

## 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

1.5

- \* 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Desk- and onsite checks	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Desk- and onsite checks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<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 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	Ukraine	Documents not reliable due to corruption; difficult to assess whether risk mitigation measures are adequate
2	China	Processing country with low traceability to country of harvest, hard to verify supply chains (mostly highly complex product such as paper and furniture); language is a challenge; documents not reliable due to corruption;
3	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Limited information on forestry sector publicly available; documents not reliable due to corruption;
4	Serbia	Limited information on forestry sector publicly available; documents not reliable due to corruption;
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		

## Comments

---

### 14 Comments:

Budget domestic timber can not be provided, as budgeting on district authority level does not provide for budgeting for individual laws.

With regard to staff's approximate combined total time spent on EUTR implementation/enforcement imported timber it is noted that 1 additional FTE started to work on EUTR in September 2019 and 3 more are planned for the second half of 2020.

Total annual budget for EUTR implementation and enforcement over the reporting period for imported timber includes staff salary costs.

Collection of relevant information concerning the forestry sector, legislation, risks etc. is one of the most resource-intentensive tasks for the competent authority as well as keeping this information up to date. Country overviews compiled by UNEP-WCMC are the most helpful tools in this regard and extremely valuable for CAs and operators to have a common ground to operate checks and due diligence.

Regarding average time spent it should be noted that work is usually not done for a CA when breaches of the EUTR are found during a check. After handing such a case over to the District Administration Authorities operators have the right to comment on the breaches they are accused of. The CA is then mostly requested to share its opinion on the operators comments what needs additional time (in average another 2 days/case) not asked for under 'average time spent'. That additional time should also be counted in the future since the CAs support of the penalising authority is crucial for proper EUTR enforcement with regard to appropriate penalties and measures taken.

## Submission info

### 15 Reporting period:

2019

### 16 Country:

- |                                          |                               |                                     |                                       |
|------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Austria | <input type="radio"/> Finland | <input type="radio"/> Latvia        | <input type="radio"/> Portugal        |
| <input type="radio"/> Belgium            | <input type="radio"/> France  | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein | <input type="radio"/> Romania         |
| <input type="radio"/> Bulgaria           | <input type="radio"/> Germany | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania     | <input type="radio"/> Slovak Republic |
| <input type="radio"/> Croatia            | <input type="radio"/> Greece  | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg    | <input type="radio"/> Slovenia        |
| <input type="radio"/> Cyprus             | <input type="radio"/> Hungary | <input type="radio"/> Malta         | <input type="radio"/> Spain           |
| <input 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:

Austria

18 Organisation name:

Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Regions and Tourism

19 Reference number:

20 Submission ID:

32525

21 Submission status:

SUBMITTED\_TO\_EC

## Contact

ENV-DECLARE@ec.europa.eu