OVERVIEW OF A SERIES OF MISSIONS

CARRIED OUT IN 2003 CONCERNING

ANIMAL WELFARE DURING TRANSPORT

AND AT THE TIME OF SLAUGHTER
This report provides an overview of the outcome of a series of missions carried out by the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) in nine Member States (MS) during 2003.

The objective was to evaluate the implementation of measures put in place, and their application, to give effect to provisions laid down in Council Directive 91/628/EEC on the protection of animals during transport and Council Directive 93/119/EC on the protection of animals at the time of slaughter and killing. The scope of the missions included controls at assembly centres and slaughterhouses and in six MSs was targeted on the actions taken in response to recommendations in previous FVO reports.

Regarding animal welfare during transport, the series has demonstrated that there has been progress in those countries where the competent authorities (CAs) have provided guidance and further developed their administrative procedures: by strengthening the requirements for the transport of particularly vulnerable animals; by carrying out well planned and targeted roadside checks and by ensuring closer and more systematic checks of repeat offenders. However where the CA does not set targets, analyse the results of inspections or establish a clear enforcement policy there are persistent areas of non-compliance. Even where animal welfare is given a higher priority, weaknesses in the operation of controls arise from incomplete transposition of certain requirements of EU law into national legislation or insufficiently detailed provisions within the EU legislation itself.

Regarding animal welfare at the time of slaughter, there is a better level of compliance in those countries where there is supervision and/or auditing of the work of the slaughterhouse veterinarians. Although there are currently no EU requirements to record or report the results of animal welfare checks within slaughterhouses, such procedures enable the CA to better monitor compliance, identify where knowledge is insufficient and take appropriate measures.

Many of the issues highlighted in relation to animal welfare during transport were already addressed by the Commission’s proposal for a Regulation on this topic in 2003, which has still to be adopted. This report indicates actions envisaged by the Commission services to strengthen EU controls for animal welfare during transport and at the time of slaughter.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Competent Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG SANCO</td>
<td>Directorate General of the European Commission for Health and Consumer Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEC</td>
<td>European Economic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFSA</td>
<td>European Food Safety Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU (15)</td>
<td>European Union (number of Member States at this time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FVE</td>
<td>Federation of Veterinarians in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FVO</td>
<td>Food and Veterinary Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Member State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OV</td>
<td>Official Veterinarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAHAW</td>
<td>EU Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRACES</td>
<td>Application linking all competent authorities and which assists controls by allowing tracing of animal movements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **INTRODUCTION**

This report is based on nine missions of the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) carried out between May and December 2003. The scope of these missions focused on controls at assembly centres and slaughterhouses. In six Member States (MSs), the mission was to follow-up on the actions taken in response to recommendations in previous FVO reports.

All other MSs (EU 15) were evaluated in relation to animal welfare during transport and at the time of slaughter in 2001 or 2002. The most recent mission report for each MS is indicated in Annex I to this report. The individual reports are available on the European Commission website(1).

This report gives an overview of implementation of EU requirements, identifying the most important areas which impinge upon the effectiveness of controls. As these findings were common to at least several MSs, individual MSs are not identified in this report.

2. **BACKGROUND**

2.1. **Animal welfare during transport**

The Commission produced a report to the Council and the European Parliament in 2000 on the experience acquired by MSs of the current Directive on animal transport(2). This report concluded that animal welfare issues must be given high priority by professionals throughout the EU and identified certain areas where controls needed to be strengthened. As part of the preparations to revise the current legislation on animal protection during transport, the EU Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW) produced a report in 2002 on the welfare of animals during transport(3). An agreement has not yet been reached on the Commission’s subsequent proposal for a Council Regulation to replace the current legal texts(4).

2.2. **Animal welfare at the time of slaughter**

The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) opinion and report on stunning and killing(5), which was published after this series of FVO missions had been

---

(1) [http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/inspections/vi/reports/index_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/inspections/vi/reports/index_en.html)


completed, will be the basis of any future Commission proposal to amend EU legislation on this topic. The EFSA report provides useful information for the implementation of current requirements and acknowledges that any potential conflict between animal welfare and hygiene requirements needs to be considered if requirements are to be successfully implemented.

Killing of animals on farm for disease control purposes is also included in the EFSA report, but was not part of the scope of the missions on which this general report is based. A previous FVO special report dealt with such aspects in the context of national contingency plans to deal with outbreaks of Foot and Mouth Disease and Classical Swine Fever\(^6\). All MSs were again evaluated by the FVO in relation to contingency plans in 2003 and aspects on the killing of animals during epizootic outbreaks were also included in individual FVO missions indicated in Annex II to this report.

3. **LEGISLATION REVIEWED**

The following table provides the EU legislation relevant to this series of missions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal instrument</th>
<th>Title of legal instrument</th>
<th>O.J. publication details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. **OVERVIEW OF MAIN CONCLUSIONS OF THE SERIES**

4.1. **Registered transporters**

The objective of registering transporters is to allow rapid identification of those who fail to comply with requirements. However a copy of this registration does not have to be kept on the vehicle. Consequently:

- Information on the transporter is not easily accessible when checks are made during transport or at destination. The documents which accompany consignments (route plan and health certificate) refer to

---


\(^7\) Hereafter, Directive 91/628/EC.


vehicle rather than transporter registration and as the CA does not have competence for vehicle registration they do not have rapid access to data held for this purpose.

- Some MSs have introduced national requirements for a copy of the transporter registration to be kept on the vehicle. However, difficulties arise when animals come from another MS and documents are in different languages.

Concerning transposition of EU requirements into national legislation:

- Certain MSs were in breach of their obligations as transporters do not declare in writing that they will comply with animal welfare requirements. Although certain CAs declared that it was inconsistent to require a declaration for something which is already a legal obligation, such declarations are useful in making transporters directly aware of their obligations.

- In other MSs, again in breach of EU rules, the transporter responsible for a consignment arriving from a third country is not registered and consequently cannot be easily traced in the event of a failure to meet requirements.

- Although not a mandatory requirement, the provision of structured training for those employed in the animal transport sector is becoming more widespread and is being phased in as a compulsory requirement in several MSs.

4.2. Transport inspection targets

Article 8 of Council Directive 91/628/EEC requires inspections “on an adequate sample of the animals transported each year”. Actions by the CA to achieve this requirement have generally been insufficient as:

- They have insufficient information on the total animals transported.

- The performance of checks is not measured against pre-determined targets.

However, certain CAs had structured an inspection programme by setting arbitrary targets such as:

- All vehicles carrying animals to or from non-EU countries;

- All vehicles carrying animals, which are stopped as part of roadside checks;

- 20% of all intra-Community transport and

- 5% of movements to slaughterhouses, scheduled to ensure that all regular transporters were inspected at least once annually.

In response to FVO recommendations, other CAs estimated the volume of animal transport from data provided by slaughterhouses and transport associations. The CAs concerned concluded that, with current staffing levels, inspection targets of between 2 and 4% of eligible transport could be achieved.
4.3. Checks at places of departure

Journey times

The most common problem was that maximum journey times were not adequately monitored or enforced. Although several CAs have promoted the use of readily available computer software, there is insufficient checking of journey times in practice. Recurring problems include:

- Route plans are poorly or incompletely filled out. The format of the route plan often leads to an inadequate itinerary and details completed before, during and after the journey are often in the incorrect place.
- Measures have generally been adopted to ensure route plans are returned. However, the lack of scrutiny of returned route plans means that excess journey times go unnoticed or there is no investigation when planned itineraries are not followed.
- The actual journey and means of transport may be completely different from that indicated in the plan, when the buyer changes after the route plan has been approved, but a new plan is not submitted.
- Ineffective sharing of information by the CA allows certain dealers, who repeatedly fail to comply, to take their business to another district where they will be under a lower level of surveillance.

Place of departure

There is a gap in EU legislation regarding the animal welfare conditions which should apply at places where animals are gathered. A definition of the length of time animals must spend at assembly centres and markets, which are the most common places of departure for long distance transport, has not been determined (Directive 91/628/EEC Article 2(2)(e) second indent). As a result:

- CAs continue to apply national provisions.
- Animals spend anything from one to twenty four hours at assembly centres before departure, depending on the MS.
- Even where food and water are available, animals are sometimes allowed insufficient time to access these and undergo long distance journeys in varying stages of hunger and thirst.
- Total travel time is not effectively monitored which involve time at a market, as transport documents generally do not take into account the journey to the market or the time at the market.

Vehicle Standards

Trucks used for long distance journeys are not suitably equipped where:

- Checks of vehicles are secondary to the task of certification of the animals.
- Inspectors do not adequately distinguish between journeys of more than or less than eight hours or checklists used lack sufficient details.
There are also problems with certain EU requirements:

- The majority of animals are unable to drink because, at the allowed stocking densities, each animal cannot access one of the drinkers on the truck (Chapter VI of the Annex to Directive 91/628/EEC).
- Vehicles without ventilation systems have to maintain temperatures between 5 and 35°C, whereas vehicles with fans do not have to respect this temperature range (Regulation (EC) No. 411/98, Annex, 4). The latter are sometimes just cosmetic and generally are not capable of functioning during long stops.
- Many trucks used for the transport of large animals do not provide direct access to the animals (Regulation (EC) No. 411/98, Annex, 3). As a result, the attendant cannot “provide all appropriate care”. Due to the high number of vehicles in service which do not meet this requirement, several CAs accept this situation. However, vehicles, which allow access to the animals via easily removable ventilation fans, have been available for several years.

Regarding stocking densities:

- In certain MSs the stocking densities found in Chapter VI to the Annex of Council Directive 91/628/EEC had not been transposed and as a result overstocking was tolerated unless animal suffering could be proven.
- Certain CAs require a document to be carried on the vehicle indicating the maximum number of animals allowed. Although this is not a specific EU requirement, it represents a good method for monitoring stocking density.

**Fitness for the intended journey**

Fitness for the intended journey is probably the most critical factor to protect against major abuses of animal welfare. Where CAs have provided little supporting guidance or training on this topic or where economic considerations take precedence, unfit animals continue to be transported. Trade in cull animals in particular often results in unfit animals undergoing long journeys to slaughterhouses specialised in handling this category of animal, or to a MS where they have a higher value.

Certain CAs have taken steps to strengthen controls of fitness for transport:

- Reference to the FVE position paper (10), which provides a useful list of clinical conditions when an animal should not be transported.
- Providing a more enforceable definition regarding the fitness of calves for transport. The requirement for a healed navel (Directive 91/628/EEC Annex, Chapter IA, 1), has been interpreted as calves of more than 14 days of age.
- Stricter surveillance of certain categories of animals, such as those with high rates of injuries or mortalities as a result of transportation.

---

(10) http://www.fve.org/papers/pdf/aw/position_papers/01_043.pdf
4.4. Checks during transport

The number of inspections carried out during transport is much smaller than the number of checks at departure or destination. Checks of consignments in transit take place mostly at ports or at roadsides and although many CAs consider them costly in terms of planning and resources:

- When they are well planned and performed they have produced significant findings. Problems such as overloading, excess journey times and, less frequently, seriously injured animals have been detected.
- Detection rates for infringements varied from 1 to 12%. The higher percentage was for well targeted and competently performed checks.
- Accurate assessment of certain criteria can be difficult, e.g. fitness of each animal. Arrangements need to be made so that when necessary, animals can be unloaded nearby. However, ports in particular, often do not have appropriate facilities to do this.

4.5. Checks at destination

Checks at slaughterhouses are generally integrated with the ante mortem inspection required for animals slaughtered for human consumption. Transport requirements are inadequately checked where:

- Animals are unloaded outside the veterinarian’s working hours.
- The OV belongs to a service responsible for public health, which is not responsible for animal transport issues.

4.6. Reports of transport inspections

Reporting on the results of inspections does not work effectively when the inspections were not systematically organised in the first place, as:

- Targets were not set and results cannot be meaningfully analysed.
- The central level does not provide feedback to those implementing the inspection programme with the result that the other levels perceive it as a bureaucratic exercise.
- There is underreporting of deficiencies as only those infringements where a solution cannot be found on the spot are reported.

4.7. Legal Enforcement and Penalties

Where there have been failures to respect the rules, measures taken have often not been effective or dissuasive:

- Withdrawing or suspending the transporter’s registration in cases of repeated infringements has been used with limited success. Certain transporters have been successful with legal challenges, where this measure was subsequently considered disproportionate to remedy the shortcomings noted. Another scenario is where the named responsible person is changed and the company resumes trading.
- Some CAs have been successful in gaining better compliance in such cases by making the issuing of subsequent health certificates conditional on detailed checks of each consignment at the time of loading.
Warnings are often issued when serious deficiencies are detected because preparation of dossiers for prosecution imposes an unwelcome additional burden on veterinary staff and there is no mechanism to impose administrative on-the-spot penalties. In addition, inspectors who initiate procedures to impose a sanction often receive no further information on the outcome.

Regarding excessive journey times, penalties are rarely imposed, other than the possible loss of subsidies for consignments of bovine animals exported to third countries.

Police services are involved in checks during transport either to stop the trucks or, in some MSs, to independently check certain requirements. In those MS where enforcement has been weak in the past, the involvement of these services in carrying out checks has led to an increase in the number and level of sanctions imposed.

4.8. Mutual assistance between MSs

Follow-up in relation to incidents involving international transport is generally insufficient or ineffective because:

- Although the MS of departure is normally informed of serious infringements, information is not passed to the local unit at the place of departure.

- In certain cases, the CA of origin needs the CA where the infringement took place to initiate legal procedures before they can take follow-up enforcement action.

- There is no feedback to the CA who reported the deficiency.

4.9. Checks within the slaughterhouse

Although the OV is required to check compliance with EU rules on animal welfare (11), there is no requirement to record the results of such inspections. This, together with the higher priority given to public health, results in:

- Inadequate supervision where animal welfare is not a well defined task of the OV or there are too many other demands made on the OV.

- Animal welfare included more as part of commercial quality assurance rather than official control. The slaughterhouse operator maintains records independently on staff training and maintenance of stunning equipment for such schemes.

- The other levels of the CA have an insufficient overview on the level of compliance, due to the lack of reporting.

Even where inspections are recorded, animal welfare is sometimes only mentioned as a general point on the checklist and specific deficiencies go unnoticed.

The integrated approach to checks established in Regulation (EC) No. 882/2004\(^{(12)}\), will make it a requirement to audit the work of the OV from 1.1.2006 and should make slaughterhouse veterinarians more accountable for animal welfare. Where this approach has already been adopted:

- It not only serves as a means to supervise the OV, but provides a supporting mechanism when the OV wishes to initiate some form of enforcement action against a slaughterhouse operator.
- It is a means for the CA to gather useful information and subsequently develop practical guidelines, such as an acceptable percentage of animals receiving back-up stunning.
- Information gathered can be used to develop strategies to achieve better compliance.

EU legislation does not contain all the technical details necessary for the effective operation of certain stunning methods. In certain MSs, further requirements for electrical stunning (more specific parameters) and for CO\(_2\) stunning (higher concentrations of gas and minimum exposure times) have been defined in national legislation or provided as guidance. In those MSs where guidance or training has not filled this gap:

- OV\(\text{s} have insufficient knowledge to monitor the effectiveness of stunning, particularly the use of electrical devices for both red and white meat species.
- Certain gas stunning systems apply the minimum level of 70% CO\(_2\), but often with an insufficient exposure time which consequently does not guarantee effective stunning (Directive 93/119/EC Annex C, II, 4).
- Supervision is inadequate where electro-immobilisation is applied immediately following the use of the captive bolt. Electro-immobilisation is used to improve operator safety but may mask the signs of consciousness\(^{(13)}\), however OV\(\text{s} did not request a delay in this procedure, so that an assessment of the effectiveness of stunning could be made.

4.10. Overall conclusion

Regarding animal welfare during transport:


\(\text{(13) See EFSA report “welfare aspects of animal stunning and killing methods”, 5.10 and 7.2.3.3} \)

http://www.efsa.eu.int/science/ahaw/ahaw_opinions/495_en.html
Progress has been achieved where the CAs have provided further guidance and developed administrative procedures. In particular by: strengthening the requirements for the transport of particularly vulnerable animals; carrying out well planned and targeted roadside checks and ensuring closer and more systematic checks of repeat offenders.

There are persistent weaknesses in controls where the CA does not set targets, analyse the results of inspections or establish a clear enforcement policy. Problems also continue where there is incomplete transposition of EU law and/or the provisions of EU law are insufficiently detailed. Inadequate transposition also gives economic advantages to the transporters based in these MSs.

Regarding animal welfare at the time of slaughter:

- Although there are no EU requirements to record or report the results of animal welfare checks within slaughterhouses, such procedures enable the CA to identify where knowledge is insufficient and develop guidelines accordingly.
- There is a better level of compliance in those MSs where supervision and/or auditing of the work of slaughterhouse veterinarians takes place.

As part of the overall CA control plan to implement Regulation (EC) No. 882/2004, inspections of transport and slaughter will have to be organised in a more systematic way after 1.1.2006, with inspections based on risk analysis, training provided and audits carried out.

5. **RECOMMENDATIONS TO MEMBER STATES**

Recommendations were made to each CA in the individual report for each mission. The following is a summary of the issues which were the subject of recommendations.


5.2. To provide guidance and training to inspectors, particularly regarding the transport of unfit animals (Directive 91/628/EEC Chapter II Article 3, 1b, 1c) and electrical stunning of animals (Directive 93/119/EC, Annex C, Chapter II, 3).

5.3. To ensure inspections on an adequate sample of animals transported are carried out (Directive 91/628/EEC Article 8) and to locate checks during transport close to sites where animals can be unloaded, as necessary.
5.4. To monitor journey times effectively (Directive 91/628/EEC Chapter II Article 3, 1aa second indent), through ensuring that the documents accompanying animals indicate the time of departure (Directive 91/628/EEC Chapter II Article 4) and through the verification and return of route plans (Directive 91/628/EEC Chapter II Article 5 A2, b, c, d, e).

5.5. To ensure that animals at markets (Directive 91/628/EEC Article 2, 2e) and at slaughterhouses (Directive 93/119/EC, Annex A, Chapter II, 9) have access to water and feed, as stipulated in these provisions.

5.6. To ensure effective communication both within and between MSs and when necessary, appropriate sanctions should be applied (Directive 91/628/EEC Article 18).

5.7. To ensure animal welfare requirements are included in slaughterhouse inspections (Directive 64/433/EEC Annex I Chapter VI, 26(b) and Directive 71/118/EEC Annex I Chapter VI, 28).

6. **ACTION ENVISAGED BY THE COMMISSION SERVICES**

6.1. To follow-up the situation in relation to each of the Member States identified in the individual reports as not having properly transposed or implemented EU legislation, and to consider the possibility of further appropriate action where areas of non-compliance have not been satisfactorily addressed.

6.2. The proposed Council Regulation on the protection of animals during transport already sought to address many of the specific issues highlighted in this report. In future developments concerning controls of animal welfare during transport, the Commission services will further consider:

   a. To require the CAs to set targets and assess the results of inspections so as to better manage available resources.

   b. To enhance co-operation between MSs, such as through the use of the TRACES application to record the results of transport inspections.

6.3. In the framework of the revision of EU requirements for animal welfare at slaughter, the Commission services will consider:

   a. To require inspections to be recorded, reported and audited. This information should be used to identify where knowledge is insufficient and develop guidelines accordingly.

   b. To elaborate further technical requirements required for gas and electrical stunning of animals.

   c. To require where electro-immobilisation is used, that this should be delayed when checks are carried out, so that it does not interfere with the assessment of the effectiveness of stunning.
### ANNEX I  Missions concerning animal welfare during transport and at slaughter

#### Details of missions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member State</th>
<th>Dates of mission</th>
<th>Report reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>5 - 9.11.01</td>
<td>DG(SANCO)3343/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>24 – 28.6.02</td>
<td>DG(SANCO)8554/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>25.2 – 1.3.02</td>
<td>DG(SANCO)8556/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>9 – 13.9.02</td>
<td>DG(SANCO)8676/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>14 – 18.10.02</td>
<td>DG(SANCO)8677/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>25 – 29.11.02</td>
<td>DG(SANCO)8678/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany*</td>
<td>19 – 23.5.03</td>
<td>DG(SANCO)9038/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal*</td>
<td>2 – 6.6.03</td>
<td>DG(SANCO)9039/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden*</td>
<td>29.9– 3.10.03</td>
<td>DG(SANCO)9210/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland*</td>
<td>1 – 5.9.03</td>
<td>DG(SANCO)9212/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK*</td>
<td>20 – 24.10.03</td>
<td>DG(SANCO)9213/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands*</td>
<td>3 – 7.11.03</td>
<td>DG(SANCO)9214/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium*</td>
<td>24 – 28.11.03</td>
<td>DG(SANCO)9281/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain*</td>
<td>9 – 17.12.03</td>
<td>DG(SANCO)9215/2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Individual missions on which overview report is based.

(14) Greece was visited twice in 2003, the first mission was from 13-17.01.03 ref: DG(SANCO)9002/2003.
ANNEX II FVO missions which included aspects on the killing of animals during epizootic outbreaks (15).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member State</th>
<th>Dates of mission</th>
<th>Report reference</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>4-8.11.02</td>
<td>8545/2002</td>
<td>Foot and Mouth Disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>4-7.4.01</td>
<td>3324/2001</td>
<td>Foot and Mouth Disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2-6.4.01</td>
<td>3323/2001</td>
<td>Foot and Mouth Disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>20 – 24.5.02</td>
<td>8643/2002</td>
<td>Classical Swine Fever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>1-5.05.03</td>
<td>9174/2003</td>
<td>Avian Influenza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>12-14.8.02</td>
<td>8722/2002</td>
<td>Newcastle disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>3-6.7.00</td>
<td>1195/2000</td>
<td>Newcastle disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>15-18.02.00</td>
<td>1161/2000</td>
<td>Avian influenza</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(15) A special report on contingency plans in the MSs 1999-2002 included the arrangements for killing in epizootic outbreaks see, [http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/inspections/vi/reports/index_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/inspections/vi/reports/index_en.html)

Reports of further missions in 2003 on disease contingency plans are also available on the Commission website for all MSs.