



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
HEALTH & CONSUMER PROTECTION DIRECTORATE-GENERAL

Directorate D - Food and Veterinary Office

DG(SANCO)/1022/1999 – MR final

FINAL REPORT OF A MISSION  
CARRIED OUT IN PORTUGAL  
FROM 15 NOVEMBER - 19 NOVEMBER 1999  
IN THE FIELD OF  
ANIMAL WELFARE ON-FARM AND  
DURING TRANSPORT.

*Please note that certain comments from the Portuguese authorities have been included in the text of the report in bold, italic type.*



22/03/00 - 26473

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION.....	4
2.	OBJECTIVES OF THE MISSION .....	4
3.	LEGAL BASIS.....	5
4.	BACKGROUND .....	5
4.1.	Summary of previous mission results .....	5
4.2.	Information on the pig and calf sectors in Portugal.....	5
5.	MAIN FINDINGS.....	6
5.1.	Competent authority (general findings) .....	6
5.1.1.	Inspections of pig holdings.....	6
5.1.2.	Inspections of calf holdings.....	7
5.1.3.	Authorisation of animal transporters.....	7
5.1.4.	Checks of animals during transport.....	7
5.2.	Applicable legislation in Portugal.....	7
5.2.1.	Protection of calves.....	8
5.2.2.	Protection of pigs.....	8
5.2.3.	Protection of animals during transport.....	8
5.2.4.	Protection of animals at the time of slaughter or killing.....	8
5.3.	Main field findings and information received .....	8
5.3.1.	Pig holdings visited .....	8
5.3.2.	Calf holdings visited.....	10
5.3.3.	Welfare during transport .....	12
5.3.4.	Welfare at slaughter .....	13
5.3.5.	Examination for Trichinella .....	14

6.	CONCLUSIONS .....	15
6.1.	Competent authority .....	15
6.2.	Animal welfare situation observed during the mission.....	15
6.3.	Closing meeting.....	16
7.	RECOMMENDATIONS .....	17
7.1.	To the central competent authorities of Portugal.....	17
7.2.	To the Commission Services.....	17

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The mission took place in Portugal from 15 November to 19 November 1999. The mission team comprised 2 veterinary experts from the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) and 1 Member State expert.

This mission was undertaken as part of the FVO's planned mission programme.

The inspection team was accompanied during the entire mission by a representative from the *Direcção Geral de Veterinária* (Veterinary Directorate General - central competent authority).

An opening meeting was held on 15 November 1999 with the central competent authority. This meeting was attended by the following:

The **Deputy Director General** and other representatives from the *Direcção Geral de Veterinária* (DGV), including from

*Direcção de Serviços de Meios de Defesa da Saúde, Bem-Estar e Alimentação Animal* (Directorate of animal health protection, animal welfare and animal nutrition)

*Direcção de Serviços Saúde Animal* (Directorate of animal health services)

*Direcção de Serviços Higiene Pública Veterinária* (Directorate of veterinary public health).

Representatives from the Veterinary Services of two *Direcção Regional de Agricultura* (Regional Agricultural Directorate) were also present.

At this meeting, the objectives of, and itinerary for, the mission were agreed.

## 2. OBJECTIVES OF THE MISSION

The first objective of the mission was to verify the means by which the competent authority ensures that the minimum standards of animal welfare are met, in the framework of Council Directive 91/629/EEC for the protection of calves and Council Directive 91/630/EEC for the protection of pigs. The second objective of the Mission was to assess progress in the field of animal welfare during transport.

In pursuit of these objectives, visits were carried out to 2 holdings with pigs, 2 holdings with calves and 2 slaughterhouses. Although welfare at slaughter was not one of the objectives of the mission certain observations were made concerning the stunning equipment in one of the slaughterhouses visited (see point 5.3.4). The visits to the slaughterhouses were revisits to two sites visited during the previous mission.

### 3. LEGAL BASIS

The mission was carried out under the general provisions of Community legislation and, in particular:

- Commission Decision 98/139/EC of 4 February 1998 laying down certain detailed rules concerning on-the-spot checks carried out in the veterinary field by Commission experts in the Member States.
- Article 9 of Council Directive 91/629/EEC of 19 November 1991 laying down the minimum standards for the protection of calves
- Article 9 of Council Directive 91/630/EEC of 19 November 1991 laying down minimum standards for the protection of pigs.
- Article 7 Council Directive 98/58/EC of 20 July 1998 concerning the protection of animals kept for farming purposes
- Article 10 of Council Directive 91/628/EEC of 19 November 1991 on the protection of animals during transport and as amended by Directives 95/29/EEC.
- Council Directive 93/119/EC of 22 December 1993 on the protection of animals at the time of slaughter or killing

### 4. BACKGROUND

#### 4.1. Summary of previous mission results

The aim of the previous mission in the field of animal welfare, undertaken from 4 February to 9 February 1996, was to get information as to how the requirements of Council Directive 91/628/EEC were met in Portugal. The lack of adequate supervision, the transport of unfit animals, the use of unsuitable loading and unloading facilities and unacceptable handling techniques were among the main findings (see Commission Document VI/1923/96 of 19.3.1996).

#### 4.2. Information on the pig and calf sectors in Portugal

Portugal is the 10<sup>th</sup> largest pig producer in the European Union. Whereas there is a large dairy industry, intensively farmed veal is not a feature of the livestock sector. The visits to the pig holdings took place in Beira Litoral, a region with 249 intensive pig rearing holdings with a total of 36,696 breeding sows. The visits to the calf holdings took place in Ribatejo e Oeste, a region with 3,375 holdings with bovine animals.

## 5. MAIN FINDINGS

### 5.1. Competent authority (general findings)

The central competent authority is the DGV, which forms part of the *Ministério da Agricultura, do Desenvolvimento Rural e das Pescas* (Ministry of Agriculture, rural development and fisheries). Within the DGV the department responsible for animal welfare legislation is the *Direcção de Serviços de Meios de Defesa da Saúde, Bem-Estar e Alimentação Animal*. This Department is obliged to prepare legislation or other administrative rules, as well as giving advice and co-ordinating the application of that legislation at a national level.

The DGV is not the executive body and this is the responsibility of each *Direcções de Serviços de Veterinária (Veterinary Services)*. *These services are incorporated into the Direcção Regional de Agricultura (DRA) and in Portugal there are 7 administrative regions each with a DRA. They are responsible for organising and carrying out on the spot inspections.*

In addition *Divisão de Intervenção Veterinária (DIV) covers a geographical area with an average of 300 to 400 municipalities, each of which employs the services of at least one veterinarian. These municipal veterinarians are obliged to follow orders given by the DRA. The DGV provides guidance and training<sup>1</sup> to both the regional veterinary services and municipal veterinarians in veterinary matters and administrative procedures.*

In the course of this mission the procedure for licensing and registration of transporters was the only area which involved the municipal veterinarians. The DGV is responsible for the authorisation of transporters and has issued instructions on the procedures to follow both to the DRA and to the municipal veterinarians. The DRA has also issued the same instructions to the municipal veterinarians (see point 5.1.3). Regarding on farm welfare, each DRA is responsible both for determining which farms to inspect and for carrying out the inspections.

#### 5.1.1. Inspections of pig holdings.

Since 1981 all pig holding with more than 20 pigs have been required to be registered with the regional veterinary service and to legally nominate a private veterinarian. An inspection of the holding is then carried out, and the findings in the short reports of these visits reflect mainly animal health requirements. Regarding inspections to assess the minimum welfare standards, the DGV circulated a standard report

---

<sup>1</sup> The Portuguese authorities in their comments on the draft report wish to point out that the Commission team was informed of training and refresher courses provided by DGV's Divisão de Informação e de Formação Profissional (information and professional training division), in particular those offered to official veterinarians by the central services, the DRAs and the municipalities, in which the subject of animal wellbeing was explained and discussed in terms of the current legislation.

form, *auto de vistoria - protecção dos suínos nos locais de criação*, in 1997, which can be used as a check list during the inspection of pig units. The regional veterinary services are not obliged to follow this report format and to date there have been 28 inspections of pig holdings made using this report.

#### 5.1.2. Inspections of calf holdings.

The Commission team were informed that the only report of an inspection of a holding with calves received by the DGV was a case relating to the starvation of bovine animals. In this case an *auto de notícia* (official notice) was issued and this led to an *auto de contra-ordenação* (infringement notice). However, legal proceedings were consequently dropped due to a national amnesty. A standard report form for the inspection of calf holdings, *auto de vistoria - protecção de vitelos alojados para efeitos de criação e engorda* has been drafted, but there were no inspection reports using this format.

#### 5.1.3. Authorisation of animal transporters.

Licensing and registering of animal transporters, who transport animals more than 50 km, is carried out by the DGV. The registration procedure follows a request from a transporter and includes an inspection of the vehicle or vehicles by a municipal veterinarian. The report of the municipal veterinarian; a declaration by the transporter of the competency of personnel accompanying the animals; driving licence and photographs of the vehicle(s) are first submitted to the regional veterinary services and from there they are sent to the DGV. The transporter is not required to give a written undertaking that all measures will be taken to comply with the Directive. The DGV issues an authorisation to the transporter and a plastic card bearing the vehicle registration ***the name and address of the transporter*** and the species for which the vehicle has been approved ***as well as the date of issue and validity***. 241 animal transporters have been authorised to date. Since 1998, 351 vehicles used for the transport of animals by road and 738 containers used for the transport of animals by sea have been inspected for the purpose of authorising transporters.

#### 5.1.4. Checks of animals during transport.

No *autos de notícia* (official notices) have been received by the DGV concerning ***offences against the legislation*** and no measures to impose sanctions have been initiated.

## 5.2. Applicable legislation in Portugal.

The Portuguese legislation corresponding to the relevant EU legislation is indicated below, in addition *Lei 92/95* of 12.9.1995 is an act providing for general animal welfare. A comprehensive check of the provisions of these legal instruments was not carried out.

#### 5.2.1. Protection of calves

*Decreto-Lei* 270/93 of 4.8.1993 and *Portaria* 733/93 of 13.8.1993 transposed the original Council Directive 91/629/EEC laying down the minimum standards for the protection of calves. *Portaria* 1030/97 of 29.9.1997 includes the amendments made by Council Directive 97/2/EC but makes no reference to Commission Decision 97/182/EC. Commission Decision 97/182/EC has not been transposed into Portuguese legislation. There is an additional requirement in *Portaria* 1030/97, which requires anyone carrying out renovations to a calf holding to submit details of the changes to the DGV.

#### 5.2.2. Protection of pigs

*Decreto-Lei* 113/94 of 2.5.1994 and *Portaria* 274/94 of 7.5.1994 transpose Council Directive 91/630/EEC laying down the minimum standards for the protection of pigs.

#### 5.2.3. Protection of animals during transport

*Decreto-Lei* 153/94 and *Portaria* 160/95, which formally transposed Council Directive 91/628/EEC (as amended by Directive 95/29/EEC), have been revoked and replaced by a consolidated *Decreto-Lei* 294/98 of 18.9.1998. This includes amendments made by Council Directive 95/29/EEC, the text of regulation 411/98 on the requirements for higher standard vehicles and a reference is also made to Regulation 1255/97.

#### 5.2.4. Protection of animals at the time of slaughter or killing

*Decreto-Lei* 28/96 of 2.4.1996 transposes Council Directive 93/119/EEC on the protection of animals at the time of slaughter or killing.

### 5.3. Main field findings and information received

#### 5.3.1. Pig holdings visited

Two pig holdings were visited:

- One farm operating a birth to bacon system with 318 breeding sows and with installations last modified in 1995.
- A second farm again operating a birth to bacon system with 110 breeding sows and with installations last modified in 1996.

On both farms the sows were housed in groups for a few days after weaning and once served they were housed in individual sow stalls for the duration of their pregnancy.

##### 5.3.1.1. Space allowances and floor type.

5.3.1.1.1. Several measurements of floor space made by the officials from the competent authority often included

areas occupied by feeding troughs, which were unavailable as a lying area to the animals.

5.3.1.1.2. On one farm an additional tubular steel bar was fitted behind several sows in farrowing crates, thus reducing the space available to the sow from 2 m to 1.57 m. On the same farm, individual dry sow stalls had a completely solid floor and in several of these stalls the floor was uneven with the result that spilled water did not drain from the lying area.

5.3.1.1.3. On the other farm visited several pens, which contained groups of 20 weaners (average weight 25 kg), had a total floor area of 3.15 m<sup>2</sup>. Pigs were not able to feed at the same time in these pens and were observed scrambling on top of each other to get access to the feeding trough.

#### 5.3.1.2. Substrates providing enrichment

The only straw bedded pens were the boar pens on one of the farms visited. No other category of pig had access to straw or other form of destructible material.

#### 5.3.1.3. Casualty pigs

On one farm the building for sick pigs was inspected only after the instigation of the Commission team. This building was separate from the other accommodation and was located beside the loading ramp where pigs would be loaded for transportation. In the four pens comprising the sick bay accommodation there were 19 fattening pigs. None of the pens were bedded. Three pigs in one pen were unable to stand and one of these pigs was lying in lateral recumbency and was showing signs of dehydration. A pig in another pen had a wound of approximately 15 cm diameter on its rump. The private veterinarian, who was also present, stated that all of these animals were under treatment and that several would be euthanised that same day.

On the second farm, the sick bay pens were empty at the time of visit. There was no permanent inspection lighting in this facility.

#### 5.3.1.4. Surgical interventions

Piglets were tail docked on one farm, but on the second farm were left without having their tails docked. Here it was reported that if any signs of tail biting occurred the pigs were fed fish meal. It was reported that teeth clipping was

practised on both farms. Castration was not carried out on either farm.

5.3.1.5. Emergency measures

Artificial ventilation systems were present on both farms but there was no alarm system to indicate a failure of the ventilation.

5.3.1.6. Performance of inspection.

Although a standard report form was followed no guidance notes were available on how measurements should be taken.

On one farm the inspecting veterinarian made several recommendations concerning injurious fittings, ventilation, temperature requirements, insect control and the sick pig accommodation. This veterinarian concluded that space allowances were in compliance, but corrected this interpretation when the problem of overcrowding in several pens was pointed out by the Commission team (see point 5.3.1.1.3).

On the second farm a report of an earlier inspection indicated that there were no significant findings. However, the Commission team identified the absence of an alarm (see point 5.3.1.5), that several sow stalls were not adequately drained and that several farrowing crates did not allow the sow to stand up and lie down without difficulty (see point 5.3.1.1.2).

5.3.2. Calf holdings visited

Two dairy farms in the region of Ribatejo e Oeste were visited. Only female calves were retained on these farms, all the male calves were transported off the farm for fattening. On one farm it was reported that on a given day all the male calves from 4 days to 4 months were transported off the farm.

During these visits, no standard inspection procedure was followed by the DRA officials<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Portuguese authorities in their comments on the draft report wish to point out that the Commission team was informed that although the regional veterinary services received guidelines from DGV (model inspection notices), they were free to use them or not as they saw fit. Furthermore, the Direcções Regionais de Agriculture were short of staff with the relevant training, while there were other tasks considered to have priority for example those concerned with animal health.

5.3.2.1. On one farm young calves were accommodated outside in calf hutches. Two designs of hutch were used, both consisted of an “igloo” where the calf could shelter and an outside area surrounded by a perimeter fence. The newer design of igloo had been installed in 1998. For one six week old calf, which was being kept in this type of accommodation, the length of the igloos did not provide the minimum length required (Council Directive 91/629/EEC, Article 3, paragraph 3a ).

5.3.2.2. On the second farm the young calves were accommodated in indoor calf pens, which had been constructed in 1980. These pens had wooden floors and three solid walls. Bedding was provided for calves for the first 10 days in this accommodation.

5.3.2.3. Feeding

On one farm calves received a milk only diet for the first month of life and on the second farm concentrate feed was offered along with milk. On this second farm hay was usually only provided after 5 weeks of age.

5.3.2.4. Social contact.

The older design of calf hutch allowed both visual and tactile contact between neighbouring calves. The newer calf hutches were separated from each other by a distance of approximately one metre and therefore did not allow tactile contact.

The calf pens on the second farm had solid walls separating each calf from its neighbour and therefore did not allow tactile contact between calves and several calves were only able to see other calves when they put their heads through the opening at the front of the pen. The farmer on this holding claimed to be unaware of the future requirements regarding this type of calf accommodation.

5.3.2.5. State of animal health.

No overtly sick or injured calves were seen during the visits.

5.3.2.6. Surgical interventions

All the female cattle and at least one male animal on one farm had been tail docked. The Commission team was informed that this was carried out for reasons of dairy hygiene and was achieved by placing a rubber ring on the

tail in the first 24 hours of life. There are no legal provisions in force in Portugal to regulate this practice.

Calves were reportedly disbudded *usually* without the use of anaesthesia.

#### 5.3.2.7. Performance of inspection

There was no structured approach in carrying out these inspections and no standard report form or written guidance was available to the inspectors.

The remarks made at the end of both inspections contained no references to the requirements of Council Directive 91/629/EEC. The above findings were those of the Commission team.

#### 5.3.3. Welfare during transport

The visits to the two slaughterhouses were scheduled to take place when animals would be arriving for the following day's kill.

5.3.3.1. At one slaughterhouse unloading of the slaughter pigs from the upper deck of a two-tier vehicle had commenced when the Commission team arrived at the unloading bay. The lorry was without a roof. The upper deck was divided into three compartments and the pigs in these compartments were in the process of being unloaded one compartment at a time via an internal ramp. Lowering the floor in the last third of the upper deck creates this internal ramp usually while the pigs in the last compartment are standing on it. The total floor area of the vehicle was measured by one of the inspectors from the central competent authority and one of the official veterinarians concluded that the vehicle was overloaded. The tailboard of the lorry was shorter than the distance from the bottom deck of the lorry to the ground. The tailboard was divided in two parts with a gap between the two parts, the size of which was equivalent to the size of a small pig's claw and was placed across the concrete ramp where the pigs were exiting the lorry. Although the unloading was done in a calm way, the pigs were observed to slip on the smooth surface of the tailboard. The transporter did not have an authorisation to transport animals more than 50 km. One of the two men accompanying the consignment reported that the lorry had travelled 60 km from the place of origin to the slaughterhouse.

5.3.3.2. At the second slaughterhouse the Commission team inspected one vehicle which had already unloaded and a second vehicle during the process of unloading. Both lorries

were used for transporting pigs and both had travelled from Navarra in Spain (i.e. more than 8 hours).

5.3.3.2.1. Functioning nipple drinkers for watering the pigs en route were present on both lorries.

5.3.3.2.2. The trailer of the empty lorry had three fans located at the front of each deck. There were no other fans installed in this vehicle.

5.3.3.2.3. The second lorry had three decks and the total floor area of the vehicle was measured by one of the inspectors from the central competent authority. From the figures obtained and taking 100 kg as the weight of the average pig, the approximate loading density calculated by the Commission team was 269 kg/m<sup>2</sup>.

5.3.3.2.4. Unloading of this second lorry was achieved by means of a hydraulic platform. This unloading operation was hastily performed and several pigs still had their hind legs in the container of the truck when the platform was lowered. The Commission team had to bring this to the attention of the responsible veterinarian in order to remedy this situation. Two pigs were dead on arrival and were unloaded from the lorry at the same time as the other pigs, which were forced to jump over the dead bodies on the platform. There was no raceway in place on the unloading bay to direct the pigs and several pigs escaped and ran around on the unloading bay.

5.3.3.2.5. This second lorry had no bedding and the pigs were covered in excrement.

#### 5.3.4. Welfare at slaughter

While welfare at slaughter was not one of the original objectives of the mission and no animals were slaughtered at the time of the visits to either slaughterhouse. Certain deficiencies with the stunning equipment were noted.

5.3.4.1. One slaughterhouse had an electrical stunner within a restrainer for stunning pigs and a set of electrical tongs for stunning any casualty pigs. These were reportedly brought to the stunning area on a trolley. There was no voltmeter or ammeter present on either device.

5.3.4.2. Two captive bolt guns and one captive bolt shaft used for stunning cattle were dirty and rusty in parts. When opened

on the demand of the Commission team, several sleeves in each gun were damaged or “ringed” and the chamber contained debris. The hollow end of one bolt was filled with a piece of bone and hair.

- 5.3.4.3. In the second slaughterhouse visited one pig in a casualty pen was off her legs. It was reported that she would not be killed until several hours later.

5.3.5. Examination for Trichinella

It was reported in one of the slaughterhouses visited that no examinations for Trichinella were carried out and in the second slaughterhouse it was reported that 1% of all pig carcasses were examined.

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

### 6.1. Competent authority

- 6.1.1. Concerning the minimum standards for the protection of calves the competent authority has failed to transpose into national legislation Commission Decision 97/182/EC (see point 5.2.1).
- 6.1.2. In the field of the protection of pigs and calves the DGV *lays down guidelines but does not have* command over the way each DRA carries out on farm welfare inspections. The information available at the DGV is not considered to be sufficient to meet the requirements of paragraph 1 of article 7 of Council Directive 91/629/EEC and paragraph 1 of article 7 of Council Directive 91/630/EEC.
- 6.1.3. The lack of detailed written guidance on what measurements to take and the conclusions and actions to follow as a result of the findings made on farm, means that the significance of the findings is often not clear to the inspector (see points 5.3.1.1.1 and 5.3.1.3).
- 6.1.4. The inspecting veterinarian failed to recognise a problem with overcrowding in several weaner pens (see point 5.3.1.1.3). No remarks were made on either farm regarding calf welfare. It was the Commission team who pointed out deficiencies concerning one design of calf hutch (see point 5.3.2.1) and the requirement for calves of more than two weeks of age to receive a daily ration of fibrous food (see point 5.3.2.2). It may be concluded that several EU requirements for the protection of pigs and calves were not well understood by the Portuguese inspecting teams.
- 6.1.5. It was the Commission team who instigated the inspections of the sick bays on both pig farms. There was a failure to make the investigation of these locations a priority (see point 5.3.1.3).
- 6.1.6. The procedure whereby transporters are authorised only partly fulfils the requirement for a written undertaking (see point 5.1.3 and Council Directive 91/628, Article 5 part A paragraph 1a ii).
- 6.1.7. There are no reports of the results of inspections of vehicles carried out at other times as required by Article 8 of Council Directive 91/628.
- 6.1.8. According to information received (see point 5.3.5), examinations for *Trichinella* are not carried out as required by point 42a (iii) of chapter 8 of Annex I of Council Directive 64/433/EEC.

### 6.2. Animal welfare situation observed during the mission

- 6.2.1. The practice of tail docking of calves (see point 5.3.2.6) is currently left to national provisions (Council Directive 98/58/EC, Annex, point 19), and there are no provisions in Portugal to regulate this practice.

- 6.2.2. Tail docking of pigs was routinely practised on one of the farms visited and tooth clipping on both farms visited (see point 5.3.1.4).
- 6.2.3. Regarding welfare during transport, the lorry described in point 5.3.3.1. did not meet the requirements of Council Directive 91/628 with regard to its unloading facilities its lack of a roof and being overstocked. Regarding the two multi-tier vehicles, which had travelled from Spain, there were doubts as to whether three fans at the front of a vehicle would be sufficient to maintain adequate ventilation in each compartment under certain meteorological conditions (see point 5.3.3.2.2). The handling of the animals during unloading was sometimes carried out in a rough manner and this was tolerated by the competent official (see point 5.3.3.2.4). This vehicle also lacked appropriate bedding to adequately absorb the urine and faeces (see point 5.3.3.2.5).
- 6.2.4. Comparing the findings from the few sites visited to assess progress in the field of animal transport (see points 5.3.3.1, 5.3.3.2.3 and in particular 5.3.3.2.4) with those of the previous mission in 1996, no progress could be observed. However the authorisation of transporters does represent some progress in administrative procedures and a greater general level of awareness of the requirements of Council Directive 91/628/EEC was detected.
- 6.2.5. Regarding welfare at the time of slaughter and killing, although no animals were slaughtered during the time of the visits, the state of repair of the captive bolt stunning equipment (see point 5.3.4.2) and the delay in killing a casualty animal (see point 5.3.4.3) were unacceptable.
- 6.2.6. As far as the well being of some individual animals was concerned, the Commission team came to the conclusion that the measures taken to implement EU animal welfare requirements were not always sufficient to avoid unnecessary distress and suffering during transport (see point 5.3.3.2.4) on farm (see point 5.3.1.3) and at the slaughterhouse (see point 5.3.4.3).

### **6.3. Closing meeting**

The findings and conclusions of this mission were presented by the Commission team at a closing meeting held on 19 November 1999 and attended by representatives from the DGV and each of the seven DRA. A representative of the DGV emphasised the difficulties for the DGV in controlling the activities of the regional services (see point 5.1).

In addition, the competent authority agreed to consider the position regarding the tail docking of calves (see point 5.3.2.6) in relation to point 19 of the Annex of Council Directive 98/58/EC, and also considering the recommendation of the Standing Committee of the European Convention for the Protection of Animals kept for Farming Purposes that it should be forbidden (article 17 of the recommendation concerning cattle adopted by the Standing Committee on 21 October 1988).

## **7. RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **7.1. To the central competent authorities of Portugal**

- 7.1.1. Transpose without delay Commission Decision 97/182/EC into national legislation.
- 7.1.2. Incorporate into the procedure for authorising transporters a written undertaking, which fulfils all the requirements of Council Directive 91/628/EEC, Article 5 part A paragraph 1 (a), (ii).
- 7.1.3. A target should be set for the annual number of inspections of animals in transit, which should be other than those checks made for the purposes of authorising transporters, and as required by article 8 of Council Directive 91/628/EEC. A procedure for monitoring these checks should also be established.
- 7.1.4. Further develop the methodology for carrying out inspections of calf and pig holdings, so that the minimum standards are clearly understood and that where necessary, appropriate corrective action is taken.
- 7.1.5. A procedure should be established so that targets can be set for the annual number of inspections of calf and pig holdings in Portugal and the implementation of these checks should be monitored.
- 7.1.6. Examine the emergence of the practice of tail docking of calves and establish a uniform policy.
- 7.1.7. Actively encourage farmers to find ways of reducing the need to tail dock piglets.
- 7.1.8. Ensure that checks of stunning equipment are carried out, so that the equipment is maintained in a satisfactory state of repair. Any electrical stunning apparatus in use must be equipped and operated as laid down in sub paragraph 2 of paragraph 3A of chapter II of Annex C of Council Directive 93/119/EC.
- 7.1.9. Give clear instructions to the competent regional and municipal authorities about the circumstances under which sanctions should be imposed.

The competent authorities of Portugal should take immediate remedial action regarding 7.1.8 and are invited to inform the Commission of the measures adopted concerning these and the other above recommendations, 6 months after receipt of the final mission report.

### **7.2. To the Commission Services**

- 7.2.1. Recommendations to the Commission services concerning the on farm welfare of pigs and calves will be presented in a general report to be prepared after the completion of this series of mission to Member States.
- 7.2.2. Although outwith the scope of this mission, a request should be made to the Portuguese authorities to explain their monitoring system for Trichinella. A mission to Portugal to look at this aspect of public health should also be considered.

ADDENDUM TO MISSION REPORT DG (SANCO)/1022/1999  
Competent Authority Response to Mission Report

1. The competent authority submitted comments on the draft report which were taken into consideration prior to the preparation of the final report.
2. In their written comments of 18<sup>th</sup> February 2000 the Portuguese authorities wish to point out that they consider the legal amendments made, the regulations issued and the training courses given represent progress in the field of the protection of animals during transport.