Over 1 Million EU citizens signed the 8hours petition, asking for a limit on transport times for animals destined for slaughter to an overall maximum of 8 hours. The European Parliament adopted a Written Declaration in support of the 8 hour limit. It’s time to stop long-distance live transport in Europe.
For 15 years, Animals' Angels has monitored animal transport throughout Europe. We have exposed the brutality of many people handling animals in markets and during transport. We have documented the widespread ignorance of relevant legislation and brought the perpetrators to court. We trained several thousand of European police officers how to enforce the law which regulates animal transportation. And we found that there is an inherent unavoidable suffering when animals are shipped for more than 8 hours.

Animals' Angels therefore advocates a limited transport time for farm animals and asks the competent authorities at the EU and Member State level to adopt a legally binding 8 hour limit for all animal transportation. Animals' Angels speaks out for many concerned citizens throughout Europe who share our ethical belief that all animals have a right to be treated with respect and consideration and not pushed beyond their physical limits for reasons of profit.

Christa Blanke
Founder of Animals' Angels.

Members of the European Parliament have called for new EU rules to secure better conditions for the millions of animals transported for slaughter on the European highways every year. But nothing has happened even though we have been promised action by the two previous commissioners responsible for animal welfare, Markos Kyprianou (2004-2008) and Androulla Vassiliou (2008-2010); both have stated publicly to the European Parliament that they would put forward a revision of the existing rules for animal transports, but they didn’t deliver. This is disrespectful behaviour from the Commission towards the elected members of our house.

The present commissioner for animal welfare John Dalli recently published an evaluation of animal transport legislation. Although this evaluation revealed big problems in the existing rules, the commissioner has so far refused to change the legislation.

It is thus time to take matters into our own hands. We want a revision of the legislation and we want an 8-hour limit on the animal transports. I hope that you will take the time to read this brochure and support the actions in the European institutions aimed at establishing a maximum 8-hour limit so we can make it happen.

We have great public support for our demand. On the website www.8hours.eu we have gathered well over 1 million signatures against long animal transports.
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The 8hours campaign was launched jointly by Animals’ Angels - an international organization which has documented hundreds of cases of severe suffering endured by animals transported on long distance journeys - together with Danish MEP Dan Jørgensen. The aim of the initiative is to bring an end to this additional and totally unnecessary suffering of farmed animals. Animals transported for the purpose of slaughter must not be transported for more than 8 hours. Destinations must be planned within this transport time.

It is the current EU legislation itself (Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005) which lays down the basic principle that journeys for animals "shall not exceed eight hours". The previous legislation, Council Directive 91/628/EEC as amended, stipulated the same basic principle. So why is it still possible to carry out long-distance transports, i.e. transports exceeding eight hours? The answer is simple: the current legislation, as well as the previous legislation, provide many pages of derogations and long-distance transports are carried out on the basis of these derogations. It should also be emphasized that the time period of 8 hours was chosen by the EU legislators themselves. In fact Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 even defines "long journeys" as "journeys exceeding 8 hours".

The 8hours campaign wants to see these long journeys brought to an end and the basic principle of the legislation come into effect.

The first step of the 8hours campaign was to collect one million signatures. The response of the EU citizens was amazing. The target was not only reached but substantially exceeded: By February 2012, the 8hours petition had collected nearly 1,100,000 signatures - either through the website www.8hours.eu or on petition forms.

Over one million citizens are asking the European institutions to take action against the biggest problem related to live animal transport: the length of the journey. The enforcement of the existing rules is not enough, if long-distance journeys are not brought to an end.

The 8hours petition is not a European Citizens’ Initiative, because it would have not been legally possible to launch it before 1st April 2012, but it gathered the support of a greater number of citizens than required by the ECI. If the Commission decides to ignore this call, it would damage the credibility of tools such as the ECI: citizens could become even more disillusioned and ask whether EU institutions care about their opinion.

Over 130 Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) have expressed their support for 8hours publicly (see www.8hours.eu/supporters/).

Over 100 organizations all over Europe are supporting this campaign.

As a second step in the 8hours campaign, in November 2011 five MEPs - Dan Jørgensen (S&D, Denmark), Esther de Lange (EPP, Netherlands), Pavel Poc (S&D, Czech Republic), Carl Schlyter (Greens, Sweden) and Andrea Zanoni (ALDE, Italy) - tabled Written Declaration 49/2011 ‘on the establishment of a maximum 8-hour journey limit for animals transported in the European Union for the purpose of being slaughtered’.

WD 49/2011 is directly linked to the 8 hours campaign. It was adopted by the European Parliament on 15 March 2012 with the signatures of over half of the MEPs (99) from all 27 Member States and all political parties. It ‘calls on the Commission and the Council to review Regulation 1/2005 to establish a maximum 8-hour transport limit for the purposes of being slaughtered’.

More initiatives will follow on the way to changing the current legislation towards an 8-hours maximum transport time limit. Through investigations, Parliamentary Questions, institutional contacts and media reports, the dreadful reality of long-distance live transport will be brought to light until this long-awaited reform is achieved.

Council Directive 91/628/EEC which came into force in 1993 was replaced by Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 in 2007. The new legislation covers transport of vertebrate animals by road, rail, sea and air but it only brought slight improvement regarding the protection of animals on board the trucks. First and foremost Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 fails to make much-needed improvements to key provisions such as journey times and space allowances. In fact it still permits commercial transports of live animals, including animals transported for the purpose of being slaughtered, over long and very long distances across all of Europe and to Third Countries.

Currently horses, other equines and pigs may be transported for 24 hours, then have a 24-hour rest period and then start another 24-hours period of transport, and so on; cattle, sheep and goats can be transported for 14 hours, then should have a 1-hour rest on board the vehicle, before being transported for a further 14 hours, then have a 24-hour rest and then start another 14 hours transport and on and on; unweaned calves, lambs, foals and piglets can be transported for 9 hours, then have a 1-hour rest, then be transported for 9 hours, then have a 24-hour rest, and then start again. These cycles can be repeated indefinitely.

Although Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 already says that journeys for animals “shall not exceed eight hours”, and the previous legislation, Council Directive 91/628/EEC as amended by Council Directive 95/29/EC, stipulated the same basic principle, many pages of derogations permit long-distance transports to continue. It is time to bring these derogations to an end and to comply with the 8-hour principle adopted by EU legislators almost 20 years ago!

The European Parliament has already called for a limitation of transport times to a maximum of 8 hours in 2001, as well as in 2003.

Horses, other equines and pigs:

Cattle, sheep and goats:

Unweaned calves, lambs, foals and piglets:

Rabbits and poultry:
The Lisbon Treaty requires a ban on long-distance transports

The Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), part of the Lisbon Treaty, came into force on 1st December 2009 after being ratified by all twenty-seven Member States. It is one of two Treaties that define the European Union.

According to Article 13 TFEU, animals are sentient beings who must be respected in the EU decision making process and full regard has to be paid to their welfare requirements. The Lisbon Treaty re-affirms the European Union’s commitment to animal welfare and creates an explicit duty of care regarding animal welfare under EU law. This means that the EU and its Member States have to pay full regard to animal welfare in policies relating, inter alia, to transport, agriculture and internal market.

Nevertheless, this avowed goal of broad animal protection and welfare is still too often not reflected in the European legislation on the protection of “farm” animals. EU legislation on the protection of “farm” animals regularly disregards the so called “Five Freedoms” which are considered as the basis of the EU animal welfare policy:

- Freedom from Hunger and Thirst
- Freedom from Discomfort
- Freedom from Pain, Injury or Disease
- Freedom to Express Normal Behaviour
- Freedom from Fear and Distress

The Lisbon Treaty requires a ban on long-distance transports

It is impossible to achieve an acceptable level of animal protection during long-distance transport due to factors which are – in practice - unavoidable, such as:

Suffering due to Injuries and Pain

It regularly happens that animals get injured during long-distance transports. This has multiple causes:

- animals get stuck with their legs between the sides of the vehicle and the floor of the decks
- animals get stuck between the dividers and the bottom of the lorry
- cattle get stuck with their horns between the ventilation openings
- animals who are lying down are trampled on and injured by other animals standing on them

It is impossible to achieve an acceptable level of animal protection during long-distance transport due to factors which are – in practice - unavoidable, such as:

Suffering due to Injuries and Pain

It regularly happens that animals get injured during long-distance transports. This has multiple causes:

- animals get stuck with their legs between the sides of the vehicle and the floor of the decks
- animals get stuck between the dividers and the bottom of the lorry
- cattle get stuck with their horns between the ventilation openings
- animals who are lying down are trampled on and injured by other animals standing on them

The longer the transport takes, the longer the animals suffer from injuries and pain.
The longer the transport takes, the longer the animals suffer from thirst and dehydration.

Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 requires that means of transport used for journeys exceeding 8 hours must be equipped with a water system and watering devices appropriately designed and positioned for the animal species being transported. The aim of this legal requirement is to ensure that the animals’ minimum need of water during transport is met. However, during its investigations on the road Animals’ Angels regularly observes watering systems which are:

- not usable by the animals because the animals are not used to the system and don’t know how to operate it
- insufficient with regard to the number of drinking devices in relation to the number of animals transported
- frozen during periods of very low temperatures
- connected to water tanks whose capacity is too low to satisfy the increased need for water of the animals during periods of high temperatures
- inaccessible by a large number of the animals due to the limited space on the vehicle and the associated limited possibilities of movement

Consequently unweaned animals do regularly suffer from feed/liquid deprivation during long-distance transports4.

The Technical Report “Project to develop animal welfare risk assessment guidelines on transport” submitted to EFSA (2009) provides the scientific basis for this by stating: “During transport it is technically impossible to feed calves on board of the vehicle with milk or milk replacer”5.

Consequently in all transports of unweaned calves checked by Animals’ Angels during its investigations, in which the vehicle’s system of providing liquid was examined it turned out to be inadequate for unweaned calves.

Thirst and dehydration

Long-distance transport, 2009

The Longer the Journey the more intense the level of the problem becomes.
Suffering due to heat and cold stress

Significant temperature fluctuations are part of long-distance transport: pigs are transported from Northern Europe to Southern Europe, small ruminants and horses are transported from Eastern Europe to the South, heifers and “dairy” cows are transported from Northern Europe to Africa, pigs are transported from Central Europe to Russia, etc. It is self-evident that during these long journeys large-scale and extreme temperature fluctuations are unavoidable. Temperature fluctuations are a major stress factor for the animals during transport.

“Temperatures which are too low or too high cause stress, which can lead to disease and even death if it is severe or prolonged.”

In animal transport vehicles fans are commonly the only forced, i.e. mechanical, ventilation system. These systems are not capable of reducing or increasing the temperature. Therefore, heat suffering cannot be remedied during long-distance transport. In cases of very low temperatures, in addition to the suffering from cold stress, generally the water supply is not available due to frozen water systems. Furthermore, there is a danger of frostbite when the animals come in contact with the frozen sides of the truck.

In none of the long-distance transports observed by Animals’ Angels since 2007 were the vehicles used equipped with a ventilation system which allowed the temperature to be adjusted.

Practical experience shows that animal suffering due to high or very low temperatures cannot be avoided during long-distance transport.

The longer the transport takes, the more likely it is that the animals experience big temperature variations and the longer the animals suffer from heat or cold stress.

Suffering due to insufficient ceiling height

Insufficient headroom above the animals during transport is a frequent problem and a major factor causing severe animal suffering.

The Technical report submitted to EFSA confirms Animals’ Angels observations and states that “too low deck height” can cause prolonged thirst, thermal discomfort, locomotion problems, injuries, disease and behavioural disorders in mammals.

The unnatural and stooped posture caused by insufficient ceiling height prevents the animals from maintaining their balance; the risk of falling down during transport and thus the risk of injuries and also of having difficulties to stand up again increases.

If the animals are forced to remain in an unnatural posture for many hours, general pain as well as exhaustion and muscle fatigue, which may cause the animals to fall down, frequently occur and injuries or wounds on their heads or backs are not rare. Furthermore, the disease susceptibility increases significantly.

An insufficient height above the animals’ backs and heads also prevents effective ventilation, in particular it prevents adequate temperature regulation and removal of ammonia gases. The presence of strong ammonia gases and dense air conditions leads to respiratory disorders which provoke anxiety and fear, leads to coughing and increases the susceptibility to illness and disease. Moreover, animals may not be able to reach feeding and drinking devices during long journeys since changes of position may be impossible or painful when the animals’ backs are rubbing against the ceiling.

Where ceiling heights are too low an adequate inspection of the animals is made impossible.

The longer the transport takes, the longer the animals suffer from not being able to stand upright and from insufficient ventilation.

Long-distance transport, 2010

Pigs suffering from heat stress during long-distance transport at 31°C external temperature and ventilation system working at full capacity. High temperatures causing immense suffering to the animals are inherent in long-distance transports.

Long-distance transport, 2010

Lambs transported on 4 decks from Eastern to Southern Europe over approx. 21 hours. The animals were not able to stand in a natural upright position and the ventilation was severely compromised. This problem has been constantly observed in practice for many years.
Suffering due to insufficient space

Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 provides tables with minimum space requirements for equines, cattle, sheep, goats and pigs. Practice has shown that the minimum space requirements indicated in the Regulation’s tables are insufficient to allow the animals:

- to lie down and rest without being trampled on by other animals
- to stand up again
- to move adequately
- to have access to the watering devices
- to be able to regulate their body temperatures
- to be inspected and cared for

This leads to severe animal suffering and can even lead to injuries, disease and death on long-distance journeys.

In practice even these space allowances are ignored in numerous cases.

Long-distance Transport, 2010

Insufficient space for animals to lie down and rest comfortably. They risk being trampled on by their companions and not being able to stand up again - even though loading density during this long-distance transport corresponds to the minimum space required by tables of current legislation on animal welfare during transport.

Lack of infrastructure for cases of emergency

On many occasions in recent years Animals’ Angels teams faced situations in which checks on road transport of live animals resulted in the urgent need to unload the animals from the vehicle. Especially in cases where such emergency situations occur during night-time and at weekends it often turns out to be very difficult - or impossible - to carry out the necessary unloading. In the cases where emergency unloading is carried out it often takes many hours, which prolongs the animals’ suffering.

The reasons are various:

- official veterinary service not reachable by police authorities
- no emergency unloading facility available
- control posts (claiming to be) fully booked and therefore not capable of accepting the animals
- control posts not equipped to accommodate the particular species transported (example: the 7 official control posts in Spain are authorised only for cattle)
- European legislation does not oblige the approved control posts to be reachable 24 hours a day for emergency cases

It is unrealistic to think that the Member States will provide a sufficient number of emergency unloading places in future.

Long-distance Transport, 2010

At the request of Animals’ Angels this long-distance transport was checked by the authorities after more than 20 hours of transport. The official veterinarian ordered the urgent unloading of the sheep because several were in very alarming condition. However, the nearest possible place for unloading was reached only after 9 more hours of transport. During emergency unloading one dead sheep and four sheep that were unable to walk were observed, as well as sheep with mastitis, severe eye inflammations and limping animals.
Suffering during transport due to other unavoidable reasons

There are various further circumstances which occur all too often and which increase the animals’ suffering during transport:

- Sudden braking or acceleration or over-rapid cornering – leading to animals collapsing onto the floor of the truck where they are in danger of being trampled on by their companions.
- Poor road conditions, such as bumpy road surfaces, winding roads, roads leading through hills and mountains.
- Traffic jams, accidents or break-downs of the trucks – leading to the animals being forced to endure additional hours on board the truck; these situations become fatal at high temperatures during summer, as the trucks are stationary without the possibility of parking in the shade.
- Waiting times, for instance, in ports before embarkation: often the trucks are exposed to direct sunlight leading to a rapid and serious increase of temperature inside the truck.
- Many hours of delay between arrival and unloading of the animals at the place of destination; this considerably prolongs the transport time, often without any authority noticing it.

These practical problems cannot be avoided by legislation as they are inherent in animal transport. They can only be helped by considerably reducing the currently allowed transport times.

The longer the transport takes, more likely it is that the animals will suffer as a consequence of unavoidable problems.

Exhaustion and death

Too many animals are not able to stand these stresses and strains associated with long-distance transports and die after many hours or even days of immense suffering. Typically during long-distance transports it is impossible to treat animals who get injured, fall ill or become too exhausted. Systematic controls of animal transports are impossible, due to the nature of this business, unless huge resources are spent for this purpose, just to allow the existence of an activity which European citizens and the European Parliament want to see ended.

Long-distance transport, 2011

42 animals on board this truck did not survive the stresses and strains of this long-distance transport. The transport covered approx. 1,594 km.

Long-distance transport, 2010

After a transport time of 29 hours these animals had to wait additional 10 hours at the place of arrival before being unloaded. The animals suffered from severe thirst – nevertheless they were forced to remain on board the truck. One lamb had its leg trapped for hours between the floor of the deck and the side of the truck. As is common, there was no veterinarian present during unloading.

Long-distance transport, July 2010

Pigs suffering from severe heat stress. The truck had a breakdown and the animals were forced to remain for additional hours on board the truck in direct sunlight on the highway at temperatures of 35°C. The distance covered by this transport was approx. 1,500 km, i.e. a minimum journey time of 22 hours, not taking into account the delay due to the truck’s breakdown.

Long-distance transport, 2011

This young bovine did not survive the transport of approx. 1,700 km.
**Timeline**

**1993**

Entry into force of Directive 91/628/EEC on the protection of animals during transport. This Directive does not contain an absolute maximum transport time limit for animal transport. The EU Parliament (Resolution of European Parliament) calls for a maximum transport time limit of 8 hours for animals transported for the purpose of slaughter.

**1994-95**


**2000**

Report from the Commission and the Council to the EU Parliament on the experience acquired by Member States since the implementation of Council Directive 91/628/EEC and amending Directive 91/629/EEC concerning the protection of animals during transport. The report states that “transport should be avoided whenever possible and journeys should be as short as possible” for animals not accustomed to transport (N.B. undoubtedly “slaughter” animals are almost always not accustomed to transport).

**2001**

EU – Parliament calls for limit of transport time to 8 hours (Resolution of European Parliament)

**2002**

The EU Commission’s Committee on Animal Health and Welfare publishes its report on the Welfare of Animals during Transport. The report states that “transport should be avoided wherever possible and journeys should be as short as possible” for animals not accustomed to transport (N.B. undoubtedly “slaughter” animals are almost always not accustomed to transport).

**2003**

EU – Parliament calls for limit of transport time to 8 hours (Written Declaration 49/2001)

**2005**

Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 comes into force but only brings very limited progress for the animals on board the trucks. It fails to make improvements to key provisions such as journey times. Still no absolute maximum time limit for animal transport is introduced.

**2006**

EFSA published Scientific Opinion concerning the Welfare of Animals During Transport (prepared on request from European Commission). EFSA confirms that Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 is not in line with scientific findings.

**2010**

More than 1 Million EU – Citizens call for a maximum transport time limit of 8 hours is approved and thus becomes the official position of the EU Parliament.

**2012**

EU – Commission report on the impact of Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 confirms that the rules are constantly breached but fails to propose the main answer to this problem: a review of the existing legislation which establishes a 8 hours maximum limit for animals transported for the purpose of slaughter. As already in 1995 the Commission still wants to focus only on enforcement of the existing rules.
Better enforcement alone is not an answer to the problems of long-distance transports

Utopia versus Reality

Some stakeholders and authorities claim that the animal welfare problems caused by long-distance transports should be addressed just by better enforcement of the existing Regulation, rather than by amending the Regulation to include a limit on transport times.

This approach is simply not realistic!

Many efforts have been made over more than 15 years to improve enforcement of the previous and of the current legislation. These efforts are appreciated and necessary. However, practice has shown that efforts to enforce the legislation have only achieved limited success and will only ever achieve limited success in the absence of new provisions in the Regulation, most importantly imposing a limit on transport times. The reasons for this are on the one hand that certain problems are inherent in long-distance transports and are thus not avoidable by increased enforcement, and on the other hand that EU-wide checks to enforce the Regulation are simply not practicable – among other reasons, simply for the lack of personnel, funding and infrastructure.

In addition, the current legislation is extremely complex and contains a vast number of provisions and derogations concerning long-distance transports. This constitutes a major and often unmanageable challenge not only for the inspection authorities, but also for transport companies.

The following examples, which have been extensively documented by the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) of the European Commission and Animals’ Angels, are evidence that enforcement has been insufficient over many years and is still insufficient:

Unweaned calves regularly not fed during transport:

Unweaned calves are regularly transported on long-distance journeys (for example from Ireland to Spain) even though it is technically impossible to supply them with adequate liquid on board the trucks during transport: these animals cannot properly use the drinking devices (bite nipples) commonly installed on trucks; it is not possible to work the commonly used drinking systems with the liquid necessary for unweaned calves; heating up the liquid – as it would be necessary for this category of animals – is also not possible on regular road vehicles:

Unbroken (e.g. not tamed) horses:

Unbroken (e.g. not tamed) horses are regularly transported on long-distance journeys, even though transporting these horses on journeys exceeding 8 hours is forbidden by the current Regulation, as these young horses are particularly prone to stress during transport.

It would be necessary for the authorities, before authorizing a transport, to verify whether each horse is unbroken and thus must not be sent on a long-distance journey, or whether it is broken and thus its transport on a long-distance journey is allowed. This is a lengthy procedure which in practice often is not carried out.

Limiting transport times to a maximum of 8 hours would eliminate this problem, as the animals would not need to be fed on board.

An 8-hour limit would drastically reduce this problem, too: far fewer requirements would have to be observed and thus it would be much easier for the competent authorities to fulfill their inspection duties.

Approval of deficient journey logs by the authorities:

As Animals’ Angels investigations as well as FVO inspection reports published in 2009 and 2010 concerning 17 missions to 13 Member States show that officials in the Member States often accept and stamp journey logs with unrealistically short estimated journey times. As a result the obligatory rest stops for very long journeys are neither planned nor carried out. Furthermore important parts of the journey log are often left blank and, despite this, officials stamp the journey log as being satisfactory.

A direct maximum 8-hour journey would make the authorisation much less complicated. In addition, it would be easier for inspection authorities carrying out checks during transport to judge if times and distances are reasonable.

Lack of checks due to lack of funding/lack of veterinary staff:

For example in Greece, which in 2009 was found guilty by the European Court of Justice for failing to fulfil its obligations on the protection of animals during transport. Nevertheless in 2010, out of 407 animal transports arriving at the main Greek ports only 6 transports were checked. In France (port of Cherbourg) where each week large numbers of calves arrive from Ireland and where provisions on transport times and rest periods have been regularly ignored for years - the competent veterinary office would be eager to carry out these checks, but it is unable to do so due to the lack of staff. In Spain it is practically impossible to reach an official veterinarian outside the very restricted office hours. Since 2004, Animals’ Angels staff has been training several thousands of police and veterinarians across Europe on the welfare of animals during transport. In some regions the number and level of checks has improved, but it is impossible to have regular checks on the tens of millions of animals transported every year across Europe because this would literally require the multiplication of competent staff – and consequently the multiplication of the resources assigned to enforcement. This is not only unlikely to happen, but it would be done only to subsist a practice opposed by most European taxpayers and by the majority of Members of the European Parliament.

Approval of and checks during transport on too many decks with the consequence that the ceiling height is so low that they cannot stand in a natural upright position and that the ventilation is compromised – even though this is forbidden by the Regulation. This concerns short distance transports as well as long-distance transports, but clearly the negative consequences on the animals’ welfare are more serious during long-distance transports.

Limiting transport times to a maximum of 8 hours would not eliminate, but considerably reduce the negative consequences of insufficient ceiling height for the animals, simply because the time during which they have to endure inadequate transport conditions, would be much shorter.

Animals transported long distances on inadequate vehicles:

Animals not able to stand upright during transport:

Animals, and in particular ovines, are very frequently transported on too many decks with the consequence that the ceiling height is so low that they cannot stand in a natural upright position and that the ventilation is compromised – even though this is forbidden by the Regulation. This concerns short distance transports as well as long-distance transports, but clearly the negative consequences on the animals’ welfare are more serious during long-distance transports.

Some stakeholders and authorities claim that the animal welfare problems caused by long-distance transports should be addressed just by better enforcement of the existing Regulation, rather than by amending the Regulation to include a limit on transport times.

This approach is simply not realistic!

Many efforts have been made over more than 15 years to improve enforcement of the previous and of the current legislation. These efforts are appreciated and necessary. However, practice has shown that efforts to enforce the legislation have only achieved limited success and will only ever achieve limited success in the absence of new provisions in the Regulation, most importantly imposing a limit on transport times. The reasons for this are on the one hand that certain problems are inherent in long-distance transports and are thus not avoidable by increased enforcement, and on the other hand that EU-wide checks to enforce the Regulation are simply not practicable – among other reasons, simply for the lack of personnel, funding and infrastructure.

In addition, the current legislation is extremely complex and contains a vast number of provisions and derogations concerning long-distance transports. This constitutes a major and often unmanageable challenge not only for the inspection authorities, but also for transport companies.

The following examples, which have been extensively documented by the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) of the European Commission and Animals’ Angels, are evidence that enforcement has been insufficient over many years and is still insufficient:

Unweaned calves regularly not fed during transport:

Unweaned calves are regularly transported on long-distance journeys (for example from Ireland to Spain) even though it is technically impossible to supply them with adequate liquid on board the trucks during transport: these animals cannot properly use the drinking devices (bite nipples) commonly installed on trucks; it is not possible to work the commonly used drinking systems with the liquid necessary for unweaned calves; heating up the liquid – as it would be necessary for this category of animals – is also not possible on regular road vehicles:

Unbroken (e.g. not tamed) horses:

Unbroken (e.g. not tamed) horses are regularly transported on long-distance journeys, even though transporting these horses on journeys exceeding 8 hours is forbidden by the current Regulation, as these young horses are particularly prone to stress during transport.

It would be necessary for the authorities, before authorizing a transport, to verify whether each horse is unbroken and thus must not be sent on a long-distance journey, or whether it is broken and thus its transport on a long-distance journey is allowed. This is a lengthy procedure which in practice often is not carried out.

Limiting transport times to a maximum of 8 hours would eliminate this problem, as the animals would not need to be fed on board.

An 8-hour limit would drastically reduce this problem, too: far fewer requirements would have to be observed and thus it would be much easier for the competent authorities to fulfill their inspection duties.

Approval of deficient journey logs by the authorities:

As Animals’ Angels investigations as well as FVO inspection reports published in 2009 and 2010 concerning 17 missions to 13 Member States show that officials in the Member States often accept and stamp journey logs with unrealistically short estimated journey times. As a result the obligatory rest stops for very long journeys are neither planned nor carried out. Furthermore important parts of the journey log are often left blank and, despite this, officials stamp the journey log as being satisfactory.

A direct maximum 8-hour journey would make the authorisation much less complicated. In addition, it would be easier for inspection authorities carrying out checks during transport to judge if times and distances are reasonable.

Lack of checks due to lack of funding/lack of veterinary staff:

For example in Greece, which in 2009 was found guilty by the European Court of Justice for failing to fulfil its obligations on the protection of animals during transport. Nevertheless in 2010, out of 407 animal transports arriving at the main Greek ports only 6 transports were checked. In France (port of Cherbourg) where each week large numbers of calves arrive from Ireland and where provisions on transport times and rest periods have been regularly ignored for years - the competent veterinary office would be eager to carry out these checks, but it is unable to do so due to the lack of staff. In Spain it is practically impossible to reach an official veterinarian outside the very restricted office hours. Since 2004, Animals’ Angels staff has been training several thousands of police and veterinarians across Europe on the welfare of animals during transport. In some regions the number and level of checks has improved, but it is impossible to have regular checks on the tens of millions of animals transported every year across Europe because this would literally require the multiplication of competent staff – and consequently the multiplication of the resources assigned to enforcement. This is not only unlikely to happen, but it would be done only to subsist a practice opposed by most European taxpayers and by the majority of Members of the European Parliament.

FVO inspection reports on missions carried out in 14 Member States between 2009 and 2011 show that officials in the Member States frequently grant certificates of approval for transports exceeding 8 hours to vehicles which do not fulfil the requirements of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 (for example, concerning water system and ventilation system). Clearly, the approval and thus the use of vehicles that do not comply with the additional standards for long-distance journeys causes negative consequences for the protection of the transported animals.

Problems caused by irregular vehicles would have a minor impact on animals if long-distance journeys were not permitted.
Lack of infrastructure for cases of emergency:

Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 requires the Competent Authorities of the Member States to take measures in the event of emergency to safeguard the welfare of animals during transport. As one necessary measure the Regulation requires: “unloading the animals and holding them in suitable accommodation with appropriate care until the problem is resolved”. This action becomes particularly important in cases where severe sick or injured animals are found on board during transport and the places of departure and destination are too far away to send the animals back or let them continue, or when water supply is impossible, the loading density is severely exceeded or when the animals suffer from severe heat or cold stress, etc. On many occasions in recent years Animals’ Angels teams have faced situations in which checks on road transport of live animals resulted in the urgent need to unload the animals from the vehicle. Especially when such emergency situations occur during night-time and at weekends it often turns out to be very difficult or impossible to carry out the necessary unloading. 10 of the European Member States do not have control posts at all; another 7 Member States only have 1 or 2 official control posts. In the cases where emergency unloading is carried out it often takes many hours, which prolongs the animals’ suffering. The reasons can be, among others:

- official veterinary service not reachable by police authorities
- no emergency unloading facility available
- no control post located at a reasonable distance
- control posts (claiming to be) fully booked and therefore not capable of accepting the animals
- control post not equipped to accommodate the particular species transported (example: the 7 official control posts in Spain are authorised only for cattle)
- European legislation does not oblige the approved control posts to be reachable 24 hours a day for emergency cases

An 8-hour maximum journey limit would also mean that in the event of emergency animals would not have to travel for more than 4 hours to either arrive at the destination or go back to the point of departure. This is much less than is the case with long-distance transports, unless Member States invest a large amount of financial and human resources into setting up emergency unloading facilities available at a reasonable distance everywhere.

Animals suffer due to heat stress during transport:

The Regulation requires that vehicles used for animal transports exceeding 8 hours are equipped with a ventilation system capable of maintaining temperatures between 5°C and 30°C with a +/- 5°C tolerance. In practice, in animal transport vehicles fans are the only forced, i.e. mechanical, ventilation system. These systems are – at best – capable of exchanging the air, but they are not capable of reducing temperature. Nevertheless these vehicles have been and are being granted certificates of approval by the competent authorities of Member States. Animals on board transport vehicles do clearly suffer from heat stress during the hot summer months, with temperatures often over 35°C particularly in Southern Europe. This concerns in particular animals that are not used to high temperatures, as for example pigs transported from Belgium or the Netherlands to Italy. As investigations have shown, especially pigs do immensely suffer from heat stress during transport.

Slaughtering animals as close as possible to the farm (i.e. observing an 8-hour maximum limit) would enormously reduce these problems, also because in summer transporters could make the whole journey during night time when temperatures are lower.

Failure to enforce the requirement that animals must be given food, water and rest during long journeys:

The FVO reports show that Member States often fail to enforce the requirement that animals must be given food, water and 24 hours rest after 24 hours travel in the case of pigs and horses, 28 hours travel in the case of cattle and sheep and 18 hours travel in the case of unweaned animals. In some cases no rest break at all is given; in other cases the rest break is much shorter than required by Regulation 1/2005. The failure to give the legally required breaks for food, water and rest can arise because:

- the transporter gave an unrealistically short estimated journey time in the journey log and this was not detected by the Competent Authority, or an accurate estimated journey time was given and a 24 hour stop was planned in the journey log but in fact the vehicle did not stop at all for the 24 hour rest break or stopped but for less than the required 24 hours.

With an 8-hour maximum transport time limit, it would no longer be necessary to unload the animals during transport for rest. In addition, the need to feed and water the animals would be considerably decreased.

Sanctions not effective, proportionate or dissuasive:

Regulation 1/2005 stipulates that the penalties provided for infringements must be effective, proportionate and dissuasive. Article 54 of Regulation 882/2004 provides that when a CA identifies non-compliance with EU rules for the protection of animal welfare “it shall take action to ensure that the operator remedies the situation”. It is clear from Animals’ Angels’ documentation that in some cases no penalties are imposed and that in other cases the penalties imposed are too low to be dissuasive. Moreover, some Member States have no effective powers to impose penalties on transporters from other Member States. These findings are confirmed by the FVO reports.

While we welcome the establishment of adequate sanctions, the establishment of an 8-hour maximum journey limit would immediately lead to a decrease of cases where sanctions are needed. Furthermore as an 8-hour maximum journey time limit would lead to fewer live animal transports between Member States, the problems the inspection authorities currently have in effectively enforcing sanctions on foreign transport companies would be reduced considerably.

More than 234,000 French citizens signed the 8hours petition
Enforcement is an illusion, if long-distance transports continue. Deficient transports originating from Spain - Commission closes complaint file as it is unable to obtain the required information from Spain

In 2007 Animals’ Angels and Compassion In World Farming filed a Formal Complaint to the European Commission concerning the systematic failure by competent authorities of Spain to secure compliance with Community legislation on the protection of animals during transport.

The essence of the Complaint was that at least since 2005, when Animals’ Angels submitted the first of its comprehensive reports on severe irregularities concerning the protection of animals during long-distance animal transports originating from Spain, the Spanish competent authorities have had detailed knowledge of these severe infractions that occur on a regular basis. Despite this, the Spanish competent authorities at least since 2005 have failed to adopt effective measures to achieve better enforcement. Indeed, there has been no improvement in the level of enforcement achieved between 2005, when Animals’ Angels submitted the first of five comprehensive reports, and 2010, the date of the most recent. Almost every single transport going from Spain to Italy continues to violate Community legislation on the protection of animals during transport.

Concretely, in the various complaint files Animals’ Angels and Compassion In World Farming complained about transports originating from 9 different regions in Spain.

Finally, in October 2011 the Commission responded to the Formal Complaint submitted in 2007, suggesting the closure of the complaint file. As reason for the suggestion to close the file, the EU Commission service explained that in the Spanish Autonomous Community of Castilla y León improvements concerning animal transport had occurred. Furthermore, the Commission stated that from the other 8 Spanish regions concerned they could not obtain any information.

It is unrealistic for the Commission to draw conclusions about all the nine regions to which the complaint referred by considering just one single region, particularly as only eight of the 48 non-compliant transports that we observed and which formed the essence of our formal complaint had their place of departure in the region of Castilla y León.

An 8-hour maximum time limit would require fewer controls, fewer interventions by the Commission and in general would cause fewer problems to be brought to the attention of the competent authorities.

The Commission itself in 2008 stated that “… efforts in enforcing the legislation will only achieve limited progress without a new approach to certain provisions in the Regulation and, in particular, on traveling times and space allowances. The Commission believes that the present time limits are not fully in line with scientific knowledge and are also inconsistent with the social legislation applicable to drivers, making the overall implementation of transport times difficult. Therefore the Commission considers the revision of travelling times and space allowances as a priority.”

And again in its long awaited report on the impact of Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport, published in November 2011, the Commission states “Enforcement of the Regulation remains a major challenge, partly because of deficiencies in interpretation of the requirements and because of lack of controls by the member States. Furthermore, the quality of monitoring data, submitted to the Commission by Member States, is often insufficient to provide a clear analysis of the situation and to allow planning of specific corrective measures at EU level”.

Despite years of efforts for better enforcement, many operators still do not comply with the legal requirements and it is unrealistic to believe that they will do it in the future if the pressure is not further increased by literally placing a police car behind every single truck. This, of course, will not be possible taking into consideration the financial situation in the Member States and the permanent lack of personnel in the governmental veterinary services and it is more than questionable whether it would be appropriate to spend more public money in the surveillance. This problematic applies for all long-distance transports of animals transported for further fattening or slaughter. The margin of profit in long-distance transports is so limited and the financial pressure so high that many of the transporters and operators of control posts simply cannot afford to comply with the animal protection rules. This is all the more shocking since the rules on animal protection during long-distance transports do not even aim to ensure the well-being of the animals but only to meet their very minimum needs to that they can survive the transport.

Too many transporters and other operators involved in long-distance transports of animals destined for slaughter will not voluntarily comply with the relevant legal requirements for animal protection. The competent authorities in the Member States do not have the means for enforcement able to guarantee compliance with the animal protection rules applicable to long-distance transports.

The Technical Report submitted to EFSA (2009) states that there are more than 100 hazards endangering the welfare of mammals during transport: it is not realistic to believe that enforcement could ever be improved in such a way as to eliminate all these hazards.

As evident from these examples, Member States have been and are systematically and permanently failing to enforce Reg. (EC) No 1/2005.

This situation has not significantly changed over the years, despite repeated commitments to focus on enforcement as an alternative to an 8-hour limit.

There is no reason to believe that these and other enforcement deficiencies which have existed for decades will be resolved in the future!

To make this clear once more:

Enforcement is and remains of utmost importance. But for practical reasons, as far as long-distance transport is concerned the efficiency of enforcement has never led and can never lead to satisfactory results.

Member States are and must remain obliged to guarantee that legislation is efficiently enforced. Any new legislation limiting transport to a maximum of 8 hours, will NOT release Member States from their duty of enforcing legislation, but it will make enforcement easier and more effective.

Current legislation is extremely complex, which constitutes a major and often unmanageable challenge for the inspection authorities. An 8 hour limit would eliminate this problem.

A revision of the legislation and a drastic reduction of the permitted transport times to a maximum of 8 hours from farm to final destination are the only realistic solution in order to considerably reduce the suffering of the transported animals.
A number of EU and national authorities and other stake-
holders have been claiming over the years that long-dis-
tance animal transports can be carried out under accept-
able conditions for the animals, IF there is enough room
for the animals on board, IF they have access to water
and food, IF they are transported under good climatic
conditions, IF the vehicles are of a high standard, IF only
healthy animals are loaded, IF obligatory rest breaks are
respected and so on.

This is simply NOT the way animal transports are
carried out in reality! Economic reasons are behind the
transport of live animals instead of carcasses, so there
will always be attempts to increase profit, which can re-
sult in serious suffering for the animals. Long-distance
transport of millions of animals is largely uncontrollable.
Both the Commission and Member States have already
spent a lot of money to focus on short-term enforcement.
If this money is invested in infrastructure for the very lim-
ited number of cases (i.e. very remote areas) where a
slaughterhouse might not be available within an 8-hour
journey, the Treaty’s mandate to consider animal welfare
will be implemented and long-lasting solutions will be es-
tablished.

It must also be stressed at this point that – in contrast
to what many still think – the presence of a veterinarian
during loading and unloading for an obvious reason: the Member States do not have the financial and personnel resources to carry out such checks.

It cannot be expected that the Member States will ever accept such a requirement and thus it is unrealistic to think that legislation allowing long-
distance transports could ever be adequately en-
forced.

The question is not whether it is THEORETICALLY
possible to carry out long-distance transports of ani-
mals transported for the purpose of slaughter under acceptable conditions for the animals. But the ques-
tion is whether it is realistic to think that long-distance
transports are or will be IN PRACTICE carried out un-
der acceptable conditions. Animals’ Angels has gath-
ered more than enough practical experience to be able to answer the latter question with a clear “No!”.

The reason behind the transport of animals for slaugh-
ter or further fattening is economics – the operators
want to make a profit. The discrepancy between finan-
cial interests and protection of animals will always be
to the disadvantage of the animals.

Thus in practice most long-distance transports
within the EU are not physically checked at any
point of the journey by any official authority for

Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 does not require the
presence of a vet during loading and unloading for
an obvious reason: the Member States do not have
the financial and personnel resources to carry out
such checks.

The long-awaited Commission Report on the impact of
Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of
animals during transport was published in November
2011. The report states “Even though animal welfare in
general has improved after the introduction of the Reg-
sulation, the available information show that severe
animal welfare problems during transport persist.”

As examples the report lists:

- transport of unfit animals
- overstocking of vehicles
- transport of animals in vehicles in which the internal
  height of the compartments is inappropriate;
- animals not receiving enough water during the jour-
  ney
- animals being transported longer than the maximum
  allowed travelling time
- authorities approving unrealistically short transport
times.

Clearly, the longer the transport takes, the more seri-
ous all these welfare problems become for the animals.

Legal provisions concerning the aspects listed
above have been in force since 199523, i.e. for the
past 17 years (N.B. it is not the case, as some mis-
takenly think that they came into force for the first time
in 2005 with the current Regulation (CE) 1/2005), yet
they are still too often being infringed. This means
that for all these years the repeated commitments
to enforce the existing legislation rather than limit
the journey times have failed. To repeat in 2012 that
enforcement is enough is simply not realistic. We
should stop denying the problem and adopt the only
possible answer: a maximum of 8 hours from farm
to destination, be it a slaughterhouse or a farm for
further fattening before slaughter.

Nevertheless the Commission’s 2011 report concludes
that “appropriate enforcement of existing rules should
remain the priority”. Given the fact that these and other
provisions which have been in force since 1995 are
not yet enforced in the year 2012, it is clear that
proper enforcement will have a chance only if an
8-hour limit is established. Ignoring evidence once
again would mean turning a blind eye to the re-
quirements of the Treaty!

‘As early as 1994 the German Agriculture Minister
Jochen Borchert, shocked by the severe suffer-
ing the animals experienced during long-distance
transports, demanded a reduction of the transport
times to a maximum of 6 hours for “slaughter” ani-
mals. Commission and Council refused to intro-
duce this time limit. Several months later, Direc-
tive 95/29/EC established some rules on watering,
feeding and resting periods, but no overall journey
time limits. These rules are the ones that still apply
today with dreadful consequences for the animals.

How can the Commission still focus on the enforce-
ment of these rules, although it’s been proven that
after 17 years they have constantly failed to achieve
an acceptable level of animal protection?

The Commission fails again to propose the only real-
istic answer to this problem: a review of the existing
legislation to establish a drastic reduction of transport
times.

This is in sharp contrast to the statement expressed
by the EU Commission in 2008: “…the Commission is
conscious that efforts in enforcing the legislation will
only achieve limited progress without a new approach
to certain provisions in the Regulation and, in particu-
lar, on travelling times and space allowances. The Com-
mision believes that the present time limits are not fully
in line with scientific knowledge and are also inconsist-
ent with the social legislation applicable to drivers”48,
making the overall implementation of transport time
difficult. Therefore the Commission considers the
revision of travelling times and space allowances
as a priority49.
Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 should be reviewed.

The previous Commissioners agree!

The previous two European Commissioners responsible for animal welfare, Markos Kyriakou and Androulla Vassiliou, clearly acknowledged the necessity for a revision of the existing rules on animal transport, in particular as regards transport times and space allowances.

Markos Kyriakou (2004-2008)

“...In relation to the duration of animal transport, the Commission envisages to propose a revision of the Transport Regulation to the Council and Parliament in 2009 at the latest on travelling times and space allowances for the different species, to bring them into line with the available scientific knowledge.”

“I would like to take this opportunity to reiterate the statement that I have already made before the European Parliament that I intend to re-visit this issue before the end of my mandate. I am particularly interested in pursuing a legislative initiative that will further improve the transport conditions for animals.”

Androulla Vassiliou (2008-2010)

“The Commission is aware of the problems of enforcement of the Council Regulation on protection of animals during transport (...). The Commission is currently undertaking the necessary preparatory work, notably an impact assessment, in order to examine the possibility of bringing forward by the end of this mandate a proposal to revise the Animal Transport Regulation (...). This work is focused on maximum travelling times and space allowances for animals during transport, as these were unchanged during the discussions to adopt the regulation in 2004. Concerning the transport of animals for slaughter, in the Commission’s view, movements over long distances should in principle be limited as far as possible due to the related risks for the welfare and the health of the animals.”

“I have seen videos on the transportation of animals which make me feel ashamed,” she said, promising better protection under a new law.

(...) The Commission believes that the current rules on journeys and densities do not reflect science or travelling time limits available to drivers under EU social laws. It also thinks that current rules on densities of packing animals into trucks “are not sufficiently precise to allow proper enforcement”. Officials think that the current regulation “leaves space” for distortion in the way the regulation is applied.

Why does the current Commissioner responsible for animal welfare, Mr. John Dalli, now NOT see the need for revised legislation anymore? What has changed?

What new elements make the Commission think that all the problems relating to enforcing the present Regulation, acknowledged by the previous two Commissioners, have been resolved?

How can the Commission be satisfied with proposing “guides to good practices” instead of changing the legislation in order to bring it in line with new scientific evidence – knowing that “guides to good practices” are not legally binding and thus not enforceable?

It is time to abolish the derogations to the 8-hours rule that have been in existence for almost 20 years causing great harm to millions of animals. We are not asking for something new, but simply for the proper implementation of a principle agreed at the EU level two decades ago and still not implemented. This is the real enforcement the Commission should pursue: proposing a review of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 to delete the derogations to the 8 hours rule.

Experience over many years has shown that enforcement of the current and previous legislation alone has not led to satisfactory results. What makes the Commission think that now enforcement alone will solve the long standing problems?

Widespread demands for a strict limitation of the transport time

Markos Kyriakou (2004-2008)

“...In the case of cattle, horses, goats, sheep and pigs not intended for specific breeding and/or sporting purposes, transport should be limited to a maximum of eight hours duration”

Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW), 2002

“...after a few hours of transport welfare tends to become poorer as journey length increases.”

“Hence such animals should not be transported if this can be avoided and journeys should be as short as possible”

Council of Europe, 2003

“...for reasons of animal welfare the period during which animals, including animals for slaughter, are transported should be reduced as far as possible...”

Federation of Veterinarians of Europe – FVE, 2007

“...the (long–distance) transport of life animals carries serious risks for the welfare of these animals. Since many years already, FVE holds the opinion that fattening of animals should take place within or near the place of birth and animals should be slaughtered as near to the point of production as possible.”

European Commission, 2008

“...the Commission is conscious that efforts in enforcing the legislation will only achieve limited progress without a new approach to certain provisions in the Regulation and, in particular, on travelling times and space allowances. The Commission believes that the present time limits are not fully in line with scientific knowledge and are also inconsistent with the social legislation applicable to drivers, making the overall implementation of transport time difficult. Therefore the Commission considers the revision of travelling times and space allowances as a priority.”

World Organisation for Animal Health – OIE, 2010

“The amount of time animals spend on a journey should be kept to the minimum.”

1.100.000 European Citizens, 8hours-petition, 2012

“With my signature, I call for a restriction of 8 hours for animal transports in the member states of the European Union.”


“The European Parliament calls on the Commission and the Council to review Regulation 1/2005 to establish a maximum 8-hour limit for the journeys of animals transported for the purpose of being slaughtered;”
Political support: Members of the European Parliament
Transport of meat instead of live animals is more sustainable

A study related to the year 2007 found out that if transports of live "slaughter" horses between EU Member States was banned and meat was transported instead, emission of CO2 would decrease by 40% and total transport costs would be reduced to 50% of the cost of live transport.

Concerning pigs and piglets the same study concluded that if transports of live pigs and piglets between EU Member States were banned and meat was transported instead, emission of CO2 would decrease by 40% and total transport costs would be reduced to 50% of the cost of live transport.

Transport of meat instead of live animals is more sustainable

There is no necessity to transport animals alive all across Europe and even export them to Third Countries, as in general it is possible to reach a slaughterhouse within 8 hours and then the meat can be transported to wherever there is demand for it. Even now, as well as in previous years, in volume the intra community trade in meat is and has been far more important than trade in live animals.12

Should it be objectively verified that from very remote areas of the EU it is really not possible to reach a slaughterhouse within 8 hours, then other solutions are imaginable, such as mobile slaughterhouses or in fact exemptions to the rule to a limited extent.

The severe problems of animal protection and animal welfare are inherent in long-distance transports, and have been for some decades. It is not realistic to assume that they will be resolved in the future. It is evident, extensively documented and confirmed by scientists that as the journey time gets longer the negative consequences for the animals increase.

Thus, long-distance transports of animals destined for slaughter are no longer legitimate in a European Union whose ethical beliefs include the protection of animals and high animal welfare standards.

The European agriculture industry will find ways to replace long-distance transports of live animals by other production paths, which already account for most of the meat trade, and Europe will no longer be responsible for the easily avoidable suffering of tens of millions of animals on Europe’s roads.

European politicians and stakeholders can no longer turn a blind eye to the appalling situation for the animals transported for the purpose of slaughter on long-distance transports.

European politicians have to take into consideration the goals of the EU Treaty. One of these – expressed in Article 13 TFEU – is to care for our animals and avoid causing them suffering.

European legislation should be amended to establish a maximum 8-hour journey limit, to reflect the demands of European citizens - expressed through over a million signatures presented to the Commission in 2012 - and of the European Parliament, confirmed in Written Declaration 49/2011 adopted on 15 March 2012.

Therefore, the organizers and supporters of the 8hours campaign INVITE:

- The European Commission and the Council to act promptly to propose a review of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 to establish a maximum 8-hour limit for all animals transported for the purpose of slaughter, i.e. slaughtered on arrival or after a fattening period following transport and similar limits for other animals transported for breeding purposes.
- Members of the European Parliament to support the parliamentary actions aimed at establishing a maximum 8-hour limit;
- Parliaments and competent authorities in the Member States to express their support for the establishment of a maximum 8-hour journey limit;
- The media to inform the public about the severe problems regularly encountered in animals transported on European roads;
- European citizens, of whom over a million have already expressed their support by signing the 8hours petition, to ask their representatives in the institutions to establish a maximum 8-hour journey limit.

Tens of millions of animals are still suffering on European roads. Long-distance transports of animals transported for the purpose of slaughter must end.

8 HOURS IS MORE THAN ENOUGH!

NetAp supporters. Over 37,300 Swiss citizens have signed the 8hours petition

It is time to make a change!

Take action!
Europeans call for an end to long-distance transports of live animals!

Perpetuum Jazzile (Slovenia)

Maurizio Costanzo and Susanna Schimperna (Italy)

Dieter Moor and Nadeshda Brennicke (Germany)

Germany

Spain

Poland

Slovakia

Licia Coló (Italy)

Jadranka Juras (Slovenia)

8hours website with Jane Goodall's appeal

8hours sticker
In the case of cattle, horses, goats, sheep and pigs not intended for transport being treated for other purposes, transport should be limited to a maximum of eight hours, or a distance of 500 km. (Commission Directive 91/628/EEC as amended, as well as the current Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport). The principle reads as follows:

The previous Council Directive 91/628/EEC as amended, as well as the current Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport fill pages with derogations to a laid down, basic principle. The principle reads as follows:

The Transport of live animals "shall not exceed eight hours".

Unfortunately, in practice, things have completely changed to the contrary: During many years of work within the Commission, in the field of animal welfare, I found out that the derogations became the rule. I remember the incidents in Bari, back in summer 1999. Many dozens of sheep and lambs suffered to death, on board of trucks with insufficient space and in burning heat. Sure, the situation has improved since 1999, but it is far from being acceptable – still in 2011 there are documented incidents of dozens of sheep, as well as cattle, originating from EU Member States that did not make by anything even more complicated. Not by including even more derogations. But the most important sentence of the Regulation should always be respected. This sentence reads – I repeat:

Journey times for animals “shall not exceed eight hours.”