

Clause on selected impacts

1. Basic information	
Title of the document	
Draft Regulation of the Government of the Slovak Republic amending Regulation of the Government of the Slovak Republic No 359/2011 laying down requirements for certain food establishments and for small quantities	
Submitter (and co-submitter)	
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development of the Slovak Republic	
Nature of the submitted document	☐ Document of a non-legislative nature ☒ Document of a legislative nature ☒ Transposition/implementation of EU law
In case of transposition/implementation, please provide a list of transposed/implemented legislation: Regulation (EU) 2017/625 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 March 2017 on official controls and other official activities performed to ensure the application of food and feed law, rules on animal health and welfare, plant health and plant protection products, amending Regulations (EC) No 999/2001, (EC) No 396/2005, (EC) No 1069/2009, (EC) No 1107/2009, (EU) No 1151/2012, (EU) No 652/2014, (EU) 2016/429 and (EU) 2016/2031 of the European Parliament and of the Council, Council Regulations (EC) No 1/2005, and (EC) No 1099/2009 and Council Directives 98/58/EC, 1999/74/EC, 2007/43/EC, 2008/119/EC, and 2008/120/EC, and repealing Regulations (EC) No 854/2004 and (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council, Council Directives 89/608/EEC, 89/662/EEC, 90/425/EEC, 91/496/EEC, 96/23/EC, 96/93/EC, and 97/78/EC and Council Decision 92/438/EEC (Official Controls Regulation) (OJ L 95, 7.4.2017, pp. 1–142), as amended. Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 laying down specific hygiene rules for food of animal origin (OJ L 139, 30.4.2004), as amended.	
Start and end dates of the preliminary consultation exercise	28 May 2025 – 6 June 2025
Expected date of submission for the consultation exercise	August 2025
Expected start and end dates of final assessment**	
Expected date of submission to a session of the Government of the Slovak Republic*	May 2026

2. Definition of the issue
<i>Please specify the basic issues that justify the elaboration of the submitted document (the reasons should indicate precisely the problem that exists and needs to be addressed by the submitted document).</i> The draft Government Regulation was drawn up on the basis of the Policy Statement of the Government of the Slovak Republic for 2023–2027, in which the Government of the Slovak Republic undertook to use all available legal and economic instruments to support the direct sale of local food from the farm to the final consumer while maintaining the necessary requirements for food safety and quality. The draft Government Regulation was also drawn up on the basis of implementation feedback calling for an increase in the limit on the quantity of hunted wild game for sale, and for the clarification and updating of provisions.
3. Objectives and the desired outcome
<i>Please specify the main objectives of the submitted document (what is the end goal that is to be achieved by adopting the document; the goal achieved must be different from that described in point 2. Definition of the</i>

issue).

The objective is to enable hunting associations to sell larger quantities of hunted wild game to the final consumer and also to enable the final consumer and local retail establishments to purchase larger quantities of fresh, high-quality game meat at more favourable prices. The resulting situation should reflect this change – on the one hand, for the hunting reserve user, who can increase the association's income by selling larger quantities of game; and on the other hand, for consumers, who will be able to purchase more affordable game meat, which, when purchased in retail chains, is several times more expensive than pork or poultry.

4. Stakeholders

Please specify the parties directly or indirectly affected by the changes in the submitted document:

Hunting associations, final consumers, retail establishments.

5. Alternative solutions

What alternative solutions leading to the stated objective have been identified and assessed to address the identified issue?

No alternative solutions were considered. The submitter has used all the options provided by European legislation to enable the sale of home-produced products at the local level.

Zero option – please specify the consequences of not implementing the changes proposed in the submitted document and the alternative solutions/methods of achieving the objectives set out in point 3.

Unless current legislation is amended, hunting reserve users would be able to offer only a very limited quantity of hunted wild game to the final consumer and supply only limited quantities to local retail establishments.

6. Implementing legislation

Is implementing legislation expected to be adopted/amended?

☐ Yes

☒ No

If so, please specify which areas will be governed by this legislation or which implementing legislation will be affected:

7. Transposition/implementation of EU law

Please specify whether the draft legislation involves gold-plating according to the correlation table or whether gold-plating occurs in the context of implementation of EU law.

☐ Yes

☒ No

If so, please specify which impacts under point 9 are subject to gold-plating:

8. Expediency review

Please specify the date by which the effectiveness and expediency of the submitted document should be reviewed.

Please specify the criteria on the basis of which the review will be conducted.

Within three years of the entry into force of the draft Government Regulation. The review criterion will be the quantity of hunted wild game sold to final consumers or supplied to local retail establishments.

* to be completed only if the document is not included in the Work Plan of the Government of the Slovak Republic or the Plan of Legislative Tasks of the Government of the Slovak Republic.

** to be completed only if the final assessment of the selected impacts has been carried out in accordance with point 9.1 of the Uniform Methodology.

*** the assessment relates only to changes in Pillar I and Pillar II of the universal pension scheme with an identified impact of 0.1% of GDP (inclusive) in the long term.

9. Selected impacts of the document

Impacts on the general government budget	☐ Positive	☒ None	☐ Negative
of which impacts covered by the budget, in case of identified negative impact	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Partial
including impacts on the budgets of municipalities and higher territorial units	☐ Positive	☒ None	☐ Negative

of which impacts covered by the budget, in case of identified negative impact	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ Partial
Impact on the long-term sustainability of public finances for selected measures ***	☐ Yes		☐ No
Impacts on the public expenditure limit	☐ Positive	☒ None	☐ Negative
Impacts on the business environment	☒ Positive	☐ None	☐ Negative
of which impacts on SMEs	☒ Positive	☐ None	☐ Negative
Bureaucracy and cost reduction mechanism is applied:	☐ Yes		☒ No
Social impacts	☒ Positive	☐ None	☐ Negative
Environmental impacts	☐ Positive	☒ None	☐ Negative
The document is assessed under Act No 24/2006 on environmental impact assessment and amending certain acts, as amended	☐ Yes		☐ No
Impacts related to information society	☐ Positive	☒ None	☐ Negative
Impacts on public administration services for the citizen, of which	☐ Positive	☒ None	☐ Negative
impacts of public administration services on the citizen	☐ Positive	☒ None	☐ Negative
impacts on service processes in public administration	☐ Positive	☒ None	☐ Negative
Impacts on marriage, parenthood and family	☐ Positive	☒ None	☐ Negative

10. Notes

If necessary, provide additional information on the identified impacts and their analyses.

If the submitted material has a marginal (negligible) impact on any of the areas covered in point 9 and for this reason it is marked as no impact, please provide the facts explaining why this impact is marginal (negligible).

The information in this section is used to summarise the impacts or to comment on marginal impacts and not as a substitute for the preparation of appropriate analyses of selected impacts.

If the document is assessed under Act No 24/2006 on environmental impact assessment and amending certain acts, as amended, please provide a web link to this process.

11. Contact details of the author

Please provide the details of the person who can be contacted with regard to the assessment of selected impacts.

Ing. Peter Tatarka, Chief State Counsellor, Food Industry and Trade Section, Food Industry Department, peter.tatarka@land.gov.sk, +421 2 59266570,

Mgr. Peter Belež, Chief State Counsellor, Legislation Section, Legislation Department, peter.beles@land.gov.sk, +421 2 59266405

12. Sources

Please specify the sources (statistics, surveys, cooperation with experts, etc.) on which you relied when preparing the document and drafting the clause and impact analyses. If the data needed to prepare the relevant analyses of selected impacts are unavailable, please indicate this fact.

Policy Statement of the Government of the Slovak Republic for 2023–2027.

13. Opinion of the Commission on the assessment of selected impacts from preliminary consultation exercise No 083/2025

(if carried out pursuant to point 8.1 of the Uniform Methodology)

☐ Agree

☐ Agree with a proposal for revision

☒ Disagree

Please provide comments from the Commission's opinion in Part II, together with your assessment:

Regarding the clause on selected impacts

When completing the clause on selected impacts, the Commission requires that the submitter

use the current version of the clause valid from 1 October 2023.

Evaluation: Comment accepted

The Commission requires that the submitter indicate, in the clause on selected impacts under point 1 ‘Basic information’ in the part ‘Nature of the submitted document’, that the document is a transposition/implementation of EU law.

Grounds: Given that the submitted document implements Regulation (EU) 2017/625 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 March 2017 on official controls and other official activities performed to ensure the application of food and feed law, rules on animal health and welfare, plant health and plant protection products, amending Regulations (EC) No 999/2001, (EC) No 396/2005, (EC) No 1069/2009, (EC) No 1107/2009, (EU) No 1151/2012, (EU) No 652/2014, (EU) 2016/429 and (EU) 2016/2031 of the European Parliament and of the Council, Council Regulations (EC) No 1/2005 and (EC) No 1099/2009 and Council Directives 98/58/EC, 1999/74/EC, 2007/43/EC, 2008/119/EC and 2008/120/EC, and repealing Regulations (EC) No 854/2004 and (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council, Council Directives 89/608/EEC, 89/662/EEC, 90/425/EEC, 91/496/EEC, 96/23/EC, 96/93/EC and 97/78/EC and Council Decision 92/438/EEC (Official Controls Regulation) (OJ L 95, 7.4.2017, pp. 1–142), it is necessary to select both options – ‘Document of a legislative nature’ and ‘Transposition/implementation of EU law’.

Evaluation: Comment accepted

The Commission proposes revising Part 2 ‘Definition of the issue’ and Part 3 ‘Objectives and desired outcome’ of the clause on the selected impacts.

Grounds: In Parts 2 and 3, the submitter does not specify the problems addressed by the document or the objectives to be achieved. Only information about what the document contains and on what basis it was prepared has been provided; this is insufficient as regards the required content of these points. Point 2, which should address the problems, instead states the objective of the proposed amendment; moreover, that statement does not meet the definition of an objective. Compliance of a government regulation with the relevant legislation is not, in itself, an objective of a legislative amendment.

Evaluation: Comment accepted

The Commission recommends that, in Part 8 ‘Expediency review’ of the clause on selected impacts, the criteria for assessing the expediency of the submitted document be added.

Grounds: Expediency reviews are scheduled after a certain period of time to assess whether, and on the basis of what criteria, the objective has been achieved.

Evaluation: Comment accepted

The Commission requires that the submitter indicate, in the clause on selected impacts under point 9 ‘Selected impacts of document’ of the clause on selected impacts, the positive impact on the business environment, including SMEs.

Grounds: By increasing the limit on the quantity of hunted wild game that a hunting reserve user may sell to the final consumer or supply to a local retail establishment, namely to a maximum of 70% of the carcasses of wild game hunted in the hunting reserve per year (previously 30%), there will be a positive impact particularly on retail establishments, as well as on farmers and hunting associations.

Evaluation: Comment accepted

The Commission recommends that, in Part 11 ‘Contact details of the author’ of the clause on selected impacts, the role of the contact person be added.

Grounds: This is required within the meaning of the Uniform Methodology for the Assessment of Selected Impacts – provide the name, surname and role of the author together with an email address and phone number.

Evaluation: Comment accepted

Regarding impacts on the business environment

The Commission requires that the submitter prepare the ‘Analysis of impacts on the business environment’ in part 3.4.

Grounds: By increasing the limit on the quantity of hunted wild game that a hunting reserve user may sell to the final consumer or supply to a local retail establishment, namely to a maximum of 70% of the carcasses of wild game hunted in the hunting reserve per year (previously 30%), there will be a positive impact particularly on retail establishments, as well as on farmers and hunting associations. The Commission requires that this impact be described qualitatively in part 3.4.

Evaluation: Comment accepted

Regarding the impact on the general government budget

From a formal point of view, the Commission notes that the clause on selected impacts must be drafted in accordance with the Uniform Methodology for the Assessment of Selected Impacts effective from 1 October 2023; therefore, point 9 of the clause on selected impacts will also include information on the impact of the document on the limit for public expenditure. At the same time, the Commission notes that, if no impacts of the document on the general government budget and on the budgets of municipalities and higher territorial units have been identified, budgetary cover should not be indicated in point 9 of the clause on selected impacts.

Evaluation: Comment accepted

Regarding social impacts

The submitted document proposes increasing the limit on the quantity of wild game that a hunting reserve user may sell to the final consumer or supply to a local retail establishment to a maximum of 70% of the carcasses of wild game hunted in the hunting reserve per year. This means there is an improvement in the access of natural persons to goods and services; therefore, this fact needs to be stated in point 4.2 of the analysis of social impacts.

Grounds: Part 4.1 of the analysis of social impacts concerns the assessment of social impacts in terms of an increase in the disposable income of affected households or a decrease in expenditures of affected households. Since the submitter does not provide any quantification of social impacts in terms of their impact on household economy in point 4.1, the Commission recommends that the submitter move the text in point 4.1 to point 4.2, which is intended for assessing the impacts related to improving the access of natural persons to goods and services.

Evaluation: Comment accepted

14. Opinion of the Commission on the assessment of selected impacts from final assessment

No (if carried out pursuant to point 9.1 of the Uniform Methodology)

☐ Agree

☐ Agree with a proposal for revision

☐ Disagree

Please provide comments from the Commission’s opinion in Part II, together with your assessment: