

## 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 or 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**?

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

\*

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**?

200

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

50

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

6

\* 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

## Operators – imported timber/timber products

---

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

23

\* 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.

27

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

5

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

4

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

0

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

This serves to estimate the workload involved.

0

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

This serves to estimate the workload involved.

27

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

9

\* 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

25 Please specify how many of the checks (check cases) primarily focused on one of the below declared countries of harvest/origin of timber/timber products:

The list contains the countries with which the EU concluded Voluntary Partnership Agreements and/or regarding which Competent authorities expressed a particular interest. It also provides 'other' for other single-country of harvest/origin products the check (check case) focused on, 'multiple focus countries' for checks focusing on several countries of harvest/origin (e.g. products of mixed origin), and 'no focus country/ies', where checks (check cases) did not focus on a specific country or countries

	Number of checks
No focus country/ies	9
Multiple focus country/ies	
Albania	
Belarus	
Bosnia & Herzegovina	
Brazil	8
Cameroon	10
Central African Republic	
Chile	
China	2
Côte d'Ivoire	1
Democratic Republic of Congo	3
Gabon	9
Ghana	
Guyana	
Honduras	
India	

Indonesia	
Laos	
Liberia	1
Malaysia	2
Myanmar	1
Papua New Guinea	
Peru	
Philippines	
Republic of Congo	1
Russia	
Serbia	
Solomon Islands	
South Africa	
Suriname	
Thailand	
Turkey	
Ukraine	2
Uruguay	
Vietnam	3
Other	

- \* 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?

2

- \* 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.

2

- \* 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.

2

## Monitoring organisations

---

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

Yes  No

## Submission info

40 Reporting period:

41 Country:

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

42 Location:

43 Organisation name:

44 Reference number:

45 Submission ID:

46 Submission status:

## Contact

ENV-DECLARE@ec.europa.eu