

**Priority question for written answer P-005524/2020/rev.1  
to the Commission**

Rule 138

**Jarosław Kalinowski (PPE), Krzysztof Hetman (PPE), Adam Jarubas (PPE)**

**Subject:** Proposal to amend the provisions on the establishment and revocation of African Swine Fever (ASF) risk areas

The national precautionary measures taken by Poland, consisting in the demarcation of a protection and surveillance zone for an outbreak of ASF, are sufficient to prevent the spread of the disease. From an epizootic point of view, the designation of long-standing risk areas (blue zones) is not justified, as it is easier to control an outbreak of ASF than to prevent one from being spread by wild animals (boars). Furthermore, the trade in pigs takes place under the full control of the Veterinary Inspectorate, and it cannot take place without health certificates being issued in various ways. However, the movement of wild boars is not subject to human control. Why, then, should there be greater rigour in the blue zone than in the red zone?

In the Blue Zone, farmers whose farms have not been affected by an outbreak are suffering huge losses – primarily because it is impossible for them to dispose of their livestock, but also because of the obligation to sell pigs only to designated slaughterhouses, resulting in monopolistic practices, i.e. the lowering of the purchase price of pigs to far below break-even level.

Farmers rearing livestock in the Blue Zone do not receive any state support, and maintaining a Blue Zone for more than a year after an outbreak (although in 2018 it was removed after three months) is incomprehensible and damaging.

Does the Commission envisage amending the rules in such a way as to allow 'clean' farms in the Blue Zone to continue producing pork?