



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

DG(SANCO)/ 2009-8271 - MR - FINAL

FINAL REPORT OF A SPECIFIC AUDIT
CARRIED OUT IN
LATVIA
FROM 02 FEBRUARY TO 06 FEBRUARY 2009
IN ORDER TO
EVALUATE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CONTROLS FOR ANIMAL WELFARE
ON FARMS, DURING TRANSPORT AND AT THE TIME OF SLAUGHTER.
IN THE CONTEXT OF A GENERAL AUDIT

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 an endnote.

Executive Summary

This report describes the outcome of a specific audit carried out by the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) in Latvia, from 2 to 6 February 2009.

The objective of the mission was to verify that official controls are carried out in accordance with the multi-annual national control plan (MANCP) referred to in Article 41 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 and in compliance with Community law. In addition, the audit sought to specifically verify the implementation of EU animal welfare legislation applicable to pig and laying hen farms, animals at the time of slaughter, during transport, and to follow up certain recommendations from previous FVO report on animal welfare.

The report concludes 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 report makes a number of recommendations addressed to the Latvian competent authorities, aimed at rectifying the identified shortcomings and further enhancing the control measures in place.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2	OBJECTIVES OF THE MISSION.....	1
3	LEGAL BASIS FOR THE MISSION.....	2
4	BACKGROUND.....	2
5	MAIN FINDINGS.....	2
5.1	Animal welfare on the farms.....	3
5.1.1	<i>Farm Inspections.....</i>	3
5.1.2	<i>Registration of laying hen farms.....</i>	3
5.1.3	<i>Inspections of laying hen farms.....</i>	4
5.2	Animal welfare during transport.....	5
5.2.1	<i>Authorisation of transporters.....</i>	5
5.2.2	<i>Checks on transport</i>	6
5.2.3	<i>Checks of journey logs</i>	7
5.3	Animal welfare within slaughterhouses.....	8
5.3.1	<i>Checks within slaughterhouses.....</i>	8
6	CONCLUSIONS.....	9
7	CLOSING MEETING.....	9
8	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	10

ABBREVIATIONS & SPECIAL TERMS USED IN THE REPORT

Abbreviation	Explanation
CA	Competent Authority
CCA	Central Competent Authority
EU	European Union
FBO	Food Business Operator
FVS	Food and Veterinary Services
MANCP	Multi Annual National Control Plan
SVA	State Authorised Veterinarian
TRACES	Trade Control and Expert System of the European Commission
TSU	Territorial Structural Unit
VI	Veterinary Inspector

1 INTRODUCTION

The mission took place in Latvia from 2 to 6 February 2009 as part of the planned mission programme of the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO).

An opening meeting was held with the competent authorities of Latvia on 3 February. At this meeting, the objectives of, and itinerary for, the mission were confirmed by the mission team. The mission team comprised two inspectors from the FVO and an observer from the European Free Trade Agreement (EFTA) Surveillance Authority and was accompanied throughout the mission by representatives from the Central Competent Authority (CCA), the Food and Veterinary Service (FVS) of the Ministry of Agriculture.

2 OBJECTIVES OF THE MISSION

As part of the general audit, the main objective of each specific audit is to verify that official controls are carried out in accordance with the multi-annual national control plan (MANCP) referred to in Article 41 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 and in compliance with Community law.

The more specific objectives of the mission were to evaluate:

- The implementation of national measures aimed at the control of animal welfare on pig, calf and laying hen farms.
- The implementation of national measures aimed at the control of animal welfare during transport.
- The implementation of national measures aimed at the control of animal welfare at the time of slaughter or killing.

The effectiveness of actions taken in response to recommendations in previous FVO missions in the above areas was also evaluated.

In pursuit of these objectives, the following meetings were held and sites visited

Competent authorities			Comments
Competent authorities	Central	2	Opening and closing meeting
	Regional	2	In regional offices and/or in establishments
Farms		1	Laying hen farm
Transport		1	Assembly centre
Slaughterhouses		1	Poultry slaughterhouse

3 LEGAL BASIS FOR THE MISSION

The mission was carried out under the general provisions of Community legislation and, in particular Article 45 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council, on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules ([see Endnote](#)).

4 BACKGROUND

The previous mission concerning animal welfare in Latvia was carried out from 31 May to 3 June 2005, the results of which are described in report DG(SANCO)/7637/2005 – MR Final (hereafter referred to as report 7637/2005). This report is accessible at: http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fvo/ir_search_en.cfm

A detailed description of the Competent Authority (CA) can be found in DG(SANCO)/7701/2008 country profile of Latvia (hereafter: country profile) which is accessible at: http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/country_profiles_en.cfm

This specific audit is part of the General Audit to Latvia to verify that official controls are carried out in accordance with the MANCP referred to in Article 41 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004. All parts of the official controls related specifically to Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 will be reported separately at the end of the full audit series. Therefore, remarks made in this part B of the report concern the specific audit over animal welfare controls and not the requirements on official controls specified in Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.

5 MAIN FINDINGS

5.1 ANIMAL WELFARE ON THE FARMS

5.1.1 Farm Inspections

Legal basis

Articles 7.1 of Directives 91/630/EEC and 91/629/EEC require the CA to carry out inspections on a representative sample of the different rearing systems for pigs and calves respectively. Article 8.1 of Directive 1999/74/EC requires checks of laying hen farms. For checks performed until the end of 2007, Decision 2000/50/EC provided the framework for collating and reporting the results of inspections of farms with these species; from 2008 the framework is provided by Decision 2006/778/EC.

Audit findings:

Concerning selection of farms, the MANCP does not provide the programme of inspections. According to the country profile report, 15% of pig and calf holdings have to be checked annually by the VIs, to be selected at regional level under a yearly programme set by the FVS, during which compliance with animal protection requirements are also checked.

The CCA indicated that, in addition to this 15% of holdings with cattle, sheep, goats and/or pigs, all pig holdings with more than 20 fatteners and with more than 350 laying hens have to be checked annually for animal welfare requirements.

The CCA pointed out that inspections were not conducted based on the statistical representative number of farm samples, because the information about the different rearing systems is not available in the relevant database and that the national legal texts do not require the CA to select pig and calf farms to carry out inspections as required by Article 7 of the Directive 91/630/EEC and Directive 91/629/EEC.

The mission team noted that:

- The CCA has not set specific targets to carry out inspections on a representative sample of the different rearing systems for pigs and calves. However, the farms with calves and the farms with less than 20 fatteners are included in the 15% global annual target.
- In Bauskas region the checks in these farms were not available on the spot and the inspection team could not assess if the 15% target was achieved. Regarding laying hen farms, the two farms in the region had been checked

Conclusion

Although 15% of pig and calf farms are to be checked annually, targets on a representative sample of the different rearing systems for each species are not set.

5.1.2 Registration of laying hen farms

Legal basis

Directive 2002/4/EC requires Member States to establish a system for registering every production site covered by the scope of Directive 1999/74/EC. Last paragraph of point 1 of the Annex of this Directive requires the registration of the maximum capacity of an establishment in number of birds present at one time.

Audit findings:

- The inspection team noted that, in response to a recommendation in Report 7637/2005, in the register additional identification characters in the identification number are given with the purpose of distinguishing single flocks kept in separated buildings of the same establishment, and that concerning the farm visited these identification characters were updated.

Conclusion

Additional identification characters with the purpose of distinguishing single flocks kept in separate buildings of the same establishment are included in the register, as recommended in report 7637/2005, and updated concerning the farm visited.

5.1.3 Inspections of laying hen farms

Legal basis

Article 8.1 of Directive 1999/74/EC requires Member States to ensure that the CA carries out inspections to monitor compliance with the provisions of this Directive and Article 5.2 requires that with effect from 1 January 2003 unenriched cages may not be built or brought into service for the first time. In addition, Commission Decision 2004/433/EC lays down transitional measures for certain establishments in Latvia derogating from Council Directive 1999/74/EC as regards the height of cages until 1 May 2007.

Audit findings:

- Report 7637/2005 recommended the CCA to complete the necessary upgrading in the farms with transitional period. The inspection team noted that procedures to check implementation of Decision 2004/433/EC were in place. From the information provided and the inspection team findings, it was noted that all the houses with non-compliant cages as regards the height of cages were out of operation.
- In one region the review of the reports of the checks in one farm from October 2004 until January 2009 indicated the detection of non-compliances in unenriched cages, such as the lack of provision of at least 550 cm² of cage area for each laying hen, and that claw shortening devices were not fitted, contrary to Articles 5.1(1) and 5.1(6) of Directive 1999/74/EC respectively. In the enriched cages, insufficient length of the perches and feeders was detected, contrary to Articles 6.1(d) and 6.2 respectively, and that at least 750 cm² of cage area per hen were not provided, contrary to Article 6.1(a) of Directive 1999/74/EC.
- During the visit the VIs adequately checked the capacity of each individual cage, the average of the number of hens per cage and the number of cages in the building at the time of the visit, but did not check the number of birds at the start of the laying

period. Therefore capacities were worked out but were not double-checked with the number of birds introduced.

- The stocking density of the checked house had been considered adequate by the CA during a previous check, whereas in reality it had been around 8% overstocked when the birds started laying. The guidance explained how to establish the maximum number of hens in each cage, but did not indicate how to assess the maximum capacity of the buildings.
- In addition, the CA did not detect that the laying hens did not have litter, contrary to Article 6.1(c) of Directive 1999/74/EC, even though this requirement is mentioned in the checklist and guidance provided by the CCA. National legislation does not transpose the requirements of Article 2 (c) and Article 6 (1)(c) Directive 1999/74/EC regarding litter.

Conclusions

Although most deficiencies had been detected, the extent of overstocking had not been fully investigated as guidance was insufficient for assessing maximum capacity and what was to be considered as appropriate litter had not been correctly transposed in national legislation.

5.2 ANIMAL WELFARE DURING TRANSPORT

5.2.1 Authorisation of transporters

Legal Basis

Article 2(x) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 defines a 'transporter' as any natural or legal person transporting animals on his own account, or for the account of a third party. A precondition for the authorisation of transporters is that applicants have no record of serious infringements of animal welfare legislation in the previous three years, or that the applicant has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Competent Authority that they have taken all necessary measures to avoid further infringements (Article 10 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005). Article 11.1 of this Regulation indicates for long journey transport (type II authorisation) that certain documents shall be submitted by the applicant.

Audit findings:

- In Ogres region long journey authorisations for transporters and for the approval of their vehicles had been issued. However, it was noted that two means of transport did not appear in the CCA list of approved means of transport. Although the regional CA indicated that the relevant documents had been sent to CCA by internal courier, the CCA subsequently indicated that due to technical failure documents of one means of transport this had not been sent to the Division of approval and registration of companies in the central office. The second means of transport was temporarily excluded from the register because it was under repair ([see Endnote](#)).
- The certificate of approval of means of transport was drawn up in the Latvian language but not in English, as required by Article 18.2 of Regulation (EC) No

1/2005.

Conclusions

As approved vehicles for long journeys of several authorised transporters were not included in the CCA database, this was incomplete.

5.2.2 Checks on transport

Legal Basis

Article 15.1 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 requires that the CA shall carry out appropriate checks at any stage of the long journey.

Point 1.4(a) of Chapter V of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 requires that unweaned calves which are still on a milk diet, when using road vehicles for long distance transport must, after nine hours of travel, be given a rest period of at least one hour sufficient in particular for them to be given liquid and if necessary fed. After this rest period, they may be transported for a further nine hours.

Point 2.2 of Chapter VI of the Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 requires that the watering devices shall be in good working order and be appropriately designed and positioned for the categories of animals to be watered on board of the vehicle.

Audit findings:

- Instructions and guidance on certain specific issues of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 were highlighted during the training courses, such as "continuous" water supply in case of long journeys. However, most of the drinkers on the vehicle seen by the inspection team during the visit to the assembly centre were not designed for unweaned calves and the few drinkers suitable for them were not accessible to all calves, contrary to point 2.2 of Chapter VI of the Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.
- In addition, it was not possible to check if the drinkers were in working order. The driver of the lorry stated that he does not provide water during transport nor any liquid, because the calves may get sick and might die, contrary to point 1.4(a) of Chapter V of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005. This was allowed by the CA who explained that in their experience providing water to calves which were not previously adapted to it causes heavy diarrhoea. They also stated, that they had informed the CA in the MS of arrival of this situation.
- There was adequate space allowance on the vehicle where calves were loaded. The CCA check list and guidance include checking the space above the animals. However, they were loaded on three decks and several heads were in contact with the roof so that the space above the animals was insufficient to ensure adequate ventilation, contrary to Annex I of Chapter II 1.2 of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.
- The assembly centre visited in Bauskas region had been approved by the regional CA. The inspection team noted that the maintenance of the facilities for the animals were insufficient, contrary to Article 11 of Directive 64/432/EEC and Chapter III, 1(3)(a) of the Annex I to Regulation(EC) No 1/2005, as regards the risk of injury

from fences and floor irregularities. This was detected and reported by the regional CA but not corrected ([see Endnote](#)).

- The lairages were overall clean, there was plenty of straw and hay available to calves, which according to the dealer received milk twice a day, the last meal was given at 10 am, and calves were loaded in the afternoon. However, there was no water in the pens and the CA indicated that the calves should not drink water at all, contrary to point 1.10 of Chapter III of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 that requires that in assembly centres animals shall have access to water.

Conclusions

The CCA instructions and guidance concerning provision of water were not enforced concerning provision of water to calves in the lorry. In addition it was not ensured that there were provisions to give liquid to unweaned calves which are still on a milk diet during the rest period of at least one hour after nine hours of travel.

The CA did not detect that the drinkers on the vehicle were not suitable for unweaned calves and that when three decks were loaded the space above the animals was insufficient to ensure adequate ventilation.

The assembly centre visited was mostly adequate, although the CA did not ensure appropriate maintenance of the facilities and provision of water.

5.2.3 Checks of journey logs

Legal Basis

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.

Point 8 of Annex II to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 requires a copy of the completed journey log to be returned to the CA of the place of departure within one month of completion of the journey, which allows the CA to check if the journey times described in point 1.1 Chapter V of the Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 are respected.

Audit findings:

- The CA guidance concerning checks on journey logs only refers to Annex II to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005. The CCA instructions regarding watering and feeding intervals, journey times and resting period did not contain the requirements in case of unweaned calves which are still on a milk diet.
- The regional CA in Ogres had approved journey logs for calves as young as 15 days containing times intended for adult cattle, as indicated in section 4 of returned journey logs concerning consignments of calves transported to Spain. In most cases section 1 of journey logs reviewed by the inspection team was incomplete with important details missed, such as the estimated total weight of the consignment and the total space provided for the consignment. Around 10% of the journey logs were returned to the CA and section 4 of returned journey logs was blank or incomplete for most consignments.

- In Bauskas region the journey times for unweaned calves were more adequate and journey logs were generally returned but not fully filled in.
- The CA did not carry out appropriate checks to verify that the journey log submitted by the organiser is realistic, contrary to Article 14.1(a)(ii) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, and accepted that the organiser inserted as total expected duration of the journey in section 1 of journey logs, the same figure as for the estimated journey time of Point I.29 of the TRACES intra trade certificate.
- As an example, in a consignment to Spain it was noted that section 1 of journey logs that indicated a total expected duration of 29 hours, resulted in section 4 in 67 hours to reach the final destination, including a 24 hours rest.

Conclusions

Control of journey logs concerning the feasibility of the journeys, as required by Article 14 1(a) (ii) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, was inadequate as the resting period and the real speed of a lorry was not taken into consideration for the calculation of total expected duration of the journey.

There was no system in place to ensure that all journey logs are returned and duly filled in ([see Endnote](#)), as required by point 8 of Annex II of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, and to ensure that consignments of calves receive appropriate feeding and rest times as required by point 1.4(a) of Chapter V of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

5.3 ANIMAL WELFARE WITHIN SLAUGHTERHOUSES

5.3.1 Checks within slaughterhouses

Legal Basis

Article 8 of Directive 93/119/EC requires that inspections and controls in the slaughterhouse shall be carried out under the responsibility of the CA. Article 3 of Directive 93/119/EC requires that animals shall be spared any avoidable excitement, pain or suffering during movement, lairaging, restraint, stunning or slaughter. Article 7 of Directive 93/119/EC indicates that no person shall engage in the movement, lairaging, restraint, slaughter or killing of animals unless they have the knowledge and skill necessary to perform the tasks humanely and efficiently.

Article 6.1 of this Directive requires that equipment and installations used for stunning must be used in such a way as to achieve rapid and effective stunning. The competent authority shall check them regularly to achieve this objective.

Point II, 3(B)1 of Annex C of Directive 93/119/EC, requires that the strength and duration of the current used in waterbath stunners will be determined by the competent authority so as to ensure that the animal is immediately rendered unconscious and remains so until death.

Audit findings:

- In the poultry slaughterhouse visited, although actions to correct the poor state of repair in the unloading area had been recently implemented, the CA did not detect

that the handling of birds was unsatisfactory. In the unloading bay there was insufficient protection from adverse weather conditions, contrary to point I.4 of the Annex A of Directive 93/119/EC; the internal height of the crates was insufficient for the birds, contrary to point 1.2 of Chapter I of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, and crossing between the birds shackled and those still in the drawers caused unnecessary excitement, contrary to Article 3 of Directive 93/119/EC, and several birds escaped during unloading with the consequent risk of injuries.

- The national legislation determines that 100 mA between 90 and 130V for 2-3 seconds is to be used for stunning of poultry and the guidance to the check list indicates that the current in the water bath stunner "has to be strong enough to produce stunning". Point 3(b) of Article 7.5.7 of the Terrestrial Animal Health Code of the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) available in their website <http://www.oie.int>, recommends that the voltage should be adjusted so that the total current is the required current of 100 mA per chicken at 50 Hz, multiplied by the number of birds in the waterbath at the same time.
- In the slaughterhouse visited, parameters of 50 to 60 mA per chicken at 680 Hz were routinely applied, whereas the report of the European Food Safety Agency ([see Endnote](#)) recommends 200 mA per chicken at that frequency. Main indicators of ineffective stunning such as wing flapping and palpebral reflex were not present; however, around one in twenty chickens presented for few seconds signs of rhythmic breathing after stunning.

Conclusions

Checks on the slaughterhouse visited were generally satisfactory. However, concerning poultry, the CA had not sufficiently determined the parameters for waterbath stunning as required and corrective actions were insufficient to avoid unnecessary excitement of poultry.

6 CONCLUSIONS

Overall Conclusion

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.

7 CLOSING MEETING

A closing meeting was held on 6 February 2009 with the CCA, the FVS of Latvia. At this

meeting, the main findings and preliminary conclusions of the mission were presented by the FVO team. The representatives of the CCA acknowledged the findings and conclusions presented, and provided further clarification on the issues discussed.

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

No.	Recommendation
1	Inspections are carried out on a statistically representative sample of the different farming systems used for pigs and calves, as required by Article 7 of Directives 91/630/EEC and 91/630/EC.
2	Inspections of establishments with laying hens should verify the maximum capacity with the number of birds introduced in the building and adequate checks are made of all the requirements of Directive 1999/74/EC.
3	The requirements of Article 2(c) and Article 6.1(c) of Directive 1999/74/EC regarding litter are correctly transposed in national legislation.
4	The electronic database of the approved means of transport by road for long journeys is complete, to make possible for the authorities in other Member States to rapidly identify these vehicles, as required by 18(3) of Regulation(EC) No 1/2005.
5	All requirements of Regulation (EC) 1/2005 for vehicles approved for long journeys are met, in particular regarding water devices, as required by point 2 of Chapter VI of the Annex I, and the space above the animals is sufficient to ensure adequate ventilation, as required by Annex I of Chapter II 1.2.
6	Liquids are given during the transport journey to unweaned calves which are still on a milk diet, travelling in road vehicles for long distance transport, as required by point 1.4(a) of Chapter V of Annex I to Regulation 1/2005.
7	Controls of journey logs are carried out, as required by Article 14.1(a) (ii) and point 8 of Annex II to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, to check that journey times, as indicated in point 1 of Chapter V of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, are respected.
8	The strength and duration of current in waterbath stunners, are determined by the competent authority as required by Annex C II.3(B)1 of Directive 93/119/EC.

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

http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/ap/ap_latvia_8271_2009.pdf

9 ENDNOTES

Concerning	Detail
Section 3	A full list of the legal instruments relevant to this report is provided in the Annex

Concerning	Detail
Section 5.2.1	In their response to the draft report, the Latvian Authorities noted that at present, inconsistencies are removed and means of transport that are in action are included in the FVS register. The responsible inspector was given an admonishment for not updating the data base register.
Section 5.2.2	In their response to the draft report, the Latvian Authorities noted that for non-fulfillment of the instructions of the FVS inspector, a penalty was applied on the assembly centre.
Section 5.2.3	In their response to the draft report, the Latvian Authorities noted that an instruction has been given to the FVS regional offices not to issue any certificate to those transporters that have not returned accordingly completed parts of journey logs. FVS is planning additional training for inspectors on the evaluation of Journey logs in June of this year.
Section 5.3.1	Opinion of the Scientific Panel on Animal Health and Welfare on a request from the Commission related to welfare aspects of the main systems of stunning and killing the main commercial species of animals, The EFSA Journal (2004), 45, 1-29. see: www.efsa.eu.int

ANNEX 1 - LIST OF LEGISLATION REFERENCED IN THE REPORT

Reference	OJ Ref.	Detail
Directive 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
Decision 2000/50/EC	OJ L 19, 25.1.2000, p. 51–53	2000/50/EC: Commission Decision of 17 December 1999 concerning minimum requirements for the inspection of holdings on which animals are kept for farming purposes
Decision 2006/778/EC	OJ L 314, 15.11.2006, p. 39–47	2006/778/EC: Commission Decision of 14 November 2006 concerning minimum requirements for the collection of information during the inspections of production sites on which certain animals are kept for farming purposes
Directive 91/629/EEC	OJ L 340, 11.12.1991, p. 28–32	Council Directive 91/629/EEC of 19 November 1991 laying down minimum standards for the protection of calves
Directive 91/630/EEC	OJ L 340, 11.12.1991, p. 33–38	Council Directive 91/630/EEC of 19 November 1991 laying down minimum standards for the protection of pigs
Directive 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
Directive 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
Regulation (EC) No 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
Directive 93/119/EC	OJ L 340, 31.12.1993, p. 21–34	Council Directive 93/119/EC of 22 December 1993 on the protection of animals at the time of slaughter or killing
Decision 2004/433/EC	OJ L 154, 30.4.2004, p. 51–53	2004/433/EC: Commission Decision 2004/433/EC of 29 April 2004 laying down transitional measures for Latvia derogating from Council Directive 1999/74/EC as regards the height of cages for laying hens