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 study visit took place in Switzerland from 4 to 8 April 2016 and is one of three visits, along with Finland and Sweden, to see how these countries manage to keep pigs with intact tails. The study group was made up of two Commission officials and one national expert from Germany, Italy, Portugal, Romania and two national experts from the Netherlands. The objective was to facilitate the six national experts in assessing the situation in a country which has successfully implemented a ban on routine tail docking of pigs, in identifying good practices and in considering how these might be incorporated into their approach to this issue.

The study visit approach is part of the Commission’s initiatives to address long standing problem areas for animal welfare. Previous study visits on the welfare of animals during transport have led to increased co-operation and communication between the competent authorities of the Member States and to improvements in controls. This study visit looked at the background and ongoing implementation of the successful ban on the tail docking of pigs in Switzerland. The national experts met a wide range of parties including, competent authorities, pig farmers and producer associations, representatives from the meat industry, farm advisory services and veterinary practitioners.

Following the visit, the six national experts considered the practical relevance of the activities and information from the study visit, and reviewed this together with their administrations. The CAs of the six national experts indicated that despite differences in the model of pig production, the study visit was beneficial to see solutions to the tail-biting/tail docking issue, and would seek to disseminate the good practices seen in Switzerland.

The Italian authorities indicated that the study visit was useful to assess validated approaches already being used that could have a decisive impact in better applying what is foreseen by current legislation regarding tail docking of pigs. The Romanian and Dutch Authorities commented that the study visit had been a very useful, informative experience.

The Portuguese authorities commented that the main outputs from the study visit were that despite the challenge it is possible to stop tail docking. However, in practice it is a long process in order to allow farmers to get the necessary expertise and experience to be successful. It was helpful to identified and understand the risks factors and to try to find the right professional expertise to overcome the problems.

The German authorities commented that the very focussed information obtained would be used in the ongoing projects and activities on reducing tail biting and avoiding tail docking. The national expert from Lower Saxony indicated that the knowledge gained from Switzerland on “good practices” concerning farming and management of pigs with tails is currently being discussed in Lower Saxony and in the current activities of the Lower Saxony ‘Animal Welfare Plan’, as well as the network of experts in animal welfare and animal health.

The Commission services will hold a meeting with stakeholders and experts from all MS to consider the overview from this series of study visits and will upload all the documents considered useful to a collaborative group site on the Commission’s database (CIRCABC) for sharing information with, amongst others, public administrations.

---

1 CIRCABC (Communication and Information Resource Centre for Administrations, Businesses and Citizens) is an open-source, web-based application which enables geographically spread collaborative groups to share information and resources in private workspaces: https://circabc.europa.eu
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ABBRVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS USED IN THIS REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Competent Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Member State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGD</td>
<td>Swiss Pig Health Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 INTRODUCTION

This study visit took place in Switzerland from 4 to 8 April 2016 and is one of three visits, the others are to Finland and Sweden, to see how these countries manage to keep pigs with intact tails. The study group comprised two members of the Commission Services and a national expert from each of the following Member States (MS): Germany, Italy, Portugal, Romania, and two experts from the Netherlands. The study group was accompanied throughout the visit by representatives of the Swiss Competent Authority, the Federal Food Safety and Veterinary Office (hereafter “the CA”).

This study visit is part of the Commission's initiative to achieve better implementation of the EU legislation on the protection of pigs which requires that tail docking must not be carried out routinely but only where there is evidence that injuries have occurred. Before carrying out these procedures, other measures shall be taken to prevent tail-biting and other vices, taking into account environment and stocking densities. For this reason, inadequate environmental conditions or management systems must be changed. A Commission Recommendation has been recently published which provides measures which should be applied in accordance with Directive 2008/120/EC.

2 OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

The objective was to facilitate the six national experts in assessing the situation in a country which has successfully implemented a ban on routine tail docking of pigs, in identifying good practices and in considering how these might be incorporated into their countries’ approach to this issue.

The visit took place in agreement with the CA. In terms of the scope, the CA was asked

---


to present: the background to banning tail docking in Switzerland, the economic impact of such a ban, the involvement of different parties, how tail biting is managed, and official controls of farms. In pursuit of the objective the following meetings were held and sites visited:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meetings/visits</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competent Authority Central</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Initial and closing meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Meeting on official controls of farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>First farm visited was built in the 70's and had 487 fatteners, the second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>farm visited had 1400 fatteners and was recently built, live weights in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>both farms were from 24 kg to 112 kg. The third farm had 80 breeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sows with closed production cycle up to 110 kg slaughter weight. All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>farms visited operated under Swiss basic requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughterhouse operators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Meeting with slaughterhouse and retailer representatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings with representatives of relevant bodies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Representatives of: pig producers association, Swiss Pig Health Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(SGD), private practitioners, University, research centre (Agroscope),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>retailers representative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 BACKGROUND

1. In Switzerland public reaction to television footage shown in 1999 initiated a change of policy on mutilations without anaesthesia. Films showing domestic pigs released into the wild and exhibiting natural behaviours were used by Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) to influence CA policy on housing conditions for pigs. In 2001, tail docking was not explicitly banned but was not permitted without anaesthesia/analgesia. Tail docking was then formally prohibited in 2008. Castration of pigs without anaesthesia has been banned since 2010; farmers are trained by veterinarians on how to administer anaesthetic gas.

2. The ban on tail docking was accepted with little negative reaction from producers. Consumer support for certain schemes which were already in place and which required pigs to be reared with entire tails contributed to this muted reaction. Having put in place a ban on tail docking the CA followed this up by stipulating minimum housing conditions to assist compliance:
   a) From 1981 to 2008 pigs had to have access to straw, roughage or other equivalent foraging material for longer periods than previously required. From 2008, pigs had to have permanent access to straw, roughage or other equivalent foraging material, with a transitional period lasting until 2013.

---

4 Swiss Pig Health Service provides advice to farmers and is owned by SUISAG.
b) In 1997 farrowing crates were banned (with a 10 year transitional period), which was significantly different from most MS at that time. In exceptional circumstances a crate can be used for three days when sows are lame or start to bite piglets. Sows can only be restrained for 10 days during artificial insemination.

c) In 1997 it was decided not to authorise the installation of new fully slatted flooring systems. There is a transitional period on the use of existing systems which must be phased out by 2018.

3. Farmers work on the basis that they cannot routinely dock tails and have learned how to manage pigs with intact tails. This was seen during the visits to the three commercial farms visited which operated under Swiss basic housing requirements, which have slightly stricter requirements than the EU. Farmers therefore have years of experience in managing and maintaining a lower stress environment for pigs.

4. In the last ten years the number of pigs in Switzerland has remained stable at around 1.5 million and the number of farms has reduced by half, which is similar to the decline in numbers of producers in other MS. The Swiss market for pigs and pig products is de facto closed. Exports and imports, mainly between EU and Switzerland, are stable. Additionally, the herd sizes in Switzerland are not big (250 sows and 1500 fatteners maximum are stipulated in legislation). Pig farming represents 10% of Agriculture production.

5. Some retailers' quality assurance schemes and brands had already banned tail docking since 1997, well in advance of the ban in 2008; and had imposed a similar ban on sow crates for farrowing. The Swiss Pig Health Service (SGD) supported farmers with information and consultancy services in the 7 years before the ban on farrowing came into effect.

6. Long lead-in periods for the implementation of new legislation allows younger farmers more time to take charge of farms and plan for future requirements e.g. building renovations. Consultation with consumers and parties is paramount to getting the correct balance between consumer demands and farmers planning, e.g. the conflicts between production and welfare regarding time spent in farrowing pens.

7. Pig prices are currently around €240/100kg deadweight, two times higher than in most MSs. Liveweight gains of approximately 900 g/day are also above the European average.

8. To support the pig industry to improve on poor animal welfare standards in the nineties the Swiss parliament introduced a system of direct agricultural payments. Farmers must demonstrate to the authorities that all norms have been complied with in order to receive payments. Financial penalties for non-compliance can be severe. Two of the pig farmers visited were not able to participate in these schemes
as they had no land.


a) Direct payments represent compensation for services provided by farmers for the common good that must comply with the Swiss animal welfare legal minimum requirements. Pig producers with land can take part in this fund which represents around one third of their income.

b) Payments for enhanced animal welfare standards can be obtained through two programmes: providing regular outdoor exercise results in a premium of 27 Swiss Francs (CHF)/pig/year (38% of pigs in 2000 and 50% in 2016). Higher standards of indoor housing, such as separate non-perforated and littered lying area, results in premiums of 26 CHF/pig/year (57% of pigs in 2003 and 66.2% in 2014).

c) Private label programmes are available for farmers if they comply with additional requirements, such as higher animal welfare standards, the origin of animals, their feed and animal transport. Retailers stock Swiss products almost exclusively with three labels: a Swiss origin label, a stricter standard label for outdoor and indoor production and organic production.

10. The cost and benefit of keeping pigs with intact tails cannot be easily separated. The overall costs and financial supports per pig (5 to 9 above) are closely interlinked with other issues, such as the economic benefit of using intact tails as an indicator of pig health and the necessary management skills to successfully operate loose farrowing crates with low pre-weaning mortalities. Despite the initial lack of experience in managing loose farrowing systems the efficiency in kilogrammes of slaughter weight/sow increased by 23% from 1600kg in 2004 to 1975 kg in 2014.

11. An average 95% of the pig meat consumed in Switzerland in the last 10 years was of Swiss origin. However, in 2007 this reduced to 90% as a result of farms closing due to the changeover to loose farrowing systems. This led to a reduction in internal production and as a consequence of the high prices more meat was imported.

12. Consumers are significantly driving progress in animal welfare. In terms of marketability, when surveyed it was shown that animal welfare is an important factor for buyers. However, pork prices in Switzerland are higher than the EU and consumers may go to neighbouring EU countries to buy cheaper meat products where producers are carrying out routine tail docking.

13. Every four years, or more frequently if the farm is selected on a risk-based approach, farms are subject to official controls by Cantonal officials or third party approved organisations. If animal welfare non-compliances are found the farm may suffer reductions in direct payments (if eligible) or sanctions.
14. A NGO Swiss animal welfare association who are considered very helpful in working with farmers is one of the third party inspection organisations. The Swiss CA's Centre for Proper Housing of Ruminant and Pigs provides training and support for practical cases to staff conducting official controls and to farmers.

4 FACTORS TO MAINTAIN PIGS WITH INTACT TAILS

15. Swiss studies showed that in 2001 when the ban on tail docking was introduced, tail biting was observed in 33% of the fattening farms visited. By 2014 tail docking was present in 19% of farms. All representatives of the relevant bodies indicated that when tail biting did occur it was mostly individual animals which were quickly identified.

16. Biters are seen as a sign of stressed pigs which under stressful situations use the snout to remove the stressor\(^5\).

17. Stress is usually associated with changes or problems with ventilation, feeding time and/or health in the batch. Such stresses may act as a tipping point if other risk factors\(^6\) are already present.

18. Several Swiss requirements help to reduce the risk of pigs starting to tail bite, such as having manipulable material from birth and a laying area of solid floor in farrowing pens. Weaned piglets must not be kept in fully slatted pens and from 2018 this will also apply to fatteners. The average weaning age is 27 days and there are no legal requirements for the minimum age for weaning pigs.

19. The Swiss CA concluded that it is better not to dock tails as it masks deficiencies in husbandry where the stress factors that produce lower growth rate and higher disease morbidity are still present. Undocked tails provides an effective health and welfare indicator.

20. To control tail biting incidents\(^7\), information from the CA, researchers, the SGD and practitioners has been made available to farmers who can also individually consult with specialists in SGD on technical issues such as feeding, ventilation and health issues. Follow-up official controls after interventions in farms showed good improvements.

21. In general genetic selection for low incidence of tail biting has not been considered. Genetic selection has been used to select sow lines compatible with free farrowing.

\(^5\) Hunger, frustration, disturbance, draught, noxious gases, cold, overcrowding, stomach pains, pains and mycotoxins.

\(^6\) Overcrowding, food and occupation, food composition, insufficient feeding places, climate changes, inadequate division of the pen areas, health problems, mycotoxins and water.

\(^7\) Remove the biter, remove and treat bitten pigs, anti-aggression spray, salt licks, mineral blocks, magnesium, fresh wood branches, paper bags, straw and stop the cause.
22. The information below is provided under headings which are the risk parameters in Article 3 of Commission Recommendation (EU) 2016/336. All representatives of the relevant bodies emphasised that management is the key to keeping pigs with entire tails.

Provision of enrichment materials

23. Research on foraging material in Switzerland in 2013 showed that pigs fed ad libitum have less exploratory behaviour than feed restricted pigs. It also showed that enrichment materials varied in their long term interest value for pigs and that the type of manipulable material was not so important. All of the materials used in the studies were suitable as enrichment material but ultimately did not influence the occurrence of tail biting or precursor events.

24. The Swiss Ordinance on enrichment material defines much more prescriptive elements, than Directive 2008/120/EC such as edible, chewable and permanently available.

25. All the CA control manuals and guidance are available online. Manuals, supported by producers' organisations, give details of permitted and banned materials for investigation and manipulation, e.g. rubber balls and tyres are not permitted.

26. Provision of enrichment material in fully slatted floor systems was mainly through compressed wheat chaff dispensers which fulfilled the basic legal requirements and as such could be utilised in MS with similar systems. Cylinders with this roll-pressed material have the advantage that pigs can eat what they extract and it doesn't clog up the slurry systems. The frequency of renewal of the dispenser's content depends upon the pigs in the pen. The diameter of the dispensers and accessibility to their content is important. Humidity can also cause a problem as the material can swell in the metal tube delivery mechanism of commercially available systems.

27. The concept for delivery of enrichment material is checked by the CA as part of its approval procedure for new animal housing technology.

28. Permanent access to manipulable material to sows in crates is mainly provided by roll-press or hay racks above their heads.

29. The quality of straw is important as wet straw may have mycotoxins that could act as a stressor. However, too much fibre decreases the absorption of volatile fatty acids that can decrease the growth rate.

30. One of the farms visited with 500 pigs, fattening for around 100 days, expended around 1000 CHF per year on compressed wheat chaff rolls. This results in an expenditure per fattening pig of less than one CHF. Every six pigs consumed

---

8 General: vaccination, deworming, cleaning and disinfection, feeding system and water quality. Specific: water supply (drinkers' number), dry matter content of the feed, manipulable material suitability and temperature fluctuations.
approximately one roll press per month.

31. Actions to deal with an outbreak of tail biting might include additional enrichment material such as sisal ropes and toys, the use of flexible water dispensers may also help. Paper or cardboard can be an alternative to straw to prevent the blockage of slurry systems and were well frequently utilised by farmers, in addition to fresh wood.

Cleanliness

32. Well-defined activity areas for lying, feeding and excretion in the pens with partially slatted floors were seen as one of the main factors in keeping pigs clean and quiet; in particular the lying area should provide peace, a good climate and safety. Newer houses may have heated floors which are drier or biological cleaning of the air and as a result pigs are cleaner.

33. To manage the excess manipulable material, that can allow pens to become very dirty, dispensers should permit adequate access to the material. Swinging feeders which pivoted out from the walls or pen dividers and could be raised when not in use provided a good solution to the fouling of feeders.

Thermal comfort and air quality

34. New buildings have more strict environmental conditions. Biological treatment of the air reduces the levels of ammonia and improves the quality of the manure and its handling.

35. Swiss legislation is very prescriptive regarding thermal comfort setting temperatures for protection against cold. If temperatures at the laying area fall below set levels, from $24^\circ \text{C}$ for piglets to $9^\circ \text{C}$ for pigs over 60 kg, the floor of the laying area should be insulated, well-bedded or equipped with a heating system. Protection must be provided against heat if the temperature in new houses for groups of pigs weighing 25 kg or more or for boars exceeds 25 °C. If this occurs the animals must be given an opportunity to cool themselves down. Cooling options include ground heat exchangers, air conditioning, floor cooling, misting systems and water cooling systems which act directly on the animals, such as showers or wallows.

36. Partially solid floors provide comfort and allow straw to be distributed. Fully slatted floors will be fully banned from 2018, as pigs should have access to a separated lying area. In new systems 2% floor openings are permitted but have not been utilised often as they can cause drainage problems: slopes on solid floors are frequently used instead.
Health status

37. Good overall health is seen as one of the best preventative measures to avoid tail biting. Switzerland is very strict on live animal imports and has very high associated costs with quarantine in the country of export and in Switzerland. Disease status is very high in Swiss pig farms, which are free of diseases such as *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* (M.hyo), porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus (PRRSV), clinical *Actinobacillus pleuropneumonia* (APP) and mange. The state intervenes if there is a detection of M.hyo and PRRSV, the others are mainly dealt with by the SGD.

38. Private veterinarians visit pig farms at least once a year. 90% of breeders and 50% of fatteners are members of the SGD. Private rather than official veterinarians are seen to be in a better position to work with farmers to solve problems, through their consulting role on prevention, detection and treatment of tail biting outbreaks.

39. Farmers must report to the CA the quantity of antibiotics they are using on a monthly basis. SGD monitor this and may intervene and set benchmarks. The CA strategy for the use of veterinary medicines has become more prescriptive in the use of antibiotics under new legislation since 1st April 2016. Prescribed drugs must be strictly controlled and specifically targeted to the infection. Where antibiotics are used to treat pigs, this is usually to treat diarrhoea five days after weaning during the period when pigs under poor management conditions may become more vulnerable to being bitten.

40. The incidence of tail damage in Switzerland is not routinely scored and reported by slaughterhouse operators. Recent targeted controls upon arrival detected 0.7% incidence in one slaughterhouse. *Post-mortem* information reported economic losses of 0.1% of animals who had total condemnation originating in tail damage due mainly to abscesses. One retailer indicated that when producers have more than 10% of their animals with severe tail damage they are put on a "watch-list" and the farmer is required to take remedial action to address the problem.

Competition for food and space

41. Space allowances in Switzerland differ at certain stages of production from EU norms; they are more generous in the initial stages but overlap with EU requirements. From 2018, fully slatted floors will be banned and the total area per animal will be around 30% more generous than EU requirements.

42. All farmers visited indicated that it was important to keep pigs of comparable size together to minimise stress due to competition and to ensure good group selection by size when the animals are 24 and 60kg live weight, when pigs are mixed and the feeding routine is changed.

43. Access to feed is also important. When pigs are fed at the same time, not *ad-lib*, the minimum length per pig is 18 cm for piglets up to 25 kg and 33 cm for pigs
weighting 25 kg or more. No comparable figures for trough space are prescribed in EU legislation.

44. Like EU legislation, Swiss legislation has a general requirement to care for sick or injured animals but with no specified ratio for sick pens per number of pigs. Lack of pens to separate biters and victims was cited as a contributing factor to tail-biting incidents.

**Diet**

45. Changes in feed composition, in particular fibre, were universally agreed as one of the main stressors by the farmers who were visited. Also a diet with too much sugar is a contributing factor in animals feeling bloated and unwell.

46. Swiss legislation is more prescriptive than EU, laying down the minimum number of drinkers provided. It requires one drinking facility for every 12 animals in the case of dry feeding and one drinking facility for every 24 animals in the case of liquid feeding. One SGD representative stressed the importance of access to water for pigs to feel well and recommended one drinking facility for every 8 animals for both dry and wet feeding.

47. When tail biting occurs, salt licks, mineral blocks and magnesium were recommended by the SGD veterinarian and the farmers visited.

5 **CLOSING MEETING**

On 8 April 2016 a closing meeting was held with the CA where the six national experts presented their preliminary conclusions on the study visit.

6 **OVERALL CONCLUSION**

The CAs of the six national experts indicated that despite differences in the model of pig production, the study visit was beneficial to see solutions to the tail-biting/tail docking issue, and would seek to disseminate the good practices seen in Switzerland.

The Italian authorities indicated that the study visit was useful to assess validated approaches already being used that could have a decisive impact in better applying what is foreseen by current legislation regarding tail docking of pigs. The Romanian and Dutch Authorities commented that the study visit had been a very useful, informative experience.

The Portuguese authorities commented that the main outputs from the study visit were that despite the challenge it is possible to stop tail docking. However, in practice it is a long process in order to allow farmers to get the necessary expertise and experience to be successful. It was helpful to identified and understand the risks factors and to try to find the right professional expertise to overcome the problems. Enrichment materials are important, especially if there is an outbreak of tail biting, and the different solutions presented could be interesting for use in slatted floor systems.
The German authorities commented that the very focussed information obtained would be used in the ongoing projects and activities on reducing tail biting and avoiding tail docking. The national expert from Lower Saxony indicated that the knowledge gained from Switzerland on “good practices” concerning farming and management of pigs with tails is currently being discussed in Lower Saxony and in the current activities of the Lower Saxony ‘Animal Welfare Plan’, as well as the network of experts in animal welfare and animal health.

### 7 Issues considered by participating CAs for inclusion in their system of controls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CA</th>
<th>Proposal for changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>The German authorities will utilise the information gained in their existing pilot and research projects and in the Animal Welfare Working Group (AGT) of the Länder Working Group for Consumer Protection (LAV) a transnational coordination group concerning the implementation of Recommendation (EU) 2016/336 on the application of Council Directive 2008/120/EC laying down minimum standards for the protection of pigs as regards measures to reduce the need for tail-docking. In this process, the findings and experience from Switzerland, including the specification of “other measures” (Directive 2008/120/EC, Annex 1, paragraph 8) for the improvement of housing conditions in establishments which are currently carrying out tail docking, are proving a useful and appropriate support to be able to avoid the routine tail docking of pigs as soon as possible. The national expert from Lower Saxony indicated that the knowledge gained from Switzerland on “good practices” concerning farming and management of pigs with tails is currently being discussed in Lower Saxony and in the current activities of the Lower Saxony ‘Animal Welfare Plan’, as well as the network of experts in animal welfare and animal health. The training of consultants and farmers in the network of experts are also involved, notably those pig farms where the intact tail premiums are being paid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>A new revised three year national animal welfare plan has been announced in April. The CA has organised a first meeting with the major pig farmer Associations, the official Regional Veterinary Services and the National reference centre for animal welfare to discuss the tail docking issue and other relevant topics such as non compliances found during audits carried out by the Ministry, highlights of the recent EU Commission Recommendation on the application of Council Directive 2008/120/EC and the related working document, the proposed EU Platform on animal welfare and the castration of pigs. The CA is considering future meetings with other parties as to further discuss strategies to better confront the tail docking issue in the light of recent scientific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
research illustrated during the Swiss study visit and to address other critical aspects of legislation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NL</th>
<th>There were no specific proposals received from the Dutch authorities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Following the EU Mission to Switzerland and with the publication of the Recommendation 216/338, some actions were taken:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Development of a specific leaflet regarding the tail biting on pigs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Meeting with the farmers associations to discuss this subject and plan future actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Translation and dissemination of the guidelines on tail biting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the near future, some meetings are planned with the various stakeholders (Farmer's association and veterinarians), in order to develop an action plan to address this specific subject, which will include other measures considered necessary to enforce the implementation of the requirements on tail docking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>The farmer associations will be provided with solutions in order to accept that routine tail docking should not be performed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The veterinarians (both private and official) will engage more actively in discussions with the farmers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Romania envisages a roadmap in order to implement the provisions of the Commission Recommendation (EU) 2016/336 on the application of Council Directive 2008/12U/EC laying down minimum standards for the protection of pigs as regards measures to reduce the need for tail-docking by the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• informing the 3 farmer's associations of the Swiss practice and finding together enrichment materials to be used in various types of housing;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• developing a best practices guide in order to prevent tail docking and encourage introduction of enrichment materials;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• giving presentations of all materials and photos received, during the first training course of the official veterinarians to be organised this year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANNEX 1 – LEGAL REFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Reference</th>
<th>Official Journal</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>