



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

DG(SANCO)/ 2009-8262 - MR - FINAL

FINAL REPORT OF A SPECIFIC AUDIT
CARRIED OUT IN
FINLAND
FROM 23 FEBRUARY TO 27 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 Finland, from 23 to 27 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 the recommendations from FVO report 7329 2007.

The report concludes that there is an organised and defined control system in place for carrying out animal welfare inspections. Much work has been done to improve the guidance available to all levels of the control chain.

The inspections of farms were satisfactorily carried out; however there was an inconsistent application of follow up procedures for farms and transport inspections when deficiencies were noted, due to a lack of systematic recording of follow up deadlines for action. The supervision of company controls in the slaughterhouses visited were competently performed and recorded and suitable enforcement action was taken when required.

Controls were carried out as laid down in the MANCP except for systematic follow up of deficiencies. Overall there are improvements noted in several areas in comparison to previous missions.

The report makes a number of recommendations addressed to the Finnish 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 | FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS..... | 2 |
| 5.1 | Animal welfare on farms..... | 3 |
| 5.1.1 | <i>Farm Inspections.....</i> | 3 |
| 5.1.2 | <i>Registration of laying hen farms.....</i> | 4 |
| 5.1.3 | <i>Inspections of laying hen farms.....</i> | 4 |
| 5.1.4 | <i>Inspections of pig farms.....</i> | 6 |
| 5.2 | Animal welfare during transport..... | 6 |
| 5.2.1 | <i>Authorisation of transporters and certificates of approval for means of transport by road.....</i> | 6 |
| 5.2.2 | <i>Checks on transport</i> | 7 |
| 5.3 | Animal welfare within slaughterhouses..... | 9 |
| 5.3.1 | <i>Checks within slaughterhouses.....</i> | 9 |
| 6 | OVERALL CONCLUSION..... | 10 |
| 7 | CLOSING MEETING..... | 10 |
| 8 | RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 10 |

ABBREVIATIONS & SPECIAL TERMS USED IN THE REPORT

| Abbreviation | Explanation |
|---------------------|---|
| CA | Competent Authority |
| CCA | Central Competent Authority |
| ELVIS | Animal welfare inspection results' database |
| EU | European Union |
| Evira | Finnish Food Safety Authority |
| FVO | Food and Veterinary Office of the European Commission |
| MA | Municipal Authority |
| MAF | Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry |
| MANCP | Multi Annual National Control Plan |
| MVO | Municipal Veterinary Officer |
| PVO | Provincial Veterinary Officer |
| SPO | State Provincial Office |

1 INTRODUCTION

The specific audit took place in Finland from 23 to 27 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 Finland on 23 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 was accompanied throughout the mission by representatives from the Finnish Food Safety Agency (Evira), the Central Competent Authority.

The Specific Audit formed part of the FVO's planned mission programme and was carried out as a component of a General Audit, as prescribed in Article 45 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules.

This report focuses on the sector specific issues identified during the audit. It does not necessarily include aspects relating to Regulation (EC) No 882/2004; these aspects will be addressed in the subsequent General Audit report.

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:

Ø The implementation of national measures aimed at the control of animal welfare on pig, and laying hen farms.

Ø The implementation of national measures aimed at the control of animal welfare during transport.

Ø 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 |
| | Municipal | 2 | In municipal office and/or in establishments |
| Farms | | 2 | Laying hen farms |
| | | 2 | Pig farms |
| Slaughterhouses | | 1 | Poultry slaughterhouse |
| | | 1 | Pig 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.

4 BACKGROUND

The previous mission concerning animal welfare in Finland was carried out from 10 to 14 September 2007, the results of which are described in report DG (SANCO)/2007/7329 – MR Final (hereafter referred to as report 2007-7329). This report is accessible at: http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fvo/ir_search_en.cfm

A detailed description of the Competent Authorities (CA) can be found in the report DG(SANCO)/7966/2008 country profile (hereafter: country profile) for Finland which is accessible at: http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/country_profiles_en.cfm and in the MANCP of Finland.

5 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 ANIMAL WELFARE ON FARMS

5.1.1 Farm Inspections

Legal requirements

Article 7.1 of Directive 91/630/EEC requires the CA to carry out inspections on a representative sample of the different rearing systems for pigs. 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.

Findings

Report 2007-7329 recommended that measures be taken by the CCA to address certain deficiencies in procedures to verify the effectiveness of inspections and the corrective actions taken in relation to the welfare of pigs and laying hens on farms. The inspection targets for 2008 were 3% for pigs, 1.5% for calves and 10% for laying hens.

The mission team noted that:

Ø The CA has set annual targets in the MANCP for animal welfare inspections for pigs, calves and laying hens of: 2%; 2% and 15% respectively. The percentage of the inspections completed during 2007 was 98% of pig farms, 97.6% of calf holdings, and 96% of laying hen farms.

Ø The CCA have developed a reporting programme in the ELVIS database to meet the requirements of Decision 2006/778/EC.

Ø There is a legal requirement for a follow-up visit where statutory non-compliances are detected during welfare inspections but this is not always followed.

Ø In one of the SPOs visited, a random selection of files reviewed showed that follow up visits had been carried out when municipal inspections had resulted in decisions being issued. In the other SPO, most of the inspection files selected had not been followed up with second visits.

Ø Neither SPO had any system of ensuring that follow up visits deadlines were recorded for action. There was no recorded follow up system in place in the municipality visited. Staff at both provincial and municipal level stated that they relied on memory to ensure follow up action was taken where deficiencies were found. Evira indicated during the final meeting that the ELVIS database have the capacity to record inspections and that they can be used to monitor re-checks.

Conclusions

The CA has set targets for animal welfare inspections for pigs, laying hens and calves covering the different rearing systems and almost fully met their own targets for on farm inspections during 2007. Follow up inspections where deficiencies had been noted were not always carried out as required and no robust system was in place in the SPOs or municipality visited to ensure this happened.

5.1.2 Registration of laying hen farms

Legal requirements

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.

Findings

There has been no change in the system for the registration of holdings with laying hens as described in report 2007-7329. If the maximum capacity of holdings is found to be incorrect at inspection; the CA are not able to update the correct information directly into the central database. The farmer must notify the area's rural authority of changes to the maximum capacity of a laying hen farm. The rural authority enters the information into the register of laying hen farms. [\(see Endnote\)](#)

Information on the maximum capacity of farms from the central database is given to MVOs and PVOs when carrying out animal welfare, salmonella and residue inspections.

The mission team noted that:

Ø All levels of the CA questioned were unsure as to who was responsible for the registration of laying hen premises, the calculation of maximum capacities for premises with more than 350 birds and the procedures involved to update farm registration parameters.

Ø PVOs and MVOs met were unable to easily access information on the maximum capacity of laying hen farms or did not know how to.

Ø On one of the two laying hen farms visited the maximum capacity of the premises had been given many years before and had not been calculated correctly. The stated capacity of the house was approximately 5% more than permitted under Council Directive 1999/74/EC. In addition, one house was no longer in use and its capacity had not been removed from the overall total.

Conclusions

The system in place for the registration of laying hen premises does not ensure that changes concerning registered data are notified to the CA without delay and that the register is updated immediately when such information is received contrary to Article 1(4) of Directive 2002/4/EC.

5.1.3 Inspections of laying hen farms

Legal requirements

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.

Findings

In response to a recommendation in report 2007-7329, new guidance instructions and updated checklists have been issued by the CCA to assist inspectors in carrying out inspections of the requirements of Directive 1999/74/EC.

Report 2007-7329 recommended that measures be taken by the CCA to address certain deficiencies concerning the minimum height of cages for laying hens and the minimum unobstructed area for each hen. Evira sent two letters to SPOs in 2008, with updated instructions, including these two issues, and a request for Municipalities to report on the situation regarding these types of cages in their provinces.

The mission team noted that:

Ø The CA inspections on the two laying hen premises visited were carried out in an effective manner. The new procedures and guidance were seen to be effectively used and were welcomed by MVOs. Both inspections were carried out using the checklists and guidance instructions supplied by Evira.

Ø The guidance does not:

o take into account limiting factors such as length of feeders and perches for calculating the maximum capacity in enriched cages as required in Directive 1999/74/EC but relies on total cage area only. This led to non-detection of 5% overstocking at the time of bird delivery in one of the two premises visited.

o require checks to be made on the materials to be used for the nest floor in enriched cages as required in EU and national legislation. As a result, wire floors were considered acceptable by the MVOs contrary to Article 2(b) of Directive 1999/74/EC.

o fully address the requirement for back up mechanical systems and alarms in farms where the health and well being of the animals is dependent on an artificial ventilation system as required by point 13 of the Annex to Directive 98/58/EC as the CCA interprets that any system which is not fully dependent on artificial ventilation is exempted from these requirements.

Ø Regarding follow up on the recommendation relating to the minimum heights in laying cages: the CCA are not in a position to have a complete overview on whether there are more of these type of cages which do not comply with the height requirements as only some of the SPOs had sent back replies to Evira's request for feedback on this issue. One of the SPOs stated that they had addressed this in a training session to MVOs but had not forwarded the request for information. In the municipality office visited, none of the MVOs knew about this issue.

Conclusions

The inspections seen by the mission team were carried out in a competent and effective manner using the updated procedures drafted by the CCA since the last mission. The new procedures and checklists are a useful improvement but still did not ensure all legislative requirements were correctly assessed. The CA has taken steps to follow up the recommendation from the previous mission on cage heights, but due to insufficient responses from Municipalities, has been unable to quantify the extent of the problem.

5.1.4 Inspections of pig farms

Legal requirements

Article 7.1 of Directives 91/630/EEC requires the CA to carry out inspections on a representative sample of the different rearing systems for pigs.

Findings

In response to a recommendation in report 2007-7329, new guidance instructions and updated checklists have been issued by the CCA to assist inspectors in carrying out inspections of the requirements of Directive 91/630/EEC.

The mission team noted that:

Ø The CA inspections on two pig farms were carried out in an effective manner. The new procedures and guidance were seen to be effectively used and were welcomed by MVOs.

Ø The guidance does not:

o fully address the requirement for back up mechanical systems and alarms in farms where the health and well being of the animals is dependent on an artificial ventilation system as required by point 13 of the Annex to Directive 98/58/EC as the CCA interprets that any system which is not fully dependent on artificial ventilation is exempted from these requirements.

Ø One of the farms visited had been subject to a routine visit by a private veterinarian the week previously. A number of issues, correctly identified by the MVO, were not detected by the private veterinarian at that visit. These concerned the relatively high percentage of large hernias in the fattening pigs, insufficient material for manipulation and investigation, evidence of tail and ear biting, and general poor environmental management. Article 12 of the Law on the Veterinary Profession requires veterinarians to report any welfare issues to the animal protection authority, without prejudice to any confidentiality provisions. The CA was uncertain about how to deal with this issue but indicated that they would investigate and contact the veterinarian concerned.

Ø Both inspections were carried out using the checklists and guidance instructions supplied by Evira. Where deficiencies were detected, these were noted and rectification orders with appropriate deadlines were served on the owners.

Conclusions

The inspections, using the updated procedures drafted by the CCA, were carried out in a competent and effective manner. The new procedures and checklists are therefore a useful improvement although they still did not ensure all legislative requirements were correctly assessed.

5.2 ANIMAL WELFARE DURING TRANSPORT

5.2.1 Authorisation of transporters and certificates of approval for means of

Legal requirements

Article 11 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 lays down the requirements for CAs to grant long journey transporter authorisations and Article 18 the requirements for CAs to grant certificates of approval of means of transport by road for long journeys.

Findings

The authorisation of transporters and approval of means of transport by road used for long journeys is carried out at the level of the SPO. PVOs themselves carry out ex-ante checks on the means of transport by road used for long journeys or ask for them to be carried out by the slaughterhouse official veterinarians or MVOs. Authority for granting authorisations and carrying out checks was provided for by the Animal Transport Act (1429/2006).

Documentation relating to this area was not examined in depth.

The mission team noted that:

Ø In the absence of centralised written guidelines, the PVOs dealing with animal transport matters, together with Evira, have informally arranged practices to standardise the approval of means of transport by preparing a written checklist for this purpose.

Ø Evira recently updated the standard checklist and instructions for carrying out inspections of vehicles and the animals transported.

Ø Transporters' names and authorisation numbers are publicly available (on the Evira website), as required by Article 13(4) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, however the approved means of transport by road for long journeys, although available in an electronic database, are not recorded in a manner enabling them to be rapidly identified by the competent authorities in all Member States, as required by Article 18(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005. ([see Endnote](#))

Conclusions

Evira has recently updated the standard documentary procedures for carrying out checks during animal transportation in an effort to harmonise the work carried out by the supervisory authorities. Approved means of transport by road for long journeys are not recorded in a manner enabling them to be rapidly identified by the competent authorities in all Member States, as required by Article 18(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

5.2.2 Checks on transport

Legal requirements

Article 27.1 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 requires that the CA shall carry out non-discriminatory inspections of animals, means of transport and accompanying documents. Such inspections must be carried out on an adequate proportion of the animals transported each year within each Member State and may be carried out at the

same time as checks for other purposes.

Findings

The CCA has put in place an annual programme of animal welfare inspections during transport and has reported the results of the inspections to the Commission services. The instructions sent from Evira to SPOs in 2007 and 2008 to carry out inspections of animal transport do not define the ratio of checks during transport/destination/departure but request a "sufficient number of checks on departure".

In 2007, 341 transport inspections were carried out at the place of destination (slaughter houses), 25 inspections during transport by road, and 3 transport inspections at the place of departure. Data of the transport inspections in 2008 was not yet available.

The mission team noted that:

Ø Both of the SPOs visited had taken part in road transport checks in cooperation with the police, and one of the PVOs had carried out two checks at departure.

Ø The results of inspections at departure for 2007, albeit from a small sample size, recorded a far higher infringement rate than those carried out during transport by road or at destination (67% against 24% and 20% respectively). The CCA did not increase the proportion of inspections as required by Article 27 of Regulation EC No. 1/2005 where it is established that the provision of the Regulation have been disregarded.

Ø The results from checks carried out during 2007 concentrated mainly on checks at destinations (approximately 93.5 % of the total for both pigs and bovines), mainly at slaughterhouses. Less than one percent of inspections were carried out at places of departure.

Ø Checks on vehicle at slaughterhouse are carried out by official veterinarians or auxiliaries during the course of their normal duties.

Ø Evira's Annual Report on the Implementation of the MANCP for 2007 noted that infringements were detected in approximately 30% of inspections of animal welfare during transport.

Ø Evira does not follow up or collect information on whether follow up inspections on transport infringements have taken place, and the results of such inspections. It is the responsibility of the inspecting PVO, MVO or official veterinarian to carry out the follow up inspections and check that corrective actions have been made. There is a lack of data required to report the outcome of checks as required by Article 27 of Regulation EC No. 1/2005.

Conclusions

The CCA does not have a satisfactory overview of the follow up of inspections of animal welfare during transport where deficiencies were detected and any subsequent enforcement action taken. The CCA is not in a position to ensure that all measures necessary to rectify the deficiencies have been taken in accordance with Article 25 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 or report on enforcement action taken as required by Article 27 of Regulation EC No. 1/2005.

5.3 ANIMAL WELFARE WITHIN SLAUGHTERHOUSES

5.3.1 Checks within slaughterhouses

Legal requirements

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.

Findings

Report DG (SANCO)/2007/7329 – MR Final on food safety recommended that measures be taken to ensure compliance with stunning and slaughter equipment requirements in slaughterhouses. Evira provided additional information outlining a series of measures that had been taken to address this recommendation.

The mission team noted that:

Ø The annual SPO report on official veterinarians' performance in slaughterhouse does not currently cover animal welfare as a specific requirement but it is taken into account during auditing and recorded in SPO's reports. However, no guidance is given by Evira on what is to be considered or inspected during these visits.

Ø In both slaughterhouses own checks by company staff on the arrival, lairaging, stunning and slaughter of animals were in place and documented. The official veterinarians regularly checked the company controls. Own checks also included checks on stunning and slaughter equipment and a written contingency plan was available in the white meat slaughterhouse in the event of machinery breakdown.

Ø Action had been taken by both official veterinarians where previous transport problems or poor animal body condition had been noted and this had been followed up.

Ø In the white meat slaughterhouse the official veterinarian had previously intervened to reduce the line speed to ensure adequate space for birds entering the CO2 stunning tunnel.

Ø A working group consisting of PVOs, official veterinarians working in poultry slaughterhouses and a representative of Evira has met fairly regularly. The aim of the group is to try and formulate solutions to ongoing issues, including animal welfare, common to the participants.

Ø Evidence of regular documented training for company employees was available in the white meat slaughterhouse. The last documented training for company staff in the red meat slaughterhouse had been four years previously although on the spot training was

said to be given on a regular basis. Handling and procedures for the welfare of animals in the two slaughterhouses visited was satisfactory.

Ø With regard to the follow up of the recommendation on stunning and slaughter equipment, the CCA has taken various measures such as training, site visits and correspondence to address this issue.

Conclusions

Official controls on animal welfare in the slaughterhouses visited were well enforced. The CCA took appropriate action in response to a previous recommendation on stunning and slaughter equipment.

6 OVERALL CONCLUSION

An organised and defined control system is in place for carrying out animal welfare inspections. Much work has been done to improve the guidance available to all levels of the control chain.

The inspections of farms were satisfactorily carried out; however there was an inconsistent application of follow up procedures for farms and transport inspections when deficiencies were noted, due to a lack of systematic recording of follow up deadlines for action. The supervision of company controls in the slaughterhouses visited were competently performed and recorded and suitable enforcement action was taken when required.

Controls were carried out as laid down in the MANCP except for systematic follow up of deficiencies. Overall there are improvements noted in several areas in comparison to previous missions.

7 CLOSING MEETING

A closing meeting was held on 27 February 2009 with the central competent authority, Evira. 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

It is recommended that the Competent Authority of (Finland):

| No. | Recommendation |
|------------|--|
| 1 | take measures to ensure that where deficiencies are detected at initial visits performed under Articles 7.1 of Directives 91/630/EEC and 8.1 of Directive 1999/74/EC follow up inspections are scheduled and carried out as necessary. |

| No. | Recommendation |
|-----|---|
| 2 | take measures to ensure that changes concerning registered laying hen flock data are notified to the CA without delay and that the register is updated immediately when such information is received in accordance with Article 1(4) of Commission Directive 2002/4/EC. |
| 3 | take measures to correct the deficiencies noted in the procedures and checklists used to carry out inspections under Articles 7.1 of Directives 91/630/EEC and 8.1 of Directive 1999/74/EC in accordance with Article 11 of Directive 91/630/EEC and Article 13 of Directive 1999/74/EC respectively. |
| 4 | take measures to ensure that where deficiencies are detected during animal transport inspections, the proportion of inspections are increased in accordance with Article 27 of Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005. |
| 5 | take measures to ensure that approved means of transport by road for long journeys are recorded in a manner enabling them to be rapidly identified by the competent authorities in all Member States, as required by Article 18(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005. |

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

http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/ap/ap_finland_8262_2009.pdf

9 ENDNOTES

| Concerning | Detail |
|---------------|---|
| Section 5.1.2 | "In their response to the draft report the Competent Authority noted that: The requirements of Directive 2002/4/EC were transposed in Finland by the Animal Welfare Act (247/1996) as amended (220/2003). This states that, for the purposes of entry in the register of hen farms, the owner of the production facility must provide the rural authority in the municipality in which the production facility is located with notification of how many birds the facility can accommodate at a time. The rural industry authorities are the CA in this field. MVOs may notify the rural industry authorities when they discover, during an inspection, maximum hen farm capacity that differs from the information in the register." |

ANNEX 1 - LIST OF LEGISLATION REFERENCED IN THE REPORT

| Reference | OJ Ref. | Detail |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Directive 98/8/EC | OJ L 123, 24.4.1998, p. 1–63 | Directive 98/8/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 1998 concerning the placing of biocidal products on the market |
| 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 |