



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
HEALTH AND CONSUMERS DIRECTORATE-GENERAL  
Directorate F - Food and Veterinary Office

Ares(2013)283398

DG(SANCO) 2012-6525 - MR FINAL

FINAL REPORT OF AN AUDIT  
CARRIED OUT IN  
LATVIA  
FROM 15 TO 19 OCTOBER 2012  
IN ORDER TO EVALUATE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CONTROLS FOR ANIMAL  
WELFARE ON FARMS AND DURING TRANSPORT

*In response to information provided by the Competent Authority, any factual error noted in the draft report has been corrected; any clarification appears in the form of a footnote.*

## ***Executive Summary***

*This audit took place in Latvia from 15 to 19 October 2012. The objective of the audit was to verify the implementation of EU animal welfare legislation regarding farms and transport of animals.*

*The report concludes that official controls of animal welfare have been well organised and implemented. However, although documented procedures are mostly comprehensive in listing the legal requirements to be checked, they do not always adequately describe how certain requirements should be checked which results in inspectors not being able to make a more complete assessment.*

*The control procedures for laying hen farms were the most developed and good practical assessments of the systems had been carried out. This had resulted in the deadline of 1.1.2012 being met by all except one of the 22 farms with cage systems. The farm which missed the deadline subsequently converted the cages, albeit with one type of cage where there was no practical way of delivering litter to the littered area and the other type of cage lacked claw shortening devices. The delay in making these changes and the continued operation of cage systems with gross overstocking indicates that the CA has not been fully successful in getting this sector to operate within the EU minimum standards.*

*Although the CA is optimistic that the pig sector will meet the deadline of 1.1.2013 for introducing group housing systems, and this sector has certain advantages over those in other parts of the EU in that many of the older housing systems allow simple conversions to be carried out, there is still considerable work needed if this is to be achieved on time.*

*The CA have further developed their controls on animal welfare during transport which generally work well. However data from Satellite Navigation Systems, and also temperature recording, is not yet fully utilised for verifying that times and conditions are respected.*

*The local CA efficiently utilises the system of administrative fines but these sanctions are not always effective in bringing about corrective actions. The good work of the CA is undone in certain cases where the economics of making the correction vastly outweigh the level of the fine.*

*The report makes recommendations to the CA aimed at strengthening the control system already in place.*

# Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b><u>INTRODUCTION</u></b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b><u>OBJECTIVES</u></b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>3</b>	<b><u>LEGAL BASIS</u></b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>4</b>	<b><u>BACKGROUND</u></b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>5</b>	<b><u>FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS</u></b> .....	<b>2</b>
5.1	<b><u>COMPETENT AUTHORITY</u></b> .....	<b>2</b>
5.1.1	<i><u>ORGANISATION AND RESPONSIBILITIES</u></i> .....	<b>2</b>
5.1.2	<i><u>COMPETENT AUTHORITY PROCEDURES TO VERIFY THE EFFECTIVENESS OF OFFICIAL CONTROLS</u></i> .....	<b>2</b>
5.1.3	<i><u>AUDIT</u></i> .....	<b>3</b>
5.1.4	<i><u>TRAINING OF CA STAFF</u></i> .....	<b>3</b>
5.2	<b><u>FARM INSPECTIONS</u></b> .....	<b>3</b>
5.2.1	<i><u>LAYING HEN FARMS</u></i> .....	<b>4</b>
5.2.2	<i><u>PIG FARMS</u></i> .....	<b>5</b>
5.2.3	<i><u>BROILER FARMS</u></i> .....	<b>5</b>
5.2.4	<i><u>FUR FARMS</u></i> .....	<b>7</b>
5.2.5	<i><u>CATTLE FARMS</u></i> .....	<b>7</b>
5.3	<b><u>TRANSPORT</u></b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>6</b>	<b><u>OVERALL CONCLUSIONS</u></b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>7</b>	<b><u>CLOSING MEETING</u></b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>8</b>	<b><u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u></b> .....	<b>10</b>
	<b><u>ANNEX 1 - LEGAL REFERENCES</u></b> .....	<b>12</b>

**ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS USED IN THIS REPORT**

BIP	Border Inspection Post
CA	Competent Authority
CCA	Central Competent Authority
DG	Director General (of the CCA)
EU	European Union
FVO	Food and Veterinary Office (a Directorate of the European Commission's DG Health and Consumers)
SNS	Satellite Navigation System
SVI	Senior Veterinary Inspector
TSU	Territorial Service Unit (Local CA)
VI	Veterinary Inspector

## 1 INTRODUCTION

This audit took place in Latvia from 15 to 19 October as part of the planned audit programme of the FVO.

An opening meeting was held with the competent authorities of Latvia on 15 October 2012. At this meeting, the objectives of, and itinerary for the audit were confirmed by the audit team and additional information required for the satisfactory completion of the audit was requested.

The audit team comprised two auditors from the FVO and a national expert and was accompanied throughout the audit by a representative of the CCA, Food and Veterinary Service (Central office).

## 2 OBJECTIVES

The objective of the audit was to verify the implementation of EU animal welfare legislation regarding farms and transport of animals. In pursuit of these objectives, the following meetings were held and sites visited:

Visits			Comments
Competent authority	Central	2	Opening and final meetings
	Regional	2	Dienvidzemgale and Austrumvidzeme
Farms		5	Two broiler farms operating at the higher stocking densities and a mink farm were selected by the CCA.  A cattle farm and a laying hen farm were selected by the audit team in order to assess the effectiveness of enforcement actions.

## 3 LEGAL BASIS

The mission was carried out under the general provisions of Community legislation, in particular Article 45 of Regulation (EC) No. 882/2004.

Legal acts quoted in this report are provided in Annex 1 and refer, where applicable, to the last amended version.

## 4 BACKGROUND

A previous mission concerning animal welfare took place from 2 to 6 February 2009 (ref. DG(SANCO) 2009-8271). This report concluded that the system of inspection for animal welfare on farms, during transport and at slaughter was generally adequate. However, the CA did not ensure that all the deficiencies in laying hens holdings equipped with cages were detected and corrected, such as the lack of litter in enriched cages and overstocking. In addition, the CA did not ensure that

all approved vehicles for long journeys were included in the CCA list, their requirements fully verified, and that there were provisions to give liquid to unweaned calves which were still on a milk diet during transport. Finally, the CA had not sufficiently determined the parameters for waterbath stunning of poultry as required. The country profile of Latvia on food and feed safety, animal health, animal welfare and plant health (ref. DG (SANCO) 2012-6419; hereafter “the country profile”) indicates that actions were taken to address all the recommendations in report 2009-8271. The above reports are available on the website of DG Health and Consumers at:

[http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/ir\\_search\\_en.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/ir_search_en.cfm)

Latvia was one of 13 Member States which were urged by the Commission services to implement the ban on unenriched cages for laying hens in January 2012 (see press release ref. IP/12/47 <http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release>).

The current audit is the first time that the implementation of certain recommendations from the European Convention for the Protection of Animals kept for Farming Purposes (hereafter “the Convention”) have been assessed.

## **5 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

### **5.1 COMPETENT AUTHORITY**

#### *5.1.1 Organisation and responsibilities*

The organisation of the Competent Authorities (hereafter: CA) is described in the country profile.

#### *5.1.2 Competent authority procedures to verify the effectiveness of official controls*

### **Legal requirements**

Article 8(3) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires the CA to have procedures in place to verify the effectiveness of official controls.

### **Findings**

There is a procedure both for senior veterinary inspectors (SVI) and for central technical managers to carry out supervision of the work of inspectors. This procedure includes an assessment of:

- Preparation of the inspection;
- Behaviour of inspector and actions taken;
- Whether the inspector evaluates documents including "own checks";
- Whether the inspector follows procedure;
- Whether the inspector checks legal conformity and his/her decision making on the spot;
- Whether the inspector seeks to establish corrective actions with deadlines.

The inclusion of an on the spot assessment has been introduced into the supervision procedure introduced in November 2005 and with recent updates in April 2012.

The SVI met has scheduled supervision of the eight VIs in her district every six months. One file for supervision of a VI examined by the audit team indicated that the SVI had followed this procedure and recorded findings and conclusions.

The central technical manager is expected to supervise animal welfare controls in a similar way every three years. Supervision has been performed in eight TSUs until 15 October 2012.

### 5.1.3 *Audit*

#### **Legal Requirements**

Under Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 competent authorities are required to carry out internal audits, or have external audits carried out.

#### **Findings**

Audits on food and feed controls have been planned in a five year cycle, animal welfare was scheduled for 2012 but postponed to 2013 due to insufficient resources.

### 5.1.4 *Training of CA staff*

#### **Legal requirements**

Article 6 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires competent authorities to ensure that staff receive appropriate training, and are kept up-to-date in their competencies.

#### **Findings**

- 144 inspectors from the level of the TSUs and BIPs have completed the e-training course “Animal welfare requirements during transportation”.
- Training material reviewed by the audit team included practical situations to illustrate the legal requirements.

#### **Conclusions on CA**

There is a good system of supervision whereby the senior veterinary inspectors supervise the work within the local veterinary unit. Although audits have been carried out in other sectors of food and feed control an audit on animal welfare controls had to be rescheduled to 2013 due to lack of resources. The training on animal welfare during transport has provided good practical guidance on how certain requirements should be implemented.

## **5.2 FARM INSPECTIONS**

#### **Legal requirements**

Article 6 of Directive 98/58/EC requires Member States to take measures to ensure that inspections are carried out by the CA to ensure compliance. Decision 2006/778/EC requires the CA to provide a report to the Commission every year on the results of farm inspections. Article 8 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires the CCA to provide documented procedures for official controls.

#### **Findings**

- The CCA have provided a series of checklists for assessing the requirements for each of the farmed species.
- These checklists are structured so that the requirements listed follow the categories listed in Decision 2006/778. The checklists expand the requirements for each category as relevant to the different species; i.e. links the general requirement from Decision 2006/778 with the more specific requirement from other pieces of legislation (e.g. Directive 2007/43/EC).
- Each criteria in each checklist is also linked to the relevant section of the violations code laid down in national legislation so that the level of the corresponding fine can be easily assessed to assist decision making when deficiencies are reported.

- The checklists are designed so that they are machine readable. This means that they can be scanned and the findings automatically compiled. While this was seen to be generally accurate and efficient, in the TSU visited the audit team requested the file relating to a sheep farm where there had been problems with buildings and equipment indicated in the reporting database, but the CA indicated that there had been no such result from inspections and that this was one of a small number of errors which occurred with this system.

## **Conclusions**

Checklists are well designed allowing for a high level of consistency in reporting between TSUs and also aid in their decision making when deficiencies are detected. The reporting system, apart from a small number of errors, was generally accurate and efficient.

### *5.2.1 Laying hen farms*

## **Legal requirements**

Article 8 of Directive 99/74/EC requires the CA has to carry out checks to monitor compliance with the requirements for laying hens. Article 5 (2) of Directive 99/74/EC banned the use of unenriched cages after 1.1.2012.

## **Findings**

- The CA had indicated that all farms, with the exception of one, complied with the requirements of Article 5 (2) of Directive 99/74/EC. In two of the four buildings on this farm unenriched cages continued to be used after 1.1.2012, contrary to the requirements of Article 5 (2) of Directive 99/74/EC. There were c. 150,000 birds on this farm.
- Eggs from these houses were sent for processing, which is in accordance with the CA action plan submitted in response to the letter in January 2012 from the Commission services urging implementation of the ban on unenriched cages for laying hens. These eggs continued to be sent for processing until April 2012 under the supervision of the CA.
- The CA had carried out a series of inspections of this farm and had found in July 2012 that in one of the two buildings, in which the old unenriched cages had been renovated, the now modified cages did not provide sufficient height. The CA indicated that now the structure of the cages was compliant with Article 6 of Directive 99/74/EC. The audit team saw that in all houses the cages were now of appropriate dimensions and all had a separate nest area and perches; however in the two houses with renovated cages there was no practical way of providing material for pecking and scratching on the litter mat which was placed in each cage, contrary to Article 6 (1) and that, while the proprietary built cages in the other two houses did have a system to supply such material, these cages did not have a claw-shortening device, contrary to Article 6 (5).
- The CA had also found in their July 2012 inspections that the cages in all buildings on this farm, including those where proprietary built cages had been installed in 2008 and 2009, were over 40% overstocked. In the case above a fine of c. €650 had been imposed. The CA explained that the highest level of fine (c. €700) had not been imposed because the operator had made significant changes to the structures of the cages, in order to comply with Article 6 of Directive 99/74/EC, and that this mitigated against a higher fine. The deadline for correction had not been respected.

- In the other TSU visited a similar finding of overstocking and lack of litter had resulted in a higher fine of c. €1 440, which is the maximum which can be imposed at TSU level under the procedure for administrative fines, when the CA detect a repeated violation in the same year. In this case a longer deadline had been given for correction; i.e. at the time of depopulation.

## **Conclusions**

Measures taken by the CA have been largely successful in bringing about major changes in the laying hen sector in making sure unenriched cages are not used. However while otherwise structurally adequate, these did not always provide litter or claw-shortening devices and in any case, as the CA has not been successful in preventing gross overstocking, the ability of the birds to utilise the different aspects of enriched cages is greatly reduced.

### *5.2.2 Pig farms*

## **Legal requirements**

Article 8(1) of Directive 2008/120/EC requires the CA has to carry out inspections on a representative sample of the different rearing systems for pigs. Article 3.4 of Directive 2008/120/EC requires sows and gilts to be group housed from 4 weeks after weaning to 1 week before farrowing.

## **Findings**

- According to the CCA all the pig breeding farms in more than half the country are already fully compliant with the requirements regarding group housing of sows and gilts. Six TSUs have indicated that all their farms comply.
- The CA carried out repeated checks of 30 farms, out of which 14 are fully compliant and 16 still to construct group housing.
- All pig breeders had given written declarations, following the instruction from the DG of the CCA on 14/9/2012 that this was required, that they would meet requirements by 2013.
- In the TSU visited the two largest farms with breeding sows had both still to construct group housing for sows. The farm with 900 sows was more advanced than a 2000 sow unit on the second farm. According to CA the existing housing provided a large walking/working area for personnel behind the dry sow stalls, and this allows a simple conversion to voluntary stall group housing by removing the backs of the stalls, and which also provides sufficient area to meet the space allowances required for group housing. On the larger unit a new building was in construction for housing gilts.

## **Conclusions**

While the CA has taken measures to ensure that the pig sector will meet the deadline of 1.1.2013 for group housing sows, there is considerable work to do, even allowing for simple conversions to existing buildings, in order for all breeding farms to convert their housing in time.

### *5.2.3 Broiler farms*

## **Legal requirements**

Article 7(1) of Directive 2007/43/EC requires the CA to carry out non-discriminatory inspections on an adequate proportion of broilers kept in each Member State. Article 4 of this Directive requires Member States to ensure that broiler keepers have received training, in particular on the issues listed in Annex IV of the same Directive.

## Findings

- The Latvian Rural Advisory and Education Centre (*Latvijas Lauku konsultāciju un izglītības centrs*) has provided training for broiler keepers as required by Annex IV of Directive 2007/43/EC.
- The audit team did not carry out a review of National legislation, but a representative of the CA indicated in explaining the omission of a requirement from the inspection checklist, that the data accompanying birds to the slaughterhouse must include the cumulative daily mortality rate. However, national legislation doesn't require the daily mortality rate to be sent. Directive 2007/43/EC Annex III 1.1 requires both sets of data, the daily mortality rate and the cumulative daily mortality rate to be sent where flocks are stocked at the higher stocking density.
- The data required by the Directive was kept on the two farms visited. However, one flockkeeper submitted data to the CA indicating that they were going to operate at 39kg/m<sup>2</sup> whereas this was not the exact figure contrary to Directive 2007/43/EC Annex II 1, which requires the keeper to indicate the exact figure and inform the CA of any change in the stocking density at least 15 days before birds arrive. On the second farm more exact figures had been provided to the CA, which took into account the number of hatching eggs, the % hatch and prospective thinning of birds.
- Although the checklist for inspection did indicate the relevant legal requirement, there was no documented procedure specifying how to assess the average relative humidity inside the house during 48 hours. The VI on the first farm explained that a single recording of relative humidity made on a daily basis was sufficient. On the second holding the SVI indicated that the keeper had recorded temperature and humidity six times a day. Directive 2007/43/EC Annex II 3(c), requires that when outside temperatures are below 10°C the average relative humidity inside the house does not exceed 70% during 48 hours.
- The procedure for assessing stocking density did not include a verification of the areas supplied by the keeper. Neither did it direct the inspector to consider the density at the time of thinning of the flock, usually 6 to 7 days before the remaining birds are slaughtered.
- On the first farm, previous problems detected by the VI regarding the lighting regime (periods of darkness) and the intensity of light were found not to occur in the house visited. On the second farm the planned lighting regime, provided by the keeper, was not compliant with the lighting regime permitted by the Directive when taking into consideration the planned slaughter. It was indicated that slaughter was on day 38 to 40 and planned reducing dark hours at day 32.
- Both inspectors included a clinical examination of some birds as part of the inspection.
- The CA used a specialist laboratory technician to measure gas concentrations within poultry

buildings. The first keeper was considering buying equipment to verify gas concentrations. It is a requirement of Annex II 3(a) that the keeper ensures that gas concentrations do not exceed the maximums specified.

## **Conclusions**

Procedures for inspections are partly fulfilled by the checklist provided by the CCA, but these do not provide sufficient instructions on how to verify certain legal requirements listed in these checklists, such as stocking density and relative humidity. The national legislation did not include all of the provisions of Directive 2007/43/EC and as a result the requirement for sending certain data to the slaughterhouse was not checked.

### *5.2.4 Fur farms*

## **Legal requirements**

The convention of the Council of Europe, in particular the recommendations for fur animals, provides details which need to be considered when inspecting the arrangements on fur farms. In addition Annex F of Directive 93/119/EC provides requirements in relation to killing such animals and this will be soon replaced by requirements from Regulation (EC) No. 1099/2009 when it comes into force on 1.1.2013.

## **Findings**

- With the help of the checklist the VI addressed issues including the provision of enrichment material for mink and the treatment of sick animals and identified an overstocking problem.
- In relation to overstocking, the procedure facilitated the checking of the dimensions of a cage; however, it did not lead to an overall evaluation of the extent of overstocking by assessing the overall maximum capacity of the site.
- The inspection procedure did not include checking of the arrangements for killing of animals, either for emergency or production reasons.

## **Conclusion**

Procedures for inspection, and the demonstration of these, were generally satisfactory, with the exception of making a more accurate assessment of stocking density and the methods of killing animals.

### *5.2.5 Cattle farms*

## **Legal requirements**

Directive 2008/119 Article 7 requires the CA to carry out inspections which shall each year cover a statistically representative sample of the different rearing systems. Article 3 1 of this Directive requires calves to be provided with pens with perforated walls which allow the calves to have direct visual and tactile contact. Point 4 of the Annex to Directive 98/58/EC requires sick or ill animals to be appropriately cared for and provided with a dry comfortable lying area. The recommendations for cattle made under the convention of the Council of Europe includes the requirement that cattle shall not be tail docked.

## Findings

The audit team selected a cattle farm to visit where the report of the previous inspection had indicated a non-compliance regarding mutilations. Regarding this dairy farm:

- The CA had carried out two inspections in the last 12 months, one was the three year dairy hygiene inspection and the second was primarily to evaluate medicine use. Animal welfare was also checked at both inspections.
- Dairy cattle with docked tails had been found at the dairy hygiene inspection. This was carried out on the replacement heifer calves using rubber rings and was done due to the design of the milking parlour and the length of the cubicles in the loose housing system where an automatic scraper was used in the passageways, and this gave rise to a risk of injury to the tails. This building and milking parlour had been built with the help of EU funds, which, according to the CA, were approved by the Latvian Rural Support Service (*Lauku Atbalsta Dienests*).
- The CA had imposed a fine of c. € 70 following the first inspection, but had found at the following inspection that more calves had been tail docked. The farmer had made certain arrangements to refine the practice by involving a private veterinarian who sedated the animals and amputated a smaller number of vertebrae than had been the case with the rubber ring method.
- The VI remarked on the insufficient accommodation for sick animals and that certain calves were kept in single boxes without perforated walls to allow social contact after these issues had been mentioned by the audit team.

## Conclusions

As the CA carry out animal welfare checks at the same time as checks for other purposes, and major deficiencies such as tail docking are duly reported and acted on this provides a good level of control of most EU welfare requirements for cattle. The level of sanction imposed in relation to the case of tail docking was not dissuasive as there would need to be major changes to the housing and milking arrangements in order to do away with the need to tail dock. Although there has been some refinement in relation to reducing the pain provoked, this is still a practice which is banned in law.

### 5.3 TRANSPORT

#### Legal requirements

Article 14(1) (a) (ii) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 requires that the CA of the place of departure shall carry out appropriate checks to verify that the journey log submitted by the organiser is realistic and indicates compliance with this Regulation.

Articles 5(4), 8(2), 14 21(2) and Annex II of Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 lay down the rules for journey logs and indicate that there shall be one journey log for long journeys.

Article 15(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 requires the competent authority to carry out at any stage of the long journey appropriate checks on a random or targeted basis to verify that declared journey times are realistic and that the journey complies with this Regulation and in particular that travel times and rest periods have complied with the limits set out in Chapter V of Annex I. Article 15(4) of the same regulation states that the records of the movements of the means of transport by

road obtained from navigation systems may be used for carrying out these checks where appropriate.

## **Findings**

- All the journey logs randomly selected by the audit team had been returned to the CA of the place of departure as required.
- Three had been approved by the TSU visited. In the journey logs for two of the three selected journeys the estimated weight of the consignment was not indicated, and therefore does not allow the stocking density to be verified.
- The CA instruction indicated that there should be one journey log for journeys with loadings at different sites, and this should be checked and approved at the first loading site. The approved journey log for the second selected journey followed this procedure. However, there were two journey logs for a third selected journey, having different places of destination, instead of one journey log for the long journey, with one section 1 and 4 per journey.
- Two further journey logs concerned consignments of cattle exported to Turkey from two TSUs, where:
  - In one journey log, approved by the CA, the plan in section 1 of the journey log indicated that the animals would be unloaded for two 24 hour rests; one in Poland and one in Hungary. The driver had also declared in section 4 that these rest stops had been made. The SNS data, which was requested by the audit team for this journey, indicated that while the rest had been made in Poland as declared, the stop in Hungary had only been for 16 hours instead of 24. In addition the driver declared that he had passed through the EU exit point in Bulgaria in 15 minutes, whereas the SNS data indicated that this was 1 hour 44 minutes. On the Turkish side there was an even greater inconsistency between the declared times and the SNS data.
  - Data from temperature monitoring, which was requested by the audit team for this journey, indicated that when the truck was stopped at the EU exit point temperatures were above the limit of 35 °C, which is the highest tolerance level indicated in Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 Annex I Chapter VI 3.1.
- The CA agreed with the audit team that there was a need to investigate further these circumstances (indicated in the above two bullet points) with the organiser of the export.
- In the second journey log, the VI had declared in section 2 of the journey log that she had checked all 59 animals loaded; however she had only seen 13 animals before loading and this was at a different location and with a different truck from where the final loading took place. The CA were already aware of this irregularity and had instigated an investigation.

## **Conclusions**

Overall the system for approving journey logs and ensuring their return is working well. However the issues relating to the certification of a consignment to Turkey and also checks on returned journey logs regarding declared journey times are unsatisfactory and SNS data is not fully utilised for carrying out these checks. In addition the CA is not fully utilising temperature data, which indicated that there are also issues to be discussed with the organiser regarding stops at the EU exit point to Turkey particularly in the heat of summer.

## **6 OVERALL CONCLUSIONS**

Official controls of animal welfare have been well organised and implemented. However, although

documented procedures are mostly comprehensive in listing the legal requirements to be checked, they do not always adequately describe how certain requirements should be checked which results in inspectors not being able to make a more complete assessment.

The control procedures for laying hen farms were the most developed and good practical assessments of the systems had been carried out. This had resulted in the deadline of 1.1.2012 being met by all except one of the 22 farms with cage systems. The farm which missed the deadline subsequently converted the cages, albeit with one type of cage where there was no practical way of delivering litter to the littered area and the other type of cage lacked claw shortening devices. The delay in making these changes and the continued operation of cage systems with gross overstocking indicates that the CA has not been fully successful in getting this sector to operate within the EU minimum standards.

Although the CA is optimistic that the pig sector will meet the deadline of 1.1.2013 for introducing group housing systems, and this sector has certain advantages over those in other parts of the EU in that many of the older housing systems allow simple conversions to be carried out, there is still considerable work needed if this is to be achieved on time.

The CA have further developed their controls on animal welfare during transport which generally work well. However data from Satellite Navigation Systems, and also temperature recording, is not yet fully utilised for verifying that times and conditions are respected.

The local CA efficiently utilises the system of administrative fines but these sanctions are not always effective in bringing about corrective actions. The good work of the CA is undone in certain cases where the economics of making the correction vastly outweigh the level of the fine.

The report makes recommendations aimed at strengthening the control system already in place.

## **7 CLOSING MEETING**

A closing meeting was held on 19 October with representatives of the CCA. At this meeting, the main findings and conclusions of the mission were presented by the FVO team. The representatives of the CA stated that they would provide further explanation of the necessary inspection procedures in supporting documented procedures, but are unlikely to change their checklists as these were adapted so that the outcome could be automatically uploaded in their database. They also indicated that any changes to the system of sanctions would require a long timescale and that the outcome was not guaranteed.

## **8 RECOMMENDATIONS**

The CA should provide the Commission services with an action plan, including a timetable for its completion, within twenty-five working days of receipt of the report, in order to address the following recommendations.

<b>N°.</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
1.	Take measures so that cages for laying hens are operated within the maximum stocking density and that litter and claw-shortening devices are provided as required by Article 6 of Directive 99/74/EC.

N°.	Recommendation
2.	Take further measures to ensure that pig breeding farms meet the deadline of 1.1.2013 for group housing sows and gilts, as required by Article 3.4 (a) of Directive 2008/120/EC.
3.	Provide documented procedures for inspections of broiler farms so that there are sufficient instructions on how to verify certain legal requirements, currently listed in checklists, such as stocking density and relative humidity as indicated in Directive 2007/43/EC
4.	Ensure that the national legislation transposes all the provisions of Directive 2007/43/EC, in particular the requirement to send data on the daily mortality rate to the slaughterhouse with the birds, as indicated in Annex III 1.1 of this Directive.
5.	Provide documented procedures for inspections of fur farms so that there is an objective assessment of stocking density as required by the recommendations of the Convention of the Council of Europe and that arrangements for killing animals, as will be required by Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009, are also evaluated.
6.	Take measures to ensure that sanctions are proportionate and dissuasive, as required by Regulation (EC) No. 882/2004, in particular when major changes to the husbandry system are needed, such as the case with the tail docking of dairy cattle or the overstocking of laying hen cages.
7.	In the context of risk based checks of animal welfare during transport, consider making use of records of the movements of the means of transport by road obtained from navigation system, as indicated in Article 15(4) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, and also temperature monitoring data as indicated Annex I Chapter VI 3.1 of the same Regulation.

The competent authority's response to the recommendations can be found at:

[http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/rep\\_details\\_en.cfm?rep\\_inspection\\_ref=2012-6525](http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/rep_details_en.cfm?rep_inspection_ref=2012-6525)

## ANNEX 1 - LEGAL REFERENCES

Legal Reference	Official Journal	Title
Reg. 882/2004	OJ L 165, 30.4.2004, p. 1, Corrected and re-published in OJ L 191, 28.5.2004, p. 1	Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules
Dir. 98/58/EC	OJ L 221, 8.8.1998, p. 23-27	Council Directive 98/58/EC of 20 July 1998 concerning the protection of animals kept for farming purposes
Dir. 1999/74/EC	OJ L 203, 3.8.1999, p. 53-57	Council Directive 1999/74/EC of 19 July 1999 laying down minimum standards for the protection of laying hens
Dir. 2002/4/EC	OJ L 30, 31.1.2002, p. 44-46	Commission Directive 2002/4/EC of 30 January 2002 on the registration of establishments keeping laying hens, covered by Council Directive 1999/74/EC
Dir. 2008/120/EC	OJ L 47, 18.2.2009, p. 5-13	Council Directive 2008/120/EC of 18 December 2008 laying down minimum standards for the protection of pigs
Dir. 2007/43/EC	OJ L 182, 12.7.2007, p. 19-28	Council Directive 2007/43/EC of 28 June 2007 laying down minimum rules for the protection of chickens kept for meat production
Reg. 1/2005	OJ L 3, 5.1.2005, p. 1-44	Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 of 22 December 2004 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations and amending Directives 64/432/EEC and 93/119/EC and Regulation (EC) No 1255/97
Reg. 1099/2009	OJ L 303, 18.11.2009, p. 1-30	Council Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009 of 24 September 2009 on the protection of animals at the time of killing
Dir. 2008/119/EC	OJ L 10, 15.1.2009, p. 7-13	Council Directive 2008/119/EC of 18 December 2008 laying down minimum standards for the protection of calves

