



Coordinated European Animal Welfare Network (EuWelNet)

Deliverable 4

Title

Report on the main problem areas and their sensitivity to be addressed by knowledge transfer for each of the specific aspects of the legislation chosen for this project

Authors

Bettina B. Bock (Wageningen University), Nick Hacking and Mara Miele (Cardiff University)

In collaboration with: L. Berg (SLU), L. Ciszter (Banat University of Agricultural Sciences & Veterinary Medicine Timisoara), P. Ferrari (CRPA), E. Fàbrega-Romans (IRTA), M. Gebska (Warsaw University of Life Science), L.G. Horlings (WUR), C. Keppler (Uni. Kassel), U. Knierim (Uni. Kassel), L. Kostal (Slovak Academy of Science), L. Mounier (VetAgro Sup Campus Vétérinaire de Lyon), J. Pallissera (IRTA), M. Ruis (WUR), H. Spoolder (WUR),

Date : 7 April 2014

Grant agreement SANCO 2012/G3/EUWELNET/SI2.635078

Content

- Abstract..... 4
- 1. Introduction..... 6
 - 1.1 Approach 6
 - 1.2 Structure of the report 7
- 2. The implementation process, its organisation and result 8
 - 2.1 The implementation setting 8
 - 2.2 The implementation process..... 8
 - 2.3 Level of implementation or execution and compliance..... 9
 - 2.3.1 The meat chicken directive (2007/43/EU) 10
 - 2.3.2 The pig directive (2008/120/EC)..... 10
 - 2.3.4 The regulation for the protection of animals at the time of killing (1099/2009)..... 11
- 3. Bottlenecks, supportive practices and knowledge transfer 13
 - 3.1 Knowledge infrastructure..... 13
 - 3.2 Bottlenecks and the relevance of knowledge transfer 16
 - 3.3 Facilitation of implementation through stakeholder collaboration..... 18
 - 3.4 Supportive practices..... 21
 - 3.5 Expectation of the Coordinated European Animal Welfare Network..... 23
- 4. Conclusion 25
- References..... 26
- Annexes 28
 - Annex 1..... 28
 - Template national reports for the implementation process 28
 - Annex 2..... 29
 - National versus EU legislation in the ten study countries..... 29
 - Annex 3..... 30
 - The implementation of the Directive 2007/43/EC across ten countries 30
 - Annex 4..... 33
 - The Implementation of the Directive 2008/120/EC across ten countries 33
 - Annex 5..... 36
 - The Follow-Up of the EU Reg. 1099/2009 across ten countries 36
 - Annex 6..... 39
 - Ten country narratives of directive 2007/43/EC..... 39
 - Annex 7..... 46
 - Ten country narratives of directive 2008/120/EC..... 46

Annex 8.....	53
Ten country narratives about EU regulation 1099/2009	53
Annex 9.....	60
Questionnaire on bottlenecks and supportive practices	60
Annex 10.....	64
Template national reports on bottlenecks and supportive practices	64
Annex 11.....	65
Anonymous list of respondents for six countries.....	65
Annex 12.....	68
Problems and problem areas per directive for six countries	68
Annex 13.....	69
Knowledge related bottlenecks for six countries.....	69
Annex 14.....	71
Formal networks of collaboration per country (six countries).....	71

Abstract

The implementation of EU legislation on animal welfare varies across Member States for what regards the organisation of the process as well as the results achieved. In all Member States national authorities take the lead in the transposition of EU directives in national legislation or the follow up of EU regulations. In some countries EU legislation is integrated into an already existing national policy for animal welfare. There is also considerable difference in the extent to which private actors such as farmers, processors, retailers and NGOs, are invited to discuss and prepare implementation in collaboration with the national authorities. This may take place at national level but also at regional level there were animal welfare policy is a responsibility of regional authorities. As a result, the national and regional laws covering the EU directives may vary considerably. This is not the case for EU regulation as they have to be directly implemented.

Member States differ also in how they organise the enforcement and monitoring of legislation. There are differences in the frequency of inspection on farms and/or slaughterhouses, in the focus of inspections on particular legal requirements as well as in indicators used to check for compliance. Also the handling of compliance data varies. The competent authorities generally store these data and they may or may not make (some of) them available to the public. Compliance data are, hence, not equally accessible across Europe. In addition, it is very difficult to compare the results of national inspections as they are based on different data. European FVO audit reports are difficult to directly compare as they take place in different years and stages in the implementation process. National and European inspection reports may, however, be used to identify problem areas in implementation. In some countries there are also other sources of information that may help to get insight in the state of animal welfare for specific types of production, such as scientific reports, governmental reports and reports from (national and European) animal welfare councils and NGOs. They do not regard compliance but indicate where problem exists, and where more attention and possibly knowledge is needed.

Directive 2007/43 /EC (meat chicken) and Directive 2008/120/EC pigs) have been transposed in all ten study countries, and Regulation 1099/2009 (Protection of animals at the time of killing) directly applies from 1/1/2013. National inspection data and FVO reports indicate that not all requirements are realised. For what regards the pig directive the main problem areas are group housing of sows, stocking density, tail-docking, light requirements, lack of manipulable material, flooring, heating and ventilation, documentation and the training of staff. For the meat chicken directive the reported problems include stocking density, mortality registration, light requirements, humidity and gas concentration, documentation and the quality of inspection and inspection equipment. For what regards the killing regulation problems concern the implementation of Standard Operating Procedures, the training of staff, the development of new stunning and killing techniques, lairage facilities, the handling and restraining of animals, training of staff, veterinary supervision and presence of a trained Animal Welfare Officer, documentation and quality of inspection, as well as (training for) emergency killing on farms.

Mapping the knowledge infrastructure across the ten study countries demonstrates that a basic infrastructure is available everywhere. It generally includes public and private agencies, which offer training to regular students as well as professionals involved in producing, transporting, inspecting or slaughtering animals. Understanding if national knowledge institutes are capable to addresses the need for knowledge training, requires more in depth

research. The study included interviews with representatives of national and regional governments, NGOs, knowledge institutes, farmers, farm unions, slaughterhouses, and the processing and breeding industry. The respondents were asked what they perceived as important bottlenecks and effective supportive measures, while paying particular attention to knowledge transfer and stakeholder collaboration. Our respondents expressed some doubt about the outreach of industry led training as they reach few of the smaller and middle sized farmers and those farms that do not participate in farm assurance schemes. More generally some concern was expressed about the theoretical nature of courses and lack of practical training. In addition, the interviews indicate a number of common knowledge gaps especially for what regards the pig directive and killing regulation. They also frequently mentioned the need to develop uniform objective indicators for measuring compliance and to support the development of a uniform understanding of the purpose of animal welfare legislation.

When asking the respondents what facilitates implementation and enforcement, they underlined the importance of collaboration between public and private actors. In their opinion public-private collaboration is supportive in itself but also plays a crucial role in the development of other supporting practices, such as wide dissemination of knowledge and tailor-made information and training of target groups. It helped as well to identify bottlenecks and to anticipate them, for instance through investment in knowledge production. Where public authorities engage the industry in the development of an animal welfare policy at an early stage, implementation proceeded more smoothly, and, according to our respondents, significant bottlenecks, such as resistance among farmers could be prevented.

A Coordinated European Animal Welfare Network could importantly contribute to successful implementation by disseminating knowledge across countries and stakeholders and unlocking knowledge to the 'new' Member States and actors whose access to knowledge is perceived as limited. Among the actors who have limited access to knowledge at this moment, are small and middle sized farmers, NGOs, farm unions, smaller slaughterhouses and processing and breeding companies located in the 'new' member states and especially the less central regions. Knowledge transfer should include technical knowledge but also managerial and strategic knowledge. In addition, a network could facilitate the sharing of material such as photographs used for training and guidelines developed in a Member State to support implementation. The network should include leading scientists of different disciplines but also involve the industry to assure that the knowledge generated and transferred is practice-oriented. The Coordinated European Network for animal welfare could play an important role in promoting the capacity for stakeholder collaboration, a need which is yet unmet.

1. Introduction

Member States are known to differ in how the implementation of EU animal welfare directives is organised and how smoothly the implementation proceeds: some countries have a history of early adoption, while other countries struggle to realise implementation. In order to advise on how to facilitate implementation through knowledge transfer strategies it is important to learn more about the differences and conditions affecting this process, and to identify the main bottlenecks and measures taken to address specific implementation problems. It is also important to record the level of intervention in cases of infringements and non-compliance.

The aim of this work-package (WP2) is to collect and analyse existing data to identify difficulties and bottlenecks in the implementation of specific examples of EU legislation on animal welfare, paying particular attention to problems related to knowledge gaps in different parts of the EU. More specifically we aim to analyse the implementation process and procedures in a purposely selected sample of 10 EU-Member States for the three selected pieces of legislation Directives 2007/43/EC and 2008/120/EC respectively for the protection of broilers and pigs, and for Regulation 1099/2009 for protection of animals at the time of killing.¹ The countries selected include France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom.

The objectives of this work package are:

1. To map the structure and organisation of the implementation-process (main public and private actors and agencies involved, procedures, financial investments);
2. To identify the main bottlenecks to the implementation of legislation and the level of implementation achieved;
3. To study the identified bottlenecks, paying particular attention to knowledge gaps, and define problem areas that may be addressed by improved knowledge transfer;
4. To make an inventory of supportive measures and best practices, as well as ideas for improvements while focusing on knowledge strategies.

1.1 Approach

We started by mapping the organisation of the implementation process employed in the ten focus countries, the main public and private actors and agencies involved and the level of implementation achieved. A desk study was carried out, supplemented with a small number of interviews with the competent authorities. The research then looked more in depth into the situation in six of the ten countries by interviewing representatives of the relevant public and private actors. The six selected countries (Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Spain, and the United Kingdom) represent the three main geographic areas of the EU and are of specific interest because of their levels of implementation and investment in implementation procedures. The interviews focused on the identification of major bottlenecks in implementation and remedial measures taken, while paying specific attention to knowledge gaps and the relevance of knowledge transfer. We discussed these findings with the advisory board members at the meeting in Brussels in October 2013, which produced additional information on bottlenecks and remedial measures.

¹ In the following also referred to as ‘the killing regulation’.

1.2 Structure of the report

This report builds on the 16 national reports, in which the members of the project team presented and discussed the national results more in detail. It synthesises the national results, focusing on the differences and correspondences that are most relevant for fulfilling our objectives and for understanding the role and function of the Coordinated European Animal Welfare Network. Chapter 2 gives a comparative description of the process and procedures for implementation, monitoring and enforcement in the ten focus countries, and identifies the most relevant public and private actors and agencies. It also characterises the level of implementation, identifies the main problem areas and bottlenecks, and those parts of the farming industry in the ten focus countries, which face a difficult or more smooth implementation process. Chapter 3 looks more in detail into the situation in the six countries where additional interviews have been done, discussing the relevance of knowledge transfer for what concerns the main bottlenecks as well as facilitating factors and best practices in knowledge transfer and ideas for new solutions. Here we include also the information gained when discussing findings with the advisory board members. Chapter 4 presents the overall conclusions of work package 2. The annex includes the templates and questionnaires used as well as additional national data referred to in chapter 2 and 3.

2. The implementation process, its organisation and result

This chapter discusses the organisation of the implementation process in Italy, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom. It briefly describes the socio-economic context in the above-mentioned Member States as far as relevant for understanding the implementation setting (2.1). It then describes the implementation process and maps the actors and agencies involved (2.2). The chapter continues by comparing the level of implementation and compliance achieved for the three selected pieces of EU legislation, meat chicken directive (2.3.1), the pig directive (2.3.2) and the killing regulation (2.3.4).

2.1 The implementation setting

The socio-economic context in which the implementation of the EU regulations in the ten study countries takes place, varies considerably. There is a great variance in average income and cost of food as percentage of personal income (ranging from 8% in the UK to 34% in Romania). The countries differ also importantly in the organisation of the animal production sector, such as reflected in the level of food chain integration (higher for broiler compared to pork, but highly variable in the countries), production for export market and level of import as well as presence of private certification schemes (ranging from 7 in the UK to 0 in Slovakia, Spain and Romania). One of the most important effects of the presence of quality certification schemes that differentiate between animal products in the market, is the different ‘relevance’ that producers and market operators attribute to improving animal welfare: in some countries animal welfare is a competitive issues (effectively a ‘market entrance requirement’, e.g. in the UK or Sweden), while in other countries animal welfare has no immediate role apart from complying with the EU Regulations (Freidberg 2004). Furthermore, there is great variation in the presence, activity and influence of NGOs, media attention given to farm animal welfare issues, and the position of farm animal welfare on the national political agenda (Miele & Lever 2014; Kjaernes 2012). These factors influence the production and transfer of the specific knowledge that is required for supporting the implementation and monitoring of the EU directives and regulations. It also affects the involvement of public and private actors and agencies as well as their relative position. Both factors impact on the speed of implementation and the quality of monitoring.

2.2 The implementation process

The far left-hand column of Annex 2, entitled ‘National versus EU Legislation in the ten study countries’ shows that there are two basic groups of countries in the study: those with a national farm animal welfare policy (Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, the UK and Italy), and those without one (France, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Spain)². The final column on the right-hand side of Annex 2 indicates that adopting or ‘transposing’ the EU directives into the national legislation tends to be quicker in the countries that have a national animal welfare policy. It is not surprising of course that implementation proceeds smoothly where the national regulations are at the level of the new EU legislation or even beyond. Here

² Some of the study countries adopted animal welfare legislations before the EU directives and regulation. The first Dutch national animal welfare law originates from 1992 (Bock & Buller, 2013). In the UK the first general animal protection law, called the Protection of Animals Act, was introduced in 1911 and updated several times since. The Animal Welfare Act, an overhaul of pet abuse laws replacing the Protection of Animals Act, came into force in England and Wales in 2007. The Swedish Animal Welfare Act and Animal Welfare Ordinance has been established in 1988 (Bock & van Leeuwen 2005). The first Germany animal welfare law was implemented in 1933 and replaced by legislation from 1972 (Knierim 1997). The Italian ‘Piano Nazionale Benessere Animali’ was implemented in 2008. France and Italy have a long history of regulation against animal cruelty but this did not include farm animals (Vapnek & Chapman 2010).

institutions needed to prepare, organise and follow up on implementation and enforcement are already in place, and often have considerable resources at their disposal. In federal states, such as Germany, Spain and Italy implementation takes place at the regional level, which renders the process probably more time-consuming but generally more efficient and finely tuned to the local circumstances.

Looking into the main actors and agencies involved in implementation, we can see that the national authorities are leading in all ten countries. In most cases it concerns the Ministry (or DG) of Agriculture, in collaboration with the Ministry of Health. Generally, the Ministry (DG) of Agriculture takes care of animal welfare whereas the Ministry of Health is responsible for food safety; the latter tends therefore to be heavily engaged in the implementation of the killing regulation as well as the monitoring of the other directives at the slaughterhouse site. Only in Italy the Ministry of Health is leading for animal welfare. The farming industry perceives this an important hindrance to the successful implementation of the EU legislation because farmers are not involved in the implementation process. As a result there is little recognition of farmers' need for support and the extra costs that implementation imposes on them in their opinion. As already indicated above this division of tasks may be replicated at the regional level in the case of federal states.

More or less the same is true for control and enforcement, which may be organised at national, regional or even municipal level, and executed by a ministerial department or a semi-public agency, that is authorised by the Ministry of Agriculture or the Ministry of Health; sometimes the police has a role in inspection as well and with it the Ministry of Interior Affairs.

Even though the implementation of EU legislation is the responsibility of public and semi-public authorities, private agencies play an important role: when the requirements of the farm assurance schemes are encompassing or set above the limits indicated in the EU directives or regulations they greatly facilitate the implementation and the monitoring (see for example FVO report about UK implementation of the Directive 2007/43/EC in annex 3, page 28). As discussed more in detail in chapter 3 collaboration of public and private actors and agencies importantly supports implementation also through knowledge transfer.

2.3 Level of implementation or execution and compliance

This section characterises the level of implementation or follow-up (table 1, 2 and 3), identifies the main problem areas and bottlenecks (annex 3, 4 and 5) per piece of legislation. It also distinguishes between those parts of the farming industry in the ten focus countries, which face a difficult implementation or execution process, and those parts of the farming industry that are able to implement the EU regulations more easily (annex 6, 7 and 8).

We used national inspection report, FVO country reports and FVO audits for understanding the level of compliance with the three pieces of legislation in the focus countries. The same reports were useful for identifying difficulties and bottlenecks. In some countries we could also use other sources of information for that purpose, such as scientific reports (e.g. Hoste 2011; Hindle *et al.* 2009), governmental reports (e.g. Defra 2012, Min EL& I, 2011-2013) and reports from (national and European) animal welfare councils (e.g. FAWC 2009; RDA 2009) and NGOs (Dier & Recht 2012; CiWF 2010). They are not available for all countries and all sectors, and are published irregularly. They do not regard compliance as such but indicate where problem exists at a certain moment in time, where more attention is needed and also where knowledge gaps exist. The results of the document analysis are summarised in the annexes 3 to 8. Below we present the conclusions based on the interpretation of these results.

2.3.1 The meat chicken directive (2007/43/EU)

The meat chicken directive has been transposed in all ten study countries by 2010. Several Member States had already pre-existing national regulations with similar and sometimes even stricter requirements than the EU directive prescribes. This is the case in Sweden, the UK, the Netherlands and Spain (here both the pre-existing laws and the stricter rules are summarised in Annex 3). Implementation is well underway in all countries but still not all requirements are being met. National and European inspections reveal different problems in all ten countries. The problems and difficulties detected include the following: stocking density, mortality registration, light requirements, humidity and gas concentration, documentation and the quality of inspection and inspection equipment.³

*Table 1: Monitoring data for Directive 2007/43 /EC
(expressed as a percentage of compliance among holdings inspected plus FVO comments)*

Country	Generalised compliance as a percentage of holdings inspected (only where national data is available)	Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) Report Comments on Enforcement
Sweden	100% (2012)	“Generally effective, [but] can be very slow” (DG-SANCO 2010-8391).
UK	No compiled data available	“Well developed and generally satisfactory system” (DG-SANCO 2013-6822).
Netherlands	46% (2011)	Competent authority is “satisfactorily verifying compliance” (DG-SANCO 2012-6376).
Germany	87% (2011)	No attention points in two Länder in 2012 (DG-SANCO 2012-6380).
Italy	86% (2011)	Official controls are “generally satisfactory” (DG-SANCO 2011-6048).
France	30% (2009)	Compliance is “generally comprehensive” (DG-SANCO 2012-6446). ⁴
Spain	No compiled data available	Concerns about ability to enforce regulations (DG-SANCO 2008-8347).
Poland	100% (2011)	Compliance is “adequate” (DG-SANCO 2011-6049).
Romania	Data classified	A lack of resources and sanctions (DG-SANCO 2012-6374).
Slovakia	91% (2011)	There are concerns about inspection quality (DG-SANCO 2011-6053).

2.3.2 The pig directive (2008/120/EC)

The pig directive has been transposed in all ten study countries by 2013. Several Member States had already pre-existing regulations with similar and sometimes even stricter requirements than the EU directive prescribes. This is the case in Sweden, the UK, the Netherlands and Germany (here both the pre-existing laws and the stricter rules are summarised in Annex 4). Implementation is well underway in all countries but still not all requirements have been met. National and European inspections reveal different problems in all ten countries. The problems and difficulties detected include the following: group housing

³ The list not organised by order of importance.

⁴ The nature of non-compliance is not revealed which may explain the general assessment by FVO.

of sows, stocking density, tail-docking, light requirements, lack of manipulable material, flooring, heating and ventilation, documentation and the training of staff.⁵

*Table 2: Monitoring data for Directive 2008/120 /EC
(expressed as a percentage of compliance among holdings inspected plus FVO comments)*

Country	Generalised compliance as a percentage of holdings inspected (only where national data is available)	Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) Report Comments on Enforcement
Sweden	85% (2012)	Compliance is “generally satisfactory”(DG-SANCO 2010-8391).
UK	No compiled data available	“Satisfactory” but some non-compliances (DG-SANCO 2009-8268).
Netherlands	68% (2011)	Positive preventative action (DG-SANCO 2012-6376).
Germany	74% (2011)	Multi-level initiative re. tail-docking suggests good coordination (DG-SANCO 2012-6380).
Italy	No compiled data available	Some progress but concerns about how widespread change is (DG-SANCO 2011-6048).
France	70% (2009)	France is generally “well organised” (DG-SANCO 2012-6446).
Spain	No compiled data available.	“Sanctions applied are not always dissuasive” (DG-SANCO 2008-8347).
Poland	100% (2012)	Group housing compliance 65% (DG-SANCO 2011-6049).
Romania	Data unavailable	“Proactive” and “very well placed” (DG-SANCO 2012-6374).
Slovakia	90% (2011)	Significant problems, some since addressed (DG-SANCO 2011-6053).

2.3.4 The regulation for the protection of animals at the time of killing (1099/2009)

Before the adoption of the Regulation for the Protection of Animals at the time of killing (1099/2009) some Member States had pre-existing national legislation at similar or higher level. This is the case for Sweden, the UK, the Netherlands and Germany (here both the pre-existing laws and the stricter rules are summarised in Annex 5). The requirements of the EU regulation are not yet completely met with problems and bottlenecks varying across the ten countries. National and European inspection reports appoint the following problems: the implementation of Standard Operating Procedures, the training of staff, the development of new stunning and killing techniques, lairage facilities, the handling and restraining of animals, training of staff, veterinary supervision and presence of a trained Animal Welfare Officer, documentation and quality of inspection, as well as (training for) emergency killing on farms.⁶

⁵ The list is not organised by order of importance

⁶ The list is not organised in order of importance.

*Table 3: Monitoring data for Regulation 1099/2009
(FVO comments on welfare at slaughter prior to 2013)*

Country	Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) Report Comments on Enforcement
Sweden	Generally adequate but enforcement could strengthen (DG-SANCO 2003-9210).
UK	Compliance with previous legislation generally satisfactory (DG-SANCO 2007-7337).
Netherlands	Dutch measures generally go beyond EU rules (DG-SANCO 2006-8041).
Germany	Largely satisfactory with weaknesses being addressed (DG-SANCO 2003-9038).
Italy	Some concerns about the lack of training (DG-SANCO 2008-7691).
France	Some deficiencies in the availability of official veterinarians (DG-SANCO 2010-8627).
Spain	Concerns about lack of compliance (DG-SANCO 2007-7328).
Poland	Concerns over monitoring and enforcement powers (DG-SANCO 2010-8387).
Romania	Concerns for compliance at the high number of subsistence farms (DG-SANCO 2006-unpublished).
Slovakia	Concern about insufficient knowledge of the stunning equipment (DG-SANCO 2004-7223).

3. Bottlenecks, supportive practices and knowledge transfer

This chapter looks more in detail into the situation in the six countries where additional interviews have been done: Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Spain and the United Kingdom. We interviewed representatives of national and regional governments, NGOs, knowledge institutes, farmers, farm unions, slaughterhouses, and the processing and breeding industry⁷ and asked them what they perceived as important bottlenecks and effective supportive measures, while paying particular attention to knowledge transfer and stakeholder collaboration. We also asked their opinion about the role and function of a Coordinated European Animal Welfare Network. In the following we summarise the main results of our inquiry, starting with a brief presentation of the knowledge infrastructure (3.1), after which we discuss the bottlenecks and problem areas identified by the respondents (3.2), their ideas about facilitation through stakeholder collaboration (3.3), their evaluation of best practices (3.4), and their expectation of a Coordinated European Animal Welfare Network (3.5). Where relevant we include insights gained during the discussion of results with Advisory Board members.

3.1 Knowledge infrastructure

Knowledge production and transfer is generally considered as a particularly important instrument for supporting implementation. It has been indicated as the core area of work for the future Coordinated European animal Welfare Network and is therefore a focal point of attention of the EuWelNet project. This work-package maps the knowledge infrastructure in the ten study countries; in addition we asked stakeholders in six focus countries to reflect on the role of knowledge transfer in facilitating implementation and compliance (see 3.2).⁸ In the following we present what we learned about education, distinguishing between formal education for students, and professional training targeting farmers, veterinaries

Student education

In all ten focus countries knowledge about farm animal welfare is produced and transferred to students at various levels of education as part of the curriculum of technical schools, veterinary schools and (applied) agricultural universities and faculties designed for students at low and mid-level vocational training, veterinaries and students in animal sciences (see table 4).

In addition, most of the institutes are engaged in the transfer of knowledge to (future) farmers, for instance by organising training for the mandatory certificates and qualifications for ‘Animal caretaker - production animals’ (the Netherlands, Germany). Private training institutes offer similar courses. In Spain, private institutions provide the mandatory training, but the certificates are always signed and approved by an official agricultural school. Also in Romania private companies provide training for farmers on animal welfare, although most of the lecturers are based in the National Sanitary Veterinary and Food Safety Authority. In Slovakia the State Veterinary and Food Administration of the Slovak Republic is organizing courses through the accredited “Institute of Postgraduate Education of Veterinary Surgeons in Košice” (<http://www.ivvl.sk>).

⁷ See annex 9-11 for the questionnaire, template for the national report, respondent-lists

⁸ Work package 4.1 collected more detailed information about the activities of the knowledge institutes and their interrelations with other implementation actors; this information is reported in deliverable 6.

Professional training

In many countries animal welfare *training for farmers* is offered by public and private farm advisory centres (Poland), agricultural consultancies (UK), chambers for agriculture (Germany, Slovakia) and animal health services (Sweden), as well as farmers associations, sector organisations and the processing industry (e.g. Poland, Netherlands).⁹ This may also be done in collaboration as for instance in Italy; here courses for farmers are offered by the local competent authority in collaboration with local and national breeders' association, and taught by teachers who are qualified by the National reference centre for animal welfare. Industry led training may also be integrated in farm assurance schemes; these courses reach only farmers producing under such a scheme.

UK: The Poultry Passport is a secure, on-online training that enables a trainee to study and access modules easily. Due to the on-line based system a company manager can see the progress of a trainee and tailor a training programme to each person needs. Furthermore, a company manager can also check a number of passports held by individuals employed. There are 4 levels of Poultry Passport where level 2 meets the requirements of the directive. The module on animal welfare lasts half a day. The Passport is an initiative of the Poultry Meat Training Initiative, a working group of industry representatives including the British Poultry Council, the National Farmers Union, and, Lantra and Poultec Training.¹⁰

It is generally veterinary colleges and reference centres that organise *training for veterinary inspectors*. In Germany, however, a private advisory and training body (BSI Schwarzenbek: Training- and consultancy institute for animal welfare at transport and slaughter) offers courses throughout the country. In Sweden training of inspectors is also meant to assure similarity in inspection across the country. In Italy the national reference centre for animal welfare is in charge of training official veterinarians; recently they have done so also at European level: the Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale d'Abruzzo e Molise G. Caporale Teramo has coordinated the '*Better Training for Safer Food*' EU project provided training for official vets of the 27 Member States.¹¹

Training of slaughterhouse staff may be organised by vocational schools (The Netherlands SVO-vakopleiding Food¹²), but is often a task of the reference centres. In the UK the Meat Training Council (MTC) provides training for slaughterhouse workers and those who require a licence (including religious slaughter men), which is a charity organisation (www.meattraining.org.uk). In Sweden a (university based) consortium called MeNY organises common training courses for slaughterhouse staff and animal welfare officers. They offer mixed training courses for farmers and inspectors (see box below). Besides, the Swedish Agricultural University (SLU) produces open access online teaching material about animal welfare at slaughter (see www.disa.slu.se). They also host a website with course material for slaughter regarding to regulation 1099/2009. This will be translated in English in the following months (check <http://disa.slu.se/>).

⁹ VION (pork meat processing and slaughtering) developed 'Farmingnet', which is a web-based information system for pig farmers. The system quickly and clearly reports the slaughter details back to the pig farmer. The details about slaughter enable pig farmers to determine whether they should make adjustments to their stable management (see www.farmingnet.nl).

¹⁰ For more information see <http://www.poultrypassport.org/> [accessed 15 January 2014]

¹¹ See <http://www.izs.it/IZS/Engine/RAServePG.php/P/574110010300/M/251510010411/Benessere-animale-di-galline-e-polli-per-la-produzione-di-carne>

¹² SVO is the acronym for 'Slagersvakopleiding' (education for butchers); nowadays the institution offers training in multiple food-related domains; for this reason they actually call themselves SVO-vakopleiding Food (professional training food).

Sweden: The Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences organises courses on animal welfare legislation in which farmers and inspectors are trained together. The idea is that it is crucial to demonstrate to farmers that inspection contributes to more animal welfare. For inspectors it is evenly important to understand the perspective of farmers. (see also <http://www.slu.se/en/collaborative-centres-and-projects/swedish-centre-for-animal-welfare-scaw/education/>)

In the UK also NGOs, such as the Soil Association, Compassion in World Farming and RSPCA, are involved in training for farmers as well as developing educational material for the public. Their educational campaigns for better treatment of farm animals vary depending on their approach. Training courses and assessments can be done in house but need to be verified by an awarding authority. In England, Food and Drink Qualifications Ltd (FDQ) and Royal Society for Public Health (RSPH) are the two awarding organisations. These two awarding organisations can provide details of authorised training providers. The training courses and assessments are overseen by Ofqual and details of slaughterhouse training are available on the Ofqual website. In the Netherlands the Dutch Society for the Protection of Animals collaborated with the vocational schools in developing a web-based animal welfare course for vocational education (MBO, level 3 and 4). In this course, the importance of animal based parameters is emphasised, and awareness is trained by exercising professional actions and ethical choices regarding animal welfare (<http://www.groenkennisnet.nl/dierenwelzijnsweb/cursus-dierenwelzijn/pages/index.html>). In Romania scientists took the lead in developing online training for animal welfare (www.welanimal.aku.edu.tr)

The governments of all six focus countries collaborate closely with the reference centres that are specifically appointed for supporting the government in the implementation and enforcement of animal health or welfare regulation (for instance with regarding to the killing regulation, see also chapter 2). In the Netherlands, Germany and the UK the government involves knowledge institutions in the development of animal welfare education and research plans (e.g. in the Netherlands) or a strategic policy on animal feeding stuff, such as for instance in the UK (see also 3.3).

Germany: For better coordination of the activities in the field of knowledge production and transfer, the Ministers of Agriculture decided that future research should be registered at the German Agricultural Research Alliance (DAFA) situated at the Thünen Institute in Braunschweig. DAFA may comment on projects, and spread information on project and research institutions included in the Information System for Agriculture and Food Research of the Federal and State Governments (FISA; <http://www.fisaonline.de>). The Institute of Animal Welfare and Animal Husbandry in Celle of the Federal Research Institute for Animal Health is the central knowledge provider for the Federal Ministry of Food. There are also other Federal Research Institutes that work on animal welfare, and also University institutions can apply to a national fund financing animal welfare research. Some of the scientists working at these institutes are members of the Federal Animal Welfare Commission or of similar commissions at the level of the Länder, which advise the government on the national/regional animal welfare policy.

Mapping the knowledge infrastructure across the ten study countries demonstrates that a basic infrastructure is available everywhere. It generally includes public and private agencies and offers training to regular students as well as professionals involved in producing, transporting, inspecting or slaughtering animals. Understanding if national knowledge institutes are capable to address the need for knowledge training, requires more in depth research. Our respondents expressed some doubt about the outreach of industry led training as they reach few of the smaller and middle sized farmers who often do not participate in farm assurance schemes. More generally some concern was expressed about the theoretical nature of courses and lack of practical training. In the following paragraphs we report the knowledge gaps and

problems in knowledge transfers identified during the additional interviews in six of the ten countries, as well as the collaboration between knowledge institutes and other important actors in agencies engaged in the implementation of animal welfare legislation.

Table 4 Infrastructure of Animal Welfare Knowledge and Training (number of institutions per country)

Country	Research Centres	Technical Schools (Higher-level Agricultural Education)	Veterinary Schools (Universities)	Other Universities
Sweden	1	55	1	5
UK	6 ¹³	12	8	6
Netherlands	1	4	1	2
Germany	5+	10+	5	10
Italy	9	-	14	8
France	1	1	4	-
Spain	4	-	11	3+
Poland	2	222	5	5
Romania	-	several	4	3
Slovakia	2	6+	1	3

3.2 Bottlenecks and the relevance of knowledge transfer

General bottlenecks

The respondents in all six countries referred initially to socio-economic and political factors when asked what they considered important bottlenecks for the implementation of animal welfare legislation. Representatives of farmers explained that implementation at farm level was hampered by the extra investments that new legislation often required, and the higher production costs, which in farmers' perceptions threatened the *economic viability* of farming. They also pointed at the difficulties that arose from the incompatibility of animal welfare legislation with other legislation, and the need for more involvement of farmers' organisation in the policymaking process. Many respondents, from different backgrounds, emphasised *political and cultural factors*, such as the level of public concern with animal welfare, that affected the relevance of animal welfare in the political arena and political will to invest into the implementation process; it also influenced in their view the market opportunities for animal friendly products.

Looking more particularly into the implementation process various respondents underlined *institutional bottlenecks*, such as the inefficiency of public control and enforcement. Monitoring practices differed in their experience across and within countries, in terms of

¹³ This is a conservative estimate and include the following: Centre for Animal Welfare – Royal Veterinary College; Jeanne Marchig International Centre for Animal Welfare Education, Univ Edinburgh – Royal Dick School of Veterinary Studies; Animal Behaviour & Welfare Team, SRUC Edinburgh; Centre for Animal Welfare & Para-veterinary Sciences, Univ Lincoln; Newcastle Behaviour and Evolution research centre;

frequencies of control, use of indicators for measuring compliance, and levels of tolerance before sanctioning. Such variances were related to differences in the attitude and behaviour of individual inspectors but also to different interpretations of legislation at the level of the central authorities.

When asking the respondents to focus on the three selected pieces of legislation, they appointed a number of more *specific problems and problem areas* that differed across country (see table in annex 12). These problems generally confirm what has been identified as problematic based on the FVO inspection data in chapter 2 (see box for the Netherlands).

General problem-areas in the Netherlands

Broiler directive: incompatibility with environmental legislation; compliance with maximum stocking density when assessed in numbers of birds, especially at the moment of transport; uniform administration and monitoring of foot pad lesions at slaughter; insufficient registering of administrative data and reporting of cumulative daily mortality

Pig directive: Space and manipulable material; permanent access to water and the fulfilment of light requirement (to be measured by presence of lamps or lux).

Killing regulation: appliance SOP; monitoring and control of small slaughterhouses;

Knowledge gaps and problems in knowledge transfer

When probed to focus on knowledge related bottlenecks, the respondents identified a number of knowledge gaps as well as problems in knowledge transfer.¹⁴ Some of these problems regard a singular piece of legislation or occur only in a singular country, such as the calibration of stunning parameters to higher slaughter weights in Italy. Others concern problems that are shared across countries or directives. The training of slaughterhouse staff has, for instance, not yet been completed in many countries. The need to develop uniform objective indicators for measuring compliance for each piece of legislation was also mentioned more frequently. The respondents thought that uniform indicators would help to assure that compliance was assessed in the same way in each farm and/or slaughterhouse within and across countries. When discussing these findings with the advisory board members during the meeting in October 2013, the board members stressed that the lack of a shared understanding of the purpose of and need for animal welfare legislation was an important bottleneck. Awareness of the need and value of legislation would result in a more positive attitude towards implementation, for instance among farmers. And with a shared understanding it would be easier to achieve a more uniform and more supportive style of inspection. They also stressed the need to better inform the public about farm animal welfare and the purpose of legislation. Besides, the advisory board members pointed at the inaccessibility of existing training (for instance “better training for safer food”), when taught in English and not at the local level. The representatives of Croatia and Slovenia reported on their inability to give concrete advice to small and medium livestock farmers on how to best adapt their farm in order to comply with animal welfare legislation.

For what concerns the *broiler directive* our respondents perceived few knowledge gaps but some reported that the transfer of knowledge to inspectors as well as small and medium-sized farmers posed problems. There were broiler production was highly integrated (such as in Italy and Spain), knowledge transfer was in their view generally ensured by the industry. Knowledge transfer was also less a problem for farmers who participated in farm assurance

¹⁴ See annex 13 for a list of knowledge related bottlenecks per country and piece of legislation

schemes, as knowledge provision was then organised as part of the assurance process. Independently working farmers with smaller holdings were, however, perceived as a target group that was hardly reached by either public or private knowledge providers.

Regarding the implementation of the *pig directive* a number of common knowledge gaps were identified: the interpretation of manipulable material, the use of straw in countries with a hot climate, the management and prevention of tail biting. Knowledge transfer towards holders of small and medium sized farms needed improvement in their opinion and should take more account of different education levels as well as language barriers. The respondents also pointed at the need for the public authorities to organise more training for inspectors as a necessary step towards more uniform inspection criteria and procedures.

For what concerns the *killing regulation* the respondents were of the opinion that there was insufficient knowledge available for developing adequate stunning and killing techniques, that fit sheep and rabbits and animals slaughtered at higher weight than considered standard (e.g. chickens in Italy). Respondents in several countries underlined the need for training of slaughterhouse staff and inspection bodies. For what regards slaughterhouse staff the generally high turnover of staff, low formal education level and low proficiency in talking the national language (given the high presence of migrant labourers) poses specific problems that are yet insufficiently addressed in the respondents' view.

3.3 Facilitation of implementation through stakeholder collaboration

When asking the respondents what facilitates implementation and enforcement, they underlined the importance of *collaboration between public and private actors*. In their opinion public-private collaboration was supportive in itself but also played a crucial role in the development of other supporting practices, such as wide dissemination of knowledge and tailor-made information and training of target groups. It also helped to identify bottlenecks and to anticipate them, for instance through investment in knowledge production. There were the government engaged the industry in the development of animal welfare policy at an early stage, implementation proceeded more smoothly in their view as likely bottlenecks, such as resistance among farmers could be anticipated. For this reason we used the additional interview in the six focus countries to inventory more in particular which actors and agencies collaborated with each other and the government, and in which activities they engaged. The interviews taught us that public and private actors collaborate in the implementation of animal welfare legislation in all the six focus countries. There is, however, great variety in the level and scope of collaboration as well as the composition and interconnection of networks.¹⁵

There are *formal networks* that are installed by the government to participate in the implementation of a either specific legislation (such as the broiler directive) or a general national animal welfare policy. Some of networks function only temporarily, others have a continuous character. Some networks are purely public and include only the relevant public authorities, but many are mixed and entail also agribusiness representatives (farm union, processing industry, breeding industry, slaughterhouses etc.), NGOs, retailers and/or knowledge institutes.

¹⁵ see annex 14 for an overview of the networks of collaboration per country

Example UK: When the two EU Directives for meat chickens (2007/43/EC) and for pigs (2008/120/EC) and Regulation 1099/2009 on killing were announced, collaborative working groups were set up and began discussing animal welfare policy issues in terms of interpretation, revision, implementation, monitoring and control. The working groups and committees were initiated by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA), by industry and by NGOs. All relevant UK animal welfare and food chain actors, as well as researchers, have therefore been represented in one or more of the working groups and committees.

In all six focus countries the government may also initiate *occasional working groups*, focusing on specific issues (e.g. *Campylobacter* infections in the Netherlands) and which dissolve once the issue has been sufficiently dealt with.

<p>Example Italy: permanent and general</p> <p>Permanent national working group for a National Plan for Animal Welfare, initiated by the Ministry of Health</p> <p>Participants: competent authorities of the Governments of Regions and autonomous Provinces</p> <p>Task</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss and decide how to implement EU, revise and enforce EU regulations. • Train official vets, farmers and slaughterhouse staff 	<p>Example Poland: irregular and general</p> <p>Irregular consultation regarding EU legislation at national or regional level, initiated by the Ministry of Agriculture and rural Development</p> <p>Participants: Agricultural Advisory Centre, Agricultural Advisory Units, Chambers of Agriculture, Farmers associations</p> <p>Task</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advise on new regulations, • Solving current problems, • Information and Training
--	--

Besides public-private also *private collaboration* was considered as crucial for facilitating implementation. Again we can find some levels of collaboration in all six focus countries, differing in formality and continuity as well as composition. Private actors and agencies organise working groups with a varied composition, in which they discuss animal welfare related questions and collaborate in practice oriented projects, often linked to the development of private standards in farm assurance schemes. Collaboration within a sector may quite frequently be found but collaboration across sectors occurs rarely.

The Netherlands: The working group “Sustainable Meat 2020” and “Den Bosch Alliance” includes supermarkets and cattle-breeders and has the support of companies, NGOs and governments. They have promised to ensure that all the meat in Dutch supermarkets is produced sustainably by 2020. The recent retail agreement on chickens (‘The chicken of tomorrow’) includes the commitment to introduce a slower growing breed. Furthermore they promise to decrease the number of chickens per m2 with 10% by 2015, to offer extra distraction material and reduce the use of antibiotics. The Central Bureau for Food Trade (CBL) played an important role in stimulating the collaboration of stakeholders in the development of an intermediary segment of animal friendly products, such as the Volwaard chicken in broiler production and the Rondeel stable for laying hens. They figured also prominently in the steering/working group on ‘sustainable meat 2020’ (see above). These negotiations have led to agreements with the supermarkets in 2013 to improve chicken and pig welfare. There are similar agreements regarding pork production that grant pigs 25% more space and piglets up to 50% more space. This should also reduce boredom and turbulence in the stable. Requirements are set to keep the tail as long as possible and interventions such as the grinding of teeth will be banned. The transport of pigs will be limited to a maximum of 6 hours and the piglets will be allowed to drink longer with their mothers (on average 28 days). Castration will be stopped earlier (2014 instead of 2015) and stringent quality checks on the drinking water of pigs will be introduced. The agreements are comparable with one star in the Better Leven label, which was initiated by the DSPCA in 2007 (Commissie Van Doorn 2011; Min EL&I 2013).

Many respondents underlined that close collaboration within the supply chain and, hence, between farmers, slaughterhouses, processing industry and retailers, promoted implementation and compliance, especially where legislation was included in farm assurance schemes. The UK feeds back all ante and post mortem inspection results to farmers where an email address is provided. Farm assurance schemes contribute to the implementation of EU animal welfare legislation through training and education, and by providing incentives for farmers to invest in animal friendly production methods. They also regularly inspect farms and slaughterhouses to check if they comply with the norms that are agreed upon as part of the scheme. The latter does not replace official inspection; still the frequent control by the certifier indirectly supports compliance with legislation there were certification rules go beyond or coincide with animal welfare legislation. This is for instance the case with the Dutch “Beter Leven”, the UK label for Freedom Food, as well as the German label ‘Für mehr Tierschutz’.¹⁶ Such farm assurance schemes were, however, common in only some of the six focus countries and rare or even absent in others. Earlier research has demonstrated that the presence of farm assurance schemes is closely related to the level of public concern for animal welfare, the concentration of the retailer sector, consumer interest in responsible and/or high quality products, industry interest in market differentiation and a neo-liberal tradition of policy-making (Buller & Roe 2012). The market share of or the number of private schemes with animal welfare indicates the extent of public private collaboration in the promotion of animal welfare, which contributes to the implementation of EU animal welfare legislation as explained above. It goes too far, however, to say that they may be used as a proxy for successful implementation of EU legislation as they do not always directly relate to specific legislation and may choose to include only relatively easy to realise animal welfare measures that do not cover the whole piece of legislation (Buller & Roe 2012).



When you see the Freedom Food label you know that animals have been kept to strict RSPCA welfare standards. The standards cover the whole of an animals' life, not just their time on farm. A stimulating environment and plenty of room to move around are just two of the many benefits.

Freedom Food can also be an affordable ethical choice, as they approve indoor as well as free range and organic farms. So, make one small change to your shopping and one big change to farm animal welfare.

[Freedom Food - rspca.org.uk](http://freedomfood.rspca.org.uk) [accessed 15.11.2013]

Cross country comparison of collaboration

When comparing the six focus countries we can see that the public authorities in the UK and the Netherlands collaborate more frequently with a wider variety of public and private actors than public authorities in the other countries do, and give them more opportunity for participating in the policymaking as explained in the following. They involve them early in the implementation process of a specific piece of legislation, and install working groups in which public authorities collaborate with the industry and knowledge institutes. The composition of these networks is also more mixed than in other countries and brings together stakeholders with opposing views and interests, such as farmers' organisation and animal protection NGOs. As a result of the many interconnected networks, there are many occasions for the stakeholders to meet, also in an informal fashion. Especially the Dutch respondents stressed how valuable such frequent meetings were for exchanging knowledge, identifying

¹⁶ [Freedom Food - rspca.org.uk](http://freedomfood.rspca.org.uk); [Beter Leven kenmerk](http://beterlevenkenmerk.nl); [tierschutzlabel](http://tierschutzlabel.de); [all accessed 15.11.2013]

knowledge gaps but also encouraging further collaboration in the knowledge production and transfer, as well as in the development of animal welfare oriented production schemes.

The level of collaboration is much lower in the other countries. There are occasional meetings between agri-business and government in Spain and Italy, but generally these meetings are organised per farm sector and do not involve retailers or NGOs. In both countries the farm-unions complain about their low involvement and the neglect of their interests and experience. Agribusinesses regularly collaborate with knowledge institutes, especially in the highly integrated broiler sector. Formally, NGOs are hardly involved in the implementation process.. In both countries there are, hence, some public-private networks of collaboration; generally, however, it concerns separate and temporary networks that do not cut across the different stakeholders (primary and processing industry, retailers and NGOs).

The **Italian** branch of Compassion In World Farming (CIWF) recently started a campaign for more farm animal welfare. They are also negotiating with the public authorities as well as farm industry and retailers for more collaboration and the development of private standards. On 10 July 2013 they organised a press conference in the Italian parliament to discuss with the member of parliament about farm animal welfare matters. [La vostra voce in Parlamento | CIWF Italia](#) [accessed 15.11.2013]

In Romania and Poland public and private collaboration in the implementation of EU animal welfare legislation is almost absent. The government informs agribusiness which new rules and regulations have to be followed, once the legislation is applicable. There is hardly if any NGO working on farm animal welfare, as most NGOs focus on pet animals, with very limited resources. They do not collaborate with the government, agribusiness or knowledge institutes. The government works with knowledge institutes, and the latter also cooperate with agribusiness, especially in the highly integrated pig sector, but these networks do not interconnect.

3.4 Supportive practices

Above we have already summarised how our respondents assessed the contribution of knowledge production and transfer to the implementation of animal welfare legislation as well as the role of stakeholder collaboration. We also asked them to evaluate the importance of a number of other supportive practices that we had come across when studying existing information about the implementation process in the ten selected countries (see table 5).

Table 5: Best practices¹⁷

In Sweden compliance data are made publicly available and stimulate farmers and slaughterhouses to comply in order to avoid reputation damage.
In Sweden the government, industry and science collaborate in networks that regularly meet to discuss animal welfare issues and to prepare the ground for the implementation of new directives.
In several countries private production schemes include regular inspection for animal welfare directive and through their regular checks contribute to compliance.
In some countries working groups of national and regional public authorities try to harmonise implementation and control and inspection procedures.
In the UK, the Netherlands and Germany NGOs collaborate with farmers, industry and science in the development of new knowledge and techniques (breeds) as well as new animal welfare production schemes.
In the Netherlands farmers, processing industry and retailers sign covenants in which they agree and promise to the public that from a certain date on all products produced, processed and sold under their responsibility will be of a higher level of animal welfare.
In some countries national or regional authorities develop animal welfare plans that run ahead of EU legislation, and on which they regularly report to the public.
In the UK the public authorities are discussing the development of a less bureaucratic and more performance – trust based approach to animal welfare inspection, where earned recognition results less stringent control of some farms.
In the UK , welfare policy delivery applies the concept of “earned recognition” to its risk based approach to farm inspection visits.
In the UK the government has developed a pig welfare code that provides guidance to farmers on how to comply with the legislation. Whether the requirements of the guidance had been met or not can be used as evidence to support a prosecution.

Almost all respondents considered continuous public-private collaboration as crucial for enabling implementation, also through the joint engagement in a national animal welfare policy and common development of a code of good farm practice. In addition, close collaboration is expected to facilitate efficient knowledge transfer and the production of knowledge that has relevance for practice. Most were also in favour of promoting animal welfare through private agreements and farm assurance schemes, although it was seen as requiring a high level of consumer interest. Collaboration with NGOs was considered as good but risky especially by farmers who doubted their reliability. Others underlined that the NGOs were only interested in pet animals in their country and not strong or resourceful enough to effectively raise public awareness of farm animal welfare through public campaigns. The publication of compliance data as practiced in Sweden, was considered effective but problematic in countries with a different regulation on privacy. Most welcomed also the development of performance/trust-based animal welfare inspection such as proposed in the UK in order to reduce bureaucracy (see box below).

¹⁷ This list of best practices is derived from interviews done in the ten study countries. When discussing the results during a project meeting, we decided to use this selection to discuss best practices with our respondents in the six focus country.

Example UK: In a recent report the independent Farming Regulation Task Force proposed to apply “earned recognition” across inspection in order to reduce bureaucracy and to ease out regulatory burden while improving animal welfare and farming in general is one of the measures. “Inspections must be clearly risk-based, targeted and, where possible, organised so that they work with normal business practice, rather than disrupting it. To achieve this, and to remove duplication, the principle of earned recognition must be developed and used. Under this, regulators take account of a wide range of information about the likely risk of each business. This includes membership of an accredited private-sector assurance scheme or other evidence that farmers have chosen to invest in, and which may duplicate official inspection. Local Authorities should not inspect the same requirements that are checked by Defra agencies and delivery partners as part of cross-compliance inspections. Finally, the Government should provide a web-based platform to help farmers and regulators share information to help determine risk and direct inspection efforts.” (DEFRA 2011: 8)¹⁸

Besides, subsidies were considered as an important facilitation instrument. We specifically asked about the perceived importance of the rural development policy of the Common Agricultural Policy that may be used to support implementation measures in the area of farm animal welfare. Member States used a variety of measures within their co-financed rural development programmes in order to meet newly introduced standards or to introduce higher standards than established by law in addition to state aid options (measure 215: “Payments for the welfare of animals”). The measure has been implemented in nine Member States for a total amount of expenditure of about 1.3 billion €, of which 722 Million € funding from the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (European Network for Rural Development 2013).

The importance of rural development money for facilitating animal welfare legislation was assessed quite differently across the six focus countries. In the Netherlands, for instance, rural development money was considered of less importance for the implementation of animal welfare legislation, as farmers engaged in intensive husbandry have generally little land and little interest in rural development programmes. Also in Spain, the rural development policy was considered as of limited importance as broiler and pig farms seldom apply for rural development funds, unless they combine it with other types of production susceptible of receiving CAP subsidies. Italy was the country that programmed to spend most, about 433 million €, although only nine Italian regional Governments included the measure in their rural development plans (Emilia-Romagna, Piedmont, Liguria, Valle d’Aosta, Veneto, Tuscany, Marche, Umbria, Campania, Calabria and Sardinia). Also in Romania considerable rural development funds are used to support animal welfare among poultry and pigs (in total 155 Million €) (European Network for Rural Development 2013).

3.5 Expectation of the Coordinated European Animal Welfare Network

We finally asked our respondents’ opinion about the role that a Coordinated Animal Welfare Network could play in the implementation process. In general the respondents were in favour of a Coordinated European Animal Welfare Network that would support knowledge transfer across Member States and among stakeholders. In doing so it would *unlock knowledge* to those countries and actors whose access to cutting edge knowledge is perceived as limited because of shortage of resources and shorter engagement in the European research community. Here our respondents referred more particularly to the new Member States and NGOs. The advisory board members stressed that a network could also facilitate the *sharing*

¹⁸ Defra (2011) Striking a balance: reducing burdens; increasing responsibility; earning recognition, The report of the independent Farming Regulation Task Force, Available at: <http://www.defra.gov.uk/publications/files/pb13527-farm-reg-task-report.pdf> [Accessed 28/02/2013]

of material such as photographs used for training and guidelines developed in a Member State to support implementation of a directive. Ensuring that technical expertise is available for each Member State would contribute to a *common understanding of the legislation* and support a more *uniform implementation and inspection* of animal welfare legislation across the EU. Our respondents thought that disseminating technical expertise across member states and allowing all member states and relevant stakeholder access knowledge on how to successfully implement legislation, would eventually facilitate the reaching of similar levels of compliance and add to the realisation of a *level playing field* for all producers.

In the opinion of the respondents the Network should include the *leading scientific institutes* and reference centres, and scientists from different natural science and social science background. An *interdisciplinary composition* was considered important as not only technical knowledge about animal welfare production systems was needed but also more knowledge on consumers and the social conditions that need to be met to encourage compliance. A mixed composition would encourage mutual learning and encourage the expansion of interdisciplinary collaboration into more countries. Many respondents stressed the importance of *involving the industry* in order to assure that the knowledge generated and transferred is *practice-oriented*; besides, it should not only regard scientific knowledge but also knowledge developed in practice. The members of the advisory board stressed the need to demonstrate to farmers how they could gain from improvements in animal welfare. They also underlined the importance to include the *general public* as an important target group for information about animal welfare and the gains made through new legislation.

Many respondents pointed at the need to include NGOs constructively engaged in farm animal welfare. The Coordinated European Network for Animal welfare could play an important role in *joining stakeholders* and, hence, promoting collaboration, which has proved to be an important success factor for implementation, especially where networks and platforms working on animal welfare are missing. It also supports the exchange of *managerial and strategic knowledge* regarding matters as campaigning for animal welfare among farmers and citizens, the organisation of public-private collaboration in implementation and knowledge production, the collaborative design of animal welfare schemes etc. Transferring knowledge includes much more than disseminating and transferring results of research. The coordinated European Network for animal welfare could also play an important role in promoting the *capacity for stakeholder collaboration*, a need which is yet unmet.

4. Conclusion

The implementation of EU legislation on animal welfare varies across Member States for what regards the organisation of the process and the results achieved. In all Member States national authorities take the lead in the transposition of EU directives in national legislation or the follow up of EU regulations. In some countries EU legislation is integrated into a national policy for animal welfare. There is also considerable difference in the extent to which private actors such as farmers, processors, retailers and NGOs are invited to discuss and prepare implementation in collaboration with the national authorities.

Member States differ also in how they organise the enforcement and monitoring of legislation and handle compliance data. Compliance data are not equally accessible across Europe. In addition, it is very difficult to compare the results of national inspections and FVO audits as they are based on different data. Both, national and European inspection reports identify problem areas in implementation. In some countries there are other sources of information that may be used to get insight into problem areas, such as scientific reports, governmental reports and reports from (national and European) animal welfare councils and NGOs.

The meat chicken and pig directives have been transposed in all ten study countries, and the killing regulation applies since 2013. National inspection data and FVO reports indicate that not all requirements are realised. For what regards the pig directive the main problem areas are group housing of sows, stocking density, tail-docking, light requirements, lack of manipulable material, flooring, heating and ventilation, documentation and the training of staff. For the meat chicken directive the reported problems include stocking density, mortality registration, light requirements, humidity and gas concentration, documentation and the quality of inspection and inspection equipment. Regarding the killing regulation problems concern the implementation of Standard Operating Procedures, the training of staff, the development of new stunning and killing techniques, lairage facilities, the handling and restraining of animals, training of staff, veterinary supervision and presence of a trained Animal Welfare Officer, documentation and quality of inspection, as well as (training for) emergency killing on farms.

In all ten study countries public and private knowledge institutes offers training to students and professionals involved in producing, transporting, inspecting or slaughtering animals. There is some concern about knowledge transfer to smaller and middle sized farmers and farms that do not participate in farm assurance schemes. Some knowledge gaps were identified hindering the implementation of the pig directive and killing regulation. Respondents underlined the need for developing uniform monitoring guidelines and stressed the importance of reaching a common understanding of the purpose of animal welfare legislation. In their view implementation and enforcement was best served by public-private collaboration. It contributed to the development of supporting practices, the early identification of bottlenecks, common investment in knowledge creation and tailor-made information and training of target groups.

A Coordinated European Animal Welfare Network could support implementation by disseminating knowledge across countries and stakeholders, by unlocking technical and strategic knowledge and supporting the exchange of implementation and training material across Europe. It should engage scientists and stakeholders to assure orientation towards practice. The Network could also play an important role in promoting the capacity for stakeholder collaboration, a need which is yet unmet.

References

- Bock B.B. and H. Buller (2013), Healthy, Happy and Humane: Evidence in farm animal welfare policy, *Sociologia Ruralis*, 53/3: 390-411
- Bock B.B. & Leeuwen and F. van (2005) Review of socio-political and market developments of animal welfare schemes, in: J. Roex and M. Miele (eds), *Farm Animal Welfare Concerns; consumers, retailers and producers*, Cardiff: Cardiff University Press, Welfare Quality Report No. 1, pp. 115-150
- Buller H. and E. Roe (2012), Commodifying animal welfare, *Animal Welfare*, 21(S1), 131-135
- Commissie Van Doorn (2011) *Al het vlees duurzaam; De doorbraak naar een gezonde, veilige en gewaardeerde veehouderij in 2020*, Den Bosch 2011
- Compassion in World Farming (CiWF) (2010) *FARM ANIMALS ARE WINNERS IN UK SUPERMARKET AWARDS*, Available at: http://www.ciwf.org.uk/news/compassion_news/farm_animals_are_winners_in_uk_supermarket_awards.aspx [accessed 4 April 2013]
- DEFRA (2012) *Welfare at slaughter*, Available at: <http://www.defra.gov.uk/food-farm/animals/welfare/slaughter/> [accessed 05 February 2013]
- Dier & Recht, Varkens in Nood (2012). *Naleving dierenwelzijnswetgeving in de vee-industrie; Een onderzoek naar overtredingen in de vee-industrie, de impact op het dierenwelzijn en het huidige controle- en handhavingsbeleid*. [http://www.varkensinnood.nl/fileadmin/user_upload/Rapporten/ViN - 2012 - Dierenwelzijns-overtredingen in de vee-industrie.pdf](http://www.varkensinnood.nl/fileadmin/user_upload/Rapporten/ViN_-_2012_-_Dierenwelzijns-overtredingen_in_de_vee-industrie.pdf) [accessed 19 December 2013]
- European Network for Rural Development (2013), *Measure 215 – Animal Welfare Programmes, progress snapshot 2007-2012* (updated June 2013). https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/myenrd/app_templates/enrd_assets/pdf/measure-information-sheets/C_Infosheet_215.pdf [accessed January 2014]
- Europese Rekenkamer (2008), *Is “cross compliance” als beleid doeltreffend?* (speciaal verslag nr. 8), Luxembourg: Bureau voor officiële publicaties der Europese Gemeenschappen
- FAWC (2009) *Farm Animal Welfare in Great Britain: Past, Present and Future*, Report, [fawc.org.uk](http://www.fawc.org.uk/pdf/ppf-report091012.pdf), Available at: <http://www.fawc.org.uk/pdf/ppf-report091012.pdf> [accessed 14 Feb 2013]
- Freidberg, S. (2004) ‘The ethical complex of corporate food power’, *Environment and Planning D – Society and Space*, 22(4), 513–531
- Kjærnes, U. (2012) ‘Ethics and action: A relational perspective on consumer choice in the European politics of food’, *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 25(2), 145–162
- Knierim, U. (1997): Die Tierschutzgesetzgebung in Deutschland. In: Sambraus, H.H., Steiger, A. (Hrsg.): *Das Buch vom Tierschutz*. Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke Verlag, pp. 832-844
- Miele, M. and Lever, J. (2014) ‘Improving Animal Welfare in Europe: cases of comparative bio-sustainabilities’, in: T. Marsden and A. Morely (eds), *Sustainable Food Systems: Building a New Paradigm*, London: Earthscan, 143-165.
- Min EL&I Ministerie Economische Zaken Landbouw en Innovatie (2013) *Agenda verduurzaming voedsel 2013 -2016, Alliantie Verduurzaming Voedsel*, Den Haag: Ministerie Economische Zaken
- Min EL&I, Ministerie van Economische Zaken, Landbouw en Innovatie (2012) *Nota Dierenwelzijn en Diergezondheid; Een maatschappelijk geaccepteerde omgang met dieren*. Den Haag.
- Min EL&I, Ministerie van Economische Zaken, Landbouw en Innovatie (2011) *Uitvoeringsagenda duurzame veehouderij; Tweede Voortgangsrapportage Samenwerkingsverband*, Den Haag.

- RDA, Raad voor Dierenaangelegenheden (2009) *Verantwoord houden; Wie is verantwoordelijk voor het welzijn en de gezondheid van gehouden dieren in Nederland?* RDA report 2009-02
- Vapnek, J. and Chapman, M. (2010), *Legislative and regulatory options for animal welfare*, Report 104 for the Development Law Service, Rome: FAO Legal Office.

Annexes

Annex 1

Template national reports for the implementation process

Please gather information on the following points, making use as much as possible of existing information, such as listed below under 'sources'; sometimes it is more efficient, however, to just phone a key informant.

Sources: FVO country profile reports; annual FVO reports, FVO audit report, cross compliance reports in rural development plans, national policy documents, info from earlier research projects (animal welfareARE, WQ) (see also links in wp2 proposal on webtool); EU questionnaire on implementation process

1. National background

- a. Characterisation of the pig/broiler farm sector (number, size, level of integration), % of self-sufficiency and whether the sector is export oriented and to which markets;
- b. Consumption of pork and poultry (organic and conventional);
- c. The organisation of slaughter (number, size, regional concentration of slaughterhouses)
- d. The structure of the retail sector: level of concentration (number of large retailers), share of sales of the larger retailers, presence of multi-nationals, national or regional diffusion of large retailers;
- e. List of private farm assurance scheme for pig and broiler meat (products), either NGO, industry or retailer led that include animal welfare issues, and their importance in terms of % production;
- f. Presence and importance of organic schemes for pig/broiler meat (products); share of sales of organic meat;
- g. Level of public concern for animal welfare (reflected in media coverage) and importance in political arena (presence and activity of animal welfare oriented NGOs; Eurobarometer)

2. Actors and agencies

- a. List of actors and agencies (public and private) and their roles in the implementation & enforcement of EU animal welfare legislation
- b. Overall flow chart of the organisation of the implementation process: what happened after the three directives have been adopted (e.g. flowchart Mara in presentation London)

3. National laws and regulation

- a. Relative level of national animal welfare legislation/ 3 directives compared to EU (*is the national legislation ahead or behind the EU regulation? Is it different? How long does it take to adopt the EU directives in the national legislation?*);
- b. Existence and short description of national policy on animal welfare;

4. Infrastructure of knowledge and training

- a. List of centres for knowledge production & dissemination on animal welfare (research centres; technical schools, veterinary schools, universities, NGOs)
- b. Supply of training courses for farmers (public and private) in relation to the 3 directives (e.g. communication and instruction by CA in preparation of implementation);
- c. Organisation of information campaign to inform farmers/the public about the new directives or EU regulation.

5. Levels of implementation/compliance

- a. Interpretation of the 3 directives in the national context;
- b. Characterisation of their implementation – for each of the 3 and in comparison: timing (early/late); level (e.g. max or min stocking density?), attention points in FVO reports;
- c. Attention given to animal welfare as part of cross compliance (CAP);

6. Level of compliance

- a. For last 3-5 years (using available European, national data)

7. Problems and bottlenecks

- a. Bottlenecks and problem areas as identified in reports e.g. interviews for each of the 3 directives/regulation (to be followed up in task 2.2)
- b. Areas where implementation proceeds smoothly (e.g. in those cases in which the national regulation already required the measures indicated in the EU directives);
- c. Identification of potentially interesting respondents and issues for 2.2 as encountered while working on 2.1

Annex 2

National versus EU legislation in the ten study countries

Country	National Legislation	National vs EU Legislation – Status	National vs EU Legislation – Differences	Timing of transposition
Sweden	Yes. Various instruments.	Ahead of EU legislation for meat chickens, pigs and slaughter.	Includes a complete ban on slaughter without pre-stunning.	On time for both Directives (1-4 years).
UK	Yes. Various instruments.	Ahead of EU Directives for meat chickens and pigs.	Some stricter or more detailed national rules.	On time for meat chicken Directive (2 years). Behind for slaughter.
Netherlands	Yes. Various instruments.	Ahead of EU legislation for meat chickens and pigs.	Tightens regulations a bit and may enable a higher level of production.	Meat chickens relatively short. Pigs longer.
Germany	Yes. Various instruments.	Ahead of EU regulation and directives.	Some stricter or more detailed national rules.	Meat chickens relatively short. Pigs very long.
Italy	National Plan for Animal Welfare (PNBA).	National legislation is at exactly the same level as the EU.	No difference.	Meat chickens and pigs long (3 years)
France	National policy on animal welfare closely aligned to EU regulation.	National legislation is at exactly the same level as the EU.	No difference.	Generally long.
Spain	National policy closely aligned to EU directives and the regulation.	National legislation is at exactly the same level as the EU.	No difference.	On time for both Directives (1-4 years).
Poland	No specific policy on animal welfare.	National legislation is at exactly the same level as the EU.	No difference.	On time for both Directives (3-4 years).
Romania	No specific policy on animal welfare.	National legislation is at exactly the same level as the EU.	No difference.	On time for both Directives (3-4 years).
Slovakia	No specific policy on animal welfare.	National legislation is at exactly the same level as the EU.	No difference.	On time for both Directives (3-4 years).

The different shadings distinguish between countries with (white) or without (grey) farm national animal welfare policy. Italy and France have a long history of regulation against animal cruelty, however the focus of these early regulation was on pets, horses and generally non-farm animals (see Vapnek & Chapman, 2010). For more explanation see footnote 1 on page 8.

Annex 3

The implementation of the Directive 2007/43/EC across ten countries

Country	Transposition	Implementation	Enforcement	Monitoring
Sweden	Fully transposed into national legislation (2010) by the Ministry of Rural Affairs (MRA).	Implementation activity undertaken by the CCA for animal welfare, the Swedish Board of Agriculture (SBA).	National farm inspections (SBA; previously Animal Welfare Agency, AWA) are risk-based and control every 1-2 years. The last report for 2012 identified no non-compliances (MRA, 2013). The last FVO audit with meat chicken welfare data was in 2010 (DG-SANCO 2010-8391). It reported generally effective enforcement.	National slaughter data, collated by the Swedish Food Agency (SFA), is available every 6 th week. SBA prepares an annual report on numbers of official controls.
UK	Fully transposed into national legislation (2010) by the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra).	Implementation activity is undertaken by the CCA, Defra and its executive agencies, the Animal Health and Veterinary Laboratories Agency (AHVLA) and the Food Standards Agency (FSA). Some stricter national rules exist.	Defra uses a risk-based system of controls and has been gathering actual compliance data (Defra, 2012). The FVO reported a well-developed and 'generally satisfactory' system (DG-SANCO 2013-6822). However, the FVO adds that the absolute numbers of Defra's inspection visits being relatively low, makes higher levels of compliance difficult to achieve.	Data collected by the Food Standards Agency's (FSA) Operations Group on certain conditions may trigger an on farm inspection by Animal Health. These trigger reports provide post-mortem data on a daily basis (DG-SANCO 2013-6822).
Netherlands	Fully transposed into national legislation (2010) by the Ministry of Agriculture (Min LNV; now Ministry of Economics, Min. EL & D).	Controls undertaken by the CCA, Dutch General Inspection Service (AID), now part of the Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority (NVWA).	NVWA uses a risk-based system of controls in generally less frequent inspections. A 2011 national audit found 46% compliance (EZ, 2012). In 2012, the FVO stated that the control system implemented by the CA is 'satisfactorily verifying compliance' (DG-SANCO 2012-6376).	Slaughter data for meat chickens informs the system of controls.
Germany	Fully transposed into national legislation (2009) by the Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Consumer Protection (BMELV).	Implemented by CAs in 16 Federal States who each control compliance with the legislation via guidance from the Animal Welfare Working Group (AGT). Stricter national rules regarding stocking densities and other measures.	A national report in 2011 (Bundesrepublik Deutschland, 2011) revealed that 2,382 farms out of 82,946 (i.e. 3%) were controlled. Of these, 87% were in compliance. The last FVO audit took place in two Länder in 2012 (DG-SANCO 2012-6380) and found no attention points.	Post mortem data indicative of infringements of welfare legislation must be communicated to the broiler keeper and the CA for animal welfare.

Italy	Fully transposed into national legislation (2010) by the Ministry of Health (MDS).	Implementation has been via the Animal Welfare Unit of the MDS (the CCA) working with Regional competent authorities in 19 Italian Regional Governments and 2 Autonomous Provincial Governments.	A national audit report in 2011 (MDS, 2012) indicated that of 2,127 farms, 819 (38%) were inspected and 86% were compliant. In a 2011 audit, the FVO noted that official controls were 'generally satisfactory', but that there were some concerns (DG-SANCO 2011-6048).	MDS audits the local competent veterinary services and makes direct inspections on farms and during transport. Outcomes of checks at slaughter are used to assess welfare conditions of chickens kept at a higher stocking density than 33 kg/m ² in farms allowed to do that by way of derogation, according to directive 2007/43/EC (MDS, 2013).
France	Fully transposed into national legislation (2010) by the Ministry of Agriculture (MAAP).	Implementation has been undertaken via the CCA, the Directorate General for Food (DGAL) resulting in a harmonised approach (DG-SANCO 2012-6446).	National data from 2009 (DGAL, 2013), indicates that from 13,282 farms in total, 180 were inspected (1%) and amongst these, 53 (30%) were in compliance. An FVO Report on animal welfare was undertaken in 2012 (DG-SANCO 2012-6446) stating that compliance was 'generally comprehensive'.	Slaughter data for meat chickens informs the system of controls.
Spain	Fully transposed into national legislation (2010) by the Ministry of Agriculture (MAGRAMA). There was pre-existing legislation.	The implementation of the new legislation was delegated to the CAs in the 17 Regional Departments of Agriculture and Health in the different Autonomous Communities.	6 full-time inspectors (2012) and 7 in 2013 (MAGRAMA Interview, 2013). Previous FVO slaughter and transport audits (e.g. DG-SANCO 2012-6373; DG-SANCO 2009-8284) and a general audit in Aragon and Castilla y Leon (DG-SANCO 2008-8347) have indicated concerns about Spain's ability to enforce animal welfare regulations.	Slaughter data for meat chickens informs the system of controls.
Poland	Fully transposed into national legislation (2010) by the Government Legislation Center subordinated to the Prime Minister. Agreed with the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD).	Implementation of the new national legislation is the responsibility of the CCA, the General Veterinary Inspectorate (GIW). Certain derogations currently exist.	It is claimed from national data from 2011 that Poland is 100% compliant with the directive (MARD, 2012). The last FVO audit that covered meat chickens was from 2011 (DG-SANCO 2011-6049). It stated that compliance was 'adequate'.	Slaughter data comes from OV's in slaughterhouses. But it is not collated in a unified way. At least 20% of all existing sites in a region are controlled (not less than 4). Data obtained is reported once a year to the GIW.

Romania	Fully transposed into national legislation (2010) by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD).	Implementation undertaken by the CCA for animal welfare, the National Sanitary Veterinary and Food Safety Authority (NSVFSA).	National data in Romania is classified making national compliance figures impossible to calculate. The most recent FVO report on meat chicken welfare was in 2012 (DG-SANCO 2012-6374) and highlighted a number of concerns including a lack of resources and procedures on when to impose sanctions.	Inspection data from slaughterhouses is collated by NSVFSA staff, compiled nationally but not made public.
Slovakia	Fully transposed into national legislation (2010) by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD).	Implementation undertaken by Department of Animal Health and Welfare (DAHW), the CCA for animal welfare in conjunction with the local District Veterinary and Food Administration (DVFA).	In the national report of 2012 (SVFA, 2012), of 113 farms, 65 (58%) were controlled, out of which 59 were in compliance (91%). In a 2011 FVO Report (DG-SANCO 2011-6053) there was concern about the quality of inspections and this was linked to poor compliance with the new stocking density. The State Veterinary and Food Administration (SVFA) has since addressed these audit recommendations.	Slaughter data are collected regionally by the DVFA and compiled nationally by the Department of Hygiene of Products of Animal Origin of the State Veterinary and Food Administration (SFVA). Monitoring is via cumulative daily mortality rates.

Annex 4

The Implementation of the Directive 2008/120/EC across ten countries

Country	Transposition	Implementation	Enforcement	Monitoring
Sweden	Fully transposed into national (2013) by the Ministry of Rural Affairs (MRA).	Implementation activity undertaken by the CCA for animal welfare, the Swedish Board of Agriculture (SBA). Stricter national rules exist.	National controls (SBA) are risk-based and reports have found compliance is mixed (MRA, 2013). The last FVO inspection said compliance is ‘generally satisfactory’ (DG-SANCO 2010-8391) and highlighted the importance of checking stocking densities and taking proportionate action.	Regional farm data is collated by the Swedish Food Agency (SFA). SBA prepares an annual report on numbers of official controls and reported 15% non-compliance in 2012.
UK	Fully transposed into national legislation (2013) by the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra).	Implementation activity undertaken by Defra’s and its executive agency, the Animal Health and Veterinary Laboratories (AHVLA). Some stricter national rules exist. AHVLA uses a risk-based system of controls based on data from farm inspections.	NGOs point out that the absolute number of visits is relatively low making compliance difficult to achieve. In the absence of published compliance data, welfare standards are said to be mixed (RSPCA, 2011; CIWF, 2013). The FVO audit in 2009 (DG-SANCO 2009-8268) stated that the enforcement system was “satisfactory” despite some observed non-compliances.	Farm control data is gathered by the AHVLA using a risk-based system of controls.
Nether Lands	Fully transposed into national legislation (2013) by the Ministry Economics (Min. EL & I).	Controls undertaken by the CCA, Dutch General Inspection Service (AID), now part of the Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority (NVWA). Some stricter national rules exist.	In 2011, the NVWA controlled 737 ‘places of production’ of which 499 showed no offenses (68% compliance) (NVWA, 2012). All farms declared not to be ready before 1.1.13 were visited in October 2012. An FVO audit in 2012 (DG-SANCO 2012-6376) reported positive preventative action ahead of the 2013 deadline: an action plan and a communication strategy.	Control is risk-based, which means that frequency and the interventions vary, for instance according to non-compliance in previous years. The NVWA has insufficient capacity to control all holdings, so controls only a sample of the ‘places of production’.
Germany	Fully transposed into national legislation (2013) by the Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Consumer Protection (BMELV).	Implemented by CAs in 16 Federal States who each control compliance with the legislation via guidance from the Animal Welfare Working Group (AGT). Some stricter national rules.	According to the national report to the EC in 2011 (Bundesrepublik Deutschland 2011), 4,271 from 99,614 farms in total (4%) were controlled, and 3,139 farms (74%) were compliant. An FVO audit in 2012 noted that a multi-level initiative re. tail-docking suggests good coordination (DG-SANCO 2012-6380).	Farm control data comes from routine and prompted controls. No post mortem data is used for animal welfare monitoring.

Italy	Fully transposed into national legislation (2013) by the Ministry of Health (MDS).	Implementation has been via the Animal Welfare Unit of the Ministry of Health (Central Competent Authority) working with Regional competent authorities in 19 Italian Regional Governments and 2 Autonomous Provincial Governments. Italian legislation is neither ahead nor behind the directive.	In 2011, the national authority reported that 25% of the Italian pig farms (3,905 of 15,837 farms) which are subjected to control by the competent authority have been inspected officially, resulting in 896 non-compliances, i.e. 77% compliance (MDS, 2012). A 2011 FVO audit noted some progress (DG-SANCO 2011-6048) but there were concerns about how widespread change is.	Farm control is carried out according to Commission Decision 2006/778/EC and to selection criteria in the PNBA (MDS, 2010). This includes a minimum of 15% of pig farms being inspected yearly which equates to a farm inspection once every six years on average.
France	Fully transposed into national legislation (2013) by the Ministry of Food, Feed, Agriculture and Fisheries (MAAP).	Implementation has been undertaken via the CCA, the Directorate General for Food (DGAL) and its sub-directorate for animal health and welfare (SDSPA).	National inspection data from 2009 (DGAL, 2013) states that of 23,412 farms, 366 (2%) were inspected. Of these, 110 (30%) were non-compliant with national regulations. An FVO inspection in 2012 (DG-SANCO 2012-6446) states that France is generally “well organised”.	A national database inventories all the data from inspections and also data is automatically collected on mortality, etc. This database is linked to the one used in the slaughterhouse to check if sanitary problems occur.
Spain	Fully transposed into national legislation (2013) by the Ministry of Agriculture. The time to adopt EU legislation ranged from 1 to 4 years because of the federal system.	The implementation of the new legislation was delegated to the CAs in the 17 Regional Departments of Agriculture and Health in the different Autonomous Communities.	The Ministry reports 100% of gestating sows in group housing systems (MAGRAMA, 2013). Action plans are being used. An FVO audit in two regions in 2008 (DG-SANCO General Audit 2008-8347) reported that ‘sanctions applied are not always dissuasive’.	There are regular controls to monitor the farms which are carried out by the competent regional authorities. However, no farm control data is compiled from the regions to give a national picture.
Poland	Fully transposed into national legislation (2013) by the Government Legislation Center and Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD).	Implementation of the new national legislation is the responsibility of the CCA, the General Veterinary Inspectorate (GVI).	The national authority claimed 100% compliance in 2012 (Interview with GVI, 2013). An FVO audit in 2011 (DG-SANCO 2011-6049) stated that, concerning the group housing of sows, 65 % of pig farms were in compliance.	The General Veterinary Inspectorate (GVI) prepares written instructions for Veterinary Officers who control farms.
Romania	Transposed into national legislation by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD).	Implementation undertaken by the CCA for animal welfare, the National Sanitary Veterinary and Food Safety Authority (NSVFSA).	No national compliance data available in Romania due to its ‘classification’. An FVO Report in 2012 (DG-SANCO 2012-6374) stated that Romania has been ‘proactive’ in assessing the compliance of its commercial pig premises and is ‘very well placed’ for the 2013 deadline.	Farm inspection data is collated by NSVFSA staff, compiled nationally but not made public.

Slovakia	Fully transposed into national legislation (2012) by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD). The legislation does not go ahead or behind the EU regulations.	Implementation undertaken by Department of Animal Health and Welfare (DAHW), the CCA for animal welfare in conjunction with the local District Veterinary and Food Administration (DVFA).	A national report (SVFA, 2012) stated that of 1,658 farms, 372 controls were made (22%) out of which 335 were compliant (90%). An FVO Report in 2011 (DG-SANCO 2011-6053) indicated significant problems, some of which have been addressed since.	Farm control data is monitored by the DVFA, compiled by the DAHW and published in annual reports.
-----------------	--	---	--	---

Annex 5

The Follow-Up of the EU Reg. 1099/2009 across ten countries

Country	Adoption	Implementation	Enforcement	Monitoring
Sweden	Fully valid as national legislation in 2013. Overseen by the Ministry of Rural Affairs (MRA). Stricter national legislation.	Execution undertaken by the CCA for animal welfare, the Swedish Board of Agriculture (SBA). The Swedish Food Agency (SFA) is the CCA for food safety, employing official veterinarians (OVs) at slaughterhouses.	Regional inspections (SFA) are risk-based and controls every 2 years. Regional reports highlight some cases of non-compliances. The SBA prepares an annual report on all official controls (e.g. MRA, 2013). The last FVO report on welfare at slaughter was in 2003 (DG-SANCO 2003-9210) indicating compliance was 'generally adequate'.	National slaughter data, compiled by the SFA in the regions, is available every 6 th week.
UK	Valid since 2009. National legislation expected to be updated late in 2013. Stricter national rules. Overseen by the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra).	Follow-up activity undertaken by Defra which is responsible for animal welfare on farms and at slaughterhouses. Enforcement activity undertaken by non-departmental executive public bodies, the Animal Health and Veterinary Laboratories Agency (AHVLA) and the Food Standards Agency (FSA) using a risk-based system of controls.	In the absence of published compliance data by Defra, the picture on the ground has been characterised by NGOs (e.g. FAWC, 2003) as problematic due to the rationalisation of the industry. The last FVO report on welfare at slaughter was in 2007 (DG-SANCO 2007-7337) which indicated compliance with previous legislation was 'generally satisfactory'.	In general, high levels of public concern about animal welfare in slaughterhouse have attracted the attention of the AHVLA and frequency of inspection has risen. In the case of chickens the trigger reports (set at a higher level than the EU Directive) provide post-mortem data on meat chickens on a daily basis.
Netherlands	Fully valid since 2009. National legislation at the same level since 2013. Overseen by the Ministry of Economics, (Min, EL&I).	Execution activity undertaken by the CCA, the Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority (NVWA). Implementation has so far been variable.	NVWA prepares a risk-based annual control plan for every slaughterhouse based on the frequency of audits. A 2011 national audit found 46% compliance (NVWA, 2012). In 2006, the FVO stated that Dutch measures generally go beyond EU rules (DG-SANCO 2012-8041).	Inspection data is entered in the databases of the NVWA. This forms the basis of quarterly and annual reports to the ministry as well as a risk assessment.

Germany	Valid since 2009. Fully valid as national legislation in 2013. Overseen by the Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Consumer Protection (BMELV). Some more detailed and stricter national regulations.	Follow-up by CAs in 16 Federal States who each control compliance with the legislation via guidance from the Animal Welfare Working Group (AGT).	Two national audits done in 2008 covering knowledge skills, movement, lairaging, restraint, stunning and religious slaughter (DG SANCO 2008-7764; DG SANCO 2008-7980). The last FVO report specifically on welfare at slaughter was in 2003 (DG-SANCO 2003-9038) which stated that compliance was 'largely satisfactory' with weaknesses being addressed.	Only routine and prompted control data.
Italy	Valid since 2009. National legislation at the same level by 2013. Overseen by the Ministry of Health (MDS). Italian national legislation is neither ahead nor behind the regulation.	Locally competent veterinary services carry out checks on follow-up. They report annually to the Governments of the Italian Regions and Autonomous Provinces.	In 2011, 993 slaughterhouses were inspected resulting in 151 non-compliances (MDS, 2012a). This roughly represents an 85% minimum rate of compliance (although more compliance data needs to be gathered). The last FVO Report was in 2008 (DG-SANCO 2008-7691). It highlighted a lack of training on animal welfare at slaughter.	Monitoring data is transmitted to the CCA, the Ministry of Health (MDS). In 2011, there were 2,693 checks of stunning efficiency which revealed 15 non-compliances/ prescriptions resulting in 11 penalties (MDS, 2012b).
France	Adopted in 2009. Fully valid as national legislation in 2013. Overseen by the Ministry of Agriculture (MAAP).	Execution has been undertaken via the CCA, the Directorate General for Food (DGAL).	National data for compliance with the killing regulation are not yet available. FVO Reports covering animal welfare and slaughter include one in 2002 (DG-SANCO 2002-8554) and one in 2010 (DG-SANCO 2010-8627). The latter highlighted some deficiencies in the availability of official veterinarians.	Farm inspection data uses national databases to identify the movements of animals. If a problem is highlighted during slaughter, the inspector should normally inform the Departmental Directorate for the Protection of the Population (DDPP).
Spain	Adopted in 2009. Fully valid as national legislation in 2013. Overseen by the Ministry of Health, Services and Equality (MHSE).	The follow-up of the new regulation was delegated to the CAs in the 17 Regional Departments of Agriculture and Health in the different Autonomous Communities. The pattern of implementation has been similar in each.	No compliance data currently available. A previous FVO audit specifically of welfare at slaughter (DG-SANCO 2007-7328) had a number of concerns about compliance.	The regional CAs use monitoring data from slaughterhouses and some farms to inform their risk-based approach to inspection.

Poland	Adopted in 2009. Fully valid as national legislation in 2013. Overseen by the the Government Legislation Center and the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD).	Follow-up of the new national legislation is the responsibility of the CCA, the General Veterinary Inspectorate (GVI).	In the most recently available national data (June, 2013; source: Interview GVI) compliance was mixed for: stunning methods (54.5%), handling (18.5%), check on stunning (59%) and bleeding monitoring procedure (3.5%). A 2010 FVO animal welfare report (DG-SANCO 2010-8387) had some concerns over monitoring and enforcement powers.	There is no unified way of collecting data or a unified dataset. OV's control slaughterhouses: at least 20% of all existing in a region, not less than 4. Data obtained are reported twice a year to the General Veterinary Inspectorate (GVI).
Romania	Adopted in 2009. Fully valid as national legislation in 2013. Overseen by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD).	Follow-up undertaken by the CCA for animal welfare, the National Sanitary Veterinary and Food Safety Authority (NSVFSA).	National data in Romania is classified so current compliance figures are hard to acquire. Romania's reply to the EC's Member State Slaughter Questionnaire (EC, 2012) revealed a mixed picture. The last FVO animal welfare audit, in 2006, had concerns for compliance at the high number of subsistence farms (DG-SANCO 2006-unpublished).	NSVFSA staff do checks at slaughter and this data is collected and compiled nationally, but this data is not released to the public and is considered 'classified' by the authorities.
Slovakia	Adopted in 2009. Fully valid as national legislation in 2012. Overseen by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD).	Follow-up undertaken by Department of Animal Health and Welfare (DAHW), the CCA for animal welfare in conjunction with the local District Veterinary and Food Administration (DVFA).	In the national report of 2012 (SVFA, 2012), of 89 slaughterhouses, there were 509 controls. Out of this, 137 controls by the animal health and welfare inspectors and 372 controls by the hygiene inspectors. In a 2004 FVO Report (DG-SANCO 2004-7233) there was concern about the quality of inspections and this was linked to poor compliance with the new stocking density.	National slaughter data is collected and compiled by the Department of Animal Health and Welfare (DAHW) of the State Veterinary and Food Administration (SVFA) and published in an annual report.

Annex 6

Ten country narratives of directive 2007/43/EC

Sweden

In Sweden, the Meat Chicken directive was transposed on time in 2010 by the Ministry of Rural Affairs (MRA). There were several stricter pre-existing national rules and regulations on animal welfare. These included mandatory daylight access, banning beak trimming, broiler breeder welfare, ammonia levels, no antibiotic feed additives and noise levels. Sweden limits the maximum stocking density to 20kg/m², with a possible derogation to 36 kg/m² under a controlled program that puts a limit on the number of birds (GAIN, 2011).

Implementation of 2007/43/EC has been coordinated by the CCA for animal welfare, the Swedish Board of Agriculture (SBA). Some County Administrative Boards (CABs) carry out specific inspections on broiler farms. National slaughter data, collated by the Swedish Food Agency (SFA), is available every 6th week, but not analysed to give a compliance figure (Sweden Interviewee A). SBA prepares an annual report on numbers of official controls.

In terms of enforcement, the level of compliance is high. There are some national reports of non-compliance regarding stocking density (overstocking 1-2 kg/m² if mortality has been unexpectedly low and growth rate unexpectedly high), a few cases of windows for daylight being closed, and problems with control and mechanical equipment (MRA, 2013). The last FVO audit with meat chicken data was in 2010 (DG-SANCO 2010-8391). This described Sweden's enforcement regime as being in a transition phase. The report notes that "Enforcement, although generally effective, can be very slow to achieve results."

The private assurance scheme run by the Swedish Poultry Meat Association (SPMA) involves an annual-biannual control visit by the National standards officer (one person for the entire country) to all farms affiliated to the broiler welfare programme.

The SPMA runs short training courses for broiler producers covering animal welfare.

References

- DG-SANCO (2010-8391), Final Report of a specific audit carried out in Sweden from 12 to 21 October 2010 in order to evaluate the implementation of controls for animal welfare on farms and during transport in the context of a general audit, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)
- GAIN (Global Agriculture Information Network) (2011), Implementation of Animal Welfare Directives in the EU, Washington: United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)
- Ministry of Rural Affairs (MRA) (Jordbruksdepartementet) (2013), Report to the Commission in accordance with decision 2006/778/EC on minimum requirements for gathering information from inspections related to farm animal welfare, Jönköping: MRA, 27.6.13

UK

In the UK, the Meat Chicken directive (2007/43/EC) was fully transposed into national legislation in 2010 by the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra). This was facilitated in large part by several items of pre-existing and/or concurrent legislation and guidance.

Implementation activity is undertaken by the CCA, Defra and its executive agencies, the Animal Health and Veterinary Laboratories Agency (AHVLA) and the Food Standards Agency (FSA). Data collected by the Food Standards Agency's (FSA) Operations Group on certain conditions may trigger an on farm inspection by Animal Health (AHVLA). The trigger levels for a possible inspection have been set on the basis of national average data and a pilot study with the meat chicken industry. This monitoring data comes from trigger reports which provide post-mortem data on a daily basis (DG-SANCO 2013-6822).

In terms of enforcement, the FVO reported in 2013 (DG-SANCO 2013-6822) that, due to low absolute numbers of inspections, Defra, has "very little concrete information" about the situation on the farms or in the sheds. Defra commissioned academic research in 2012 aimed at getting more precise figures for compliance (Defra, 2012). The FVO further noted that relatively low-level trigger

reports are providing *post-mortem* monitoring data on a daily basis which *could well* help to identify problems more swiftly. Plus, farm-level action plans and graduated enforcement action have been introduced, but the FVO feels some question marks remain about the UK system's ability to boost welfare.

The FVO noted in 2013 (DG-SANCO 2013-6822) that sufficient training for keepers of meat chickens, of a recognised standard, and provided within a national proficiency framework, is available in the UK.

Welfare assurance in the UK meat chicken industry is dominated by various private assurance schemes. The industry's leading scheme, Red Tractor, typically inspects several times a year. Retail-led schemes also make periodic spot check visits on farms and in slaughterhouses each year.

References

Defra (2012), Evaluation of Meat Chicken Regulations (AW1144),

<http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=2&ProjectID=17720>

DG-SANCO (2013-6822), Final Report of an audit carried out in the United Kingdom from 25 February to 01 March 2013 in order to evaluate the implementation of Council of Europe requirements for animal welfare in major farmed species and official controls on chickens kept for meat production, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

Netherlands

In the Netherlands, the Meat Chicken directive (2007/43/EC) was fully transposed into national legislation in 2010 by the Ministry of Agriculture (LNV; since the Ministry of Economics (EL&I). This was aided in large part by several items of pre-existing and/or concurrent legislation and guidance. The cutting of chicken beaks is forbidden from 2018 on according the Dutch Intervention Decision ("Ingrepbesluit).

Implementation began as an industry covenant (2009) but has since been coordinated by the CCA, Dutch General Inspection Service (AID), now part of the Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority (NVWA). Animal welfare problems are partly due to the high stocking density. The Dutch regulation makes use of additional requirements to allow for a maximum stocking rate up to 42 kg/m². Most Dutch keepers (90%) chose the range between 39-42 kg/m². This is only allowed if holders are able to limit the amount of animals with hock burns and foot pad lesions. In 2012, the Ministry of Agriculture (EL&I) announced that the water bath method for stunning will be phased out from September 2012 onwards and new stunning and killing methods will be implemented for broilers (Min EL&I, 2012).

In terms of enforcement, control is based on risk assessment, which means that frequency and the interventions vary, for instance according to non-compliance in previous years. The NVWA gives verbal warnings (without a deadline), written warnings (with a deadline) and fines. A 2011 national audit found that of 230 places of production controlled, 105 (46%) complied with the rules (NVWA, 2012). 31 keepers received a verbal warning and in 4 cases written warnings were issued. This audit also noted that most problems concerned light requirements and the delivery of flock data. The FVO stated in 2012 that the Dutch system is "satisfactorily verifying compliance". However, the FVO also reported that the CA had not provided equipment to enable the inspectors to verify the measurement of ammonia and CO₂ levels on farms (DG-SANCO 2012-6376). In 2012, 48 farms were checked by the NVWA. Non-compliance was noted with regard to: stocking density above 42kg/m², light intensity and data registration (for example on mortality) (Interview with NVWA, 2013).

In terms of training, a wide range of public and private bodies offer support to keepers.

Regarding industry, there are a number of private quality assurance schemes such as IKB ('integrated chain control') certification and control which do not replace control and registering of information for EU Directives by public authorities. The requirements for the IKB certificate include aspects such as light, ventilation, drink, feed, veterinary visits and the use of antibiotics. IKB checks all holdings every year. There is also "Beter Leven" (better life), a private animal welfare label supported by the Ministry of Agriculture and launched in 2006. Three star equals with organic

production, two stars means that the welfare of animal is assured at a considerably higher level than required by law (e.g. outdoor access for broilers), and also meat produced under 1 star is somewhat above the level of legal requirements (e.g. age at slaughter for broilers).

References

Beter Leven web site, <http://beterleven.dierenbescherming.nl/>

DG-SANCO (2012-6376), Final Report of an audit carried out in the Netherlands from 21 to 25 May 2012 in order to evaluate the implementation of controls on animal welfare on farms and during transport, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

Hindle, V.A., Lambooi, E., Reimert, H.G.M., Workel, L.D., Gerritzen, M.A. (2009) *Electrical water bath stunning of poultry. An evaluation of the present situation in Dutch slaughterhouses and alternative electrical stunning methods*. WUR Animal Sciences Report, No. 200, Wageningen.

Min EL&I (2012), Note on Animal Welfare and Health, p.18

NVWA (Dutch Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority) (2012), Inspection results, Annual Report (*Jaarverslag*), 2.7.12

Germany

In Germany, the Meat Chicken directive (2007/43/EC) was fully transposed into national legislation a year early, in 2009, by the Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Consumer Protection (BMELV). Beforehand there was only a voluntary agreement between industry and ministries in place.

In terms of implementation, work on the directive has been overseen by CAs in 16 Federal States (Länder) who each control compliance with the legislation via guidance from the Länder Welfare Working Group (AGT). The AGT has elaborated guidelines (“implementation guidelines for broilers”) for the implementation of the national broiler regulation. Germany limits the maximum stocking density to 39 kg/m² (35 kg/m² if slaughter weight under 1600g). Stocking densities over 33 kg/m² must be notified to the CA. Monitoring of slaughter data is done by the official veterinaries of the districts. Meat hygiene data are collected by the CAs for meat hygiene statistics, but not used for systematic animal welfare monitoring because of data protection reasons. However, post mortem data indicative of infringements of welfare legislation must be communicated to the broiler keeper and the CA for animal welfare. Data can also be requested by the CA for animal welfare for specific reasons.

In terms of enforcement, according to the national report to the EC in 2011 (Bundesrepublik Deutschland, 2011) revealed that 2,382 from 82,946 farms in total (3%) were controlled and 87% of these were in compliance with 2007/43/EC. There was an FVO audit in two Länder in 2012 – Brandenburg and Saxony - and this report had no attention points for meat chickens (DG-SANCO 2012-6380).

With respect to training, a wide range of public and private bodies offer support to keepers. At the Länder level Chambers of Agriculture take the lead in vocational training in North and West Germany with Federal States’ institutes of agriculture working in South and East Germany. The aim is to obtain certificates of competence for keeping of broilers and in relation to slaughter/killing and related activities.

There are 4 private animal welfare assurance schemes four for broiler meat, three from NGOs, and one from industry. In the conventional sector most broiler farms participate in a private quality assurance scheme (QS; http://www.q-s.de/home_gb.html) which among others controls compliance with animal welfare legislation via plausibility control of documentation.

References

Bundesrepublik Deutschland (2011), Jahresbericht 2011 der Bundesrepublik Deutschland zum mehrjährigen nationalen Kontrollplan nach Verordnung (EG) Nr. 882/2004, Bonn: Germany, Bundesministerium für Ernährung, Landwirtschaft und Verbraucherschutz (BMELV)

DG-SANCO (2012-6380), Final Report of an audit carried out in Germany from 06 to 10 February 2012 in order to evaluate the implementation of controls for animal welfare on farms and during transport, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

Italy

The Meat Chicken directive (2007/43/EC) was fully transposed into national legislation in Italy in 2010 by the Ministry of Health (MDS).

Implementation has been led by the Animal Welfare Unit of the Ministry of Health (the Central Competent Authority) which works with Regional Competent authorities in 19 Italian Regional Governments and 2 Autonomous Provincial Governments.

Regarding enforcement, MDS audits the local competent veterinary services and makes direct inspections on farms and during transport. A national audit report in 2011 (MDS, 2012) indicated that of 2,127 farms, 819 (38%) were inspected and 86% were compliant. The main deficiencies were related to staff, registers, livestock buildings and rearing methods. In a 2011 audit, the FVO noted that official controls were generally satisfactory, but there were concerns about resources to measure environmental parameters and stocking densities in subdivided buildings (DG-SANCO 2011-6048).

In terms of monitoring, the outcomes of checks at slaughter are used to assess welfare conditions of chickens kept at a higher stocking density than 33 kg/m² in farms allowed to do that by way of derogation, according to directive 2007/43/EC (MDS, 2013).

Regarding training, the *National Plan for Animal Welfare* (PNBA) (MDS, 2010) aims to improve training resources for veterinarians and farmers.

In terms of private schemes, only a few farm assurance schemes, including upgraded standards for animal welfare, have been developed in Italy for broiler meat.

References

DG-SANCO (2011-6048), Final Report of an audit carried out in Italy from 09 to 18 November 2011 in order to evaluate the implementation of controls for animal welfare on farms and during transport, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

MDS (Ministero della Salute / Ministry of Health) (2010), Piano Nazionale Benessere Animale (PNBA)

MDS (Ministero della Salute / Ministry of Health) (2012), Relazione attività ispettiva anno 2011 ai sensi della decisione 2006/778/CE, Direzione generale della sanità animale e dei farmaci veterinari. 30 Novembre, 2012, ultimo aggiornamento 5 Dicembre, 2012.

MDS (Ministero della Salute / Ministry of Health) (2013), Decreto 4 Febbraio 2013 Disposizioni attuative in materia di protezione di polli allevati per la produzione di carne, ai sensi degli articoli 3, 4, 6 e 8 del decreto legislativo 27 Settembre 2010, n. 181

France

Chicken directive (2007/43/EC) was fully transposed into national legislation in 2010 by the Ministry of Agriculture (MAAP). There is no national policy on farm animal welfare.

Implementation has been undertaken via the CCA, the Directorate General for Food (DGAL). This has facilitated a “harmonised approach to inspections that is generally comprehensive in covering the legal requirements” (DG-SANCO 2012-6446). DGAL works with local vets and inspectors via the Departmental Directorate for the Protection of the Population (DDPP).

Regarding enforcement, national data from 2009 (DGAL, 2013) indicated that from 13,282 farms in total, 180 were inspected (1%) were inspected, and on 126 (70%) of these farms infringements were found. This equals a 30% compliance rate (but it comes from a relatively small sample). A 2012 FVO audit notes that compliance was generally comprehensive (DG-SANCO 2012-6446). However, this audit also pointed out that the competent authorities’ (CA) procedures do not adequately cover the assessment or verification of environmental parameters such as light intensity, relative humidity and gas concentrations.

In terms of monitoring of the slaughter data, it is not clear from national sources how often, which indicators are recorded or how this data is used.

With regard to training, there is INFOMA (National Training Institute of Personnel of Ministry of Agriculture) for public staff (veterinary public health, technicians, etc.), as well as the National Veterinary Services School (ENSV) which performs continuous training sessions.

On private assurance schemes, there are four in France covering meat chickens.

References

DGAL (Directorate General for Food) (2013), Control data for 2009 shared with EUWeINet national researcher
DG-SANCO (2012-6446), Final Report of an audit carried out in France from 12 to 22 November 2012 in order to evaluate the implementation of controls for animal welfare on farms and during transport, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

Spain

The Meat Chicken directive (2007/43/EC) was fully transposed into national legislation in Spain by 2010 by the Ministry of Agriculture (MAGRAMA). One policy instrument specifically for meat chickens, RD 1084/2005, pre-existed the legislation.

The implementation of the new legislation was then delegated to the competent authorities (CAs) in the 17 Regional Departments of Agriculture and Health in the different Autonomous Communities. Spain interpreted the legislation as implying an increase in stocking density with regards to the previous legislation (RD 1084/2005). Regarding monitoring, the outcomes of checks at slaughter are fed back into the system of controls.

In terms of enforcement, there were 6 full-time inspectors in 2012 and 7 in 2013 (MAGRAMA Interview, 2013) however inspection rates are not known. Compliance has been boosted with inspector coordination and farmer training but non-compliances reported regionally and compiled nationally typically includes problems regarding documentation (MAGRAMA Interview, 2013). Previous FVO slaughter and transport audits (e.g. DG-SANCO 2012-6373; DG-SANCO 2009-8284) and a general audit (DG-SANCO 2008-8347) have indicated concerns about Spain's ability to enforce its animal welfare regulations.

On training, MAGRAMA currently considers that animal welfare training should be improved and strengthened, both at the level inspection and at the farmers' or slaughterhouse personnel level (MAGRAMA Interview, 2013).

On private assurance schemes, there are no major private or NGO-driven farm assurance schemes in relation to animal welfare claims.

References

DG-SANCO (2008-8347), General audit, Spain – 2008, Final Report, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

DG-SANCO (2009-8284), Final Report of a mission carried out in Spain from 23 March to 03 April 2009 in order to evaluate the implementation of rules for the protection of animals during transport and at the time of slaughter or killing, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

DG-SANCO (2012-6373), Final Report of an audit carried out in Spain from 23 January to 03 February 2012 in order to evaluate the implementation of controls for animal welfare at the time of slaughter, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

Poland

In Poland, the Meat Chicken directive (2007/43/EC) was fully transposed into national legislation by 2010 by Government Legislation Centre subordinated to the Prime Minister. New national legislation was agreed with the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD). There is no special national policy on animal welfare.

Implementation of the new national legislation is the responsibility of the CCA, the General Veterinary Inspectorate (GIW). The new national legislation has derogations to allow farmers permission to keep their stocking density up to 42kg/m², if they have, for example, very low mortality. But the density will drop to 33kg/m². Farmers are obliged to record basic data at farm (e.g. mortality rate, cause of chicken death, number of chicken, allowed surface) which inspectors draw on. There is no unified way of collating regional slaughter data at the national level nor is there a standardised set of indicators. OV's control at slaughterhouses. They cover at least 20% of all sites in a region, ensuring no less than 4 sites are covered. Data obtained are reported once a year to the GIW.

In terms of enforcement, the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development appointed a Chief Veterinary Officer who, with the General Veterinary Inspectorate (GVI), prepares written instructions for Veterinary Officers. Regional inspectors (OVs) control farms but the percentage of the farms controlled per year is low because there is a high number of broiler farms in Poland. OVs prepare an annual report on official controls for The General Veterinary Inspectorate. It is claimed from national data from 2011 that Poland is 100% compliant with the directive (MARD, 2012). The last FVO inspection that covered meat chicken data was from 2011 (DG-SANCO 2011-6049). It stated that compliance was 'adequate' suggesting that one concern was that keepers did not hold training certificates attesting to their competence.

A number of public and private bodies in Poland undertake training relevant to 2007/43/EC. Training for farmers was provided by agricultural advisory centres and farmers' organisations. Training for official veterinarians was provided by The General Veterinary Inspectorate.

Regarding broiler meat, there are two private quality assurance schemes such as Quality Assurance for Food Products (QAFP) and Kurczak Zagrodowy z Podlasia" (the free range chicken from Podlasie province). The labels were set up in 2010. It is not significant in volume terms. They produce less than 1% of all broiler meat (Interview with GIW, 2013).

References

DG-SANCO (2011-6049), Final Report of an audit carried out in Poland from 25 May to 01 June 2011 in order to evaluate the implementation of controls for animal welfare on farms and during transport, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

MARD (Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development / Ministerstwo Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi) (2012), Information shared with EUWelNet national researcher

Romania

Directive 2007/43/EC was fully transposed into national legislation in Romania by 2010 by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD). Romania has no specific national policy on animal welfare.

Implementation has been undertaken by the CCA for animal welfare, the National Sanitary Veterinary and Food Safety Authority (NSVFSA). There are 42 inspectors at county directorate level, plus one inspector at national level. Inspection data from slaughterhouses and farms is checked by these staff and this data is collected and compiled nationally. However, this data is not released to the public and is considered 'classified' by the authorities.

Regarding enforcement, the most recent FVO report on meat chicken welfare in Romania was in 2012 (DG-SANCO 2012-6374). It highlighted a lack of resources in risk prioritisation, a lack of dissuasive sanctions for commercial transporters and overstocking in laying hen premises, plus a lack of procedures on when to impose sanctions.

With training, the National Sanitary Veterinary and Food Safety Authority (NSVFSA) organises periodic courses through a private company.

In Romania, there are no private assurance schemes for poultry.

References

DG-SANCO (2012-6374), Final Report of an audit carried out in Romania from 21 to 29 November 2012 in order to evaluate the implementation of controls for animal welfare on farms and during transport, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

Slovakia

In Slovakia, the Meat Chicken directive (2007/43/EC) was fully transposed into national legislation by 2010 by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD). There is no special national policy on animal welfare.

Implementation was undertaken by the Department of Animal Health and Welfare (DAHW), the CCA for animal welfare in conjunction with the local District Veterinary and Food Administration (DVFA). Slaughter data are collected regionally by the DVFA and compiled nationally by the Department of Hygiene of Products of Animal Origin of the State Veterinary and Food Administration (SFVA). Monitoring is via cumulative daily mortality rates.

In terms of compliance, in the national report of 2012 (SVFA, 2012), of 113 farms, 65 (58%) that were controlled, 59 of which were in compliance (91%). In a 2011 FVO Report (DG-SANCO 2011-6053) there was concern about the quality of inspections and this was linked to poor compliance with the new stocking density of 39 kg/m² and hence, for example, cumulative daily mortality rate monitoring and the adequate control of environmental parameters. It seems that keeping the cumulative daily mortality rate under the maximum allowed 3.52% was a major obstacle. In addition, at the time of testing, the central competent authority (CCA) did not have the equipment to carry out such checks. The State Veterinary and Food Administration (SVFA) has since addressed these audit recommendations.

Training comes via the DVFA which organises accredited courses through the Institute of Postgraduate Education of Veterinary Surgeons in Košice.

There are no private assurance schemes for poultry in Slovakia.

References

DG-SANCO (2011-6053), Final Report of an audit carried out in Slovakia from 06 to 14 September 2011 in order to evaluate the implementation of controls for animal welfare on farms and during transport, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

SVFA (State Veterinary and Food Administration) (2012), Annual Report
http://www.svssr.sk/dokumenty/zakladne_info/Vyrocnna_sprava_2012a.pdf

Annex 7

Ten country narratives of directive 2008/120/EC

Sweden

In Sweden, the Pig directive (2008/120/EC) was transposed by January 1st, 2013, by the Ministry of Rural Affairs (MRA). There were several stricter pre-existing national rules and regulations on animal welfare including daylight access, noise level, ban on fully slatted floor, requirement for proper bedding material, lower stocking density, ban on stalls for pregnant and lactating sows (i.e. no crates), no tolerance for tail docking and so on.

Implementation of 2008/120/EC has been coordinated by the CCA for animal welfare, the Swedish Board of Agriculture (SBA). Some County Administrative Boards (CABs) carry out specific inspections on farms. Regional monitoring farm data from the CABs suggests that the national authorities need regional monitoring data to be better compiled to give a more definitive national picture of animal welfare concerns (Swedish Interviewee A).

In terms of compliance, regulations related to the ban on tail-docking and crating of dry or pregnant sows are completely complied with. However, there were reports of 15% non-compliance in 2012, for example, in relation to temporary crating of sows during the first days after parturition, buildings, mechanical equipment, feed, water and also to documentation/record keeping (MRA, 2013). There were also non-compliances related to manipulable material, control, space, floor surface, fibre feed, staff and mutilations. Examples were absence of straw for comfort and occupation, poor cleaning and sanitation, and overstocking (MRA, 2013). The most recent FVO audits on pig welfare were carried out in 2007 (DG-SANCO 2007-7336) and 2010 (DG-SANCO 2010-8391). Compliance, according to the FVO, was generally satisfactory, but the national authorities were told to be more stringent in checking information from the farmer i.e. on stocking density, and in taking proportional action in cases of non-compliance.

There is a private assurance scheme which covers 99 % of pigs produced.

Training of future pig producers is mainly carried out by the agricultural schools/colleges, and short specific training courses for pig producers are also supplied by Djurhälsovården (the Swedish Animal Health Service).

References

Ministry of Rural Affairs (MRA) (Jordbruksdepartementet) (2013), Report to the Commission in accordance with decision 2006/778/EC on minimum requirements for gathering information from inspections related to farm animal welfare, Jönköping: MRA, 27.6.13

DG-SANCO (2007-7336), Final Report of a mission carried out in Sweden from 19 to 23 March 2007 concerning animal welfare on farms, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

DG-SANCO (2010-8391), Final Report of a specific audit carried out in Sweden from 12 to 21 October 2010 in order to evaluate the implementation of controls for animal welfare on farms and during transport in the context of a general audit, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

UK

In the UK, the Pig directive (2008/120/EC) was transposed into national legislation by January 1st, 2013, by the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra). This was facilitated in large part by several items of pre-existing and/or concurrent legislation and guidance including a sow stall ban since 1999, the tethering of sows and gilts being prohibited since 2006 and environmental enrichment having been a requirement since 2001.

Implementation activity is undertaken by the CCA, Defra and its executive agencies, the Animal Health and Veterinary Laboratories Agency (AHVLA) and the Food Standards Agency (FSA). AHVLA and FSA responsible for the monitoring and enforcement of official controls related to this Regulation. Some equivalent national rules pre-existed 2008/120/EC, e.g. the Welfare of Farmed Animals (England) Regulations (WOFAR) 2000. In addition, the Code of Recommendations for the Welfare of Livestock: Pigs provides guidance to farmers on how to comply with the legislation.

AHVLA uses a risk-based system of controls based on data from farm inspections. NGOs point out that the absolute number of visits is relatively low making compliance difficult to evaluate. In the absence of published compliance data, welfare standards are said to be mixed (RSPCA, 2011; CIWF, 2013). The RSPCA advocates greater resources to undertake more controls plus the recording of more welfare indicators. The 2009 FVO report on compliance with animal welfare regulation in the UK (DG-SANCO 2009-8268) revealed that inspections on pig farms were planned and performed in a satisfactory way. However, “some non-compliances observed by the mission team were not detected.” (DG-SANCO 2009-8268). This included a farm in England where a boar was kept in an isolated pen and a farm in Scotland where tail docking of pigs was still routine despite previous checks.

In terms of training, neither the directive nor national regulations contain strict rules, therefore the pig sector training may not be officially prescribed by the CCA, Defra and its training agency ADAS which no longer operates on Defra’s behalf. Private training is offered by British Pig Executive (BPEX) which in conjunction with Defra, Lantra, National Pig Association, Agricultural Development in the Eastern Regions and Agskills has developed pig industry training strategy.

Welfare assurance in the UK pig industry is dominated by the various private assurance schemes in the UK: industry-led schemes (e.g. Red Tractor), Farm Assurance Schemes (industry or retailer led) and retail schemes led by retailers (Tesco, Waitrose, M&S, McDonald). Some welfare standards are higher than the UK minimum e.g. The Soil Association Organic food. There are also high welfare schemes e.g. RSPCA’s Freedom Food. These schemes typically inspect every 6, 9 or 12 months.

References

- Compassion in World Farming (CiWF) (2009), Guidance on Compliance with Provisions of Council Directive 2008/120 EC Laying down Minimum Standards for the Protection of Pigs
- Compassion in World Farming (CiWF) (2013), Press Release: Reports by the Food and Veterinary Office that show failure to enforce provisions of Council Directive 2008/120/EC on the protection of pigs that require enrichment materials to be provided and that ban routine tail docking, September 2013
- DG-SANCO (2009-8268), Final Report of a specific audit carried out in the United Kingdom from 02 to 18 September 2009 in order to evaluate the implementation of rules on animal welfare in the context of a general audit, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)
- Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA)(2011), *The Welfare State: Five Years Measuring Animal Welfare in the UK 2005-2009*

Netherlands

In the Netherlands, the Pig directive (2008/120/EC) was fully transposed into national legislation by 2013 by the Ministry of Economics (EL&I). There were several items of pre-existing and/or concurrent legislation and guidance including some additional demands concerning a greater minimum unobstructed floor space, smaller draining openings, smaller maximum gap and slat width and an earlier shift towards groups housing of sows after service (Mul et al, 2010).

Implementation has been coordinated by the CCA, Dutch General Inspection Service (AID), now part of the Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority (NVWA). Control is risk-based, which means that frequency and the interventions vary, for instance according to non-compliance in previous years. The NVWA has insufficient capacity to control all holdings, so controls only a sample of the ‘places of production’.

In terms of enforcement, the NVWA gives verbal warnings (without a deadline), written warnings (with a deadline) and fines. There is only a small chance of being fined, and the fines for violation are low (Dutch interviews, 2013). In 2011, the NVWA controlled 737 ‘places of production’ of which 499 showed no offenses (68% compliance) (NVWA, 2012). Although more widely known animal welfare problems such as tail biting, stomach disorders, osteochondrosis, respiratory problems, heat stress and use of antibiotics (Leenstra et al, 2011) are partly due the intensive way of production and lack of space. All farms declared not to be ready before 1.1.13 were visited in October 2012. An

FVO audit in 2012 (DG-SANCO 2012-6376) noted this preventative action ahead of the 2013 deadline, as well as an action plan and a communication strategy.

In terms of vocational training, public and private bodies offer support. The main public educational programmes on livestock in Dutch vocational education (MBO), also aiming at pigs, include organisations involved in research and education, Applied University (HBO) level activity, university-level work, e.g. at Wageningen UR Livestock Research.

Regarding industry, there are a number of private quality assurance schemes such as IKB ('integrated chain control') certification and control, which do not replace control and registering of information for EU Directives by public authorities. IKB, for example, checks all holdings every year and also offers training. Data on sales of antibiotics from veterinarians are included in the IKB registration. This information is sent anonymously to the Foundation Animal Medicines Authority who calculate a risk profile. The NVWA can use these anonymous data for their risk assessment. Production under the private label "Better Life" is somewhat above the level of legal requirements (supermarket criteria are e.g. 1m² space per pig) (<http://beterleven.dierenbescherming.nl/>).

References

- DG-SANCO (2012-6376), Final Report of an audit carried out in the Netherlands from 21 to 25 May 2012 in order to evaluate the implementation of controls on animal welfare on farms and during transport, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)
- Hoste, R. (2011) Stand van zaken van implementatie van groepshuisvesting voor dragende zeugen in Nederland, Den Haag: LEI-nota 11-139. Min EL&I,
- Leenstra, F. Neijenhuis, F. Bosma, B. Ruis, M. Smolders, G. Visser, K. (2011), *Ongerief bij rundvee, varkens, pluimvee*, Wageningen UR Livestock Research, report 456, Wageningen
- Mul, M. Vermeij, I. Hindle, V. Spoolder, H. (2010), *EU-Welfare legislation in pigs*, Wageningen UR Livestock Research, report 273, Wageningen
- NVWA (Dutch Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority) (2012), Inspection results, Annual Report (*Jaarverslaag*), 2.7.12

Germany

In Germany, the Pig directive (2008/120/EC) was fully transposed into national legislation in 2013 by the Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Consumer Protection (BMELV) by amending the pre-existing regulation.

In terms of implementation, work on the directive has been overseen by competent authorities (CAs) in 16 Federal States (Länder) who each control compliance with the legislation via guidance from the Länder Animal Welfare Working Group (AGT). The AGT has elaborated guidelines (with its "Handbook on Animal Welfare Inspection") for the implementation of the national pig regulation. Germany has implemented slightly stricter national rules, e.g. regarding provision of day light, slightly more space allowances etc. (GAIN, 2011). In terms of enforcement, control is risk-based according to EC Regulation 882/2004. Additionally, it may be prompted e.g. by reports to the authority. Possible interventions are warnings, fines, cross compliance cut downs, prohibition to keep pigs and so forth.

Regarding enforcement, according to the national report to the EC in 2011 (Bundesrepublik Deutschland 2011) 4,271 farms from 99,614 in total (4%) were controlled, and 3,139 farms (74%) were compliant. An FVO audit in 2012 had some concern regarding group housing of sows and tail-docking of pigs (DG-SANCO 2012-6380).

With respect to training that exists outside the various higher education institutions, a wide range of public and private bodies offer support to farmers. These are supplied at the Länder level by institutions of Chambers of Agriculture (in North and West Germany) or Federal States institutes of agriculture (South and East Germany). Courses are part of the vocational training, of continuing education or specifically as preparation to obtain certificates of competence.

In terms of private assurance schemes, there are five in total in Germany for pig meat, two are industry-led and three come from NGOs. In the conventional sector most pig farms participate in a private quality assurance scheme (QS; http://www.q-s.de/home_gb.html) which among others controls compliance with animal welfare legislation via plausibility control of documentation.

References

- Bundesrepublik Deutschland (2011), Jahresbericht 2011 der Bundesrepublik Deutschland zum mehrjährigen nationalen Kontrollplan nach Verordnung (EG) Nr. 882/2004, Bonn: Germany, Bundesministerium für Ernährung, Landwirtschaft und Verbraucherschutz (BMELV)
- DG-SANCO (2012-6380), Final Report of an audit carried out in Germany from 06 to 10 February 2012 in order to evaluate the implementation of controls for animal welfare on farms and during transport, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)
- GAIN (Global Agricultural Information Network) (2011), Implementation of Animal Welfare Directives in the EU, Report E60042, Washington, D.C.: USDA Foreign Agricultural Service

Italy

The Pig directive (2008/120/EC) was fully transposed into national legislation in Italy by 2013 by the Ministry of Health (MDS). Italian legislation is neither ahead nor behind the directive.

Implementation has been led by the Animal Welfare Unit of the Ministry of Health (the Central Competent Authority) which works with Regional competent authorities in 19 Italian Regional Governments and 2 Autonomous Provincial Governments. MDS audits the local competent veterinary services and makes direct inspections on farms and during transport according to Commission Decision 2006/778/EC and to selection criteria of the PNBA. This includes a minimum of 15% pig farms to be inspected annually which equates to a farm inspection roughly once every six years on average (MDS, 2010). The outcomes of monitoring during farm checks, in particular, feed into the competent authorities' risk-based approach to enforcement.

Regarding enforcement, in 2011, the national authority reported that 25% of the Italian pig farms (3,905 of 15,837 farms), which are subjected to control, have been inspected officially. In 17% of the inspected farms (660 farms), 896 breaches were identified. The type of irregularities concern mostly the housing and the husbandry systems (MDS, 2012). In 2010 and 2009, 30% and 26% of the farms have been inspected, respectively, resulting in 971 and 915 breaches related mainly to lacks of manipulable materials, housing systems, feeding and drinking, register keeping, flooring, space allowances and the farm staff (MDS, 2012). A 2011 FVO audit (DG-SANCO 2011-6048) noted that despite a good frequency of controls, previous concerns, including training and guidance, reported in 2010 (DG-SANCO 2010-8388), had not been fully addressed.

Regarding training, the *National Plan for Animal Welfare* (PNBA) (MDS, 2010) is intended to improve training resources for veterinarians and farmers.

In terms of private Italian farm assurance schemes, only niche high quality products from free range farms using native breeds or genotypes (e.g. Cinta Senese, Mora Romagnola, Nero Siciliano, Apulo-Calabrese, Nero di Parma) exist and these account for much less than 1% on the national pig production.

References

- DG-SANCO (2010-8388), Final Report of a specific audit carried out in Italy from 15 to 26 March 2010 in order to evaluate the implementation of controls for animal welfare on farms and during transport in the context of a general audit, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)
- DG-SANCO (2011-6048), Final Report of an audit carried out in Italy from 09 to 18 November 2011 in order to evaluate the implementation of controls for animal welfare on farms and during transport, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)
- MDS (Ministero della Salute / Ministry of Health) (2010), Piano Nazionale Benessere Animale (PNBA), http://www.salute.gov.it/imgs/C_17_pubblicazioni_1304_allegato.pdf
- MDS (Ministero della Salute / Ministry of Health) (2012), Relazione attività ispettiva anno 2011 ai sensi della decisione 2006/778/CE, Direzione generale della sanità animale e dei farmaci veterinari. 30 novembre 2012, ultimo aggiornamento 5 dicembre 2012. http://www.salute.gov.it/imgs/C_17_pubblicazioni_1873_allegato.pdf

France

The Pig directive (2008/120/EC) was fully transposed into national legislation by 2013 by the Ministry of Food, Feed, Agriculture and Fisheries (MAAP). There is no national policy on farm animal welfare.

Implementation has been undertaken via the CCA, the Directorate General for Food (DGAL). The sub-directorate for animal health and welfare (SDSPA) is the competent authority with responsibility for issuing regulations and instructions, and coordinating and supervising the activity of the decentralised offices. A national database inventories all the data from inspections and also data is automatically collected on mortality, etc. This database is linked to the one used in the slaughterhouse to check if sanitary problems occur. The national data informs the French system of inspections.

Regarding enforcement, national inspection data from 2009 (DGAL, 2013) states that of 23,412 farms, 366 (2%) were inspected. Of these, 110 (30%) were non-compliant with national regulations. An FVO inspection in 2012 (DG-SANCO 2012-6446) states that France is well organised to enforce the ban on the permanent confinement of sows in stalls and offers support to convert buildings.

With regard to training, there is INFOMA (National Training Institute of Personnel of Ministry of Agriculture) for public staff (veterinary public health, technicians, etc.), as well as the National Veterinary Services School (ENSV) which performs continuous training sessions.

On private assurance schemes, the Label Rouge scheme leads in France for pig meat.

References

DGAL (Directorate General for Food) (2013), Control data for 2009 shared with EUWelNet national researcher
DG-SANCO (2012-6446), Final Report of an audit carried out in France from 12 to 22 November 2012 in order to evaluate the implementation of controls for animal welfare on farms and during transport, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

Spain

The Pig directive (2008/120/EC) was fully transposed into national legislation in Spain by 2013 by the Ministry of Agriculture (MAGRAMA). The time to adopt EU legislation ranged from 1 to 4 years because of the federal system.

The implementation of the new legislation was then delegated to the competent authorities (CAs) in the 17 Regional Departments of Agriculture and Health in the different Autonomous Communities. In their risk-based approach to inspection, these bodies use monitoring data from farm visits to warn farmers of their non-compliances and provide corrective measures when doing their regular controls. However, no farm control data is compiled from the regions to give a detailed national picture.

In terms of enforcement, the major non-compliances detected nationally/regionally are those related to documentation and non-proper adaptation of housing requirements. 100% of gestating sows are already in a group housing system (MAGRAMA, 2013). Action plans suggest better coordination between all inspection bodies and improving animal welfare training. Previous FVO slaughter and transport audits (e.g. DG-SANCO 2012-6373; DG-SANCO 2009-8284) and a general audit in Aragon and Castilla y Leon (DG-SANCO 2008-8347) indicated concerns about Spain's ability to enforce its animal welfare regulations with the latter reporting 'sanctions applied are not always dissuasive'. This general audit found enrichment material used inappropriately and the tail-docking of pigs widely accepted.

On training, the Ministry currently considers that animal welfare training should be improved and strengthened, both at the level inspection and at the farmers' or slaughterhouse personnel level (Ministry of Agriculture interviewee, 2013).

On private assurance schemes, there are no major private or NGO-driven farm assurance schemes in relation to animal welfare claims.

References

- MAGRAMA (Ministry of Agriculture) (2013), Data provided directly to EUWelNet Research Team
- DG-SANCO (2008-8347), General audit, Spain – 2008, Final Report, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)
- DG-SANCO (2009-8284), Final Report of a mission carried out in Spain from 23 March to 03 April 2009 in order to evaluate the implementation of rules for the protection of animals during transport and at the time of slaughter or killing, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)
- DG-SANCO (2012-6373), Final Report of an audit carried out in Spain from 23 January to 03 February 2012 in order to evaluate the implementation of controls for animal welfare at the time of slaughter, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

Poland

In Poland, the Pig directive (2008/120/EC) was fully transposed into national legislation by 2013 by the Government Legislation Center subordinated to the Prime Minister. New national legislation referring to animal welfare is agreed with the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD). There is no special national policy on animal welfare but in May 2004, Poland banned keeping sows in individual stalls in new farmhouses.

Implementation of the new national legislation is the responsibility of the CCA, the General Veterinary Inspectorate (GVI) working with farmers and producers associations. In terms of monitoring, the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development appointed a Chief Veterinary Officer who, with the General Veterinary Inspectorate (GVI), prepares written instructions for Veterinary Officers who control farms.

In terms of enforcement, the CCA (the GVI) claimed 100% compliance in June 2013 based in 2,447 inspections carried out at farms which did not comply in December 2012 (Interview with GVI, 2013). The competent authority reported some problems with detailed interpretations of the legislation including different understandings in different regions, e.g. total number of hogs in one group (Interview with GVI, 2013). An FVO audit in 2011 (DG-SANCO 2011-6049) stated that, concerning the group housing of sows, for example, 35% of pig farms had not yet complied. Training for farmers was provided by agricultural advisory centres and farmers organisations. Training for official veterinarians was provided by The General Veterinary Inspectorate.

A number of public and private bodies in Poland undertake training relevant to 2008/120/EC.

In terms of quality assurance schemes for pig meat, the public Quality Assurance for Food Products (QAFP) label was set up in 2010 while the private Pork Quality System (PQS) was set up in 2009. Neither are regarded as significant in volume terms.

References

- DG-SANCO (2011-6049), Final Report of an audit carried out in Poland from 25 May to 01 June 2011 in order to evaluate the implementation of controls for animal welfare on farms and during transport, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

Romania

Directive 2008/120/EC has been transposed into national legislation in Romania by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD). The previous directive 91/630/EEC was transposed into a national order in 2006 and, in 2012, an addendum was attached to it in order to comply with 2008/120/EC. Romania has no specific national policy on animal welfare.

Implementation has been undertaken by the CCA for animal welfare, the National Sanitary Veterinary and Food Safety Authority (NSVFSA) which does a programme of farm checks.

Regarding enforcement, national control data in Romania is classified. Nevertheless, an FVO Report in 2012 (DG-SANCO 2012-6374) stated that Romania has been proactive in assessing the compliance of its commercial pig premises and was very well placed for the 2013 deadline.

With training, the National Sanitary Veterinary and Food Safety Authority (NSVFSA) organises periodic courses through a private company.

In Romania, there are no private assurance schemes for pigs.

References

DG-SANCO (2012-6374), Final Report of an audit carried out in Romania from 21 to 29 November 2012 in order to evaluate the implementation of controls for animal welfare on farms and during transport, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

Slovakia

In Slovakia, the Pig directive (2008/120/EC) was fully transposed into national legislation by 2012 by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD). Slovakian national legislation does not go ahead or behind the directive. There is no special national policy on animal welfare.

Implementation has been undertaken by the Department of Animal Health and Welfare (DAHW), the CCA for animal welfare in conjunction with the local District Veterinary and Food Administration (DVFA). Regarding monitoring, farm control data is monitored by the DVFA and compiled by the DAHW and published in annual reports.

In terms of compliance, the national report for 2012 (SVFA, 2012) stated that of 1,658 farms, 372 controls were made (22%) out of which 335 were compliant (90%). In a 2011 FVO Report (DG-SANCO 2011-6053) significant problems were identified in terms of manipulable material, staff education, sharp objects in pens, heating and ventilation. In contrast, the FVO noted that there was plenty of straw and sawdust in sow and wiener pens and piglets had not been tail-docked.

Training comes via the DVFA which organises accredited courses through the Institute of Postgraduate Education of Veterinary Surgeons in Košice.

There are no private assurance schemes for pigs in Slovakia.

References

DG-SANCO (2011-6053), Final Report of an audit carried out in Slovakia from 06 to 14 September 2011 in order to evaluate the implementation of controls for animal welfare on farms and during transport, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

SVFA (State Veterinary and Food Administration) (2012), Annual Report,
http://www.svssr.sk/dokumenty/zakladne_info/Vyrocna_sprava_2012a.pdf

Annex 8

Ten country narratives about EU regulation 1099/2009

Sweden

In Sweden, there were several stricter pre-existing national rules and regulations on animal welfare before the adoption of the Regulation for the Protection of Animals at the Time of Killing¹⁹, regarding the stunning of all animals (but Halal slaughter with standard stunning prior to bleeding is taking place), design of slaughterhouse lairage areas, noise levels, and extensive national legislation covering other types of slaughter and killing (i.e. for household consumption, small quantities, on-farm killing, killing of other species and so on).

The execution of the killing regulation is coordinated by the central competent authority (CCA) for animal welfare, the Swedish Board of Agriculture (SBA). The Swedish Food Agency (SFA) is the CCA for food safety, employing official veterinarians (OVs) at slaughterhouses. OVs are present every day when slaughter is taking place. An Animal Welfare Inspector (AWI) from County Administrative Boards (CABs) visit slaughterhouses approximately twice a year, but this depends on previous compliance records and on any indications by the OV. No exact levels of triggering action have been established, only informal levels. National slaughter data is available every 6th week. National slaughter data, compiled by the SFA in the regions, is available every 6th week although it is not analysed in much greater depth (Swedish interviewee A).

In terms of enforcement, regional inspections (CABs) are risk-based and these slaughter controls are every 1 to 2 years. SBA prepares an annual report on official controls (e.g. MRA, 2013). Government transparency legislation means names are revealed for written injunctions. The national authorities are felt to need improved compilation of the regional monitoring data to give a more definitive picture of where animal welfare concerns are arising. The last FVO audit on welfare at slaughter was in 2003 (DG-SANCO 2003-9210).

Animal Welfare training of slaughterhouse staff handling live animals (including stunning and bleeding) used to be done by the slaughterhouses internally or by the MeNY consortium based at the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU). However, during 2012 the SBA has instead funded the development of an open access e-learning material covering all the aspects required by the regulation.

References

Ministry of Rural Affairs (MRA) (Jordbruksdepartementet) (2013), Report to the Commission in accordance with decision 2006/778/EC on minimum requirements for gathering information from inspections related to farm animal welfare, Jönköping: MRA, 27.6.13

DG-SANCO (2003-9210), Final Report of a mission carried out in Sweden from 29 September to 3 October 2003 in order to evaluate controls of animal welfare during transport and at the time of slaughter, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

UK

In the UK, there were several items of pre-existing and/or concurrent legislation and guidance, before the killing regulation (1099/2009) became operative, chiefly the Welfare of Animals (Slaughter or Killing) (WASK) Regulations (amended) 1995. Also, a 'Duty of Care' principle allows enforcement before suffering.

The CCA, Defra and its executive agencies, the Animal Health and Veterinary Laboratories Agency (AHVLA) and the Food Standards Agency (FSA) are responsible for the follow-up of the regulation. They gather data from farms and slaughterhouses via risk-based systems of farm controls (AHVLA) and slaughter inspections. In general, high levels of concern in slaughterhouse data will attract attention by the AHVLA and control frequency will rise. Trigger reports set at a relatively low level provide post-mortem data on meat chickens on a daily basis, for example.

¹⁹ In the following referred to as 'the killing regulation'.

Enforcement activity is undertaken by non-departmental executive public bodies, the Animal Health and Veterinary Laboratories Agency (AHVLA) and the Food Standards Agency (FSA) using a risk-based system of controls. In the absence of published compliance data by Defra, the picture on the ground is uncertain. There are long-standing concerns about the potential impact of the rationalisation of the industry on welfare standards (e.g. FAWC, 2003). The last FVO report on welfare at slaughter was in 2007 (DG-SANCO 2007-7337) which indicated compliance with previous legislation was generally satisfactory.

In terms of training, slaughterhouse workers and those who require a licence (including religious slaughter men) can undergo training on-the-job or/and through accredited NVQ Level 2 in Meat and Poultry Processing awarded by the Meat Training Council (MTC). The Meat Training Council also offers Species Specific Animal Welfare Certificate and Abattoir Animal Welfare Certificate – Poultry.

References

DG-SANCO (2007-7337), Final Report of a mission carried out in the United Kingdom from 25 June to 3 July 2007 in order to assess the system of controls on animal welfare at slaughter and during killing, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

FAWC (Farm Animal Welfare Council) (2003), Report on the Welfare of Farmed Animals at Slaughter or Killing Part 1: Red Meat Animals, London: FAWC

Netherlands

In the Netherlands, there were several items of pre-existing legislation and guidance before the adoption of the ‘killing regulation’. The follow-up of the regulation is undertaken by the CCA, the Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority (NVWA). Execution has so far been variable. This is due to uncertainty about: 1) emergency killing on site, 2) stunning methods for chickens, and 3) stunning methods for pigs. Info on animal welfare is reported back to the animal keepers.

Regarding enforcement, reports of animal welfare inspections are entered in internal databases (ISI or SPIN) by the NVWA inspectors. This data forms the basis of quarterly and annual reports to the EZ and informs risk assessment. An annual control plan is prepared for every slaughterhouse and the frequency of NVWA audits depends on the results of a risk assessment. A 2011 national audit found 46% compliance (NVWA, 2012). A FVO report from 2011 which mainly focussed on hygiene (DG-SANCO 2011-6008) concluded that the effectiveness of slaughterhouses controls is compromised by incomplete supervision by official veterinarians is, by deficiencies not detected during official controls, as well as by inadequate follow-up and enforcement. According the FVO audit report of 2012 which focused on control systems for broiler production (DG-SANCO 2012-6376), the Netherlands has not been able to identify a suitable method for the killing of small animals on farms without a veterinarian and without this has been unable to provide suitable training for farmers to do so, a point not addressed since 2006. The last FVO Report specifically on welfare at slaughter was in 2006 (DG-SANCO 2006-8041) and it indicated Dutch measures generally went beyond EU rules.

The Ministry of EL&I is not satisfied with the progress in the slaughter houses sector, such as the appliance of standard operating procedures and new techniques on killing animals (Dutch interview with Ministry EZ, 2013). An audit commission (Piet Vanthemsche) appointed by the Minister showed in 2008 and 2011 that problems on animal welfare, mostly occur in small and middle-sized slaughterhouses. The commission also concluded that the monitoring/control of slaughterhouses by the NVWA was insufficient, partly due to budget costs and reorganisations.

In terms of vocational training, several public and private bodies offer support including SVO, an association that provides vocational education (MBO) and training for people who work in fresh food retail, supermarkets, fast food companies and the food industry.

Regarding industry, there are a number of private quality assurance schemes such as IKB (‘integrated chain control’) certification and control which do not replace control and registering of

information for EU Directives by public authorities. IKB, for example, checks all holdings every year and also offers training.

References

DG-SANCO (2006-8041), Final Report of a mission carried out in the Netherlands from 6 to 9 June 2006 in order to assess animal welfare at slaughter, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

DG-SANCO (2011-6008), Final Report of an audit carried out in the Netherlands from 16 to 25 November 2011 in order to evaluate the food safety control systems in place governing the production and placing on the market of poultry meat and poultry meat products, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

DG-SANCO (2012-6376), Final Report of an audit carried out in the Netherlands from 21 to 25 May 2012 in order to evaluate the implementation of controls on animal welfare on farms and during transport, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

NVWA (Dutch Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority) (2012), Inspection results, Annual Report (*Jaarverslaag*), 2.7.12

Germany

Also in Germany, there were several items of pre-existing federal and devolved legislation and guidance, many of which are more detailed and stricter than the killing regulation. Germany, for example, does not allow captive bolt stunning, regulates the different stunning/killing methods in more detail or has provisions for the keeping of fish and crustaceae before slaughter and on stunning/killing methods.

In terms of implementing the regulation, this is overseen by the competent authorities (CAs) in 16 Federal States (Länder) who each undertake controls for compliance with the legislation via guidance from the Länder Animal Welfare Working Group (AGT). The AGT has elaborated guidelines ("Slaughter Handbook") for the follow-up of the EU killing regulation and the national killing regulation, the latter comprising the provisions on penalties and fines, and the more detailed and stricter rules stemming from the former national regulation. Frequency and focus of controls is risk-based according to EC Regulation 882/2004. Additionally, they may be prompted e.g. by reports to the authority. The CAs on the level of the District authorities (Kreise) or municipal authorities (Kreisfreie Städte) are responsible.

Regarding enforcement, two FVO audits were done in 2008 covering knowledge skills, movement, lairaging, restraint, stunning and religious slaughter (DG SANCO 2008-7764; DG SANCO 2008-7980). Non-compliances included excitement of poultry during lairaging and restraint (Directive 93/119/EC). The last FVO report specifically on welfare at slaughter was in 2003 (DG-SANCO 2003-9038).

With respect to training that exists outside the various higher education institutions, a wide range of public and private bodies offer support to farmers. These are supplied at the Länder level by institutions of Chambers of Agriculture (in North and West Germany) or Federal States institutes of agriculture (South and East Germany). Courses are part of the vocational training, of continuing education or specifically as preparation to obtain certificates of competence.

References

DG-SANCO (2003-9038), Final Report of a mission carried out in Germany from 19 to 23 May 2003 in order to evaluate controls of animal welfare during transport and at the time of slaughter, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

DG SANCO (2008-7764), General Audit - report of a specific audit carried out in Germany from 14 to 18 April 2008 in order to evaluate the implementation of controls for animal welfare on farms, during transport and at the time of slaughter, Part B – Sector specific issues, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

DG SANCO (2008-7980), General Audit - report of a specific audit carried out in Germany from 6 to 10 October 2008 in order to evaluate the implementation of controls for animal welfare on farms, during transport and at the time of slaughter, Part B – Sector specific issues, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

Italy

The killing regulation (1099/2009) is been followed up by the Animal Welfare Unit of the Ministry of Health (the Central Competent Authority) which works with Regional competent authorities – local vets - in 19 Italian Regional Governments and 2 Autonomous Provincial Governments.

Regarding enforcement, MDS audits the local competent veterinary services and makes direct inspections at slaughterhouses. The outcomes of monitoring feed into MDS' risk-based approach to enforcement. In 2011, the national authority reported that all Italian slaughterhouses (993 establishments) were subjected to control resulting in 151 non-compliances (MDS, 2012a). This represents an 85% minimum rate of compliance. 2,693 checks of stunning efficiency resulted in 15 non compliances/prescriptions and 11 penalties (MDS, 2012b). The last FVO Report was in 2008 (DG-SANCO 2008-7691). It highlighted a lack of training on animal welfare at slaughter.

Regarding training, the *National Plan for Animal Welfare* (PNBA) is designed to improve training resources for veterinarians and farmers (MDS, 2011).

References

DG-SANCO (2008-7691), Final Report of a mission carried out in Italy from 10 March to 14 March 2008 in order to evaluate the system of control in relation to animal welfare during transport and at the time of slaughter and killing, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

MDS (Ministero della salute / Ministry of health) (2011), Controlli benessere durante la macellazione 2011, Verifiche periodiche programmate.
http://www.salute.gov.it/imgs/C_17_paginaRelazione_971_listaFile_itemName_0_file.pdf

MDS (Ministero della salute / Ministry of health) (2012a), Controlli benessere durante la macellazione 2011, Controlli straordinari sull'efficacia di stordimento.2012.
http://www.salute.gov.it/imgs/C_17_paginaRelazione_971_listaFile_itemName_1_file.pdf

MDS (Ministero della salute / Ministry of health) (2012b), Ministero della salute, Relazione Annuale al Piano Nazionale Integrato – 2011, July 4th 2012,
<http://www.salute.gov.it/relazioneAnnuale2011/homeRA2011.jsp>

France

In France the CCA, the Directorate General for Food (DGAL) coordinates the execution of the killing regulation. The sub-directorate for animal health and welfare (SDSPA) is the competent authority with responsibility for issuing regulations and instructions, and coordinating and supervising the activity of its decentralised offices. Two decrees were made: one for ritual slaughter and the other to specify the conditions for obtaining certificates of competency. Farm inspection data uses national databases to identify the movements of animals. If a problem is highlighted during slaughter, the inspector should normally inform the Departmental Directorate for the Protection of the Population (DDPP).

Regarding enforcement, national data for compliance with the killing regulation are not yet available. FVO Reports covering animal welfare and slaughter include one in 2002 (DG-SANCO 2002-8554) and one in 2010 (DG-SANCO 2010-8627) which noted deficiencies in the availability of official veterinarians in slaughterhouses.

With regard to training, there is INFOMA (National Training Institute of Personnel of Ministry of Agriculture) for public staff (veterinary public health, technicians, etc.), as well as the National Veterinary Services School (ENSV) which performs continuous training sessions.

References

- DG-SANCO (2002-8554), Final Report of a mission carried out in France from 24 to 28 June 2002 in order to evaluate the systems for checks of animal welfare during transport and at the time of slaughter, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)
- DG-SANCO (2010-8627), Final Report of a general audit carried out in France in 2010 in order to evaluate official controls put in place by the competent authorities, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

Spain

The execution of the killing regulation was delegated to the competent authorities (CAs) in the 17 Regional Departments of Agriculture and Health in the different Autonomous Communities. These bodies use monitoring data from slaughterhouses and farms to inform their risk-based approach to inspection.

In terms of enforcement, compliance data is not yet available. However, the Catalan Government, for example, employs 22 full time technical staff to control animal welfare at the slaughter level which is one indicator of the resources going into compliance in one of the autonomous communities. Recent non-compliances detected by national authorities include documentation (MAGRAMA, 2013). However, action plans now include better coordination between all inspection bodies as well as training (MHSE's responsibility). Previous FVO slaughter and transport audits (e.g. DG-SANCO 2012-6373; DG-SANCO 2009-8284) and a general audit (DG-SANCO 2008-8347) indicated concerns about Spain's ability to enforce animal welfare regulations. A 2007 audit specifically of welfare at slaughter (DG-SANCO 2007-7328) found "Animal welfare conditions observed in most of the slaughterhouses visited, with suffering and injury being caused, did not comply with EU legislation" with major deficiencies regarding the transport of poultry, the handling of animals, the restraint of sheep and the stunning of poultry.

On training, the MHSE currently considers that animal welfare training should be improved and strengthened, both at the level inspection and at the farmers' or slaughterhouse personnel level.

On private assurance schemes, there are no major private or NGO-driven farm assurance schemes in relation to animal welfare claims.

References

- DG-SANCO (2007-7328), Final Report of a mission carried out in Spain from 5 to 9 March 2007 in order to assess the system of controls on animal welfare at slaughter, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)
- DG-SANCO 2008-8347), General Audit Spain – 2008 Final Report, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)
- DG-SANCO 2009-8284), Final Report of a mission carried out in Spain from 23 March to 03 April 2009 in order to evaluate the implementation of rules for the protection of animals during transport and at the time of slaughter or killing, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)
- DG-SANCO 2012-6373), Final Report of an audit carried out in Spain from 23 January to 03 February 2012 in order to evaluate the implementation of controls for animal welfare at the time of slaughter, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)
- MAGRAMA (Ministry of Agriculture) (2013), Data provided directly to EUWelNet Research Team

Poland

In Poland, following-up the killing regulation is the responsibility of the Central Competent Authority (CCA), the General Veterinary Inspectorate (GVI), which inspects the slaughterhouses. The Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development appoints a Chief Veterinary Officer who prepares written instructions for Veterinary Officers. There have been some minor problems with interpretation (Interview with CCA, 2013). There is no unified way of collecting data or a unified dataset. OVs

control slaughterhouses: at least 20% of all existing in a region, not less than 4. Data obtained are reported twice a year to the General Veterinary Inspectorate (GVI).

In terms of enforcement, in the most recently available national data (Interview with GVI, 2013) showed that from 430 controlled slaughterhouse 193 didn't comply with the directive. Main problems concerned lack of written procedures (12,5%), lack of full information about livestock storage (e.g. number animals in the pen, date of arriving animals) 9%, lack of written devices instructions 5%, lack of animal officer 4, 2% and lack of proofs (documentation) of equipment maintenance 12,4% (Interview with GVI, 2013). Previous data indicate non-compliance due to stunning methods (54.5%), handling (18.5%), check on stunning (59%) and bleeding monitoring procedure (3.5%). In many slaughterhouses animal welfare officers don't have certificates proving their competences, because in Poland there is no national regulation clarifying who is responsible for training of animal welfare officers employed at slaughterhouses. According to the regulations such position is obligatory, but it is unclear who has the right to train workers and who might give them authorisation. A previous FVO animal welfare report (DG-SANCO 2010-8387), which was indirectly concerned with slaughter, indicated concerns for monitoring and enforcement powers.

A number of public and private bodies in Poland, beyond higher education, undertake training relevant to the regulation including the training for official veterinarians which is provided by the General Veterinary Inspectorate (GVI).

References

DG-SANCO (2010-8387), Final Report of a specific audit carried out in Poland from 23 February to 04 March 2010 in order to evaluate the implementation of controls for animal welfare on farms and during transport in the context of a general audit, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

Romania

The follow up of regulation 1099/2009 has been coordinated by the CCA for animal welfare, the National Sanitary Veterinary and Food Safety Authority (NSVFSA). Its staff do checks at slaughter and this data is collected and compiled nationally, but this data is not released to the public and is considered 'classified' by the authorities.

Regarding enforcement, because national slaughter control data in Romania is classified compliance figures cannot be acquired. Nevertheless, Romania's response to the EC's Member State Slaughter Questionnaire (EC, 2012) revealed a mixed picture:

- 1) Compliance for red meat, 1.5% for stunning methods, 1.5% for checking the stunning, 100% for certificate of competence, 2% for lairage facilities, 2.5% for animals not delivered in containers, 2% for arrival, moving and handling, 1% for mammals in lairage, 1% for handling and restraining, and 100% for animal welfare officer.
- 2) Compliance for poultry: 1.5% for stunning methods, 100% for certificate of competence, and 100% for animal welfare officer.

No previous FVO animal welfare audits have directly covered issues of welfare in slaughterhouses in Romania. One unpublished audit on farms (DG SANCO 2006-unpublished) cited concerns for compliance on slaughter given the high number of subsistence farms.

With training, the National Sanitary Veterinary and Food Safety Authority (NSVFSA) organises periodic courses through a private company.

References

EC (European Commission) (2012), Questionnaire referred to in point 6 of Minutes of 'Summary record of the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health held in Brussels on 3 & 4 April 2012 (Section Animal Health and Welfare)',
http://ec.europa.eu/food/committees/regulatory/scfc/ah/sum_0304042012_en.pdf

DG SANCO (2006-unpublished), Audit of controls on farms and at slaughter in Romania

Slovakia

In Slovakia, the execution of the killing regulation has been undertaken by the Department of Animal Health and Welfare (DAHW), the CCA for animal welfare in conjunction with the local District Veterinary and Food Administration (DVFA). National slaughter data is collected and compiled by the Department of Animal Health and Welfare (DAHW) of the State Veterinary and Food Administration (SVFA) and published in an annual report.

In terms of compliance, of 89 slaughterhouses cited in the national report of 2012 (SVFA, 2012) there were 509 controls. Out of this number, 137 controls were made by animal health and welfare inspectors and 372 controls by hygiene inspectors. More precise details of compliance/non-compliance rates is due. Previously, a 2004 FVO Report (DG-SANCO 2004-7233) identified problems in relation to stunning through insufficient knowledge of the equipment used. The State Veterinary and Food Administration (SVFA) of the Slovak Republic has since taken measures to address this audit's recommendations.

Training comes via the DVFA, which organises accredited courses through the Institute of Postgraduate Education of Veterinary Surgeons in Košice.

References

DG-SANCO (2004-7233), Final Report of a mission carried out in Slovak Republic from 24 to 28 May 2004 in order to review controls concerning animal welfare, Brussels: EC/Food and Veterinary Office (FVO)

SVFA (State Veterinary and Food Administration of the Slovak Republic) (2012), Annual Report 2012, http://www.svssr.sk/dokumenty/zakladne_info/Vyrocná_správa_2012a.pdf

Annex 9

Questionnaire on bottlenecks and supportive practices

Purpose of the interview

Thank you very much for agreeing to talk to us about the implementation of these three EU directives/regulations on Animal Welfare (broiler, pig and slaughter). The purpose of this study is to better understand the implementation process in six European countries (UK, Netherlands, Spain, Italy, Poland and Romania), the bottlenecks experiences, the measures to facilitate implementation, and the role that knowledge strategies play and could play. It is a follow-up of a desk study on ten European countries (including also Germany, Slovakia, Sweden and France); we have chosen these 6 countries as they represent more widely shared bottlenecks and can inform us more about 'successful facilitating measures and knowledge strategies'. In doing so we also hope to better understand which role a European Network for Animal Welfare (as recently proposed by the EU Commission in the Animal Welfare Strategy) could play. We start with questions about collaboration in the development and implementation of animal welfare regulations. Then we would like to talk a bit more about the relevance of knowledge production and transfer and check the relevance of some best practices in effective knowledge transfer from other countries. And finally we are interested in what else you consider for the successful implementation of animal welfare in our country.

But before we start with some more specific questions we are interested in your opinion about the implementation of these regulations in our country.

Could you please tell us if the level of implementation is, in your view, satisfactory or not and why?

What about the broiler directive?

What about the pig directive?

What about the killing regulation?

A General

Implementing and enforcing European animal welfare regulations is the responsibility of public authorities and often the National Ministry of Agriculture and/or the Ministry of Health. In doing so they collaborate with other public and private actors. We want to better understand how such networks of collaboration function, and what role knowledge transfer plays in them; this helps us to understand the potential role of a European Network for Animal Welfare which should support knowledge exchange across Member States.

1. Does your institution/organisation discuss with other public or private organisations/institutions or market actors about the **general issue of (farm) animal welfare** and **national animal welfare policy** in any regular fashion, independent of the introduction of any specific EU directives?

If yes,

With whom (of the actors below) are you discussing when and on which occasion? Are these for instance quite informal discussions in pairs, collegial discussions involving several actors or does it concern formal meetings that are organised for the purpose of discussing about animal welfare.

a. Please specify with which actors/agency

- national public authorities
- regional public authorities
- farmers
- the processing industry
- retailers
- NGOs
- researcher institutes
- educational institutes
-

b. Is there any formal network established?

c. What is the purpose of the discussion? It is mainly instrumental to the solution of short term problems? Or is it a more strategic discussion of the country's long term goals and ambition on animal welfare?

d. What is the result of this discussion? Are these meetings sufficiently effective or should anything be changed and improved? Have they led to any structural arrangements or agreements and if yes, which?

if not

- a. Why such discussion is not taking place?
- b. Do you think it would be useful?
- c. What could be obtained by discussing regularly with whom?

2. Does your organisation discuss with other actors when the **implementation of new European animal welfare directives** has to be prepared and organised?

If yes,

- a. With whom (of the actors above are they discussing and at which moment/phase in the implementation process?
- b. Is there any formal network established?
- c. What is the purpose of the discussion? *For example: co-creation of policy, consultation, participation, implementation of regulation*

d. What is the result of this discussion? Are these meetings sufficiently effective or should anything be changed and improved? With other national public authorities

- ⇒ What about the broiler directive?
- ⇒ What about the pig directive?
- ⇒ What about the killing regulation?

If, not

- a. Why is such discussion not taking place?
- b. Do you think it would be useful?
- c. What could be obtained by discussing regularly with whom?

3. Does your organisation discuss with some of the actors listed above about how to ensure and improve the **enforcement of animal welfare regulation**?

If yes,

- a. With whom (of the actors above are they discussing?
- b. Is there any formal network established?
- c. What is the purpose of the discussion?
- d. What is the result of this discussion? Are these meetings sufficiently effective or should anything be changed and improved? With other national public authorities

- ⇒ What about the broiler directive?
- ⇒ What about the pig directive?
- ⇒ What about the killing regulation?

If, not

- a. Why is such discussion not taking place?
- b. Do you think it would be useful?
- c. What could be obtained by discussing regularly with whom?

B Knowledge production and transfer

Implementation does not always proceed without problems. In any country there are some bottlenecks that hinder implementation and/or compliance and contribute to the persistence of some animal welfare problems

First we would like to look into the process of implementation

4. What are the **main bottlenecks** hindering successful **implementation** of the three directives? At the level of the farm? At the level of the slaughterhouse?

- ⇒ What about the broiler directive?
- ⇒ What about the pig directive?
- ⇒ What about the killing regulation?

5. What could be done to address the problems in the implementation of animal welfare regulations? Who should do what? Does this differ per directive/regulation?

6. Do you think that there is a **problem with knowledge**, such as lack of technical knowledge, ineffective knowledge transfer, exchange and/or distribution, insufficient and/or unequal access to knowledge?.

- ⇒ What about the broiler directive?
- ⇒ What about the pig directive?
- ⇒ What about the killing regulation?

If yes,

- a. Is there a lack of knowledge/innovation? Who lacks knowledge on what?
- b. Is there a problem of knowledge transfer – from whom to whom? (between institutes and policy or between experts and animal holders),
- c. What could be done to solve it?
- d. Is there a lack of training?
- e. What kind of training do you think would be most useful? Which subjects require training (Farmers? Temporary/permanent farm workers? Workers in slaughterhouses? Veterinarian inspecting slaughterhouses? Certifiers and inspectors?)

If not, is there sufficient knowledge available and is knowledge effectively transferred?

Now we would like to talk a bit more about compliance

7. What is hindering **full compliance** for the three directives?
 - ⇒ What about the broiler directive?
 - ⇒ What about the pig directive?
 - ⇒ What about the killing regulation?
8. In your opinion what are the priority areas of intervention to address the problems of compliance and successful implementation of EU animal welfare regulations? Who should take the initiative? Does this differ per directive/regulation?
9. To what extent is there for what regards compliance a **problem with knowledge**, such as lack of technical knowledge, ineffective knowledge transfer, exchange and/or distribution, insufficient and/or unequal access to knowledge, incomplete and/or late feedback of inspection data/compliance problems? (*this could overlap with responses for question nr 7, but not necessarily*)
 - ⇒ What about the broiler directive?
 - ⇒ What about the pig directive?
 - ⇒ What about the killing regulation?

If yes,

- a. Is there a lack of knowledge? Who lacks knowledge on what?
- b. Is there a problem of knowledge transfer – from whom to whom?
- c. Is there a lack of training? On what for whom?
- d. What could be done to solve it?

If not, is there sufficient knowledge available and is knowledge effectively transferred?

10. How is the development and transfer of (new) knowledge on animal welfare organised and funded? Is it a responsibility of the national government, the regions, and the sector? What is done to support the development, transfer and valorisation of new knowledge? Is there any collaboration with the industry? Is there any international collaboration? Are there sufficient funds available for knowledge production?
11. Is the development of knowledge and innovation in animal welfare considered as an important priority?

If yes, Why and what does that result in?

If not, why not?
12. Do you think that more collaboration/exchange within Europe in the production and transfer of animal welfare knowledge could play a role in supporting implementation and/or compliance?²⁰

If yes,

- a. What could more collaboration and exchange of knowledge produce?
- b. What would be the advantage(s) for our country?
- c. What could be its relevance be for the broiler directive, pig directive and/or killing regulation?
- d. Who should participate in such a network?
- e. What should be its main goal and its main activities? (*instruction: for instance awareness-raising, agenda-setting, exchange of technical knowledge, signalling problems, policy-advising etc.*)

If not, why not?

²⁰ The idea of an European Network of Animal Welfare aims at supporting the Commission and the Member States with technical expertise, training courses, dissemination of research findings and technical innovations and collaboration in research.

C Best practices

We now present some best practices that contribute to the successful implementation and compliance in some countries. Some of them might also be useful in our country. Please let me know if and why you think this could be of interest or why not. (instruction: Choose which examples are relevant to discuss)

13. In Sweden compliance data are made publicly available and stimulate farmers and slaughterhouses to comply in order to avoid reputation damage.
14. In Sweden the government, industry and science collaborate in networks that regularly meet to discuss animal welfare issues and to prepare the ground for the implementation of new directives
15. In several countries private production schemes include regular inspection for animal welfare directive and through their regular checks contribute to compliance.
16. In some countries working groups of national and regional public authorities try to harmonise implementation and control and inspection procedures.
17. In the UK, NL and Germany NGOs collaborate with farmers, industry and science in the development of new knowledge and techniques (breeds) as well as new animal welfare production schemes.
18. In the NL farmers, processing industry and retailers sign covenants in which they agree and promise to the public that from a certain date on all products produced, processed and sold under their responsibility will be of a higher level of animal welfare.
19. In the UK the public authorities are discussing the development of a less bureaucratic and more performance –trust based approach to animal welfare inspection, where earned recognition results less stringent control of some farms.
20. In some countries national or regional authorities develop animal welfare plans that runs ahead of EU legislation, and on which they regularly report to the public.
21. In the UK the result on animal welfare checks at the slaughterhouse are fed back to farmers on a daily basis, which enables them to immediately improve the production conditions.
22. In the UK the government has developed a Code for farmers in which the practices of 'good animal farming' are described and promoted.

D country-specific questions

Finally we have some questions that regard the situation in our country and which help us to better understand the chances and challenges of animal welfare implementation in our specific context.

(Instruction: please think of questions/issues that might be important to understand better for what regards our understanding of implementation and/or compliance problems, the role of knowledge transfer strategies and the role that a European network could play. Please choose as well which respondent to address with which question)

Annex 10

Template national reports on bottlenecks and supportive practices

General instruction

This report should allow Mara and me to write a comparative report and generate conclusions for the situation across Europe. So we need the information that you have gathered 'in context' – we need you to analyse your findings and tell us about what you learned through the interviews. But we also need you to provide the 'evidence' and provide quotes and summaries of what has been said. It matter quite a lot who has said what (e.g. a policymakers or a farmers), so please make sure that you take the perspective from which something has been said, into account as well, and tell us if there was agreement or not on specific issues. Please make sure as well to specify if which of the 3 pieces of legislation you are referring to, and if regards implementation or enforcement/control. In doing so you should depart from what you already learned in wp2.1 about the context of implementation in your country. This is also why we ask you to start with a brief context description. In total it should be around 10 pages to be delivered by the end of august.

1. Introduction:
 - Respondents, their affiliation, reason to interview them/focal area of their expertise
2. Identification and description of existing networks of collaboration (question 2, 3, 4):
 - list the networks of collaboration and the participating parties/stakeholder groups in a tabel
 - describe the aim of their collaboration (policy development/preparation, implementation, enforcement, development vision) as well as the level (local, regional, national)
 - describe the effect of it and what facilitates or blocks it
 - indicate of parties easily find themselves or not, if a group is excluded and why
 - and what else your respondents say about collaboration (need, usefulness, lack of)
3. Evaluation of the level of implementation (question 1), identification of the main bottlenecks and to what extent knowledge forms a problem, with regards to:
 - implementation (question 5 and 6)
 - compliance/enforcement (question 8 and 9)
4. Evaluation of the national state of animal welfare knowledge production/transfer
 - Brief characterisation of the system (question 11 and 12)
 - Identification of bottlenecks in knowledge transfer (question 7 and 10)
 - Attitude towards a European network of animal welfare (desirability and expectancies) (question 13)
5. Reaction to the best practices referred to in the interview/questionnaire (part C, question 14-23)
 - Which were considered useful and applicable, by whom and why
 - Which were considered irrelevant and/or inapplicable, by whom and why
 - Any other best practices, or necessary new strategies referred (during the whole interview)
 - Any other new and necessary strategies
 - Any needs for learning mentioned
6. Responses to the country specific questions (part D)
7. Conclusions:
 - Which (new) insights did you get into the implementation process in your country, its most important bottlenecks and facilitating strategies (regarding communication, control & enforcement, institutional arrangement ...)?
 - what did you learn about the desirability, potential role and function of a European Network of Animal Welfare: what could such a network do and how would it then need to operate?

ANNEX

1. brief explanation of the organisations and abbreviations that you refer to
2. List of country specific questions
3. Brief sketch of the national implementation context based on 2.1 (*was listed as part of the introduction in an earlier template, but this did not work out well in the Dutch report*)

Annex 11

Anonymous list of respondents for six countries

Italy	
Type of stakeholder	Organisation
National Government	Ministry of Health, Animal Welfare Unit
Regional Government of Emilia-Romagna	Veterinary Service
Regional Government of Lombardy	Veterinary Service
Knowledge institute	CRPA – Research Centre for Animal Production
Industry: Slaughterhouses	ASSICA – National association of pig slaughterhouses and processing companies
Industry: Slaughterhouses	Amadori Group, large cooperative of poultry farms
Primary sector	ANAS National association of pig breeders
Primary Sector	UNAPROS Umbrella association of pig farmers' product organisations, ASSER pig product organisation of Emilia-Romagna
Primary Sector	Amadori Group, large cooperative of poultry farmers
Primary Sector	UNA ITALIA
NGO	CIWF, Compassion in World Farming (Italian spinoff)

Netherlands	
Type of stakeholder	Organisation
National Government	Ministry of Economic Affairs (EZ) DG Animal Agro-chains and Animal Welfare (<i>Dierlijke Agroketens en Dierenwelzijn</i>)
Knowledge institute	Animal Sciences Group (WUR ASG)
Knowledge institute	Van Hall Larenstein (applied green University)
Knowledge institute	GKC (Green Knowledge Cooperation)
Knowledge institute/experimental farm	Pig Innovation Days at VIC Sterksel
Farmers union	ZLTO (Southern Agricultural Organisation)
Industry: Slaughterhouse & processing	VION Food Netherlands
Industry: breeding animals	Hendrix Genetics BV
Industry: poultry processing	NEPLUVI, Association of the Dutch poultry-processing industry
NGO	Dutch Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (DSPCA)
Primary sector	Broiler farm

Poland	
Type of stakeholder	Organisation
National Government	GIW - Główny Inspektorat Weterynaryjny (General Veterinary Inspectorate)
Knowledge institute	SGGW - Warsaw University of Life Sciences
NGO	Euro Group for Animals
NGO	Compassion in World Farming
Industry: slaughterhouses and meat processing	Unia Producentów i Pracodawców Przemysłu Mięsnego (Union of Producers and Employers of Meat Industry)
Industry: meat processing	Związek Polskie Mięso (Polish Meat Association)
Farmers association	POLSUS (Polish Pig Breeders and Producers Association)
Farmers association	Polskie Zrzeszenie Producentów Bydła Mięsnego (Polish Association of Beef Cattle Producers)
Farmers association	Krajowa Rada Drobiarstwa -KRD (National Poultry Council)
slaughterhouses with poultry processing	DROSED
Agricultural advisory unit	Mazowiecki Ośrodek Doradztwa Rolniczego - MODR (Mazowiecki Agricultural Advisory Unit)
Agricultural advisory center	Centrum Doradztwa Rolniczego w Brwinowie – CDR (Brwinow Agricultural Advisory Center)
Primary sector	Pig breeding farm

Romania (to be completed)	
Type of stakeholder	Organisation
National Government	ANSVSA, Caras-Severin Directorate
Industry: Slaughterhouse & processing	C+C SA Berzovia
Industry: pig processing	SC Dirar Prodcar SRL
Knowledge Institution	Faculty of Animal Science and Biotechnologies

Spain	
Type of stakeholder	Organisation
Knowledge institute	Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB), Animal Welfare Group
Knowledge institute	National Institute of Agricultural Research (INIA)
Knowledge institute/Experimental farm	CESAC, Catalan Centre for Avian Health
Industry: Slaughterhouses	Avinyó S.L., pig slaughterhouse and meat processing
Industry: Slaughterhouses	Catalana Federation of Meat Industries (FECIC)
Industry: Pig Consultancy	SIP consultants, pig consultancy, providing evaluation of economic parameters and advice
Farmers Union	ANPROGAPOR, National Association of Spanish Pig Producers
Farmers Union	PORCAT, Catalan Association of Pig Producers
Primary sector	Pig farm

United Kingdom	
Stakeholder Type	Organisation
Non-governmental Organisation (NGO)	Humane Slaughter Association
Knowledge institute	Bristol University
Knowledge institute	Bristol University
National Government	Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA).
Industry Body	British Poultry Council (BPC)
National Government	Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA).
National Government	Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA).
Industry Body	Poultec Training Limited
Enforcement Agency	Food Standards Agency (FSA), an executive agency of DEFRA (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs).
Industry Body	British Pig Executive (BPEX).
Non-governmental Organisation (NGO)	Compassion in World Farming (CiWF).

Annex 12

Problems and problem areas per directive for six countries

	Meat chicken	Pig	Killing
Italy	Fitness of EU legislation to Italian production context (e.g. higher slaughter weight);	Fitness of EU legislation to Italian production context (e.g. higher slaughter weight);	the use of litter in the lairage area; adoption of standard operating procedures; feasibility of renovating small and medium-sized slaughterhouses
Netherlands	Difficulty to assess maximum stocking density in numbers especially at the moment of transport; uniform administration and monitoring of foot pad lesions at slaughter; insufficient registering of administrative data and reporting of cumulative daily mortality; incompatibility with other legislation	Lack of space and manipulable material, stomach ulcers; permanent access to water; monitoring of light; little financial room for investments	Appliance standard operation procedures and new killing techniques; public monitoring and control of small, independent slaughterhouses
Poland	Resistance against mortality as on-farm animal welfare indicator		
Romania		Insufficient movement area and flooring quality	
Spain	Harmonising implementation and guidelines across regions; guarantee maximum stock density at transport time;	Harmonising implementation and guidelines across regions;	Harmonising implementation and guidelines across regions;
United Kingdom	Variable interpretation of EU directives	Risk-based mode of governance; slow speed of changing legislation	Lack of transposition in Wales and England; appointment of animal welfare officers; cuts to veterinary inspections

Annex 13

Knowledge related bottlenecks for six countries

Meat chicken directive		
	Knowledge transfer problems	Knowledge gaps
Italy	Training for inspection bodies that assures uniform knowledge and interpretation of rules; training that improves communication between inspecting vets and operators of farms and slaughterhouses	Calibration of stunning parameters for higher slaughter weight
Netherlands		monitoring food pad lesion; ambiguity of when mortality and maximum stock density should be measured
Poland	Insufficient capacity of the regional agricultural advisory unit with infrequent farm visits.	Lack of clear indicators for compliance;
Romania	Information and training of farmers in legislation	
Spain		Uniform objective animal welfare indicators and monitoring practices; ambiguity of how to register and report daily mortality and food pad lesions
United Kingdom	training and information of independent farmers and operators, unaffiliated to farm assurance schemes; language barriers for workers on broiler farms (literacy and computer use)	
Pig directive		
	Knowledge transfer	Knowledge gaps
Italy	Training of pig farmers taking into account different education levels; training facilitating communication between inspecting vets and operators of farms and slaughterhouses	
Netherlands		Interpretation of manipulable material; management and prevention of tail biting; clear indicators for light requirement and water access
Poland	Insufficient capacity of the regional agricultural advisory unit with infrequent farm visits.	Scientific evidence of economic effects of implementation; clear indicators for sick bays and water access
Romania	Information/training of independent farmers with small holdings	
Spain	Harmonising implementation and guidelines across regions; lack of training for stockpersons in handling sows in groups;	Uniform objective animal welfare indicators and monitoring practices; interpretation manipulable material; management and prevention of tail biting; indicators that demonstrate animal welfare achievement to proof added value of meat products;
United Kingdom	training and information of small and medium-sized independent farmers and operators, unaffiliated to farm assurance schemes; geographically spread out industry; presenting knowledge in an accessible way; cuts in public training budget; better public-private coordination of knowledge transfer;	Ambiguity of interpretation of directive; contested nature of scientific evidence base

Killing regulation		
	Knowledge transfer	Knowledge gaps
Italy	Training of slaughterhouse operators and staff; lack of knowledge regarding administrative procedures and monitoring criteria;	proper standards for stunning that assure animal welfare and meat quality;
Netherlands		On-farm emergency killing; new stunning techniques;
Poland	Unclear who is authorised to train staff	
Romania	Information of slaughterhouses and training of personnel	
Spain	Harmonising implementation and guidelines across regions; lack of knowledge among official veterinaries about the interpretation of the regulation and training in the use of objective technical criteria; more information for farmers when feeding back animal welfare problems;	Uniform objective animal welfare indicators and monitoring practices; application of stunning regulations to sheep and rabbits
United Kingdom	Lack of training and training resources especially at small and medium-sized operations among operators and staff; language barriers (not native English); training of vets to improve their persuasiveness	contested scientific evidence base for suffering; technical specifications for electric stunning;

Annex 14

Formal networks of collaboration per country (six countries)

Italy			
Network	Topic/goal	Participants	Scale
public²¹			
Temporary interdisciplinary tables formed by the Veterinary Services of the Regional Governments of Emilia-Romagna and Lombardy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harmonise enforcement, monitoring and control of animal welfare regulations 	Regional CA, Regional Services for rural development, Farmer unions, Livestock farmers' associations and product organisations	Regional
Conferenza Stato Regioni	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transpose EC directives into the Italian legal system Issue Ministry decrees and circulars aimed to facilitate and harmonise the enforcement of EC regulations 	CA of the Governments of the Regions and of the autonomous Provinces	National
Permanent National Plan for Animal Welfare: Formal working groups for enforcement and control, initiated by the Ministry of health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss and decide how to implement, revise and above all to monitor/control EU regulations. Training official vets, farmers and responsible for slaughterhouses 	Competent authorities of the Governments of Regions and autonomous Provinces	National
private²²			
Working group, initiated by UNI, the Italian standard setting body	Set up the standard: "Animal welfare - Minimum requirements for the drafting of a scheme for animal intended to food production"	Knowledge providers (CRPA, NRCAW), Livestock farmers' associations, Farmers' unions, Certification bodies, Large retailers	National
AGER research project	Innovation for green sustainable pig production	Knowledge providers	National
International private			
European Platform for Animal Welfare	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Define and disseminate best practices. Integrate emerging science-based animal welfare assessment systems with existing quality assurance schemes. Develop information tools and communication strategies. Identify and prioritise key welfare issues and needs for animal welfare research. 	200 participants from a number of Countries (e.g. Amadori Group, Coop Italia, Autogrill from Italy)	EU

²¹ Public means initiated by a public authorities for all national tables

²² Private means initiated by a private agency for all national table

The Netherlands			
Network	Topic/goal	Participants	Scale
public			
Formal working groups for implementation initiated by the Ministry of EZ (Direction DAD); among others on: the EU broiler directive and Interventions Decision, Covenant Castration, Revision Killing Regulation	Discuss and decide how to implement, revise and monitor/control EU regulations	Product Boards and sector organisations (LTO, NVP, NOP, NEPLUVI, COV), government, monitoring and control (EZ, NVWA, DR), research (WUR-ASG), NGO (DSPCA)	National
'Table of 11' meetings at the Ministry of EZ ²³	Investigate bottlenecks in implementation and improve compliance	Stakeholders, EZ, NVWA, DR	National
Formal juridical consultation of new laws	Animal Law	Legal consultation	National
"Sustainable Animal Husbandry" covenant	Formulate a vision for 2020 and discuss innovation	COV, DSCPA, provinces (IPO), banks (Rabobank), LTO, EZ, The NGO Nature and Environment (<i>Natuur en Milieu</i>), Nevedi, NZO, GKC	National.
Working group animal health and welfare within education installed by the Ministry of EZ	Develop a policy strategy for animal welfare in education.	Green education institutes	National
Alliance on 'Sustainable meat 2020'	Develop agreements between retail and sector to improve animal welfare	Supermarkets, cattle-breeders, supported by companies, NGOs and governments.	National
Working group Campylo- bacter'	Develop strategies to reduce animal diseases caused by this bacteria	NEPLUVI, Ministry VWS, Chicken keepers, unions of animal keepers	National
Council for Animal Affairs (<i>Raad voor de Dieraangelegenheden</i>)	Advice to the National Government	Independent experts	National
private			
Unions of animal keepers	NVP, NOP, NVV, COV, NEPLUVI	Animal keepers, breeders	National
Working Group 'Curly tail'	Discuss and develop new strategies towards reduction and banning of pig tail cutting	LTO, DSPCA, VIC Sterksel, etc.	National
International public			
Collaboration Working Group on Animal health and Welfare research	Research	Around 30 organisations (including the Dutch Ministry of EZ) in 20 countries	EU
International private			
Euro group for animals	Cooperation, coordination and formulation of joint strategies of NGOs	Most important NGOs on animal welfare in the EU members states	Europe
Collaboration within the international Association of Poultry Processors and Poultry Trade in the EU countries (a.v.e.c.)	Cooperation between poultry processors	Including the Dutch NEPLUVI 18 organisations	EU
The European Forum for Farm animal Breeders (EFFAB)	Cooperation between animal breeding firms	Including Hendrix Genetics BV 29 European breeders firms	Europe

²³ The 'Table of Eleven' is a format for analysis consisting of 11 factors that determine regulatory compliance.

Poland			
Network	Topic/goal	Participants	Scale
public			
Formal irregular consultation on directives	new animal welfare regulations, Solving current problems, Information, Education, Training	Agricultural Advisory Centre, National authorities: Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development Agricultural Advisory Units, Chambers of Agriculture, Farmers associations, Farmers	National & regional
Formal irregular consultation on directives	new animal welfare regulations (concerning poultry)	National Poultry Council, General Veterinary Inspectorate	National
Formal irregular legal consultations	new animal welfare regulations concerning pigs), Rules interpretation	National authorities (General Veterinary Inspectorate), POLSUS – Polish Pig Breeders and Producers Association	National
private			
Formal regular meetings	Education, information, solving current problems,	National Poultry Council Farmers, Farmers associations	National
Formal regular group meetings 1 x year	Exchanging information, cooperation, solving current problems, developing strategy	POLSUS – Polish Pig Breeders and Producers Association, agricultural advisers, farmers associations: Polish Meat Association, FBZPR- Industry Federation of Agricultural Producers, farmers, industry unions (meat processing), scientists	Regional
International private			
Working group (Formal regular meetings 4 times a year)	Formal consultation on the new EC Directives (concerning pigs)	COPA-COJECA, POLSUS – Polish Pig Breeders and Producers Association	EU
Working group (Formal irregular individual and group talks)	Solving current problems, reducing duration of animal transport, castration	COPA-COJECA, Polish Association of Beef Cattle Producers	EU
Formal regular meetings	solving current problems,	National Poultry Council and a.v.e.c.	EU
International public			
Formal irregular individual talks and meetings	Information, clarification, solving current problems	General Veterinary Inspectorate EC	EU

Romania			
Network	Topic/goal	Participants	Scale
public			
Delegation agreement between National Agency for Payment for Agricultural Development and Fisheries, National payment and Intervention Agency for Agriculture and National Sanitary Veterinary Authority and for Food Security (ANSVSA)	Control the animal welfare assurance in farms requiring the subsidies, according to the National Rural Development Plan 2007-2013	National Agency for Payment for Agricultural Development and Fisheries National payment and Intervention Agency for Agriculture National Sanitary Veterinary Authority and for Food Security (ANSVSA)	National
private			
Collaboration within the international Association of Poultry Processors and Poultry Trade in the EU countries ²⁴ (a.v.e.c.)	Cooperation between poultry processors	Uniunea Crescatorilor de Pasari din Romania (UNCPR-Romanian Poultry Producers' Association) http://www.avicultura.ro/	EU
International private			
Euro group for animals ²⁵	Cooperation, coordination and formulation of joint strategies of NGOs	Vier Pfoeten Romania http://www.vier-pfoeten.ro/	EU

Spain			
Network	Topic/goal	Participants	Scale
public			
Formal working groups for implementation initiated by the Ministry of Agriculture	Discuss and decide how to implement, revise and monitor/control EU regulations Long and short term policies on animal welfare	National and Regional government representatives, Farmers unions. Researchers when technical input is required.	National
International private			
COPA-COGECA	Discuss on common policies or country-tailored specific aspects of welfare regulations (e.g. future abandonment of pig castration)	Farmer Unions of different European countries	EU
The European Forum for Farm animal Breeders (EFFAB) ²⁶	Cooperation between animal breeding firms	Including Hendrix Genetics BV 29 European breeders firms	EU
INTERPORC ²⁷	Global network for the exchange of comparable farm level pig costs of production data. Provide a network of pig production experts for the sharing of expertise and information.	Members will be preferred if a national representative from a not for profit organisation but must be an expert in the costs of pig production for their representative country.	Global

²⁴ <http://www.avec-poultry.eu/>

²⁵ <http://eurogroupforanimals.org/>

²⁶ <http://www.effab.org/>

²⁷ INTERPORC is an inter-professional organisation of white porcine livestock producers, who collaborate in the Extension of the Standard System ("Sistema de Extensión de Norma"), which is an agreement acknowledged by the Spanish Government. INTERPORC represents more than 90% of the production as well the industrialisation of the white porcine livestock of Spain. Their aim is to develop actions that support the pig production chain.

United Kingdom			
Networks	Topic/goal	Participants	Scale
public			
Advisory Committee on Animal Feeding stuffs (ACAF) (FSA-linked)	Strategic policy advice affecting the health and welfare of kept animals.	scientists working with DEFRA, its agencies and the UK national governments.	UK-wide
Farm Animal Welfare Forum (FAWF) (NGO-linked)	Policy advice for government.	Compassion in World Farming, the Food Animal Initiative, the Co-operative Group, World Society for the Protection of Animals, RSPCA, the Soil Association and Bristol University (consultants).	UK-wide
National Animal Health and Welfare Panel (NAHWP)	Co-ordinate best practice and enforcement.	Local authority officers who bring together specialist and expert advice. Includes FSA.	UK-wide
Expert Advisory (Core) Group for the Defra funded EU Meat chicken Directive Implementation Review Project.	Advise on implementing, revising and monitoring/ control of EU regulations.	Wide ranging inc. Industry, NGOs, Local Government Regulation	UK-wide
AHVLA/FSA Consultation network initiated by DEFRA for the Slaughter Regulation.	Strategic long-term policy issues and short-term implementation issues.	Inc: BMPA, AIMS, BPC), EBLEX, HSA, RSPCA, CiWF, Vet Schools & Religious Authorities	UK-wide
Farm Animal Welfare Committee (FAWC) (DEFRA-linked)	Strategic planning for research/investigations.	scientists working with DEFRA, its agencies and the UK national governments.	UK-wide (not N Ireland)
Animal Health and Welfare Board for England (AHWBE)	Strategic policy advice affecting the health and welfare of kept animals.	scientists and industry representatives working with DEFRA, its agencies in England.	England
Steering Committee for the Implementation of the Animal Health and Welfare Strategy for Wales	Strategic planning for policy implementation.	Animal Health and Veterinary Laboratories Agency (AHVLA), British Veterinary Association (BVA), Food Standards Agency (FSA), Hybu Cig Cymru/Meat Promotion Wales (HCC), National Farmers Union (NFU) Cymru, Organic Centre Wales, Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Wales (RSPCA Cymru), Welsh Local Government Association (WGLA).	Wales
Liaison Group of UK Animal Welfare Advisory Bodies (DEFRA-linked)	Strategic planning for research/investigations.	Animal Procedures Committee (APC), Companion Animal Welfare Council (CAWC), Farm Animal Welfare Committee (FAWC) and the Zoos Expert Committee.	UK-wide
Welfare of Killing Committee, a sub-group of FAWC	Short and long-term.		UK-wide
Private			
British Poultry Council's Growers Committee	Strategic long-term policy issues and short-term implementation issues.	Various industry members (drawn from BPC's 25 company members)	UK-wide
Poultry Welfare Forum	Strategic long-term policy issues and short-term implementation issues.	Compassion in World Farming (CiWF), Cooperative Food, FAI, RSPCA, Soil Association, WSPA, University of Bristol	UK-wide
British Pig Executive (BPEX) Health and Welfare Council (PHWC)	Short-term implementation issues.	A cross-industry alliance representing every stage of pig production from "farm to fork".	UK-wide

		Includes regulators, industry, RSPCA.	
BPEX Real Welfare Project Steering Group	Short-term implementation issues.	BPEX and Red Tractor representatives, Universities of Newcastle and Bristol, private vets.	UK-wide
Red Tractor Assurance Pigs Sector Board and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	Strategic long-term policy issues and short-term implementation issues.	scientists and industry representatives working with DEFRA, its agencies and the UK national governments.	UK-wide
Red Tractor Assurance Poultry Sector Board and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	Strategic long-term policy issues and short-term implementation issues.	scientists and industry representatives working with DEFRA, its agencies and the UK national governments.	UK-wide
RSPCA's Freedom Food Technical Advisory Committee on pigs	Short-term implementation issues.	Scientists and industry representatives	UK-wide