



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
HEALTH AND CONSUMERS DIRECTORATE-GENERAL

Directorate F - Food and Veterinary Office

DG(SANCO) 2013-6807 - MR FINAL

FINAL REPORT OF AN AUDIT

CARRIED OUT IN

DENMARK

FROM 07 TO 11 OCTOBER 2013

IN ORDER TO EVALUATE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COUNCIL OF EUROPE
REQUIREMENTS FOR ANIMAL WELFARE IN MAJOR FARMED SPECIES AND OFFICIAL
CONTROLS ON CHICKENS KEPT FOR MEAT PRODUCTION

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) audit which took place in Denmark from 7th to 11th October 2013.

The objective of the audit was to evaluate the implementation of EU animal welfare legislation regarding farm animals, in particular farms keeping chickens for the production of meat, and other species covered by the Recommendations from the European Convention for the Protection of Animals kept for Farming Purposes (hereinafter "CoE Recommendations").

The recent reorganisation and merger of field staff carrying out certain animal welfare controls into DVFA has proceeded relatively smoothly with few problems reported by the CA or noted by the audit team. Following on from these changes at the beginning of 2013, the CA is examining how it can better prioritise its controls and has changed its planning and enforcement strategies accordingly in an effort to achieve higher levels of producer compliance with animal welfare requirements.

With respect to cattle and fur farms Denmark has fully implemented the legal provisions in CoE Recommendations, and has legislated beyond the basic requirements in both sectors.

The CA is implementing satisfactory controls on requirements which go further than those of the CoE recommendations on cattle and fur farms. Regular satisfactory inspections are being carried out, which together with strict enforcement, provide assurance that compliance with CoE and national requirements on dairy farms and fur farms are being effectively controlled.

The CA has a well developed and satisfactory system of official controls to implement the broiler directive on farm. This includes programmed annual checks of at least 5 % of all broiler farms, but at least 50 farms each year, which means that in practice 50 farms (which equals about 25 % of the farms) are controlled and effective targeted follow up inspections as a result of information received from slaughterhouse checks resulting in graduated enforcement action and sanctions being imposed when required.

The well conceived and implemented system for assessing and reporting on welfare indicators found at post-mortem in poultry slaughterhouses, together with financial incentives provided by slaughterhouses, has been effective in raising the level of welfare on broiler farms through marked reductions over time in the level and severity of footpad dermatitis.

The report makes a number of recommendations to the Danish 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</u>	1
3	<u>LEGAL BASIS</u>	1
4	<u>BACKGROUND</u>	1
5	<u>FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS</u>	2
5.1	<u>COMPETENT AUTHORITIES</u>	2
5.2	<u>IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EUROPEAN CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF ANIMALS KEPT FOR FARMING PURPOSES</u>	3
5.3	<u>CHECKS ON FARMS</u>	4
5.3.1	<u>CHECKS ON DAIRY FARMS</u>	5
5.3.2	<u>CHECKS ON FUR FARMS</u>	6
5.4	<u>IMPLEMENTATION OF DIRECTIVE 2007/43/EC</u>	8
5.4.1	<u>CHECKS ON BROILER FARMS</u>	8
5.4.2	<u>REPORTING OF RESULTS OF CHECKS IN POULTRY SLAUGHTERHOUSES</u>	11
6	<u>OVERALL CONCLUSIONS</u>	13
7	<u>CLOSING MEETING</u>	14
8	<u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	14
	<u>ANNEX 1 - LEGAL REFERENCES</u>	15

ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS USED IN THIS REPORT

CA	Competent Authority
CCA	Central Competent Authority
CDMR	Cumulative Daily Mortality Rate
CoE	Council of Europe
DK	Denmark
DG(SANCO)	Health and Consumers Directorate-General
DMR	Daily Mortality Rate
DVFA	Danish Veterinary and Food Administration
EC	European Community
EU	European Union
FPD	Foot Pad Dermatitis
KIK	<i>Kvalitetssikring i Kyllingeproduktionen</i> - Quality Assurance in Poultry Production
MS	Member State
OV	Official Veterinarian
QA	Quality Assurance
VO	Veterinary Officer

1 INTRODUCTION

The audit took place in Denmark (DK) from 7th to 11th October 2013 as part of the planned audit programme of the FVO. An opening meeting was held with the DK competent authorities on 7th October 2013. At this meeting, the objectives of, and itinerary for the audit were confirmed by the audit team and additional information required for the satisfactory completion of the audit was requested.

The audit team was composed of two inspectors from the FVO and a national expert from Germany, and was accompanied throughout the audit by representatives from the central and regional levels of the competent authority (CA) the Danish Veterinary and Food Administration (DVFA).

2 OBJECTIVES

The objective of the audit was to evaluate the implementation of measures aimed at the control of animal welfare on farms, in particular farms keeping chickens for the production of meat, and other species covered by the Recommendations from the European Convention for the Protection of Animals kept for Farming Purposes (hereinafter “CoE Recommendations”¹) with particular reference to fur farming and cattle.

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

Visits			Comments
Competent authority	Central	2	Opening and final meetings
	Regional	2	Vejle and Herning
Farms/ assembly centres/ slaughterhouses etc		2	Premises rearing chickens for meat production
		1	Dairy farm premises
		1	Fur farm rearing mink
		1	Slaughterhouse processing chickens reared for meat

3 LEGAL BASIS

The mission was carried out under the general provisions of Community legislation, in particular Article 45 of Regulation (EC) 882/2004. A full list of the legal instruments quoted in this report is provided in Annex 1 and refers, where applicable, to the last amended version.

4 BACKGROUND

This is the first such audit carried out by the FVO in DK to evaluate the implementation of control measures on the keeping of chickens for the production of meat and on certain major farmed species covered by CoE Recommendations and is part of a series of audits being carried out by the FVO in

Member States.

5 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 COMPETENT AUTHORITIES

Legal Requirements

Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires MS to designate the CA responsible for the purposes and official controls set out in the Regulation. It also lays down operational criteria for the CA.

Findings

The audit team noted that:

- There have been significant changes in the structure and organisation of the CA in the period since the last FVO animal welfare audit in 2010. The revised organisation of the CA is described in detail in FVO report DG SANCO 2013-6857-MR Final which reviewed the systems in place for the verification of effectiveness of official controls and which is accessible at: http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/country_profiles_en.cfm
- In brief the main changes relate to the transfer of responsibility for legislation and implementation of controls: legislative responsibility was transferred in 2011 from the Ministry of Justice to the Ministry of Agriculture and now for a large part rests with the DVFA . Implementation of certain animal welfare controls moved in 2013 from the Danish Agrifish agency to the DVFA field services;
- Both DVFA central headquarters and field services received additional staff but at central levels this was not in proportion to the staff formerly allocated to these tasks (2 staff out of 13 allocated to the central level). Most inspectors carrying out certain animal welfare inspections for the Agrifish Agency transferred to DVFA field service in 2013;
- Field delivery function remains essentially similar to before as the former Agrifish inspectors carry out the same animal welfare inspection functions but now for a different organisation;
- The audit team noted no particular difficulties in the implementation of controls resulting from the organisational changes. The majority of information requested by the team was easily retrieved but some historical inspection reports from the Agrifish Agency database were not able to be accessed;

Conclusion

The recent reorganisation and merger of field staff carrying out certain animal welfare controls into DVFA has proceeded relatively smoothly with few problems reported by the CA or noted by the audit team.

5.2 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EUROPEAN CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF ANIMALS KEPT FOR FARMING PURPOSES

Legal Basis

Council Decision 78/923/EEC concerning the conclusion of the European Convention for the Protection of Animals kept for Farming Purposes and Council Decision 92/583/EEC on the conclusion of the Protocol of amendment to the European Convention for the Protection of Animals kept for Farming Purposes have approved the Convention on behalf of the EU. Recommendations adopted under the Convention must be applied by the Member States, in national legislation or by other administrative arrangements.

The CoE recommendations are designed in such a way that they contain both legislative provisions, which Contracting Parties to the European Convention for the Protection of Animals kept for Farming Purposes shall implement, and guidelines, which Contracting Parties may implement on a voluntary basis.

Findings

Legislation

The audit team noted that with respect to the implementation of the COE recommendations on fur farming that:

- The CA has produced specific legislation to govern the farming of fur animals:
 - Order no. 1734 on the protection of fur animals (22/12/2006) as amended by Order no. 856, (implementing date July 2014) to address behavioural needs: This legislation goes beyond the requirements of the CoE recommendations on fur farming in a number of areas: e.g. specifying requirements for nest sizes, provision of shelves and pipes (for mink);
 - Order no. 1207 on Training of staff on Mink Farms (14/12/2012) gives the requirements for training of keepers and staff working for them;
 - Order no. 261 on Mandatory Veterinary Advisory Service Contracts for Mink Farms (30/3/2011): gives the requirement for mink producers with more than 10 mink and dependent upon their compliance history to have a contract with a private veterinarian which provides for a minimum of four visits per year.

The audit team noted that with respect to the implementation of the COE recommendations on dairy farms that:

- The CA has produced specific legislation to govern the farming of bovine animals:
 - Consolidated Act No. 260 of 8 March 2013 relating to the keeping of dairy cattle and the offspring of dairy cows. This legislation is wide ranging in scope and its applicability and entering into force is subject to many transition periods from 2012 to 2032 which are dependent upon the date the animal accommodation was built. This legislation goes beyond the requirements of the COE recommendation and requires for example:
 - Minimum number and type of calving boxes in dairy herds;
 - Space allowances for various categories of animals over 6 months;
 - Minimum numbers of isolation boxes per 100 animals;

Hoof paring at least twice per year from either 2014 or 2016 depending upon date of build;

Provision of motorised brushes for use on animals' backs for those over one year old.

- Order No. 544 of 29 May 2013 Veterinary Advisory Service Contracts for cattle herds specifies that farmers with at least 50 cows must have a contract with a private veterinarian which provides for a varying number of visits (minimum of 12) depending upon the farmer's compliance history and their wish to administer certain medicines;
- Order No. 999 of 14 December 1993 on the protection of calves, as amended, gives the requirements for the provision of fibre for calves over two weeks of age which are twice those laid down in Council Directive 2008/119/EC;
- The guideline in the COE recommendation concerning cattle stating that cows and heifers should not be kept in a totally slatted area has been implemented, albeit with a long transitional period for offspring of dairy cattle.
- The guideline that cows and heifers should have opportunity to go outside whenever possible has not been implemented. Transitional period are in place for the keeping of heifers on fully slatted floors (with access to pasture) till 2024.

Conclusion

With respect to cattle and fur farms Denmark has fully implemented the legal provisions in CoE Recommendations, and has legislated beyond the basic requirements in both sectors.

5.3 CHECKS ON FARMS

Legal Basis

Article 3 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires that official controls are carried out regularly, on a risk basis and with appropriate frequency.

Findings

- The system for planning farm inspections in general has changed since the last FVO audit. Since the beginning of 2013 the DVFA has been developing a revised system of centrally planned farm inspections focussing more on risk. It has split inspections into three categories: zero point controls (totally random inspections to get an idea of overall levels of compliance); basic controls (cross compliance inspections - 20-25% random, 75-80% risk based) and prioritized controls (risk based controls). These accounted for 1700 planned controls in 2013. In addition there may be other campaign controls including inspections carried out by the Veterinary Task Force such as on herds with high antibiotic usage or mortality levels- this accounted for 1000 planned controls in 2013. In addition, the results of all Police animal welfare prosecutions sent to DVFA offices feed into the planning process; '
- The CA has also been tasked as part of the The Veterinary Policy Agreement between the Government and the opposition parties to follow up more intensively those non-compliances which resulted in written warnings being given to owners for lesser grade offences. In the previous system there was no automatic follow-up visit. The CA wishes to analyse if there is any change in the overall levels of compliance with animal welfare requirements by

following up these warnings with a chargeable visit. This policy will enter into effect on 1 January 2014 and is expected to result in approximately 1200 extra follow-up inspections.

Conclusion

Following on from the changes in structure and organisation which took place at the beginning of 2013, the CA is examining how it can better prioritise its controls and has changed its planning and enforcement strategies accordingly in an effort to achieve higher levels of producer compliance with animal welfare requirements.

5.3.1 Checks on Dairy Farms

Legal Basis

The convention of the Council of Europe, in particular the recommendations for cattle, provides details which need to be considered when inspecting the arrangements on dairy farms.

Findings

The inspection target of the previous system for cattle farms was five percent of farms checked, approximating to 600 visits per year. Since the beginning of 2013 the DVFA target for cattle farms was 895 inspections.

Detailed guidelines and a check-list on carrying out inspections on cattle farms have been drawn up by the CA. The CA has also provided model control case studies on animal welfare on dairy farms to their inspectors. These include clear guidance and photographs of acceptable solutions to non-compliances, such as lack of tactile and visual stimuli for calves and a video on lameness in loose housing systems for dairy cows.

Denmark has legislated for compulsory Veterinary Advisory Service Contracts for farms which have more than a certain number of cattle; for dairy farms this is 100 cows or more. This involves a variable number of advisory visits by a veterinarian and covers, at its most basic: a review of relevant data for the herd, including the use of medication, findings at slaughter and mortality; checks on the owners' own controls of animal welfare; a review by the veterinarian of the current herd welfare in all units, including the welfare of any free range cattle, and an assessment of possible deficiencies with an animal welfare impact in the herd, including feeding, climate, housing conditions and production parameters. Veterinary advice is aimed at the specific circumstances of the herd, so as to focus on areas of particular need or potential for improving animal welfare.

The audit team visited a commercial dairy farm with 168 adult milking cows and 146 replacement heifers, and calves and observed a routine inspection carried out by an official veterinarian. It was noted that:

- The inspector carried out a competent, thorough inspection of all areas of the farm and its activities. She used the check-list for background information/guidance but was not very familiar with certain aspects of it or some of the requirements of the new legislation and the various transitional periods applicable. However, the CA acknowledged that a revision of the check-list is being undertaken as it is known to be rather difficult to use due to its size and the complexity of the transitional periods applicable to the national legislation on cattle farms;
- The requirement in national legislation for the number of calving boxes to be made available was not fully clear to the inspector or CA. The CoE recommendation only indicates that calving boxes should be available, not how many. The CA stated that there was clear

guidance in the explanatory text that had accompanied the draft of the national legislation containing this provision to Parliament and that this guidance could be incorporated in the revision of the check-list or OV guidance;

- The requirement of the CoE recommendation on the limitations on use of mechanical devices to assist calving are included in the guidelines drawn up by the CA but this item is not covered in the check-list and was not addressed during the inspection by the OV;
- In general, the condition of the animals, their welfare and the environmental conditions were all effectively assessed and observed to be satisfactory, notwithstanding the minor issues noted above.

The audit team reviewed a number of inspection files in one of the regional offices visited and noted that:

- Nine out of 29 programmed inspections for 2013 on dairy farms had been completed at the time of the audit. The audit team noted that in five cases there had been enforcement action taken varying from warning letters to producers for first offences relating to lack of tactile and visual stimuli for calves, reporting owners to the Police for repeated offences, to euthanasia of animals that were suffering. Sanctions included fines of 3000 Danish Krone (about €400) and in all cases included reductions in cross compliance payments. In the whole of the country there had been enforcement action taken in about 10% of inspections i.e. 25/270 inspections in 2013.

Conclusion

The CA is implementing satisfactory controls on requirements which go further than those of the CoE recommendations on cattle. Regular satisfactory inspections are being carried out, which together with strict enforcement, provide assurance that compliance with CoE and national requirements on dairy farms are being effectively controlled.

5.3.2 Checks on Fur Farms

Legal Basis

The convention of the Council of Europe, in particular the recommendations for fur animals, provides details which need to be considered when inspecting the arrangements on fur farms.

Findings

- Training courses for staff working on mink farms have been approved by DVFA. Certificates are issued with the annexes detailing the training given and personnel must be trained in killing of fur animals according to the requirements of Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009. There is a requirement for eight hours of continuous training per year. In 2012, 486 persons employed to work on mink farms were trained and 30 active mink breeders. In 2013 the same categories were 260 and 817 respectively. Prior experience can be taken into account in awarding training certificates;
- In response to photographs of injured mink published by animal activists which raised concerns with conditions on fur farms during 2009, the CA carried out a series of intensive inspections on fur farms: all 1500-1600 farms were visited in 2010; 50% were visited in

2011 and 2012. The target for 2013 has reverted to 5%, approximately 80 farms. In addition, there were additional inspections carried out by the Veterinary Task force during 2013 on the subject of sick and injured mink;

- The CA has provided extensive inspection and enforcement guidance for inspectors and has drawn up clear checklists to assist in carrying out inspections. CoE requirements, relating to stocking densities; environmental enrichment and manipulable materials, nests, are well developed in the CA guidance;
- The mink producer association has produced guidance for mink farmers which is available on the Internet and covers all stages of mink rearing and includes guidance on the killing of mink.

The audit team visited one commercial mink farm with 2700 breeding females and 11, 300 weaned pups kept in 3 sheds of differing construction type and age. It was noted that:

- The inspecting officer, an agricultural technician, had previously worked at the Danish Agrifish Agency carrying out the same inspection role in relation to fur farms as now for the DVFA. He carried out a thorough inspection of all animals present on the farm (this is a requirement of the CA controls) with priority given to sick and injured animals and their treatment. The animals were assessed as being in good condition with plenty of straw, adequate environmental stimuli and satisfactory management practices were observed. The hospital area was well arranged, almost all the animals that needed treatment (two fresh wounds were detected) were isolated and receiving it. Veterinary colleagues can be, and are, consulted by phone (including the sending of photographs) when a clinical assessment may be required on more seriously injured or non-treated animals. Veterinarians may be required to visit in such cases where the evidence is not clear or is sufficiently serious to warrant the collection of evidence and further clinical assessment;
- The inspecting officer verified that the stocking density in the three houses was compliant with the requirements in the CoE recommendation (appendix A 7);
- The inspector noted that escape traps had not been provided in the recently built shed and that two tier cages would need to be fully accessible in January 2014 to comply with the new Danish requirements for shelving. The CA have implemented the CoE requirements for environmental enrichment for fur animals (Article 11,2) through statutory requirements for pipes and shelves to be placed in each cage. A notice was to be drawn up and sent to the owner on these two issues at the end of the inspection;
- The inspecting officer requested details of training which was provided for the staff attending the mink who had attended basic training on 25 September 2013. One of the owners already had a certificate of competence and the other was scheduled for training during the week following the inspection. Records of veterinary visits were also requested and provided. These indicated that the private veterinarian had assessed as satisfactory: treatment records, the selection of breeding stock, treatment of injuries, stocking density and a number of other issues as laid down in the Order on Veterinary Advisory Service Contracts for Mink Farms;

The audit team reviewed a number of inspection files in one of the regional offices visited and noted that:

- 10 out of 45 programmed inspections for 2013 on fur farms had been completed at the time of the audit. 2 out of 10 of the completed inspections had resulted in enforcement action being taken: one farm was slightly overstocked (1% -130/13,000 cages had 3 animals rather than the 2 permitted for the size of cage) and lacked enough traps at entrances. The farmer received an administrative order to rectify the deficiencies, and will receive a chargeable unannounced follow-up inspection visit. The second farmer will be subject to Police investigation as there was evidence of gross maltreatment of the animals: 27 out of 29 animals in sick pens had to be destroyed and there was insufficient straw in sick pens and nesting boxes;

Conclusion

The CA is implementing satisfactory controls on requirements which go further than those of the CoE recommendations on fur farms. Frequent intensive inspections are being carried out, which together with strict enforcement, provide assurance that compliance with CoE and national requirements on fur farms are being effectively controlled.

5.4 IMPLEMENTATION OF DIRECTIVE 2007/43/EC

5.4.1 Checks on Broiler Farms

Legal Basis

Article 7(1) of Directive 2007/43/EC requires the CA to carry out non-discriminatory inspections on an adequate proportion of animals within each Member State to verify compliance with the requirements of this Directive. Such inspections shall be carried out on an adequate proportion of animals kept within each Member State, in accordance with the relevant provisions of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, and may be carried out at the same time as checks for other purposes.

Article 4 of Directive 2007/43/EC requires training to be available for keepers of chickens bred for the production of meat.

Findings

Legislation

- Denmark has implemented the provisions of Directive 2007/43 through the following legislation: Act no. 687 on the keeping of broilers; Order no. 757 on the keeping of broilers and the production of eggs for hatching and Order no. 245 on education and qualifications in connection with the keeping of broilers;
- A maximum stocking density of 40 kg/m², measured as the average of the stocking densities for the present flock and the two previous flocks is permitted. At no time is it allowed to exceed the maximum stocking density permitted in the Directive of 42 kg/m² ;
- Guidelines drafted by the Danish poultry Council and the Ministry of Justice have been issued in accordance with Article 8 of the broiler directive and provide useful management information for producers;
- Keepers of chickens bred for the production of meat must participate in a training course to

receive a certificate attesting their competence. Transitional provisions were made for persons who had been responsible for a broiler farm from 1 April 2005 until 1 April 2010 and had no serious infringements of animal welfare legislation during that period. One day courses approved by the DVFA have been given by the Knowledge Centre for Agriculture, which is part of the Danish farmers advisory system. The courses cover the subjects mentioned in annex IV of the Directive. Satisfactory documentation of training for keepers and staff was provided during farm visits and staff met were competent in their tasks.

Rearing Chickens for Meat Production in Denmark

DVFA make extensive use of and rely on the KIK quality assurance database to inform and carry out their official controls on broiler farms. The basic concept and features of the system are therefore described briefly below:

- The Danish Poultry Meat Association has developed a quality assurance and documentation system for its members (*KIK-Kvalitetssikring i Kyllingeproduktionen*) accredited to the EN 45011 standard, including a central database, which records information on all stages in the rearing of chickens for meat including: breeding, hatching, feed and other suppliers, rearing on farm, catching, transport and slaughter. Part of the KIK standard has been approved by the DVFA. The system has been fully implemented since 2009 covering all farms slaughtering in Denmark, only a small number of producers exporting birds are not within it. Members are subjected to an annual inspection by KIK and an inspection by an external audit body every three years;
- All bodies involved in the rearing of chickens for meat have access to KIK, including DVFA officials who can interrogate it at farm, office, or slaughterhouse level to ensure that keepers are complying with the requirements of the Directive;
- Information on the KIK system is based around the concept of rearing of birds in flock rotations and recording it on a house basis. Information on the requirements of the Annexes to the Directive including parameters for each building such as measurements, ventilation capacities, alarms, lighting programmes etc. used for registration of producers are entered into KIK. Useable floor area is not measured or routinely verified by VOs but is initially assessed by Industry Consultants. One case was reported where the Police were asked to measure the useable area as a producer had not used a consultant to submit data and had a poor compliance history;
- Producers must record key figures daily regarding the environment in the house (temperature and air humidity), mortality and any reasons for killing birds. Daily mortality rates (DMR) are entered by the farmer and are available to the slaughterhouse OV;
- The database calculates stocking densities on the basis of house measurements and the number of animals and weights of consignments delivered to the slaughterhouse. It also calculates the CDMR on the basis of food chain information submitted by the farmer and this is then subsequently updated when additional dead birds may be found during house cleansing and disinfection between batches. Results of scoring for foot pad dermatitis (FPD) are also recorded within the database. After slaughtering, the producer can obtain the slaughter results and broiler payment information via his access to the database.

Official Controls on Farms

Training for VOs and OVs was held on two occasions in 2011 and 2013 with a meeting of all personnel involved in field controls in 2012. Detailed guidance for carrying out animal welfare checks on holdings of broiler chickens was revised by the DVFA in 2013.

Prior to 15 February 2001 every flock rotation on broiler farms was visited by a VO to carry out *ante-mortem* inspection. Since then *ante-mortem* inspection has been carried out in slaughterhouses, although control of hygiene requirements was still carried out in each flock on-farm until March 2010, when the legislation was changed. The CA inspects at least 5% of all broiler farms, but at least 50 farms, each year, which means that in practice 50 farms (which equals about 25% of the farms) are controlled yearly. The premises to be visited are selected centrally and sent to the regional offices where VOs specialised in broiler production perform the visits. Inspections must take place in last week of the rearing cycle when the birds are usually at their highest stocking density.

The audit team visited two broiler premises, both authorised for the highest permitted stocking density (40kg/m² average over 3 cycles), where two veterinary officers from two different regions performed routine inspections. It was noted that:

- Both VOs carried out satisfactory inspections utilising previous inspection reports for background information and examining the FCI information available from the KIK database for incidences of raised mortality; high levels of FPD and differences in the calculated mortality on farm and the numbers of live animals arriving at the slaughterhouse;
- Animals (25 and 33 days old in the respective flocks) were generally satisfactory in both premises with minimal FPD lesions;
- Information relating to the registration of the premises and approval documentation for rearing birds at stocking densities over 33kg/m² as required in Annex II of the Directive was available in the KIK database and accessible to the VOs;
- The CA requirement for always visiting at the end of the rearing cycle means that for those premises using gas heaters there is no useful assessment of CO₂ levels in relation to high temperatures during the initial brooding/rearing phase;
- Gas parameters (carbon dioxide CO₂ and ammonia NH₃) are not checked by producers. There is no requirement in the broiler industry guidelines that operators must ensure that the requirements of Annex 2 point 3 of the directive are met. Farmers are required by the KIK system to record levels of relative humidity and temperature on a daily basis and these measurements were recorded in both farms visited. The CA do not assess whether operators can ensure that environmental gas parameters (CO₂ and NH₃) remain within the limits of the Directive, and have not issued guidance in the VO instructions regarding how they should assess this. VOs do measure these parameters during their inspections. However, the CA do have an abundance of data on animal welfare indicators *post-mortem* which will quickly identify when a farm is not rearing under good management conditions;
- The VOs took measurements of CO₂ and NH₃ levels on both farms which were very low and well within the limits set by Annex II point 3 of the Directive;
- The template document seen on both farms and supplied by their hatcheries gave management guidelines for relative humidity levels of over 70% for the last week and a half of the rearing cycle which was not in compliance with Annex II, point 3 of the Directive when the outside temperature dropped below 10 degrees centigrade in winter time;
- Light levels on farm were assessed by one VO with a lux-meter and by the other without. When asked to measure levels on the second farm, they were compliant but the light programme in use was not operating according to the stated programme in the KIK database and this was not detected although this farm had been visited many times. The farmer amended the light programme immediately to rectify the deficiency;

The audit team reviewed a number of inspection files in one of the regional offices visited and noted that:

- Regular enforcement and follow up of reports from slaughterhouses were seen. Reports of follow up visits were noted with evidence of sanctions applied (5000 Danish Krone, €666 approximately) where farmers had not heeded advisory letters or were rearing birds at a higher stocking density than permitted;
- In one office the OV was uncertain about the requirement for calculating stocking density, FPD scores and differences in plausibility of CDMR figures on the basis of single house as opposed to the average of a number of houses from statistics which were generated by a series of printouts from the KIK database.

Conclusion

The CA has a well developed and satisfactory system of official controls to implement the broiler directive on farm. The programmed annual checks of 5%, but at least 50, broiler holdings and effective targeted follow up inspections based on information received from slaughterhouse checks has resulted in graduated enforcement action. Although there is a possible weak point in controls in relation to environmental parameters, the outcome based system has resulted in the identification of problem farms and action has resulted in an improved animal welfare situation.

5.4.2 Reporting of Results of Checks in Poultry Slaughterhouses

Legal Basis

Annex III of Directive 2007/43/EC requires Official Veterinarians at poultry slaughterhouses to evaluate welfare indicators at post-mortem (PM) for flocks of densities higher than 33kg/m². In cases where the mortality rate or PM inspection results are consistent with poor animal welfare conditions, these have to be communicated to the keeper of the animals and to the CA for appropriate actions to be taken.

Findings

Denmark has had legislation in place requiring the monitoring of *post mortem* indicators of animal welfare in poultry at slaughterhouses since 2001. Every flock delivered to the slaughterhouse, has had to be examined for a number of welfare indicators at the slaughterhouse including:

- Control of plumage condition (since 2001)
- Control of FPD (since 2001)
- Control of information from the producer regarding breed and mortality, and the number of chickens dead on arrival (since 2010)
- Control of other indicators, which may indicate welfare problems in the house, for instance hock burns, breast blisters, scratches, emaciation, dehydration, crop constipation (since 2010)

For FPD: 100 feet from 100 different birds (50 from the first and 50 from the last part of the flock) must be examined for foot pad lesions and each foot must be given a score:

- If no foot pad lesions are seen: score 0
- If non serious lesions are seen: score 0,5
- If serious lesions: score 2.”

The score for all 100 feet is then calculated and the OV at the slaughterhouse must react as follows:

- If the total score is no more than 40 points: no reaction
- If the total score is from 41-80 points: the OV issues a warning, telling the producer to correct the conditions in order to reduce the score of the next flock delivered for slaughter. If the total score is 41 or more when the next flock is delivered, the OV asks the regional veterinary authority to take action.
- If the total score is 81-200 points, the OV asks the regional veterinary authority to take action.
- Serious maltreatment of broilers, refusal to correct problems or other infringements can still be reported to the police, irrespective of the FPD score.

The KIK system's database has been instrumental in being the portal for data entry, recording and interrogation of this data as it relates to FPD for a number of years. From this data the DVFA has been able to calculate that the prevalence of serious FPD (scores over 80) has dramatically decreased from approximately 60% in 2002 to about 10% in 2012. There has been a correlated increase in the number of flocks judged to have low FPD (scores less than 40) from approximately 10% in 2002 to 65% in 2005. There has not been much change in these parameters between 2005 and 2012. The prevalence of mid range scores has narrowed from 30% in 2002 to 20% by 2012.

Training for OVs in the scoring of FPD has recently been given every 2 years, and results from the anonymous scoring of feet samples sent to OVs have been collated and reported upon to DVFA at the same frequency as this was seen to be necessary to maintain and improve consistency of scoring. One University researcher in the field acts as the reference judge for scoring the samples and providing consistency. OVs have also joined the field VOs for training days on broilers.

The audit team visited one large commercial slaughterhouse and observed the system of official controls as it related to the evaluation of *ante* and *post-mortem* indicators of animal welfare. It was noted that:

- Examples of reports were seen where OVs had routinely taken the initial enforcement action by writing to owners, and copying the regional services, in those cases where there were high levels of FPD recorded, repeated differences (plausibility checks) over the threshold set of 1% in mortality rates, and incidences of overstocking. In many cases the problems highlighted related to differences in the CDMR calculated by KIK on the numbers of birds arriving at the slaughterhouse and the DMR figures entered by the owner. It was acknowledged that the slaughterhouse visited had had problems with the accuracy of counting birds received for slaughter but this had now been resolved. However, this had not been relayed to the regional services or the farmers concerned. In Denmark the figures for follow up visits by regional services resulting from slaughterhouse checks were as follows:
 - 2012: 41 administrative controls, 34 farm visits;
 - 2013: 11 administrative controls and 12 farm visits.

The OV met had recently initiated a prosecution at slaughterhouse level against the owner and the transporter of a consignment of birds which had suffered 6% mortality rates, had a FPD score of 200, and the birds were wet when they arrived at the establishment. The average transport mortality rate would be approximately 0.3%, the intervention level for mortality rates was over 1.5% upon arrival.

- The slaughterhouse chain visited operates a financial incentive and penalty scheme relating to FPD. Those consignments with FPD scores over 80, or hock burns, are penalised financially per kg live-weight of bird delivered. On the other hand, they receive a small incentive for FPD scores less than 40. The two rearing premises visited had mentioned that they pay close attention to management of FPD and are rewarded accordingly by the slaughterhouses when they produce flocks with low FPD scores.

Conclusion

The well conceived and implemented system for assessing and reporting on welfare indicators found at *post-mortem* in poultry slaughterhouses, together with financial incentives provided by slaughterhouses, has been effective in raising the level of welfare on broiler farms through marked reductions over time in the level and severity of footpad dermatitis.

6 OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

The recent reorganisation and merger of field staff carrying out certain animal welfare controls into DVFA has proceeded relatively smoothly with few problems reported by the CA or noted by the audit team. Following on from these changes at the beginning of 2013, the CA is examining how it can better prioritise its controls and has changed its planning and enforcement strategies accordingly in an effort to achieve higher levels of producer compliance with animal welfare requirements.

With respect to cattle and fur farms Denmark has fully implemented the legal provisions in CoE Recommendations, and has legislated beyond the basic requirements in both sectors.

The CA is implementing satisfactory controls on requirements which go further than those of the CoE recommendations on cattle and fur farms. Regular satisfactory inspections are being carried out, which together with strict enforcement, provide assurance that compliance with CoE and national requirements on dairy farms and fur farms are being effectively controlled.

The CA has a well developed and satisfactory system of official controls to implement the broiler directive on farm. This includes programmed annual checks of 5 % of the holdings, but at least 50 holdings, which means about 25 % of broiler holdings and effective targeted follow up inspections as a result of information received from slaughterhouse checks resulting in graduated enforcement action and sanctions being imposed when required.

The well conceived and implemented system for assessing and reporting on welfare indicators found at *post-mortem* in poultry slaughterhouses, together with financial incentives provided by slaughterhouses, has been effective in raising the level of welfare on broiler farms through marked reductions over time in the level and severity of footpad dermatitis.

7 CLOSING MEETING

A closing meeting was held on 11 October 2013 with representatives of the CCA. At this meeting, the main findings and conclusions of the mission were presented by the FVO team. The

representatives of the CA did not express any major disagreement with these and provided a number of clarifications to the audit team team which were duly noted.

8 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 recommendation set out below, within twenty five working days of receipt of this specific audit report.

N°.	Recommendation
1.	The CA should take suitable measures to ensure that guidance on the assessment of environmental parameters provided to both operators and CA staff include all the requirements of Annex II, point 3 of Directive 2007/43/EC and that rearing templates supplied by hatcheries to farmers comply with these.

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

http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/rep_details_en.cfm?rep_inspection_ref=2013-6807

ANNEX 1 - LEGAL REFERENCES

Legal Reference	Official Journal	Title
Dec. 78/923/EEC	OJ L 323, 17.11.1978, p. 12-13	78/923/EEC: Council Decision of 19 June 1978 concerning the conclusion of the European Convention for the protection of animals kept for farming purposes
Dec. 92/583/EEC	OJ L 395, 31.12.1992, p. 21-21	92/583/EEC: Council Decision of 14 December 1992 on the conclusion of the Protocol of amendment to the European Convention for the Protection of Animals kept for Farming Purposes
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
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
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
Dir. 2007/43/EC	OJ L 182, 12.7.2007, p. 19-28	Council Directive 2007/43/EC of 28 June 2007 laying down minimum rules for the protection of chickens kept for meat production