court found for the plaintiff, Ferskar kjöttvörur, and the Icelandic State was ordered to pay damages as requested by the plaintiff.
46. On 14 December 2016, Iceland replied to ESA's reasoned opinion, maintaining its position and providing additional comments.<sup>24</sup> It informed the Authority that it had decided to seek leave to appeal the judgment of the District Court.
47. As Iceland still maintained the national provisions in question by the deadline set for response to the reasoned opinion, ESA decided to bring the matter before the EFTA Court pursuant to the second paragraph of Article 31 SCA.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Document No. 809275. Annex A.10 to this Application.

<sup>22</sup> Document No. 826535. IS. Ref. ANR15110013/20.5. Annex A.11 to the this Application.

<sup>23</sup> Document No. 826554. Annex A.12 to this Application.

<sup>24</sup> Document No. 831589. Annex A.13 to this Application.

<sup>25</sup> Document No. 829509. College Decision No. 247/16/COL, adopted on 20 December 2016, Document No. 829509. Annex A.14 to this Application.

## 4 THE INFRINGEMENTS

### 4.1 Introduction

48. The rules concerning the intra-EEA trade of products of animal origin and veterinary checks have been harmonised in the EEA.
49. According to Directive 89/662/EEC, veterinary checks are to take place at the place of dispatch, and the competent authority at the place of destination may carry checks only by means of non-discriminatory spot-checks. In addition, Article 5 of Directive 89/662/EEC provides that the veterinary checks at the place of destination are limited to verifying the fulfilment of the requirements of EEA legislation. Hence, veterinary checks on imports of egg and dairy products can only be aimed at verifying by means of non-discriminatory spot-checks compliance with the requirements of relevant EEA legislation.
50. The EFTA Court stated, in its judgment of 1 February 2016 in Case E-17/15 *Ferskar kjötvörur ehf.* that:

*“65 The harmonised system of veterinary checks [under Directive 89/662/EEC] is based on full inspection of the goods in the EEA State of dispatch. The system is intended to replace, as a rule, inspection in the EEA State of destination. Considerations related to the need to protect public or animal health cannot justify additional specific constraints imposed by an EEA State when the frontier is crossed (see, for comparison, judgment in Commission v Sweden, C-111/03, EU:C:2005:619, paragraph 51).*

*66 The objective of the Directive could not be realised, nor its effectiveness achieved, if the EEA States were free to go beyond its requirements. Maintaining or adopting national measures other than those expressly provided for in the Directive must therefore be regarded as incompatible with the Directive’s purpose”.*

51. Furthermore, the EFTA Court stated in paragraph 76 of that judgment that:

*“The aim to protect human and animal health in EEA trade mentioned in Article 13 EEA cannot be invoked to justify measures banning or restricting imports when a Directive provides for the harmonization of the measures necessary to guarantee the protection of animal and human health and when they establish procedures to check that they are observed”.*

52. It also follows from the consistent interpretation made on several occasions by the Court of Justice of the European Union (“the CJEU” or “the Court of Justice”) that Directive 89/662/EEC has exhaustively harmonised veterinary checks that can take place in the State of destination<sup>26</sup>. The CJEU has stated that a detailed and harmonised system of health inspections, based on harmonised rules at EEA level,

<sup>26</sup> See, in particular, *Commission v Germany*, C-186/88, ECLI:EU:C:1989:601; *Commission v Germany*, C-102/96, ECLI:EU:C:1998:529; *Danske Slagterier v Bundesrepublik Deutschland*, C-445/06, ECLI:EU:C:2009:178 and *Commission v Sweden*, C-111/03, ECLI:EU:C:2005:619.

replaces all other inspection systems existing within the country of destination, whatever the place where such inspections may be carried out<sup>27</sup>.

53. A review of the Icelandic legal framework, in light of the above and in particular of the *Ferskar kjötvörur ehf.* judgment, has led ESA to reach the conclusion that the authorisation procedure and the additional requirements imposed by the Icelandic legislation on imports of egg and dairy products are not in line with Directive 89/662/EEC, and in particular Article 5 thereof. ESA also notes that the amendment of Article 10 paragraph 2 of Act No 25/1993 by Act No 71/2015 mentioned above does not alter this conclusion.

#### **4.2 The Icelandic legal framework regarding imports of raw eggs and raw egg products is in breach of Directive 89/662/EEC**

54. First of all, Article 10 of Act No 25/1993 read in conjunction with Articles 3 to 5 of Regulation (IS) No 448/2012 imposes an authorisation procedure for the import into Iceland of raw eggs and raw egg products from other EEA States.
55. In particular, Article 4 of Regulation (IS) No 448/2012 requires all operators to submit an initial application and then – systematically and for each consignment – an application for the import of raw eggs and raw egg products.
56. The EFTA Court concluded in the operative part of the *Ferskar kjötvörur ehf.* judgment that:
- “It is not compatible with the provisions of Directive 89/662/EEC for an EEA State to enact rules demanding that an importer of raw meat products applies for a special permit before the products are imported [...].”*
57. The authorisation system for the import of raw eggs and raw egg products is similar to the one for raw meat products. Therefore, the same conclusion must be made, i.e. that these requirements are not compatible with the provisions of Directive 89/662/EEC, and in particular Article 5 thereof, as they constitute obligations that go beyond the controls permitted at the place of destination.

---

<sup>27</sup> See, in particular, joined cases *Ligur Carni Srl and Genova Carni Srl v Unità Sanitaria Locale n. XV di Genova and Ponente SpA v Unità Sanitaria Locale n. XIX di La Spezia and CO.GE.SE.MA Coop a r l*, C-277/91, C-318/91 and C-319/91, ECLI:EU:C:1993:927, paragraph 26 and *Commission v Sweden*, C-111/03, cited above, paragraph 51.

#### **4.3 The Icelandic legal framework regarding imports of unpasteurised milk and dairy products processed from unpasteurised milk is in breach of Directive 89/662/EEC**

58. First of all, Article 10 of Act No 25/1993 read in conjunction with Articles 3 to 5 of Regulation (IS) No 448/2012 imposes an authorisation procedure for the import into Iceland of unpasteurised milk and dairy products processed from unpasteurised milk from other EEA States.
59. Article 4 of Regulation (IS) No 448/2012 requires all operators to submit an initial application and then – systematically and for each consignment – an application for the import of unpasteurised milk and dairy products processed from unpasteurised milk, and Article 5 of the above (IS) Regulation imposes additional requirements concerning certain cheeses, including a confirmation that they have been subject to a heat treatment and a storage for at least 6 months.
60. In addition, it results from Article 7a of Regulation (IS) No 104/2010 that the marketing for direct consumption of imported dairy products processed from unpasteurised milk is prohibited.
61. It follows from Article 5 of Directive 89/662/EEC in conjunction with its Article 3, that veterinary checks on dairy products can only be aimed at verifying, by means of non-discriminatory spot-checks that these products comply with relevant EEA rules, and in particular the harmonised requirements applicable to dairy products set by the Hygiene regulations.
62. In this regard, ESA submits that the Icelandic measure does not find a legal basis, as a matter of EEA law, in Article 10.8 (a) of Regulation (EC) No 853/2004, as:
- the authorisation procedure for the import of unpasteurised milk goes beyond what is permitted under Article 10.8 (a) of Regulation (EC) No 853/2004, which only allows restrictive measures concerning raw milk for direct human consumption, but does not cover raw milk for other uses (i.e. destined for further processing). The Icelandic legislation, which generally covers raw milk irrespective of its use, is thus not in line with Article 10.8 (a) of Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 ;
  - the authorisation procedure for the import of dairy products processed from unpasteurised milk and related prohibition of their marketing for direct human consumption goes beyond what is permitted under Article 10.8 (a) of

Regulation (EC) No 853/2004, which only allows restrictive measures on raw milk or raw cream for direct human consumption.

63. In this respect, ESA disagrees with the argument of the Icelandic Government that Article 10.8 (a) of Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 would extend to all dairy products processed from raw milk. Indeed, this provision allows EEA States to maintain or establish national rules prohibiting or restricting the placing on the market of solely two specific products, i.e. raw milk and raw cream, and solely for a specific use, i.e. the marketing for direct human consumption. This interpretation appears to be further confirmed by Recital 23 of the said regulation, which states that:

*“This Regulation should establish criteria for raw milk pending the adoption of new requirements for its placing on the market. These criteria should be trigger values, implying that, in the event of any overshooting, food business operators are to take corrective action and to notify the competent authority. The criteria should not be maximum figures beyond which raw milk cannot be placed on the market. This implies that, in certain circumstances, raw milk not fully meeting the criteria can safely be used for human consumption, if appropriate measures are taken. As regards raw milk and raw cream intended for direct human consumption, it is appropriate to enable each Member State to maintain or establish appropriate health measures to ensure the achievement of the objectives of this Regulation on its territory.”* (emphasis added)

64. In its reply to the reasoned opinion, Iceland held that dairy products made of unpasteurised milk pose the same risks as unpasteurised milk.
65. In this respect, ESA underlines that the European legislation by Article 10.8 (a) of the aforementioned Regulation introduces an exception allowing EEA States to maintain or establish health measures concerning only two specific products (i.e. raw milk and raw cream) for a specific use (i.e. for direct human consumption). This deliberate choice by the legislator to not mention or include dairy products in that exception cannot be subject to an expansive interpretation. Moreover, Iceland has not provided factual or scientific elements to substantiate its argument, nor has it provided other justifications in light of the harmonised rules.
66. It follows from the above that the authorisation system and the related prohibition of the marketing of imported dairy products processed from unpasteurised milk cannot be based on Article 10.8 (a) of Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 and, in view of the EFTA Court’s *Ferskar kjötvörur ehf.* judgment as presented above, it is not compatible with the provisions of Directive 89/662/EEC and in particular Article 5 thereof.



#### **4.4 The Icelandic legal framework regarding imports of treated egg and dairy products is in breach of Directive 89/662/EEC**

67. ESA understands that importers of treated egg and dairy products (i.e. complying with the heat treatments mentioned in Article 3, paragraphs (e) and (f) respectively of Regulation (IS) No 448/2012) are not subject to the authorisation procedure of Article 4 of Regulation (IS) No 448/2012, but still have to make a declaration and obtain the approval of MAST in order to get customs clearance.
68. Although there does not appear to be an express provision in Act No 25/1993 or Regulation (IS) No 448/2012 providing for this obligation, this practice was confirmed by the Icelandic Government during the package meeting of 27 May 2015.
69. In view of the judgment of the EFTA Court mentioned above and relevant case-law of the CJEU, ESA submits that this obligation of declaration and approval by MAST goes beyond the checks allowed under Article 5 of Directive 89/662/EEC. This administrative practice is thus incompatible with Directive 89/662/EEC, and in particular Article 5 thereof.

## **5 CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, ESA requests the Court to declare that:

1. **By maintaining in force (i) an authorisation system for the import of raw eggs and raw egg products such as the one laid down in Article 10 of Act No 25/1993 and Articles 3 (e) and 4 of Regulation (IS) No 448/2012; (ii) an authorisation system for the import of unpasteurised milk and dairy products processed from unpasteurised milk and additional requirements, such as laid down in Article 10 of Act No 25/1993 and Articles 3 (f), 4 and 5 of Regulation (IS) No 448/2012, and a prohibition of the marketing of imported dairy products processed from unpasteurised milk, such as laid down in Article 7a of Regulation (IS) No 104/2010; and (iii) an administrative practice of requiring importers to make a declaration and obtain an approval for the import of treated egg and dairy products, such as the one established in the**

context of the application of Regulation (IS) No 448/2012, Iceland has failed to fulfil its obligations arising from the Act referred to at Point 1.1.1 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Council Directive 89/662/EEC of 11 December 1989 concerning veterinary checks in intra-Community trade with a view to the completion of the internal market* as amended and as adapted to the EEA Agreement by Protocol 1 thereto and by the sectoral adaptations in Annex I thereto, and in particular Article 5 of that directive

2. Iceland bears the costs of the proceedings.

  
Carsten Zatschler

  
Maria Moustakali

Agents of the EFTA Surveillance Authority

## 6 SCHEDULE OF ANNEXES

No	Description	Date	Document Number	Number of pages	Referred to in this Application at paragraph(s)
A.1	ESA's pre-Article 31 letter	21/10/2015	757580	16	33
A.2	ESA's letter following the EFTA Court judgment in Case E-17/15	10/02/2016	792343	2	34
A.3	Iceland's reply to the follow-up letter	09/03/2016	796940	2	35
A.4	ESA's letter of formal notice	20/04/2016	793185	13	36
A.5	Iceland's request for extension of the deadline to reply to the letter of formal notice	21/06/2016	809405	1	37
A.6	ESA's reply to the request for extension	23/06/2016	809423	1	37
A.7	Iceland's request for additional extension	04/07/2016	811054	1	37
A.8	ESA's reply to the request for additional extension	05/07/2016	811072	1	37
A.9	Iceland's reply to the letter of formal notice	13/07/2016	812328	4	38
A.10	ESA's reasoned opinion	14/09/2016	809275	13	42

A.11	Iceland's request for extension of the deadline to reply to the reasoned opinion	14/11/2016	826535	1	43
A.12	ESA's reply to the request for extension	15/11/2016	826554	1	44
A.13	Iceland's reply to the reasoned opinion	14/12/2016	831589	4	46