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The chair, Ms Christine Wirtz, opened the meeting. She introduced herself and the Eurostat team on Animal Production Statistics.

The meeting, originally scheduled to take place in March, had to be moved to February. Shortage of meeting rooms for at least a few more years obliged to be flexible with regards to timing. The next meetings would also be organised in the first months of the year.

She presented the changes in the working environment, due to the new governance model in the ESS. This implies that the Working Group on Animal Production Statistics would report to the DGAS. The comitology function of the CPSA has been transferred to the ESSC.

On the way of working, the exchange of views (EoV) had been introduced, and clear benefits have already been noticed. Through this new procedure, 23 countries provided comments. The relevant documents had been made available in time for this EoV. Few documents, only for information, had been updated later. The presentations had been uploaded in CIRCABC before the meeting and everybody in the room could follow them on their mobile devices if needed.

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda had been sent together with the invitations and few small changes were introduced, i.e. information by Directorate General on Agriculture and Rural Development (DG AGRI) under item 4 about the new high-level Task Force for market products. No further change was requested.

The agenda was adopted.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING
   DOC. ANI/WG/2016/1/2

The Working Group was reminded about the minutes of the previous meeting, provided in April 2015 and already approved without comments.

Eurostat informed about the follow-up regarding the Confidentiality Charter for Animal Production Statistics. The Charter had been approved by the DGAS in July 2015, the Expert Group on Statistical Disclosure Control had been informed in October 2015 and finally, the Working Group on Statistical Confidentiality had approved the charter in December 2015. The Charter was thus applicable from a procedural point of view. Therefore the next step would be implementation in the Eurostat processes. Eurostat invited countries to transmit all the data which could help to compute more complete European aggregates.

The Working Group took note.
3. **Mandate of the Working Group**  

**Doc. ANI/WG/2016/1/3**

Eurostat explained the new governance structure in the European Statistical System. The hierarchical organisation of the ESS, (Working Groups / Directors’ Group / ESS Committee) was briefly explained with the respective responsibilities of each level. The draft mandate and rules of procedure for the Working Group on Animal Production Statistics were presented.

A minor mistake was reported in Article 9 of the draft Rules of Procedure. The **discussion** was especially about the level where the common rules of procedure should apply. One Member State suggested that all draft mandates should be presented to the DGAS in order to ensure alignment. Eurostat confirmed that the mandates of all relevant Working Groups will be presented to the DGAS for endorsement but that mandates of groups reporting to other directors’ groups will be handled by the relevant group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The draft mandate of the Working Group was accepted as such.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Working Group asked Eurostat to double-check the content of its draft rules of procedure against other endorsed rules of procedure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Working Group agreed to submit the mandate and the rules of procedure to the DGAS meeting in June 2016.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Future of Agricultural Statistics**  

**Doc. ANI/WG/2016/1/4**

Eurostat presented the progress on the Strategy for Agricultural Statistics towards 2020 and beyond.

In the past, the Working Group had been briefed regularly on the developments concerning the future of agricultural statistics. The DGAS endorsed a document on the *Strategy for Agricultural Statistics for 2020 and beyond* (presented in document /04) in June 2015 and it was agreed in November 2015 by the ESSC. The needs for agricultural statistics expressed by the data users should be met, while limiting burden on the other stakeholders by producing efficiently a coherent set of agricultural statistics. A single framework Regulation for agricultural statistics appeared as too ambitious, but the need for a legal text is critical. The proposed approach should enable having a timely legislation for the agricultural census in 2020 and for structural statistics on farms, while considering agricultural statistics as a whole, with a second legal package for tabular data on statistics on agricultural input and output (SAIO). The proposed timetable foresees the integrated farm statistics (IFS) to be applicable in 2020 and the SAIO in 2022. Those two legal acts would refer to a common conceptual framework of items, definitions and scope. The SAIO would provide for aggregated data from various statistical units.

DG AGRI expressed its support to the strategy and underlined that all agricultural statistics currently produced by the ESS in the field of animal statistics will remain relevant.
The needs for statistics were underlined by DG AGRI while introducing the **Agricultural Market Task Force**. With a less regulated market, the established needs had become more critical for the policy makers and had also extended to the farmers for their marketing decisions. The Task Force, a group of high level national experts, had organised the discussion on the food supply chain in four strands, of which market transparency was a key-element. It enables the weakest stakeholders, the farmers, to access market information, accessibility and clarity for them being as critical as the volume of available information or other quality issues. First conclusions and recommendations as well as meeting minutes are available on the Task Force’s website.

Eurostat clarified its expectations regarding the **role of the various Working Groups** towards implementation of the Strategy. The discussions on the technical aspects of the current legislations have to be conducted at the level of the Working Groups and within their fields of competence, as the DGAS was not the right level for technical discussions. The work of the Working Groups would be an essential precondition for the success of the endeavour. Therefore the Working Group was invited to go ahead with every discussion on legal or methodological issues, so that future integration would become possible. Every mature item should thus be pushed forward, like the ESS agreement on other slaughtering or work on handbooks, as an intermediate step before integration in the SAIO. However, SAIO would not only copy and paste the current legislation into a common framework. Simplification would also mean not increasing the burden while covering new needs or strengthening the commitments. The time table would have to consider the Strategy as well as the CAP calendar.

The Working Group took note of the Strategy as reflected in the ESSC document, of the user needs, and of the expectation regarding its contribution to the Strategy.

5. **COMPLIANCE ASSESSMENT**  
**DOC. ANI/WG/2016/1/5**

Eurostat presented the outcome of the compliance assessment referring to the collection period 2015. After having reported on the missing data files, punctuality and completeness were discussed. Some non-compliance cases had already been clarified bilaterally. The lack of explanations on the assessment had apparently limited clarity of the exercise. Therefore Eurostat had made detailed metadata available, but just before the meeting. While compliance was clearly not limited to punctuality and completeness, Eurostat nevertheless underlined that improvements are needed.

The discussion covered especially the need for detailed information, the weaknesses of the transmission tool and the option of conducting more frequent but even partial compliance exercises and expressed the need for more direct human contacts with the data providers. Eurostat welcomed all these comments and acknowledged the limits of tool usability, grateful for the efforts of the Member States for providing data. In view of the ever decreasing staff availability, automated information was becoming even more important. The complexity of the collection tables and the diversity of the requirements, intended to limit the burden, was also reported as a limit in implementation of automated feedback.

The Member States took note of the Eurostat report, committed clarifying some issues bilaterally and improving their situation, where relevant.

Eurostat confirmed that EDAMIS is the unique data transmission tool.
6. **QUALITY REPORTS UNDER REGULATION (EC) NO 1165/2008**

**DOC. ANI/WG/2016/1/6**

**Eurostat** presented a proposal for content of the quality reports for reference year 2016. It had been agreed previously that only some core elements of the report would be reported for every three-annual exercise, in order to limit the burden on the Member States and to allow more complete investigations on a particular quality dimension. Based on the ESS handbook on quality assessment, it appeared that *Cost and burden* was the only one not yet covered by the reporting exercise and that covering it would complete the exercise.

Some **Member State** noticed that only the six main dimensions were explicitly listed in Regulation (EC) No 1165/2008. Eurostat agreed but referred to the ESS code of practices.

**Eurostat** explained how burden could be measured, by estimating it for a limited number of respondents and by extrapolating it based on the annual number of questionnaires. Regarding the costs, Eurostat provided a detailed list of the costs to be considered in order to cover the overall cost for Livestock and Meat Statistics. In particular, staff costs and other direct costs needed to be included. A breakdown by process was proposed to facilitate dealing with answer by the various institutions involved at national level.

Several **Member States** expressed doubts on the feasibility of such an assessment and on the final need for such information. Also comparing the cost of the process of one country with another would not be sound. One Member State suggested that voluntary reporting could help to solve the issue. However, this later proposal would confound result.

**Eurostat** also explained the usefulness of such estimates in the context of drafting new legislation. Finally comparing the national results amongst each other was not the purpose. Eurostat underlined the importance of knowing the cost of the statistics produced at European level. Establishing a first estimate of the cost for animal production statistics could also be useful at national level. As this quality indicator was agreed within the ESS, it should be reported by every Member State.

A **Member State** agreed that its particular situation made this information available but that this was an exception. The particular scope of Regulation (EC) No 1165/2008 (livestock and meat statistics) appeared to be an obstacle for displaying the costs precisely at this level. When costs were available at a higher level, a share would have to be estimated to allocate the relevant costs to production of these only statistics. When they were available at a lower level, the number of detailed costs to be aggregated made the burden on the reporters dissuasive. Furthermore information of this nature appears to be rarely handled by the delegates at their level.

Several Member States stated that filling the questionnaire as drafted was impossible. It was thus agreed that they would investigate and indicate what is possible for them.

---

**Member States would provide written comments by 3rd March 2016.**

Eurostat invited volunteers to express their interest to work in a small group towards a simplified proposal. Expression of interest was invited by 25th February 2016.

Eurostat would provide a simplified proposal by written procedure by end of July 2016, with a deadline for comments by September 2016.
7. **Towards EU Acquis**

The candidate and potential candidate countries had been supported for developing pilot projects up to November 2015 in Animal Production Statistics under IPA 2012. Diversity in the level of implementation of EU acquis did not enable drawing a general picture and therefore they all kindly agreed to present a particular topic related to their activity during this project.

Each of these countries presented briefly a particular issue, activity or project agreed in advance.

---

The Working Group took note of the on-going developments in the candidate and potential candidate countries.

8. **News from the Milk Market Observatory**

DG AGRI reported on the latest news in the Milk Market Observatory (MMO), referring to two pillars, its economic board of milk experts meeting every month and the market data. Their website contains various reports, including historical and fresh statistics. The prices and margin relate to various products in EU and the world, also described through production (delivery, dairy products, internal measures, yields and trade). Tables, charts, maps are refreshed weekly and provide user-friendly information. A clear release calendar contributes to transparency of the market. Information from the MMO was spread widely including on social networks. The MMO gives high visibility to the statistics on animal production prepared by the Member States.

---

The Working Group took note of the report on the Milk Market Observatory.

9. **Cross-border Milk Collection**

**Doc. ANI/WG/2016/1/9**

Eurostat introduced the issue of cross-border raw cows' milk collection after the end of the milk quota. This phenomenon generated several problems in estimates of the volumes of milk, with a clear risk of double counting or of missing some milk flows. As a result of cross-border milk collection, the volumes reported by the dairies in Table B did not correspond to those representing the farm deliveries in Table C.

DG AGRI confirmed loss in coherence of the statistics since April 2015.

In preparation of this discussion, the Member States had investigated the issue. Several Member States appeared to be concerned, at least by the under-estimation for Table C or by a reported increase in volatility of the foreign and national volumes. DG AGRI explained that substitution effects between flows of milk from farms and from dairies might also have played a role. Information on these particular flows from farms to a dairy in a neighbouring country could be available in the neighbour countries where the dairies collect foreign milk. However, such information, even if it existed would normally be confidential, especially when trying to identify the originating country. The diversity of national situations and solutions did not simplify looking for a common solution. Those Member States having maintained or restored data collection from farms about their deliveries were in the best situation, from a legal and a statistical point of view. For the other ones, bi-lateral discussions between neighbouring Member States could help to assess the situation, but would not solve this issue on the longer term.
Eurostat could facilitate bi-lateral contacts, but Member States did not express any interest in this regard. Eurostat emphasised that the Member State would be considered as breaking the requirements of Directive 96/16/EC if no solution were found, as the farm data collection was a legal obligation.

The Working Group agreed that further findings should be discussed at the latest in the next meeting.

The Commission underlined that the legal requirements had to be respected.

Some Member States stated that they would seek bilateral cooperation.

10. DRINKING MILK
Doc. ANI/WG/2016/1/10

Eurostat outlined the need to revise the categories of drinking milk. Several options were presented to classify milk with specific fat content not covered by the existing categories, i.e. (1) creating one or several additional classes and (2) changing the fat rate limit of the existing classes. Whatever could be the decision regarding the technical solution, three procedural options are possible, i.e. (1) a technical change in form of an ESS agreement, (2) a legal amendment limited to drinking milk with a faster procedure and (3) a deeper revision amending Decision 97/80/EC only from a technical point of view (no increase of burden) and especially on the list of dairy products and their definitions.

The Working Group unanimously preferred changing the limit of the classes over creating one or several new classes. Some Member States had already changed the class limits, however in different ways. Where future limits would not coincide with national practice, some time for adaptation would be needed. One Member State highlighted that not only 1% was a limit in the Combined Nomenclature, but also 3%. Eurostat proposed, based on the recommendations received during the strategy presentation, revising the non-essential elements of Directive 97/80/EC. In parallel more fundamental discussions could be opened in order to prepare future integration in the SAIO.

The Working Group was in favour of keeping three categories. The class limits to be used in the amended definitions would either by aligned with the Combined Nomenclature or keep an arbitrary limit at 3.5% fat content in line with the practice of one country. The procedural options would need to be discussed in the light of the progress made in the discussion.

Eurostat should send a Circular Note in order to clarify the possible options, including whether a limited or more complete proposal for change should be submitted to the DGAS.
11. METHODOLOGY OF STATISTICS ON EGGS AND POULTRY

Eurostat summarised the issues on the methodology for eggs for consumption. The outcome of the grants agreements would be available only for the next meeting. The list of requested variables regarding reports by the packing centres had been simplified. The deadline, clearly too early for the layer statistics, did not enable to monitor properly data collection. Finally availability of the data delivered by the volunteer countries was presented but several countries delivered further data after the document was published and therefore the document statement was significantly amended. Furthermore the situation of those countries with less than 3 million laying hens, which data are due only for the FSS reference year, was clarified.

Eurostat also reported on implementation of the shortcut to Comext for the data on trade of chicks. As promised previously, Eurostat came with a concrete request for assessment of the Comext data, especially oriented on the coverage of the related statistics.

The report on eggs for consumption was welcomed by the Working Group, which unanimously agreed on a deadline on 30 June. The discussion was more intense about assessment of quality of the Comext data for those countries having requested an implementation of the Comext shortcut. Eurostat reminded that the 2-year provisional implementation was intended to enable such quality investigations.

The Working Group members which had not yet done so would provide the methodology on eggs for consumption.

The 30 June was agreed as an acceptable deadline for data delivery on eggs for consumption.

Eurostat invited the relevant Working Group members concerned by the shortcut in data flows to provide the quality assessment requested.

The Member States with a shortcut to Comext will provide the assessment of the Comext data.

12. METHODOLOGY OF MEAT AND LIVESTOCK STATISTICS

GIP forecast assessment

Eurostat presented the first trial for assessment of the GIP forecast by comparison with the GIP achieved. When this latest had been transmitted by the Member State, it had been used in the comparison and, otherwise, the Comext data and the slaughtering figures had been used in the assessment. One Member State highlighted that the Comext selection was not satisfying and Eurostat would review its assessment after the meeting. Nevertheless this was a first step illustrating how to go ahead and to provide a real assessment of the forecast with a view to provide recommendations on the model to be used for forecasting GIP. The Working Group had previously insisted on a handbook drafted by Eurostat and the intention was to go a step forward with this assessment. Eurostat highlighted the predictive values had been assessed, not necessarily the forecast quality, and the weight of the various forecast categories and on the limited time range.
Even if some Member States disagreed with the results, the method itself was, after explanations, agreed upon in principle. Use of GIP forecast at national level was reported as being of diverse relevance. Various difficulties were reported for establishing the forecast or downgrading the predictive value of the results (animal disease).

The Working Group supported the assessment method presented by Eurostat.

The Working Group invited Eurostat to continue the assessment of methods. The exercise would be repeated with the definitive 2015 data and the results would be presented during the next meeting.

The Members States would provide their own assessment of the GIP forecasts to Eurostat.

Use of meat statistics

DG AGRI presented the dashboard, a set of data presentation modules based on the example of the MMO dashboard (Item 8). A webpage was presented for accessing the dashboards for many agricultural products, and factsheets explaining their content. Each dashboard reflected the content of about 80 blocks of information, the format enabling to zoom in on particular charts. A detailed 'presentation of a dashboard illustrated the statistics required for building such overviews. The usefulness of the data behind the dashboard was emphasised.

Use of statistics for market monitoring

DG AGRI presented how they use livestock and meat statistics to design the CAP, looking to the future by economic analysis, impact analysis and market monitoring. Examples of use illustrated the need for high-quality statistics for evidence-based policy: short-term outlook and projection for agricultural commodities (3 times a year); medium term market perspective (annual), commodity price dashboards (monthly) and food-chain monitoring tool.

The Working Group took note of DG AGRI’s uses of Eurostat statistics, especially livestock and meat statistics.

13. INVENTORY AND MAPPING OF AGRICULTURE STATISTICS DEVELOPED FOR NATIONAL PURPOSES OR SENT TO EUROSTAT OR OTHER COMMISSION SERVICES OR INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

DOC. ANI/WG/2016/1/13

Eurostat introduced the first presentation on the mapping of the data flows after two years. Grants had been signed with four countries which had inventoried the main data flows for agricultural statistics or for more limited domains. Starting point for streamlining and reducing the burden, it should impact positively data quality, especially coherence, and limit overlaps in data transmission to international organisation like FAO and Eurostat. These reports were designed to be communicated to other country. Lithuania had done a complete inventory, A country had covered prices and another Animal Production Statistics, while the work of a third one was at an intermediate level and the fourth country covered agricultural statistics. Previously, one of them had made the inventory of the milk data flows and Italy of the meat data flows.
The Hungarian CSO presented the outcome of their investigation over the national institutions dealing with crop and animal production statistics, including administrative data, and the relevant data users. The result was an exhaustive map of the data flows, highlighting the central role of the CSO, at least for coordination, and the risk for overlaps, leading to useless burden on the respondents. Further recommendations were provided on harmonisation and accessibility of the data and on better use of administrative sources. Cooperation between the various stakeholders appeared to be essential for improving efficiency in the statistical system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Working Group thanked the Hungarian CSO for their presentation and noticed that the recommendations provided some guidelines for further work.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. **ORGANISATION OF THE REFERENCE DOCUMENTS FOR THE ANIMAL PRODUCTION STATISTICS**

**Doc. ANI/WG/2016/1/14**

Eurostat explained the organisation of the reference documents. The change in numbering of the working documents presented an opportunity to propose a particular handling of the handbooks, continuously updated. Furthermore clarity and accessibility of the existing documents should favour their re-use and avoid re-starting discussions from scratch. Finally clearer organisation should enable to re-use in a future methodology most of the pieces of the current one. Integration of the methodology was already effective at some levels but also highlighted some gaps or need for harmonisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Working Group invited Eurostat to clear the ground in order to go ahead with the other related issues.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. **DATA REVIEW**

**Doc. ANI/WG/2016/1/15**

Eurostat had uploaded a set of 12 reports for checking by the Member States. As an example Eurostat compared the milk statistics drawn from table B and C about delivery by the farms and collection by the dairies. Whereas the EU-28 figures smoothed the discrepancies, the national situations were more contrasted. The discrepancies, absolute or relative, were presented to the Working Group for collecting explanations.

Some Member States provided feedback and reported about mistakes, improvement of coherence at a level generating incoherence at another level, or committing to provide feedback after the meeting. DG AGRI requested checking whether confidentiality was still relevant. Finally Eurostat insisted that cross-checking might mostly lead to explanation and only exceptionally to revision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Working Group took note of the results.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Working Group was reminded that this example illustrates the whole set of tables without softening coverage of the check to be done. Everybody has thus work to do.
16. TASK FORCE ON DATA VALIDATION  
DOC. ANI/WG/2016/1/16

Eurostat introduced the item on data validation. Over the years, various projects and documents were presented to the Working Group and a Task Force had met twice for discussing on data validation in Animal Production Statistics. It dealt with the 1100 validation rules delivered by the pilot project but the Task Force worked based on the common denominator of its members, the livestock statistics. Meanwhile, several developments and outcomes were presented at various levels of Eurostat and of the ESS.

A Member of the Task Force presented the report provided in Annex 1 of document /16. In June 2015, the Task Force had met for the second time and discussed the validation rules to be implemented and how to implement them. They agreed on distinguishing between true errors, leading to file rejection, and warnings, requiring explanations. Technical solution for full implementation this would be developed.

Eurostat summarised the next steps, i.e. developing validation rules for milk statistics, completing the set of VTL rules, and providing user friendly feedback. Finally using the validation results for compliance is an option requiring further investigations.

The Working Group thanked the Task Force for the work done on the validation rules.

The Working Group invited Eurostat to complete the VTL expression of the rules and to come with a proposal for validation rules for milk, and it agreed to contribute to the further work for validation rules on milk statistics.

Eurostat introduced the next agenda items by clarifying the purpose of any cross-check, i.e. comparing, explaining and improving, but normally not correcting.

17. CROSS-CHECK WITH FSS  
DOC. ANI/WG/2016/1/17

Eurostat reported on the cross-check of the FSS 2013 data against crop and animal production statistics and over the time. Substantial discrepancies were identified in bovine males over 2 years and in heifers as well as in other sheep and goats. The main explanations provided by the MSs were: the different reference time, the market demand (with seasonal culling and slaughtering) and other methodological explanations like sampling, calibration and misclassification. The differences in December survey for animal production statistics and in June for FSS were systematic for sheep and goats and, depending on the MSs in other species. However, for the cases where differences had been statistically significant Eurostat had contacted bilaterally the concerned Member States. It should be noted that in the breeding female categories, none of the above factors could explain the observed discrepancies between both domains. In general, the overall quality was quite good but some FSS data had been revised in the light of the exercise. Eurostat stressed that this comparison exercise could also be conducted at Member State level before sending the data.

DG AGRI welcomed this exercise. A Member State highlighted the challenge in comparing the November/December animal survey with the spring FSS data. Eurostat insisted on the need for discussion at national level for all those services involved in providing similar statistics. The feedback by the national services was important for the understanding by the data users at EU level.

The working Group broadly agreed that this exercise contributed to quality improvement;
The Working Group thanked Eurostat for the comparison but also the Member States for the data updates and the explanations provided.

Eurostat invited the Member States to talk to their national FSS counterparts in order to align their ideas about the set up in the countries.

Eurostat invited Member States to provide suggestions on how to improve the situation where divergences had been reported amongst the data sources.

18. CROSS-CHECK WITH AGRI NOTIFICATIONS

DG AGRI presented a comparison of the notifications by first purchasers of raw cows' milk, compulsory monthly for all the Member States, against Table A. Three cases were identified, where the values fit (15 MSs), where the trends fit (2 countries), and where nothing fits, with limited (4 countries) or important (7 countries) discrepancies. Some assumptions were presented for explaining these differences, where relevant. Some important milk producing countries were concerned by incoherence between both data series. After less than one year collecting notifications, availability appeared surprisingly good. The same presentation would be done to the Milk Management Committee and national services providing these data were invited to cooperate together. DG AGRI also offered support, through the European Dairy Association, where difficulties in obtaining cooperation from the respondents were reported.

The concerned Member States provided some explanations and their opinion. In general some margin corrections could not be implemented in time in the notifications. The purpose being collecting the same information, the Working Group invited the Commission to streamline this data collection. Delivering the notifications to Eurostat appeared feasible for a number of Member States, but at least one was limited by incompatibility of short timeliness with quality. A duplicate data collection set up without consulting the Working Group should not be matter for discussion, even less for investigations, stated one Member State.

Some Member States agree to check the data and to come back with explanations.

The Working Group asked the Commission to reflect on the collection of these data.

19. GRANT AGREEMENT INVESTIGATION ON DATA VALIDATION IN ANIMAL PRODUCTION STATISTICS

The Polish delegation presented the first outcome of their running grant agreement on data validation in Animal Production Statistics. They implemented the Eurostat validation rules for aggregated data in their system. Detection of outliers was given as an example to illustrate the method and its steps. Converting business rules expressed in VTL and in text description into technical rules appeared efficient as both are complementary. Conversion of VTL into SQL was supported by an interpreter, under development for other languages. A first step of data validation was preparing the reference information, with importation and transformation and a second step consisted in identifying the records breaking the rule. Various data sources had also been compared and the detailed results were presented. This work favoured cooperation with the other bodies involved in production of similar statistics.
The question from Commission representatives highlighted the positive impact expected from the work, by implementing the Eurostat validation rules in the Member States, by favouring cooperation between national data producers and by softening burden on the respondent.

The Working Group thanked the Polish delegation for their work and expressed its interest in seeing the final outcome.

20. CHANGES IN DATA COLLECTION TOOLS AND CONTENTS

DOC. ANI/WG/2016/1/20

Eurostat presented the few changes having occurred in the design of EDAMIS and EDAMIS webforms, including creation of new data sets for GIP forecast. The incidents which the data providers had to face were reported and the Working Group was reminded about the data transmission expected from them on the structure of dairy enterprises by 30 September 2016.

A Member State expressed its worries about the changes in browser security. The Java applet of the webform interface was already locked by Google Chrome and Mozilla Firefox would do the same in 2017. The IT experts in Eurostat and in the Member States were working on a solution.

Eurostat also presented the roadmap for the coming changes in the design of the webform templates with two flag fields. A hierarchy in the flags to be used in this context was presented, as requested by the Working Group in 2015. The new templates would integrate the updated constraints in the design and they would be a compromise between compliance to the SDMX standard and usability. The current plans for the design of these templates were annexed to document /20. The proposed labels for the codes could be adapted in case of linguistic issue. The Member States would be informed before implementation of the change and, at the time of switch from an old to a new template, the draft versions would be deleted and the old data file would no longer be usable. All the templates should be changed by the end of 2016.

The Working Group took note of the changes implemented and of the coming ones, and was fully aware of the impact foreseen.

Eurostat would inform the Member States 30 days in advance before the change in templates.

21. DATA DISSEMINATION

Eurostat presented the general publications using the Animal Production Statistics, issued as paper book or pdf publications, and the only-electronic articles (Statistics explained). The Statistical book on agriculture, just released, and which paper versions were distributed, included a special chapter on 30 years of milk quotas. The related press release was also made available. The next statistical book would use the data as on 15 October 2016.

22. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None.

The Chair thanked the secretariat, wished the participants safe home, and closed the meeting.