



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

DG(SANCO) 2010-8384 - MR FINAL

FINAL REPORT OF A SPECIFIC AUDIT
CARRIED OUT IN
THE CZECH REPUBLIC
FROM 01 TO 10 JUNE 2010
IN ORDER TO EVALUATE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CONTROLS FOR ANIMAL
WELFARE ON FARMS AND DURING TRANSPORT
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 a footnote.

Executive Summary

This report describes the outcome of a Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) specific audit in the Czech Republic, which took place from 1 to 10 June 2010, as part of the general audit of the Czech Republic carried out under the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 on official food and feed controls of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004.

The specific audit evaluated the implementation of national measures, aimed at the control of animal welfare and how these are organised and carried out in accordance with relevant provisions of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, and the multi-annual national control plan (MANCP) prepared by the Czech Republic. Specifically the evaluation included measures aimed at the control of animal welfare on farms and during transport. Attention was paid to examining the implementation of corrective actions undertaken in response to the recommendations made in the report of previous FVO animal welfare missions to the Czech Republic.

The report concludes that the CCA has addressed all recommendations of the previous FVO reports on animal welfare on farms and during transport, except two recommendations from the 2007 report and one from the 2005 report. The system for checks on animal welfare is well documented and the prioritisation of checks has been formalised. Although the staff has received updated instructions and generally adequate training to keep up to date with their competences, some procedures need further improvement and time to be implemented. The internal audit division of the CCA has carried out audits on animal welfare in most of the regions and supervision carried out according to planned frequencies; however, the effectiveness of inspections is not yet fully verified. Although sanctions were generally dissuasive for the cases seen, the enforcement system does not easily allow the CA to apply some sanctions.

85% of laying hens are still in unenriched cages and the CA and the laying hen sector have insufficient plans to ensure the deadline of 1.1.2012 is met for phasing out this production system. Regarding the pig sector, the willingness to implement EU legislation noted in previous mission is continuing. Holdings visited generally met the requirements and as two thirds already have group housing systems it should be feasible to respect the deadline of 1.1.2013 for group housing of sows. However, the composition of the manipulable material was not equivalent to that indicated in EU legislation and tail docking was carried out systematically.

There has been progress with the implementation of checks on transport but there were several shortcomings. These were mainly regarding long distance transport of unweaned calves. In addition, although the CA verified that journeys times were realistic prior to transport, they did not fully ensure that journey times were subsequently respected, as journey logs were not systematically filled in and returned, and records from the satellite navigation system were not checked.

The multi-annual national control plan (MANCP) has not yet updated the information for prioritising operations in relation to animal welfare.

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

Table of Contents

1	<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1
2	<u>OBJECTIVES OF THE MISSION</u>	1
3	<u>LEGAL BASIS FOR THE MISSION</u>	1
4	<u>BACKGROUND</u>	2
	<u>CONTRIBUTION TO THE GENERAL AUDIT</u>	2
	4.1 <u>SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS FVO MISSION RESULTS</u>	2
5	<u>FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS RELATED TO IMPLEMENTATION OF REGULATION (EC) no 882/2004</u> 3	3
	5.1 <u>COMPETENT AUTHORITIES</u>	3
	5.1.1 <u>DESIGNATION OF COMPETENT AUTHORITIES</u>	3
	5.1.2 <u>CO-OPERATION BETWEEN COMPETENT AUTHORITIES</u>	3
	5.1.3 <u>CO-OPERATION WITHIN COMPETENT AUTHORITIES</u>	4
	5.1.4 <u>DELEGATION OF SPECIFIC TASKS RELATED TO OFFICIAL CONTROLS</u>	4
	5.1.5 <u>CONTINGENCY PLANNING</u>	5
	5.2 <u>RESOURCES FOR PERFORMANCE OF CONTROLS</u>	5
	5.2.1 <u>LEGAL BASIS FOR CONTROLS</u>	5
	5.2.2 <u>STAFFING PROVISION AND FACILITIES</u>	5
	5.2.3 <u>STAFF QUALIFICATIONS AND TRAINING</u>	6
	5.3 <u>ORGANISATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF OFFICIAL CONTROLS</u>	7
	5.3.1 <u>REGISTRATION / APPROVAL OF FOOD BUSINESS OPERATORS</u>	7
	5.3.2 <u>PRIORITISATION OF OFFICIAL CONTROLS</u>	7
	5.3.3 <u>CONTROL ACTIVITIES, METHODS AND TECHNIQUES</u>	8
	5.3.4 <u>SAMPLING AND LABORATORY ANALYSIS</u>	8
	5.3.5 <u>PROCEDURES FOR PERFORMANCE AND REPORTING OF CONTROL ACTIVITIES</u>	9
	5.3.6 <u>TRANSPARENCY AND CONFIDENTIALLY</u>	9
	5.4 <u>ENFORCEMENT MEASURES</u>	10
	5.4.1 <u>MEASURES IN THE CASE OF NON-COMPLIANCE</u>	10
	5.4.2 <u>SANCTIONS</u>	10
	5.5 <u>VERIFICATION AND REVIEW OF OFFICIAL CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES</u>	11
	5.5.1 <u>VERIFICATION PROCEDURES</u>	11
	5.5.2 <u>AUDIT</u>	12
	5.6 <u>MULTI ANNUAL NATIONAL CONTROL PLAN</u>	13
6	<u>SECTOR SPECIFIC FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS</u>	13
	6.1 <u>ANIMAL WELFARE ON FARMS</u>	13
	6.1.1 <u>REGISTRATION OF HOLDINGS WITH LAYING HENS</u>	13
	6.1.2 <u>INSPECTIONS OF LAYING HEN FARMS</u>	14
	6.1.3 <u>INSPECTIONS OF PIG FARMS</u>	16
	6.2 <u>ANIMAL WELFARE DURING TRANSPORT</u>	17
	6.2.1 <u>AUTHORISATION OF TRANSPORTERS</u>	17
	6.2.2 <u>CHECKS ON TRANSPORT</u>	18
7	<u>OVERALL CONCLUSION</u>	21
8	<u>CLOSING MEETING</u>	22
9	<u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	22
	<u>ANNEX 1 - LEGAL REFERENCES</u>	24

ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS USED IN THIS REPORT

Abbreviation	Explanation
CA	Competent Authority
CCA	Central Competent Authority
DG(SANCO)	Health and Consumers Directorate-General
EC	European Community
EU	European Union
FBO	Food Business Operator
FVO	Food and Veterinary Office
GA	General Audit
MANCP	Single Integrated Multi-Annual National Control Plan
MS	Member State
RVA	Regional Veterinary Administration
SVA	State Veterinary Administration

1 INTRODUCTION

The Specific Audit formed part of the FVO's planned mission programme. It took place in the Czech Republic from 1 to 10 June 2010 . The audit team comprised three inspectors from the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO). Representatives from the central competent authority (CCA), the State Veterinary Administration (SVA) , accompanied the audit team for the duration of the audit. An opening meeting was held on 1 July 2010 with the central competent authority. At this meeting, the objectives of, and itinerary for, the specific audit were confirmed by the audit team and the control systems were described by the authorities.

2 OBJECTIVES OF THE MISSION

The objectives of the specific audit were to:

- verify that official controls in the sector currently audited are organised and carried out in accordance with relevant provisions of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004, and the multi-annual national control plan (MANCP) prepared by the Czech republic.
- evaluate the implementation of EU legislation on animal welfare on farms and during transport. The implementation of corrective actions undertaken in response to the recommendations made in the report of previous FVO missions was also assessed.

In terms of scope, the audit concentrated primarily on:

- As regards Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, the organisation of official controls (Articles 3-7), control and verification procedures and methods (Articles 8-10), enforcement (Articles. 54-55), MANCP (Articles 41-42) and registration and approval of establishments (Article 31).
- Animal welfare legislation concerning the protection of animals kept for farming purposes (Council Directive 98/58/EC), the minimum standards for pigs (Council Directive 2008/120/EC) and laying hens (Council Directive 1999/74/EC) and the protection of animals during transport and related operations (Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005).

The table below lists sites visited and meetings held in order to achieve that objective.

MEETINGS/VISITS		n	COMMENTS
COMPETENT AUTHORITIES	Central	2	Opening and closing meeting with the SVA.
	Regional	4	Meetings in the offices of the Regional CA in the regions of South Bohemia and Plzen.
FARMS		6	4 laying hen farms and 2 pig farms.
ESTABLISHMENTS		1	Slaughterhouse in South Bohemia for checks on transport.
ASSEMBLY CENTRES		1	In South Bohemia region.

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.

A full list of the legal instruments referred to in this report is provided in the Annex and refers, where applicable, to the last amended version.

4 BACKGROUND

CONTRIBUTION TO THE GENERAL AUDIT

Article 45 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires the Commission to carry out general and specific audits in member States. The main purpose of such audits is to verify that, overall, official controls take place in Member States in accordance with the multi-national control plans referred to in Article 41 and in compliance with Community law.

This Specific Audit was carried out as a component of a General Audit to the Czech Republic. Section 5 below contains findings and conclusions relating to the implementation of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004; Section 6 below contains findings and conclusions relating to sector specific issues.

4.1 SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS FVO MISSION RESULTS

Previous animal welfare missions to the Czech republic were carried out in January 2005 and June 2007 and their results are described in reports DG(SANCO)/7519/2005 and DG(SANCO)/2007-7232. The reports of these missions (henceforth referred to as reports 7519/2005 and 2007-7232) have been published on the website of the Directorate – General for Health and Consumers:

http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/ir_search_en.cfm

Report 7519/2005 concerning animal welfare concluded that very good progress has been made by the CA in the implementation of EU welfare requirements. EU legislation has been transposed and the veterinary inspectors have received adequate training on animal welfare, resulting in uniform and adequate implementation. There is a good flow of information among all levels of the CA and the enforcing authorities. Controls at laying hen farms were satisfactory. The control of long distance journeys and the transport of casualty animals to slaughterhouses represent areas where implementation was not adequate.

Report 2007-7232 concerning animal welfare on farms concluded that there is a good framework for controls, with systematic training of officials and well established training for persons working in the livestock sectors. The system of building approval is also a useful mechanism to ensure that basic standards are met in new buildings. However, when planning inspections, the CAs have not taken adequate account of the need to include checks of the different farming methods used in each sector. Furthermore, the checks carried out by the CA have been limited in their effectiveness as insufficient guidance has been provided for inspectors and although a system of supervision exists, the quality of checks and data reported had not been adequately verified. When deficiencies were identified procedures to ensure corrective actions have been mostly adequate. The one issue which was the subject of a recommendation in a previous FVO report, the registration of holdings with laying hens, has been partially addressed, as the process of amending legislation was just being completed and thus the registration of holdings had not yet been fully implemented.

5 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS RELATED TO IMPLEMENTATION OF REGULATION (EC) NO 882/2004

5.1 COMPETENT AUTHORITIES

5.1.1 Designation of Competent Authorities

Legal Requirements

Article 4(1) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires Member States to designate the competent authorities responsible for official controls.

Findings

The structure and organisation of the CAs are described in the FVO report DG(SANCO)/7700/2008 country profile of the Czech Republic published on the DG SANCO web site http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/country_profiles_en.cfm. Further information is available on the CCA web site: <http://www.svs-cr.cz>

The above documents and the FVO reports 7519/2005, 8040/2006 and 2007-7232 describe the role and responsibilities of the CCA and of other authorities involved in animal welfare controls on farms and during transport.

In summary, the SVA within the Ministry of Agriculture is responsible for controls on animal welfare. Control systems are centralised, with a direct chain of command between central services and regions. At regional level the SVA has 14 regions each with its own Regional Veterinary Administration (RVA). Execution of the official controls covered by the scope of this mission is all done by the Animal Welfare Division of the RVAs with the exception of the daily controls of animal welfare in slaughterhouses. The veterinarians of the RVA's Veterinary Hygiene Division based in the slaughterhouses carry out those daily controls.

A contact point as required by Article 24 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 has been designated within the CCA and within each RVA.

5.1.2 Co-operation between Competent Authorities

Legal Requirements

Article 4(3) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 provides for efficient and effective co-ordination and co-operation between competent authorities.

Findings

- The CA for the registration of laying hen farms is The Ministry of Agriculture - Agricultural Commodities Section, which delegated its tasks to The Czech – Moravia Breeders' Association, as indicated in report 2007-7232. The State Veterinary Administration is not involved in the registration process. The audit team noted progress in the co-operation between the CAs involved and the register of laying hens is now fully operational. Details are provided in section 6 of this report.
- Regarding the operation of checks on road vehicles, as indicated in previous FVO missions,

the Police co-operate with the regional CAs. This was the case during an intensive joint inspection day noted in Plzen region.

5.1.3 Co-operation within Competent Authorities

Legal Requirements

Article 4(5) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires that, when, within a competent authority, more than one unit is competent to carry out official controls, efficient and effective co-ordination and co-operation shall be ensured between the different units.

Findings

With the exception of daily controls over animal welfare in slaughterhouses all official controls of animal welfare are performed by the animal welfare specialists of the RVAs' Animal Welfare Division. Veterinarians of the RVA's Veterinary Hygiene Division based in the slaughterhouses carry out daily controls of animal welfare at slaughter.

- Whenever animal welfare deficiencies are detected in slaughterhouses (either on arrival or during slaughter itself) a report is drafted indicating actions taken and is sent to the RVA's Animal Welfare Division for information and/or additional action. The audit saw examples of such reports (mainly concerning slaughter of pregnant cows).
- Once per year the district animal welfare specialist carries out an inspection visit to each slaughterhouse in that district in order to directly assess the performance of the FBOs, and the performance of the veterinarians from the Veterinary Hygiene Division who perform the daily controls.

Concerning exchange of information between the central and regional levels of the CA on deficiencies noted during transport to enable the requirements of Article 24 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 to be fulfilled, complaints or other information from and to other Member States concerning animal welfare during transport were sent from the central contact point to the regional contact point.

- Examples of communications originating in a region or in another EU Member State in 2009 and 2010 and dealt with by the contact point were noted. The majority of complaints were in relation to incomplete information, such as the lack of transporters authorisation, approval document of the vehicle not in English and incomplete journey logs. All cases were well documented and replies from other Member State were obtained in half of the instances.

5.1.4 Delegation of specific tasks related to official controls

Legal Requirements

Article 5 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 sets out the scope of possible delegation to control bodies, the criteria for delegation, and the minimum criteria which must be met by control bodies. Where such delegation takes place, the delegating competent authority must organise audits or inspections of the control bodies as necessary. The Commission must be notified about any intended delegation.

Findings

There was no delegation of control tasks for the subjects covered by this mission.

5.1.5 Contingency planning

Legal Requirements

Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 also requires that competent authorities have contingency plans in place, and are prepared to operate such plans in the event of an emergency. Article 13 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires Member States to draw up operational contingency plans setting out measures to be implemented without delay when feed or food is found to present a serious risk.

Findings

Not applicable to this specific audit.

Conclusions on Competent Authorities

The cooperation within CAs involved in the registration of laying hen holdings and between CAs on operation of road-side checks was good. Evidence of adequate cooperation within the CAs regarding checks at slaughterhouses was also good.

Measures have been taken to exchange information on deficiencies noted during transport to enable the requirements of Article 24 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 to be fulfilled, and these were effective within the Czech Republic but were hampered by the lack of reaction from the contact points in several other Member States.

5.2 RESOURCES FOR PERFORMANCE OF CONTROLS

5.2.1 Legal basis for controls

Legal Requirements

Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires that the necessary legal powers to carry out controls are in place and that there is an obligation on food business operators to undergo inspection by the competent authorities. Article 8 of the above Regulation requires that competent authorities have the necessary powers of access to food business premises and documentation.

Findings

This specific audit did not detect any gap in relation to the legal powers of the CAs.

5.2.2 Staffing provision and facilities

Legal Requirements

Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires the competent authority to ensure that they have access to a sufficient number of suitably qualified and experienced staff; that appropriate and

properly maintained facilities and equipment are available; and that staff performing controls are free of any conflict of interest.

Findings

It was noted that:

- At the assembly centre the facilities provided for inspection were satisfactory.
- Satisfactory equipment was available for checking environmental parameters in laying hen and pig premises. However, some types of specialised equipment have to be shared between inspectors from different districts requiring additional co-ordination.
- In Plzen region the CA indicated that they have no device to check noise level¹.
- The mission team did not identify any potential conflicts of interest for the staff involved in animal welfare controls.

5.2.3 Staff qualifications and training

Legal Requirements

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

Findings

The yearly training for the RVA inspectors organised regularly in VFU Brno is a specific training on the animal welfare requirements not only in farm animals, it includes also update of provisions on experimental animals, companion animals and different activities with animals. As regards transport of animals the CCA organised one day training in January and April 2010 for inspectors responsible for checking consignments of live animals at departure.

It was noted that:

- Documented evidence was available to the audit team showing that the animal welfare officials in the RVAs visited had successfully participated in that mandatory initial training and the in the yearly two day updating course. Other training courses were attended. A "cascade" system was in place to disseminate the information and training received to the other regional officials.
- The lack of detection of several non-compliances in the assembly centre visited, detailed in section 6.2.2 of this report, indicated that the one day training above mentioned was not fully comprehensive or well absorbed.

Conclusions on Resources for Performance of Controls

1 In their response to the draft report the Competent Authority noted that: In Plzen region the CA has an agreement with the Regional Hygiene Station on measuring the noise level.

The CCA has taken action to address deficiencies in training identified in the previous report and staff met had received generally adequate training to keep up to date with their competences. However, some requirements concerning transport have not been adequately explained.

In general the regional CAs had satisfactory facilities and equipment, if co-ordination between districts is adequate, allowing staff to perform official controls effectively.

5.3 ORGANISATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF OFFICIAL CONTROLS

5.3.1 Registration / approval of food business operators

Legal Requirements

Article 31 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires Member States to establish procedures for the registration/approval of food and feed business operators, for reviewing compliance with conditions of registration and for the withdrawal of approvals.

Findings

Report 2007-7232 recommended correctly and completely transposing and implementing Directive 2002/4 /EC on the registration of holdings with laying hens. It was noted that:

- The register of laying hens is now transposed and implemented in compliance with Directive 2002/4/EC. Details are provided in section 6 of this report.
- The RVAs' prior approval is mandatory before refurbishment of holdings. Binding instructions were given by the CAs approving renovation of laying hens houses.

5.3.2 Prioritisation of official controls

Legal Requirements

Article 3 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires that official controls are carried out regularly, on a risk basis and with appropriate frequency. Controls shall be carried out at any of the stages of the production and processing chain and, in general, are to be carried out without prior warning. Controls shall be applied with the same care to exports from the Community, imports into the Community and to product placed on the Community market.

Findings

Report 2007-7232 recommended that the CA identify the risks that influence animal welfare on farm and take them into account when controls are carried out.

The programme of animal welfare checks for 2010 formalises the introduction of risk parameters and small pig farms are now included in the programme. The selection of holdings is made at the beginning of each year at central level.

In general an annual inspection visit of at least 5% of all holdings is mandatory. In cases where there are no more than 1 to 2 farms of a specific type in the same district both should be visited. It was noted that:

- The 5% of pig farms to be visited in each region are identified at central level by a third party using software set according to risk parameters established by the SVA. These included the number of holdings per region, number of animals per holding, balance between large and small holdings, funding received, number of inspectors by each RVA, data on non-compliances identified during previous controls. The CCA indicated that the selection made by this contractor in some cases included establishments which should not have been included and the procedure still needed to be improved.
- The number of laying hen farms (with over 350 laying hens) is much smaller than the number of pig farms. Due to this in the two regions visited the annual percentage of laying hen farms visited varied between 50 to 100%.
- Both RVAs visited had respected the planned frequencies for official controls in 2009. Both RVAs expected to be able to respect them also for 2010.
- Controls on transport are more frequent either at places of departure or at destination, mostly because the lack of legal powers for the veterinary authorities to stop vehicles on the road and the need to coordinate this with the police. Each region prioritises the type of transport controls. Details are provided in sections 5.4.2 and 6 of this report.

5.3.3 Control activities, methods and techniques

Legal Requirements

Article 10 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 specifies the control activities, methods and techniques that should be deployed.

Findings

- Concerning farm inspections, the CA indicated that most checks are with prior warning but the FBO is not informed in advance of the subject, which could be animal welfare alone or with other topics, such as residues or animal health.
- The CA has chosen to carry out checks on all the listed requirements in Commission Decision 2006/778/EC. In addition they have subdivided pig farms into those with stalls and those with sows in groups. This is useful for the CCA in order to monitor progress with phasing out of stalls.

5.3.4 Sampling and Laboratory analysis

Legal Requirements

Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires competent authorities to have, or to have access to, adequate laboratory capacity. Article 11 of the Regulation establishes requirements for sampling and analysis and Article 12 requires the competent authority to designate laboratories that may carry out analysis of samples taken during official controls. It also lays down accreditation criteria for laboratories so designated.

Findings

Not applicable to this specific audit.

5.3.5 Procedures for performance and reporting of control activities

Legal Requirements

Article 8 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires that competent authorities carry out their official controls in accordance with documented procedures, containing information and instructions for staff performing official controls.

Article 9 of the above Regulation requires competent authorities to draw up reports on the official controls carried out, including a description of the purpose of official controls, the methods applied, the results obtained and any action to be taken by the business operator concerned.

Findings

Report 2007-7232 recommended that the documented procedures contain information and instructions to adequately assess the EU requirements for pig, calves and laying hen holdings.

- It was noted that procedures were recently updated and were generally in compliance with the requirements of Article 8 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004. However, some issues need further clarification such as the head space within transport vehicles and how to calculate the ventilation capacity for the approval of the vehicle. Details are provided in section 6 of this report.

Concerning reporting of animal welfare checks both regions visited reported the deficiencies found as required by Article 9 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.

5.3.6 Transparency and confidentiality

Legal Requirements

Article 7 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires that competent authorities carry out their activities with a high degree of transparency, in particular by giving relevant information to the public as soon as possible. However, information covered by professional secrecy and personal data protection is not to be disclosed.

Findings

Several documents have been made available to the public on the CCA web site such as the yearly animal protection programme and the results of the inspections. The lists of transporters are also available on the CCA's website including details of what is required to be authorised as an animal transporter, including approval of vehicles.

Conclusions on Organisation and Implementation of Official Controls

Recommendation 1 from report 2007-7232 has been satisfactorily addressed and the laying hens register now includes all the data required by Directive 2002/4/EC.

The system for checks on animal welfare is well documented and the programme of animal welfare checks for 2010 formalises the prioritisation of checks using several risk parameters. However, some procedures for animal welfare during transport need further improvement.

5.4 ENFORCEMENT MEASURES

5.4.1 Measures in the case of non-compliance

Legal Requirements

Article 54 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires a competent authority which identifies a non-compliance to take appropriate action to ensure that the operator remedies the situation.

Findings

In response to a recommendation in report 2007-7232 that actions are taken when non-compliances are identified so that the operator remedies the situation, the CCA stated that new procedures would be in place after amendment of the Act No 246/92.

It was noted that:

- Act No 246/92 on the protection of animals against cruelty was last amended in 2008.
- After non compliances were detected, corrective actions were requested, with deadlines established, and follow up inspection visits performed. Details are provided in section 6 of this report
- In 2009 in Plzen region a one day special control on animal welfare during transport detected seven non-compliances concerning four transporters. Administrative procedures were initiated and for most non-compliances fines were imposed directly by the RVA based in the Veterinary Act 166. One non-compliance was notified to the municipality based on the Act No 246/92.

5.4.2 Sanctions

Legal Requirements

Article 55 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 states that Member States shall lay down the rules on sanctions applicable to infringements of feed and food law and other Community provisions relating to the protection of animal health and welfare and shall take all measures necessary to ensure that they are implemented. The sanctions provided for must be effective, proportionate and dissuasive.

Findings

It was noted that:

- Article 72 (l) of the Veterinary Act 166 provides the legal basis to issue some sanctions in connection with animal welfare (e.g. fines linked to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005). This Act also includes a range of values for the fines according to the infringement in question,

directly applicable up to 2000000 CZK (circa 780000€). The local veterinary inspectors do not indicate the level of fine; they detect deficiencies and write a report stating the infringement. The report is submitted to the animal welfare expert of the RVA who draws up a proposed a sanction to the legal Department. This topic is discussed at Regional Director Meetings to ensure uniform application.

- In both regions visited sanctions were imposed when necessary. However, the RVAs cannot directly impose fines for non-compliances with regards to the Animal Protection and Welfare Act 246/92, which for the areas covered by this specific audit refers mainly to welfare on farms. Sanctions for enforcement of these non-compliances are under the competence of certain Municipalities, i.e. those with extended powers. Details are provided in section 6 of this report
- In both regions visited documented evidence was available of non-compliance notifications sent by the RVAs to the municipalities. According to the Welfare Act No. 246/1992 Coll. the municipalities with extended powers shall discuss all the RVA proposals and notify RVA in writing of the measures taken no later than one month after the motions are filed and of the result of the procedure after the decision is taken. The content of the result of the decision is not further specified by the Act”. In South Bohemia nine months after notification of one case to the municipality there had been no feedback. The RVA stated that this was quite a long time but that usually the sanction procedures via the municipalities did take several months.
- In Plzen a CZK 50000 fine (circa 2000€) was imposed for pigs which had died during transport. The RAV also initiated criminal procedure regarding cruelty to animals in this case.

Conclusions on Enforcement Measures

Actions were taken when non-compliances were identified so that the operator remedied the situation, as recommended (5) in report 2007-7232. Sanctions were sufficiently dissuasive for the cases seen, but incomplete and late feed back for those cases which involve municipalities weakens the efficiency of this part of the system.

5.5 VERIFICATION AND REVIEW OF OFFICIAL CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES

5.5.1 Verification procedures

Legal Requirements

Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires the competent authorities to ensure the impartiality, consistency and quality of official controls at all levels and to guarantee the effectiveness and appropriateness of official controls. Article 8 states that they must have procedures in place to verify the effectiveness of official controls, to ensure effectiveness of corrective action and to update documentation where needed.

Findings

Report 2007-7232 recommended to put in place adequate and effective procedures to verify the effectiveness of inspections and follow-up actions.

It was noted that:

- The CCA response to recommendation 4 of the 2007 report indicated that supervision would include on the spot verification during the performance of the official controls. The CA indicated that this action was discussed and agreed in one of the periodical meetings between the SVA and RVAs. Nevertheless the procedure itself was not amended and in neither RVA visited had verification been implemented.
- A procedure/instruction is in place concerning the supervision of inspectors. It requires the heads of the RVAs' Animal Welfare Divisions to verify the performance twice a year.
- The emphasis of the supervisory reports seen was on performance of tasks according to their required planning, and not in the verification of their effectiveness as such. Checks were not fully effective in certain establishments visited by the mission team and detailed in section 6 of this report, such as in the pig farm in Plzen or in the assembly centre in South Bohemia.

5.5.2 *Audit*

Legal Requirements

Under Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 competent authorities are required to carry out internal audits, or have external audits carried out. These must be subject to independent scrutiny and carried out in a transparent manner.

Findings

In response to recommendation 6 in report 2007-7232 the CCA indicated that from January 2008 internal audits would be carried out according to their specific guideline.

It was noted that:

- The internal audit Division of the SVA carried out audits in the animal welfare field in 2008 and 2009. So far out of 14 regions, two were audited in 2008 and eight in 2009. In 2009 an animal welfare expert from a different region was included in the audit teams and animal welfare issues were more detailed in these reports than in the 2008 reports.
- The minimum internal audit requirement is that all SVA control systems must be audited at least once every five years. However, the agreed frequency for auditing the animal welfare control system is at least once every two years.
- The audit team was informed that since it is the national control system that is being audited and every RVA is expected to implement it in the same way it does not automatically mean that every RVAs' welfare control system would be audited every two years. In practice the currently agreed planning of internal audits foresees performing animal welfare control system audits in seven RVAs in 2011, with seven more in 2013.

Conclusions on Verification Procedures

There is progress in implementing measures to verify the effectiveness of official controls and

supervision is carried out according to planned frequencies. However, recommendation 4 of report 2007-7232 has not been fully addressed as the verification procedures did not adequately assess the effectiveness of inspections. Supervision has been more to do with meeting targets and completing documents rather than on the effectiveness of the controls themselves.

Although not all the regions have been audited, the system in place addresses recommendation 6 of report 2007-7232 concerning Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.

5.6 MULTI ANNUAL NATIONAL CONTROL PLAN

Legal Requirements

Article 41 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires that each Member State prepares a single integrated multi-annual national control plan (MANCP). According to Article 42 it should be implemented for the first time no later than 1 January 2007 and be regularly updated in light of developments. Details on the type of general information on the structure and organisation of the systems of feed and food control and of animal health and welfare control in the Member State concerned are provided.

Findings

A description of the control system for the animal welfare sector is included in the MANCP and all the controls carried out in the sector are reflected. However, it is incomplete as the procedure to prioritise year 2011 controls with the results of 2010 checks is not reflected.

Conclusions on Multi-Annual National Control Plan

Although the MANCP is drafted in accordance with Article 41 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 and all the controls are included, it does not fully reflect the prioritisation of controls.

6 SECTOR SPECIFIC FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

6.1 ANIMAL WELFARE ON FARMS

6.1.1 Registration of holdings with laying hens

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

The audit team noted that:

- In response to a recommendation of report 2007-7232 the CCA demonstrated that, the register of holdings with laying hens fully complies with the requirements of Decision 2002/4/EC.

- Report 2007-7232 also recommended a correct implementation of Decision 2002/4/EC requirements. The CA has not correctly verified if the numbers for the maximum capacities of establishments, as required by point 1 of the Annex to Directive 2002/4/EC, declared by the operator are correct. The maximum capacity of laying hen farms is based on a producer's declaration. There is no guideline in place instructing the inspectors to verify if the maximum capacity declared corresponds in reality. In the four laying hen farms visited none of the inspectors had performed such a verification.

Conclusions

A unified and integrated register is fully operational. However, the CA has not correctly verified that the maximum capacities of establishments declared by the operator are correct, as the OV relied on data supplied by the keeper and the guidance does not sufficiently indicate how to assess the maximum capacity.

6.1.2 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. Article 5(2) of this Directive requires Member States to ensure that rearing in unenriched cages systems is prohibited with effect from 1 January 2012. In addition, with effect from 1 January 2003 no such cages may be built or brought into service for the first time.

Findings

The CCA provided the following information on 9 June 2010 on the status of the 68 laying hen holdings with more than 350 birds.

Type of system	No of houses	No of birds	%
Alternative	39	132182	3.2%
Enriched cages	26	460075	11.2%
Unenriched cages	210	3495747	85.5%
Total	275	4088004	100%

According to the above information 14.4% of the birds are kept in houses that would already meet 1.1.2012 requirements. The remaining 85.5% are kept in houses (76% of all houses) that would not currently meet requirements. It was noted that the CCA do not have an overview at national level of the modernising plans of these houses for the phasing out of their cages by 1.1.2012. However, both RVAs visited had overview of the farms in their regions, which was more precise in Plzen.

In addition the audit team noted that:

- Regarding the phasing out of unenriched cages by 1.1.2012, the CCA and the regional CA indicated that the laying hen farm operators had been informed of the relevant deadlines for

using unenriched cages. In the three holdings visited that used this type of cage all operators were aware of the approaching deadline and had plans in place to modify their production system in at least half of the houses before the deadline.

- On one farm visited in South Bohemia region the unenriched cages were brought into use for the first time in January 2005, after the date of Accession. The CA indicated that despite the fact that these cages are suitable to be enriched, in their opinion this was not required as the cages were bought in April 2004, before accession date. The FBO indicated that the cages will be enriched before next repopulation to comply with the phasing out of unenriched cages by 1.1.2012.
- Concerning assessment of the maximum capacity in cage systems, it was noted that the guidance from the CCA did not indicate that the data supplied by the keeper regarding the number of cages in the house should be verified and the maximum number of birds compared with the number of hens in the house at the start of the laying period, instead of at the time of the visit. The CAs have not detected overstocking in any of the farms visited. The audit team compared the number of birds at the start of the laying period with the maximum capacity established by the CA and noted that in houses visited the overstocking was 5% max.
- Regarding unenriched cages, the maximum number of hens per cage was properly assessed by the OVs, except one cage type seen in Plzen. Here around one third of the total area of the cage has less than 35 cm high, contrary to Article 5(4) of Directive 1999/74/EC.
- Overstocking was also not detected in an alternative system visited in South Bohemia. The maximum number of hens was based on the total length of the feeders, whereas the total length of the perches was the most limiting factor in determining the maximum capacity. The result was around 50% overstocking.
- Regarding enriched cages the CA did not detect that the nest area was not sufficiently separated from the rest of the cage and that a period of twilight of sufficient duration ought to be provided, as required by point 3 of the Annex to Directive 1999/74/EC.
- Concerning alternative barn systems, the house visited in Plzen complied with all the requirements. However, in South Bohemia the CA did not detect that the litter area of the house did not occupy at least one third of the ground surface, required by Article 4(1) of Directive 1999/74/EC. The CCA has not issued updated guidance for checks of alternative farms.

Conclusions

The CA have generally achieved compliance in the laying hen sector and most inspections in holdings were adequate. However, there were certain shortcomings and overstocking was undetected or underestimated. In particular, unenriched cages were brought into use for the first time after the date of Accession and one cage type was not compliant for cage height. Enriched cages had not sufficient separation of the nest area and finally, alternative systems had litter area that did not occupy at least one third of the ground surface and the most limiting factor concerning stocking density was not detected.

Procedures were insufficiently detailed concerning the correct calculation of the maximum capacity of individual houses, the overall capacity of holdings and the assessment of the adequate stocking densities, the requirement of the period of twilight and the guidance for checks on alternative farm was not updated. Recommendation 3 of report 2007-7232 has not been fully addressed.

Regarding the 85% of laying hens that are still in unenriched cages which need to be replaced by 1.1.2012, there has been insufficient planning to work with owners/keepers with modernisation plans to meet this deadline.

6.1.3 Inspections of pig farms

Legal requirements

Article 8 of Directive 2008/120/EC requires Member States to ensure that inspections are carried out under the responsibility of the competent authority in order to check that the provisions of this Directive are being complied with.

Findings

Although Article 3(9) of Directive 2008/120/EC does not apply to the two farms visited as they were rebuilt before 1.4.2004 (the date of Accession to the EU), both farms already met these requirements as they kept sows and gilts in groups. According to data provided by the CCA two thirds of the sows in the country are already accommodated in groups. In addition, stocking densities complied with those laid down in Article 3 (a) of Directive 2008/120/EC. However it was noted that:

- The number of farms are categorised by both sows kept in groups and those kept in individual boxes. The CA indicated that one holding could have both systems. This would result in certain farm checks being completed twice.
- In both farms visited the materials provided, such as plastic bottles and iron chains, did not allow proper manipulation and investigation, contrary to point 4 of Chapter 1 of Annex I to Directive 2008/120/EC. The wooden pellets recently introduced in the farm in Plzen were not present in all the pens. Routine tail docking was carried out in both farms without sufficient action from the CA to ensure that the farmers had tried changing aspects of the environment or management, as required by point 8 of Chapter I of the Annex I to Directive 2008/120/EC.
- The CCA has indicated in a checklist that all dry pregnant sows and gilts, are given a sufficient quantity of bulky or high-fibre food, as required by Article 3(7) of Directive 2008/120/EC. However, the CCA guidance on what is considered high fibre food (fibre content 8% max in the ration, in practice 7%) was very recently provided to the RVAs and this issue was not investigated by the OV's during inspection.
- In the farm visited in South Bohemia the CA detected the main animal welfare deficiencies in previous inspections. A fine of CZK 5000 (circa 200€) was imposed in 2009 for lack of manipulable material, but the corrective action subsequently taken by the FBO and considered adequate by the CA still did not adequately address this requirement. However, the CA did not detect that there was no permanent access to fresh water for the sows kept in

individual stalls and boars, contrary to point 7 of Chapter 1 of Annex I to Directive 2008/120/EC. No other major deficiencies were noted.

- In the farm visited in Plzen, there were no animal welfare deficiencies noted in the previous inspection reports. During the visit the mission team identified several deficiencies in particular, the lack of an alarm system to give warning of breakdown of the artificial ventilation system, contrary to point 13 of the Annex to Directive 98/58/EC. Additionally, the continuous noise levels from ventilators in a part of the building where pigs were kept was not assessed to check if the noise levels were as loud as 85 dBA; the limit set by point 1 of Chapter I of the Annex I to Directive 2008/120/EC.
- A well maintained captive bolt pistol was the stunning method for dealing with injured or diseased animals. The FBO indicated that he always consulted the veterinary practitioner in case of transport of injured or diseased animals for the purpose of slaughter or killing.

Conclusions on inspections of pig farms

Two thirds of the sows in the country are already in group housing and even though both pig farms visited were built before the date of Accession they nevertheless met the requirements for group housing of sows. Only limited efforts had been made to get better compliance with the requirements for manipulable material and tail docking was carried out systematically.

6.2 ANIMAL WELFARE DURING TRANSPORT

6.2.1 Authorisation of transporters

Legal Requirements

Article 10 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 lays down the requirements for authorising transporters carrying out journeys up to eight hours. In particular, the applicants must demonstrate that they have sufficient and appropriate staff, equipment and operational procedures to comply with this Regulation and that they do not have criminal records of infringements in relation to animal welfare.

Article 11 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 laying down the provisions for authorising transporters carrying out long journeys, in addition to the documentation mentioned in Article 10, requires further documents, such as the certificates of approval of vehicles, procedures to trace and record the movements of vehicles and to contact drivers, a contingency plan in the event of emergency, and the certificates of competence for drivers and attendants.

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

Findings

Report 2005/7519 indicated that a system for authorising transporters is in place. In addition, it was noted that the SVA's website includes specific questionnaires identifying the requirements, for any applicant who wishes to request authorisation as an animal transporter and approval of vehicles for transport of animals for more than eight hours.

Training for handlers and drivers is provided in several training centres. Most trainers are veterinarians (including CCA officials) and the participants have to pass an exam in order to get a certificate of competence.

The audit team noted the following:

- Transporters make a self declaration that they have no record of infringements in relation to animal welfare and an extract of criminal records is requested by the RVA from the Ministry of Interior before they authorise a transporter. Approved means of transport are recorded in an electronic database in a manner enabling them to be rapidly identified by the competent authorities in all Member States, as required by to Article 18.3 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, and are publicly available in the CCA website.
- During the training for drivers and handlers information from Regulation (EC) 1/2005 and the Veterinary Act is provided concerning fitness for transport. In addition, a booklet on best practices on animal welfare during transport is provided and other e-material such as videos are presented which covers relevant issues regarding fitness of animals and other issues such as vehicle speed and influence of temperature on animal welfare.
- There are procedures on how to assess the requirements of the means of transport for approval of vehicle. However, they did not indicate how to calculate the minimum airflow of nominal capacity of 60 m³/h/KN of payload, as required by point 3.2 of Chapter VI of the Annex I of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, and did not provide any clarification on what is sufficient headspace to ensure that there is adequate ventilation when the animals are in a naturally standing position, as required by point 1.2 of Chapter II of the Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.
- Most of the long distance transporters listed in both regions visited were for other species, mostly fish and zoo animals in containers. Therefore, the requirements of Chapter VI of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 did not apply.

Conclusions on authorisation of transporters

The system for authorisation of transporters, training of drivers and attendants and approval of vehicles is generally good. However, procedures did not ensure that fully compliant vehicles are operating to required standards.

6.2.2 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.

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

Article 15(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 requires that the CA, at any stage of the long journey, carries out appropriate checks on a random or targeted basis to verify that declared

journey times are realistic and that the journey complies with this Regulation and in particular that travel times and rest periods have complied with the limits set out in Chapter V of Annex I.

Findings

The CCA procedures require 5% of consignments, based on a total of international and national historical movements, to be checked. They indicated that it is difficult to get the right selection criteria from which to decide the number of consignments to be checked. The target was achieved in 2009. For 2011 the CCA will propose a plan for inspection based on a risk analysis, using historical data².

Concerning checks at departure, the facilities of the assembly centre visited were satisfactory. Regarding provision of liquid to unweaned calves during long distance transport, the CCA circulated to the regions a letter from the Commission Services, instructing the CAs that transport of unweaned calves for more than nine hours should be allowed only if the means of transport are equipped with an adequate number of buckets and flexible nipples. Additionally those vehicles should be loaded with sufficient milk substitutes and electrolytes to feed animals on board during the resting interval after eight hours of travel. The audit team noticed that:

- The CA of the assembly centre visited was satisfied with the transporter's declaration that animals will be watered on board and during the mid-journey rest. However, the watering devices on the means transport seen during the visit were unsuitable for unweaned calves, and there was no equipment on board or provisions to feed the animals during the mid-journey rest. A representative of the CCA acknowledged that in practice it is not possible to provide adequate feeding to unweaned animals on board vehicles. 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, after nine hours of travel are given a rest period of at least one hour sufficient in particular for them to be given liquid and if necessary fed.
- The CA were not aware that long journeys are only permitted if calves are older than fourteen days unless accompanied by their mother, as required by point 1(9) of Chapter VI of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, and as a result a younger calf was loaded during the visit.
- The stocking density of the 218 calves loaded was between 0.30 and 0.40 m²/animal, as required by point B of Chapter VII to the Annex I of Regulation (EC) 1/2005. In the section of the vehicle with three tiers the back of several calves touched the ceiling. The CCA instructions did not provide any clarification on what is sufficient headspace to ensure that there is adequate ventilation when the animals are in a naturally standing position, as required by point 1.2 of Chapter II of the Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

Checks at slaughterhouses accounted for the vast majority of transport controls. At the slaughterhouse visited the audit noted that:

² *In their response to the draft report the Competent Authority noted that: For 2011 the CCA will propose a plan for inspections based on an analysis using historical data. However for a system of the risk analysis used on the controls of holdings of farm animals which is calculated by the software according to set risk parameters more data on the level of transport are required to have the efficient procedure (eg. the frequency of the journeys carried out by a transporter, differentiation on short and long journeys, species etc.). These data are registered in the systems outside the SVA information system, eg. TRACES system.*

- The checks carried out on a vehicle were satisfactory and the OV detected that there was insufficient bedding.
- In 2010 a keeper was fined CZK 5000 (circa 200€) for transporting a pregnant cow for whom more than 90% of the expected gestation period has already passed. The sanction was based on the prohibition of transport healthy pregnant animals for slaughter, laid down in the Veterinary Act. It could have been based alternatively on an infringement of fitness for transport, but in this case it would have to be dealt with by the municipality.
- There were three cases in 2009 and one in 2010 of bovine animals that were unable to move independently without pain or to walk unassisted. These were stunned in the vehicle on arrival. Investigations performed by the CA concluded that the animals became unable to walk during the transport to the slaughterhouse.

In relation to the checks on transport at other locations, the audit team noticed that in 2009:

- In Plzen checks were at departure (31), in control posts (24), at destination (12) and at the road-side (4). There were no markets in the region. Concerning the checks at departure, the CA indicated that all consignments are checked at departure at the moment of loading, but only the ones with an animal welfare report are entered in the database. The non-compliances were detected at the four road-side checks and in one check at departure. Most were for small consignments that lacked movement documents and fines circa CZK 2000 (circa 80€) were imposed.
- In South Bohemia checks were at departure (168), at destination (40), in market³ (3) and at the road-side (2). There were no control posts in the region. There were no non-compliances detected apart from those in the slaughterhouses. The CA indicated that road-side checks are joint controls in collaboration with the police which has the legal power to stop the vehicles, but checks were not successful because the drivers inform each other. The vehicles stopped were transporting fish.

Concerning checks of journey times the audit team noted that:

- The OVs adequately verified that journey times were realistic by using route planner websites.
- In the assembly centre visited, section 1 of the journey log was systematically replaced by the planning sheet of the TRACES documentation. In addition, for the consignment seen the date and time of departure was not indicated in point 3 of section 2.
- The CA did not have records of the SNS available and could not demonstrate that this provided all the information required by point 4(1) of Chapter VI of the Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, equivalent to those mentioned in the journey log as referred to in Annex II, Section 4. In neither of the two regions visited were the CA able to verify if the declared journey times were respected, contrary to Article 15(1) of 1/2005 as not all completed journey logs were returned.

³ *In their response to the draft report the Competent Authority noted that: There are no markets with farm animals in operation in the Czech Republic, the term used is based on the table report submitted to the Commission. In this part animal gatherings (shows and exhibitions) are included.*

- Regarding the availability of records from SNS, the CCA indicated communication problems regarding non Czech transporters. The CCA provided documents from 2009 requesting a Dutch transporter to provide SNS records for a consignment, as the driver indicated that the information only can be provided by the company headquarters. Due to the lack of response from the transporter, the Dutch contact point was also contacted later on to request the issue of relevant instructions to the transporters in order to comply with this requirement, but without any reaction. For 2010 the CCA has given instructions to all RVAs to check records of the SNS and all the records of transporters based in the Czech Republic, results are not yet available.
- In South Bohemia, six journey logs were requested by the audit team. Copies of four were provided, two with Section 3 and 4 returned. Three had departure times indicated. Important data, such as the estimated total weight of the consignment in 5.4 of Section 1 were missing. The journey times for consignments sent to Belgium and Spain were realistic.
- In Plzen region, four journey logs were requested and three returned journey logs were provided. It was noted that the journey logs reviewed were complete, planning was realistic, even though in one of them section 1 was not signed by the organiser.

Conclusions on checks on transport

Regarding the system for checks on transport, there are good procedures in place. However, there were shortcomings in particular regarding long distance transport of unweaned calves, as the CA did not ensure the provision of liquids during transport and sufficient head space.

The CA verified that journeys times were realistic; however, they did not fully ensure that journey times were subsequently respected, as records from the satellite navigation system were not checked and journey logs were not systematically filled in and returned. Recommendation 4(b) of report 7519/2005 has not been fully addressed.

7 OVERALL CONCLUSION

The CCA has addressed all recommendations of the previous FVO reports on animal welfare on farms and during transport, except two recommendations from the 2007 report and one from the 2005 report. The system for checks on animal welfare is well documented and the prioritisation of checks has been formalised. Although the staff has received updated instructions and generally adequate training to keep up to date with their competences, some procedures need further improvement and time to be implemented. The internal audit division of the CCA has carried out audits on animal welfare in most of the regions and supervision carried out according to planned frequencies; however, the effectiveness of inspections is not yet fully verified. Although sanctions were generally dissuasive for the cases seen, the enforcement system does not easily allow the CA to apply some sanctions.

85% of laying hens are still in unenriched cages and the CA and the laying hen sector have insufficient plans to ensure the deadline of 1.1.2012 is met for phasing out this production system. Regarding the pig sector, the willingness to implement EU legislation noted in previous mission is continuing. Holdings visited generally met the requirements and as two thirds already have group housing systems it should be feasible to respect the deadline of 1.1.2013 for group housing of sows. However, the composition of the manipulable material was not equivalent to that indicated in EU legislation and tail docking was carried out systematically.

There has been progress with the implementation of checks on transport but there were several shortcomings. These were mainly regarding long distance transport of unweaned calves. In addition, although the CA verified that journey times were realistic prior to transport, they did not fully ensure that journey times were subsequently respected, as journey logs were not systematically filled in and returned, and records from the satellite navigation system were not checked.

The multi-annual national control plan (MANCP) has not yet updated the information for prioritising operations in relation to animal welfare.

8 CLOSING MEETING

A closing meeting was held on 10 June 2010 with representatives of the central competent authority. At this meeting, the audit team presented the main findings and preliminary conclusions of the mission. The representatives of the CCA acknowledged the findings and conclusions presented, and provided clarifications on some of the issues discussed.

9 RECOMMENDATIONS

The competent authorities are invited to provide details of the actions taken and planned, including deadlines for their completion ('action plan'), aimed at addressing the recommendations set out below, within twenty five working days of receipt of this specific audit report.

N°.	Recommendation
1.	From previous report 2007-7232, recommendation 4 is outstanding and recommendation 3 is outstanding concerning Directive 1999/74/EC and they require urgent action.
2.	Recommendation 4(b), concerning control of journey times, is outstanding from previous report 7519/2005 and requires urgent action.
3.	The CA should ensure that the training of Official Veterinarians includes sufficient background on the requirements of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 so that they can carry out inspections competently and consistently, as required by Article 6 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.
4.	The CA should ensure that the documented procedures contain information and instructions, as required by Article 8.1 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, so that the requirements of Regulation 1/2005 can be adequately assessed.
5.	The CA should ensure that the Multi-annual control plan, as required by Article 41 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, is updated regarding the system of control for animal welfare.
6.	The CA should ensure that all cage systems are operated in compliance with the

N°.	Recommendation
	minimum requirements as laid down in Council Directive 1999/74/EC and that plans are made for phasing out unenriched cages by 1.1.2012, as required by Article 3 of this Directive.
7.	The CA should ensure that all alternative systems are operated in compliance with the minimum requirements as laid down in Council Directive 1999/74/EC.
8.	The CA should ensure that farmers change aspects of the environment or management, as required by point 8 of Chapter I of the Annex I to Directive 2008/120/EC, instead of carrying out routine tail-docking.

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

http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/ap/ap_cz_2010-8384.pdf

ANNEX 1 - LEGAL REFERENCES

Legal Reference	Official Journal	Title
Dir. 1999/74/EC	OJ L 203, 3.8.1999, p. 53-57	Council Directive 1999/74/EC of 19 July 1999 laying down minimum standards for the protection of laying hens
Dir. 2008/120/EC	OJ L 47, 18.2.2009, p. 5-13	Council Directive 2008/120/EC of 18 December 2008 laying down minimum standards for the protection of pigs
Dir. 98/58/EC	OJ L 221, 8.8.1998, p. 23-27	Council Directive 98/58/EC of 20 July 1998 concerning the protection of animals kept for farming purposes
Dir. 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
Dec. 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
Reg. 1/2005	OJ L 3, 5.1.2005, p. 1-44	Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 of 22 December 2004 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations and amending Directives 64/432/EEC and 93/119/EC and Regulation (EC) No 1255/97
Reg. 882/2004	OJ L 165, 30.4.2004, p. 1, Corrected and re-published in OJ L 191, 28.5.2004, p. 1	Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules