

II.II. Resources

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.II. Resources for EUTR compliance verification and enforcement

The resources available for the verification of compliance and enforcement are key for ensuring the application of the EUTR and thus the reduction of illegally harvested timber or derived products being placed on the EU market and the improvement of traceability of timber throughout the supply chain in the EU. It is therefore important to understand, how much resources are at the disposal of the authorities implementing the EUTR and how much resources they need per compliance verification check. For a better understanding of the resources needed for compliance verification of operators placing imported timber /timber products, it is also important to understand, whether there are specific countries of harvest or origin, for which the verification of compliance with the EUTR it is particularly complex and thus resource-consuming.

Resources available for compliance verification and enforcement

Please specify the staff and resources dedicated to EUTR implementation and enforcement over the reporting period. Please **only count staff with a strong focus on EUTR**, not additional support staff or customs staff, unless customs is one of the Competent Authorities.

* 1 **Staff and budgets** dedicated to EUTR implementation and enforcement for **domestic timber** and **imported timber** are:

- Separated
- Combined

For **domestic timber** (including operators, traders and monitoring organisations, if relevant)

* 2 What is **the staff's approximate combined total time** spent on EUTR implementation/ enforcement?

Provide as full-time equivalents (FTE), e.g. 10 part-time staff who each work 50%, and 50% of that time is spent on EUTR = 2.5 FTE

401

- * 3 What was the total annual budget for EUTR implementation and enforcement over the reporting period (e.g. travel costs, workshop costs, costs for sample analysis, costs for issuing penalties, legal fees etc., but excluding staff salary costs)?

EUR

For imported timber (including operators, traders and monitoring organisations, if relevant)

- * 4 What is the staff's approximate combined total time spent on EUTR implementation/ enforcement? Provide as full-time equivalents (FTE), e.g. 10 part-time staff who each work 50%, and 50% of that time is spent on EUTR = 2.5 FTE

- * 5 What was the total annual budget for EUTR implementation and enforcement over the reporting period (e.g. travel costs, workshop costs, costs for sample analysis, costs for issuing penalties, legal fees etc., but excluding staff salary costs)?

EUR

8 It is assumed that the implementation of the EUTR in relation to traders and monitoring organisations is included in the above. If this is not correct, please clarify this here:

Resources needed on average for compliance verification per type of check

9 What is the average time spent on each type of check on operators placing domestic timber/timber products on the market (including preparation, transport, inspection onsite, follow-up, administrative procedure, but **not** including pursuing enforcement actions, preparation of replies to complaints and court cases)?

Purely desk based check can consist of **multiple** document reviews. Desk- and onsite check can consist of **multiple** document reviews and visits.

	Up to 1 day	1-2 days	3-4 days	1 week	Longer than 1 week
Purely desk based checks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Desk- and onsite checks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

10 What is the average time spent on each type of check on operators placing imported timber/timber products on the market (including preparation, transport, inspection onsite, follow-up, administrative procedure, but **not** including pursuing enforcement actions, preparation of replies to complaints and court cases)?

Purely desk based check can consist of **multiple** document reviews. Desk- and onsite check can consist of **multiple** document reviews and visits.

	Up to 1 day	1-2 days	3-4 days	1 week	Longer than 1 week
Purely desk based checks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Desk- and onsite checks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

11 What is the **average time spent** on each type of check on operators placing **unspecified** timber/timber products on the market (including preparation, transport, inspection onsite, follow-up, administrative procedure, but **not** including pursuing enforcement actions, preparation of replies to complaints and court cases)?

Purely desk based check can consist of **multiple** document reviews. Desk- and onsite check can consist of **multiple** document reviews and visits.

	Up to 1 day	1-2 days	3-4 days	1 week	Longer than 1 week
Purely desk based checks	<input type="radio"/>				
Desk- and onsite checks	<input type="radio"/>				

12 What is the **average time spent** on each type of check on **monitoring organisations**?

Purely desk based check can consist of **multiple** document reviews. Desk- and onsite check can consist of **multiple** document reviews and visits.

	Up to 2 days	3-5 days	Longer than 5 days
Purely desk based checks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Desk- and onsite checks	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Resource-intensive compliance verification for certain Non-Voluntary Partnership Agreement countries (non-VPA countries)

13 For particularly resource intensive compliance verification of operators placing imported timber/timber products on the market, which are linked to the Non-VPA country of harvest or origin, from which the operator imported them, please indicate the name of the country/ies and the reason(s) for the particular resource intensity:

	Country/ies of harvest or origin	Reason(s) for complexity (e.g. complex applicable legislation on country of harvest; language; documents not reliable due to corruption; processing country with no/low traceability to country of harvest)
1	Nigeria	It is an example as an operator approached the CA before the planned import, therefore, there has not been a check. However, in order to inform the operator or in case a check was planned, apart from the evidence of high corruption, there is no useful info on Nigeria. There was no info on the internet, other EU CAs could not help. The Commissions could not help, approached NGOs (like, Forest Trends or similar) could not help, and, naturally, the Nigerian governmental institutions did not answer to questions. In these circumstances, it is not possible to do a qualitative inspection or inform the operator (before placing on the market, for example).
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		

Comments

14 Comments:

Question 1 specification:

Budget is combined.

Staff is mostly separated but, when needed, can be combined.

Question 3:

No special budget. EUTR enforcement is within the total budget allocated to the State Forest Service.

Question 5:

No special budget. EUTR enforcement is within the total budget allocated to the State Forest Service.

Submission info

15 Reporting period:

2019

16 Country:

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> Austria | <input type="radio"/> Finland | <input checked="" 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 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 | |

17 Location:

Latvia

18 Organisation name:

State Forest Service

19 Reference number:

20 Submission ID:

32540

21 Submission status:

SUBMITTED_TO_EC

Contact

ENV-DECLARE@ec.europa.eu