



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

DG(SANCO)/8553/2002 Final

FINAL REPORT OF A MISSION
CARRIED OUT IN SPAIN
FROM 02 TO 11 APRIL 2002
CONCERNING ANIMAL WELFARE
DURING TRANSPORT AND AT SLAUGHTER

Please note that factual error in the draft report have been corrected in bold, italic type. Clarifications provided by the Spanish central authorities are given as footnotes in the bold, italic type at the relevant part of the report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	4
2. OBJECTIVE OF THE MISSION.....	4
3. LEGAL BASIS FOR THE MISSION.....	4
4. BACKGROUND TO THE CURRENT MISSION.....	5
5. MAIN FINDINGS	6
5.1. Applicable legislation	6
5.2. Competent Authority	6
5.3. Implementation and surveillance	6
5.3.1. Checks at markets	7
5.3.2. Checks at slaughterhouses	9
6. CONCLUSIONS	12
6.1 Legislation	12
6.2 Implementation	13
6.3 Surveillance	13
6.4 Overall assessment of competent authority	14
7. CLOSING MEETING	14
8. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	14
8.1. To the central competent authorities of Spain	14
8.2. To the Commission Services	15

ABBREVIATIONS & SPECIAL TERMS USED IN THE REPORT

AR	Autonomous Region
BSE	Bovine Spongiforme Encephalopathy
CA	Competent Authority
CCA	Central Competent Authority
DG SANCO	Directorate General of the European Commission for Health and Consumer Protection
EEC	European Economic Community
EC	European Community
EU	European Union
FVO	Food and Veterinary Office
MAPA	Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentation
OV	Official Veterinarian
PM	Post Mortem
VS	Veterinary Service

1. INTRODUCTION

The mission took place in Spain from 02 to 11 April 2002. The mission team comprised 3 inspectors from the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO). The mission was undertaken as part of the FVO's planned mission programme. The team was accompanied during the mission by a representative from the central competent authority (CCA), the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAPA), *as well as by a representative of the relevant Autonomous Regions (AR) while in every region.*

An opening meeting was held on 11 April 2002 with the CCA. At this meeting, the objectives of the mission were confirmed by the inspection team and further clarification sought on several answers given by the CCA in answering a pre-mission questionnaire.

2. OBJECTIVE OF THE MISSION

The objective of the mission was to evaluate progress in the operation of controls operated by the CA for animal welfare during transport and at slaughter since the last mission was carried out between 29 May to 2 June 2000 (reference DG (SANCO)/1104/2000).

In pursuit of this objective, the following meetings were held and sites visited:

MEETINGS WITH CA			Comments
Competent authority	Central	2	Opening and closing meetings
	Regional	2	CA of <i>Castilla-La Mancha</i> and <i>Galicia</i>
LIVE ANIMAL CONTROL SITES			
Markets		2	One in <i>Castilla-La Mancha</i> and one in <i>Galicia</i>
Slaughterhouses		4	2 for pigs and 2 for ruminants (cattle, sheep)

3. LEGAL BASIS FOR THE MISSION

The mission was carried out under the general provisions of Community legislation and, in particular:

Article 10 of Council Directive 91/628/EEC of 11 November 1991 on the protection of animals during transport¹ (as amended by Council Directive 95/29/EC²).

Article 14 of Council Directive 93/119/EC of 22 December 1993 on the protection of animals at the time of slaughter or killing³.

Commission Decision 98/139/EC of 4 February 1998 laying down certain detailed rules concerning on-the-spot checks carried out in the veterinary field by Commission experts in the Member States⁴.

¹ OJ L 340 of 11.12.1991 p.17

² OJ L 148 of 30.6.1995 p.52

³ OJ L 340 of 31.12.1993 p.21

4. BACKGROUND TO THE CURRENT MISSION

The report of the previous mission to Spain concerning animal welfare during transport (reference number DG(SANCO)/1104/2000) is available on the DG (Health and Consumer Protection) internet site at

http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fs/inspections/vi/reports/spain/index_en.html

Recommendations were made to the Spanish CCA in the previous mission report to ensure that:

- all parts of Council Directive 91/628/EEC are transposed and implemented into Spanish legislation, including the possibility of penalising any infringements as laid down in Article.18 of the Directive in all Autonomous Regions;
- animals which have undergone long journeys, are rested for 24 hours, where applicable, before continuing their journeys and that the other Member States concerned in all cases where the journey times have not been respected will be informed;
- no animals shall be transported unless they are fit for the intended journey and unless suitable provisions have been made for their care both during the journey and on arrival at the place of destination;
- means of transport and all staging points comply with Council Directive 91/628/EEC and Council Regulation (EC) No. 411/98⁵ and that there are suitable facilities for checking both animals and vehicles at exit points of the EU;
- market facilities and handling of animals comply with Council Directive 98/58/EC⁶;
- when a market is designated as a place of departure, animals have been watered and fed before being reloaded.

In addition, since the previous mission, the Commission has received complaints concerning the conditions of commercially traded greyhounds in Spain, including their transport. The CCA informed the mission team that an investigation had been carried out with the collaboration of the authorities of the ARs and of *one of the main* animal protection groups. In Spain there is only one track for dog racing and there was no evidence on the ANIMO system that greyhounds had been sent to Spain from other countries.

⁴ OJ L 38 of 12.2.1998, p.10

⁵ OJ L 52 of 21.02.1998 p.8

⁶ OJ L 221 of 8.08.1998 p.23

5. MAIN FINDINGS

5.1. Applicable legislation

There has been no change in the relevant legislation from that indicated in the last mission report 1104/2000. The national law still does not provide a basis for sanctions for deficiencies such as overcrowded or inadequate transport and other infringements of Council Directive 91/628/EEC. At a regional level, the situation varies from one region to another. In *Castilla La Mancha*, the legislation in force is insufficient for penalising many breaches of Council Directive 91/628/EEC, and in *Galicia* the existing law for animal protection only refers to pet animals. According to the information received regarding the regional legislation:

- Four out of the 17 Autonomous Regions still have no valid law at all on animal protection
- Five more have a law only applicable to the protection of pet animals.

Therefore in 9 out of 17 ARs, there is no adequate law for the protection of livestock during transport. The remaining 8 regions have one law applicable both to pet and domestic animals. However, even this legislation might be considered inadequate, if, as in *Castilla La Mancha*, they do not specify the infractions on transport, or the regulations establishing the rules for transport.⁷ This lack of a legal basis for sanctions does not comply with Article 18 of the Council Directive 91/628/EEC (as amended), that requires Member States to take the appropriate specific measures to penalise any infringement of this Directive by natural or legal person.

5.2. Competent Authority

The responsibilities of the Competent Authorities have not changed since the last mission report 1104/2000. In all ARs, the VS at markets are under the Agriculture Department of the region and in the slaughterhouses are under the Department of Health for the region.

The annual reports of checks on animal welfare during transport covering 1999 and 2000 (Article 8 of Council Directive 91/628/EEC - as amended) were sent to the European Commission on the 6th October 2000 and the 18th February 2002, respectively. The report for 2001 is currently under preparation and will be sent mid 2002.

5.3. Implementation and surveillance

MAPA has organised a course specifically for those handling animals during transport and in slaughterhouses. *According to the CA 3 different sessions of that course have already taken place* A leaflet explaining the requirements concerning

⁷ *In the response to the draft report, the CCA noted that according to an opinion of the Castilla-La Mancha legal service, the legislation in this AR permits the imposition of the necessary sanctions. The CCA also stated that of the 4 regions without a valid law on animal protection, Extremadura have just passed a law to that aim, and two more, Andalucia and Aragon, have already drafted legislation.*

animal welfare during transport has been widely distributed. The CCA has established a target to be implemented by the regions of 10% of live animal consignments to be checked. *During the official meeting with the regional authorities held in Castilla La Mancha, a representative from that region*, argued that this target would not be achieved because it was unrealistic.

The system for authorisation of transporters includes an inspection of every truck, which, if it meets the necessary requirements, is officially approved for transporting animals. A standardised checklist was used in *Galicia* for this purpose, however in *Castilla La Mancha*, this was not the case. In *Galicia* there was a requirement to renew this authorisation every four years, in *Castilla La Mancha*, there was no requirement for an authorisation to be renewed.

At no point was documentation seen, which would indicate the date and time of departure of a consignment and which should accompany the animals on journeys of more than 50 km.

Instructions have been given to the local inspectors regarding the criteria to be checked, however, no clear instructions have been given regarding fitness of animals for transport. There was neither a system in place for recording inspections carried out nor to inform the AR of the results of these checks as required by Article 8 of Council Directive 91/628/EEC (as amended).⁸ OVs in both slaughterhouses and in markets only found it necessary to make a written report where severe shortcomings had been detected. In *Castilla La Mancha*, there were no written reports of inspections carried out at markets for 2000 or 2001. In the slaughterhouses in the same region, there were no reports of inspections carried out in 2000 and one report had been made in 2001.

5.3.1. Checks at markets

The AR had issued instructions to the local veterinary inspectors concerning checks at markets. These instructions did not include the details to check concerning:

- fitness for travel
- loading density
- technical equipment of means of transport
- travel times.

Route plans were not particularly relevant in the markets visited as over 90% of the animals traded in them come from the surrounding areas (50 to 200 km). Only official veterinarians carried out the checks. No detailed checklists were used but the veterinarians checked in a skilled and

⁸ *In the response to the draft report, Castilla la Mancha mentioned that the protocol of inspection used in that region fulfils all the requirements of the Protocol agreed at a national level in 1999 and the CA of Galicia mentioned that 312 documented road checks were carried out in 2001 with 144 enforcement actions.*

professional manner. One market visited had its internal rules concerning animal welfare on display.

5.3.1.1.Means of transport at markets

Most of the trucks had undergone journeys of less than 50 km. Many of these trucks lacked lateral protection and several trucks had no roof. In another case, there was a gap between the floor of the vehicle and the ramp, which could pose a risk for animals during loading or unloading. The ramps of the old trucks were often very short and steep, sometimes slippery and without adequate lateral protection. Although the requirements of Council Directive 91/628 do not apply to journeys of less than 50 km, it is possible that these vehicles could have been used for longer journeys on other occasions.

5.3.1.2.Fitness of animals at markets

The animals seen were generally fit for further transport. However, a cow, which was unable to stand, had been transported on one truck, which was dirty and overcrowded. The official veterinarian ordered that it be sent to the nearby slaughterhouse and drew up an official report (*acta*). In one pen there was a young calf whose navel was not completely healed. The official veterinarian agreed with the mission team that this calf should not have been transported.

Equipment for carrying out emergency slaughter was available at both markets, but it was reported that in such a case, the animal is not killed on the spot, but rather sent to a slaughterhouse. There was a slaughterhouse close to both markets.

5.3.1.3.Handling of animals and facilities at markets

The handling was generally satisfactory. In those cases where rough treatment of animals was seen, there was prompt intervention by the local veterinarians. During the visit, an official report was written concerning one bovine animal, which had been tied by the horns during transport. The veterinarians' advice was generally accepted regarding other minor deficiencies. However in one case, where a cow was lying on a truck without making any attempt to stand up, it took almost 30 minutes for the official veterinarian to come to a conclusion on how to proceed.

The facilities were generally adequate but the following points were noted:

During the visits, neither market could provide adequate water. In one market in *Castilla La Mancha*, there was no permanent water supply, whereas in the other market in *Galicia*, several official reports had been drawn up regarding the inadequacy of the water supply for animals. In the latter case no follow-up action had been taken. It was reported that in this market the watering system worked now and then. Young calves in this market were provided with warm milk during the visit.

In the market in *Castilla La Mancha*, bovine and ovine animals were kept in loose pens with bedding. In the other market in *Galicia*, adult bovine animals were individually tethered to open railings, with ropes of adequate

length permitting them to drink, feed and lie down. In both markets, animals were generally accommodated together according to their species and age, but adult male and females were often kept together.

Facilities for unloading and reloading the animals were mostly inadequate. Lateral protection, where present, was sometimes not used, resulting in some animals stumbling during unloading.

Ramps were often unsuitable and the animals had to jump down from the ramp of the truck.

In the market in *Galicia*, the official veterinarians paid particular attention during unloading to the problems during unloading and gave precise directions to drivers. Here, to facilitate the unloading of young calves, the ramp of the trailer was almost horizontal with the market floor. Wooden wedges were used to reduce the height of the step at the end of the ramp and ramps were covered with straw. Trucks, whose ramps were too steep, were sent to a sloping concrete unloading area. Both markets had designated sick bays.

5.3.1.4. Documentary checks at markets

Data related to cattle arriving and leaving the markets are entered into a computerised data base system (“SIMOGAN”) to ensure traceability. As most of the animals traded in both markets were from the same region or coming from a maximum distance of 400 km, a route plan was not required.

According to a representative of the AR, reports of any negative observations made by the local VS were transmitted to the regional VS. The regional VS in *Galicia* had provided checklists for carrying out the inspections, whereas this was not the case in *Castilla La Mancha*. Various reports were made available to the mission team in both markets dealing with shortcomings encountered, which were usually about insufficient identification, insufficient health or transport certificates. Few reports dealt directly with animal welfare. No sanctions had been initiated in relation to animal welfare.

5.3.2. Checks at slaughterhouses

Although there were no instructions directly related to animal welfare, according to a representative of the CA, all veterinarians had been informed verbally about animal welfare by their hierarchy. Written instructions, which had been given to the official veterinarians, focused on animal health and identification and on public health matters. In the bigger slaughterhouses, the management had established an internal quality control system, but animal welfare was only marginally covered. The checks on live animals reflected the priority established in the instructions. Two OVs stated that, due to the pressures of their work, priority was given to public health. According to a representative of CA, the Agriculture department officials *of one AR* had carried out checks of animal welfare on one occasion in one of the visited slaughterhouse.

5.3.2.1.Means of transport at slaughterhouses

The overall standard of the vehicles was generally good. However, the equipment and the conditions of the trucks were not checked in the abattoirs visited. Problems were seen in relation to unloading, e.g. vehicle ramps were often too short and steep and sometimes slippery. Facilities for unloading the animals were not always adequate.

- During unloading, there were often a high step forcing animals to jump from the ramp of the trucks.
- Lateral protection was not always in place or was not used if present. This resulted in a pig jumping and escaping from the unloading area. Regarding another truck without lateral protection, an official veterinarian stated that an official report had been drawn up but that no deadline had been given for the correction of this deficiency.
- During unloading of cattle the official veterinarian did not comment on the lack of lateral protection.

5.3.2.2.Fitness of animals at slaughterhouses

All animals arriving at the slaughterhouses were accompanied by a certificate of health and a declaration concerning freedom from harmful residues. Both the certificate and the declaration are normally issued by a private veterinarian. Although the majority of animals seen were fit for transport, the mission team saw evidence that some injured animals were transported:

- One pig had a severely injured leg and was unable to stand. The veterinarian decided to kill this animal on the spot. The machinery to hang the stunned pig did not work and the bleeding was performed with the animal on the floor.
- In another abattoir, several cows in a pen were in a very poor state, some cachectic, others with swollen limbs. The official veterinarian explained that such animals should not have been transported in that state. These casualty animals were killed at the end of the day. This would not comply with point 6 of Annex A of Council Directive 93/119/EC, which requires such animals to be killed after a maximum delay of two hours. The official veterinarian reported that the post-mortem inspection revealed septicaemia, abscesses and cachexia.
- PM records in one slaughterhouse revealed that unfit animals arrive frequently. In these cases, animals unable to stand or with cachexia were not considered suitable for this abattoir and were subsequently re-transported to another slaughterhouse. Official reports regarding these cases were sent to the CICRE (*Centro Integral Control Residuos Encefalopatias*) in Chantada, Lugo. According to the representatives of the region, it was decided, during the BSE crisis, that animals which were not 100% healthy, should be sent to a special slaughterhouse for ease of

monitoring.⁹ The re-transport of any unfit animal would be a further non-compliance with point 6 of Annex A of Council Directive 93/119/EC.

An official veterinarian declared that an animal with a broken leg was fit for transport. In no cases had there been a follow-up action, such as an investigation of the circumstances at the place of departure, or sanctions imposed for cases of transport of an unfit animal.

5.3.2.3. Handling of animals and facilities at slaughterhouse

Handling of animals was appropriate, and no mistreatment of animals was seen in the lairages during the visits. In general, the facilities were satisfactory. The lairages seen in use were appropriate for the number of animals, and provided adequate ventilation and protection from adverse weather. There was also sufficient light for inspection and the floors were not slippery. In the four slaughterhouses visited, water was always available. The following deficiencies were, however, noted:

- In one slaughterhouse in *Galicia* part of the lairage (not used at the time of the visit) was outdoors and would therefore not guarantee adequate protection against adverse weather.¹⁰
- Feeding and bedding were not always given to animals remaining in the slaughterhouses more than 12 hours or overnight.
- In one slaughterhouse in *Galicia* some of the corridors had floors, which were not completely smooth, and metallic rings protruded from the walls. Both of these could be the cause of injuries to the animals.

No actions had been taken by the CA in relation to these deficiencies.

Restraint of animals prior to stunning was appropriate and particularly in one slaughterhouse, where a mechanical system of restraint was used, this was very effective. The stunning equipment seen functioned correctly in the slaughterhouses visited, with the following exceptions:

- In one slaughterhouse, three out of six bovine animals had to be stunned a second time because the captive bolt pistol was placed in the wrong position.
- In all slaughterhouses, the back-up electrical equipment had either no displays of voltage or impedance or lacked acoustic or visible signal to indicate its functioning, which does not comply with the requirements of Annex C of Council Directive 93/119/EC.

⁹ *In the response to the draft report, the CA of Galicia stated that unfit animals have only been retransported to a second slaughterhouse in those cases when the animals presented symptoms which made a special study necessary in order to eliminate any risk of BSE.*

¹⁰ *In the response to the draft report, it is mentioned that the premises of one slaughterhouse in Galicia without protection against adverse weather had only been used last year and only for a brief period due to overstocking arising during the BSE crisis.*

The official veterinarians had not taken any action to solve these problems. A representative of the CA explained that the first failure was due to the nervousness of the operator, however, such an explanation may also indicate that the operator was not accustomed to being supervised carrying out this task.

5.3.2.4. Documentary checks in slaughterhouses

In all slaughterhouses, ante-mortem and post-mortem registers had been completed and in one slaughterhouse, data to ensure traceability was entered in a computer and sent to the CA. A representative of the CA indicated that negative findings would be transmitted to the district level. According to the official veterinarians, when they encounter deficiencies, they usually give verbal rather than written directions to the slaughterhouse management. A few copies of official written reports, which had been sent to the Public Health administration of the AR, concerned animal welfare. The collaboration between public health and agriculture in the ARs was not well established since the few reports from the slaughterhouses regarding unfit animals did not reach the agriculture administration and consequently no action was taken. In one slaughterhouse visited in *Castilla La Mancha*, some reports had been written for severe abuses of animal welfare:

- use of “*puntilla*” for stunning bovines; that is, cutting the spine through the atlanto-occipital space
- sheep slaughtered without stunning
- animals injured during transport.
- In one consignment of 47 cattle, 17 were dead and 3 animals *in extremis* due to the loading density and the transport conditions. An official report had been sent to the regional Health department, but no follow up action had been taken. Representatives of the Agriculture department denied having received this information.

No sanctions had been initiated for any cases directly related to deficiencies concerning animal welfare in any of the slaughterhouses visited.¹¹

6. CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Legislation

The EU legislation has been transposed into Spanish legislation but in most regions, the Spanish legislation does not allow the CA to impose sanctions for breaches of animal

¹¹ *In the response to the draft report, the CA of Castilla la Mancha stated that an economic sanction was imposed on one of the slaughterhouses visited during the mission, due to infractions against animal welfare legislation.*

welfare regulations. This lack of a legal basis for sanctions does not comply with Article 18 of Council Directive 91/628/EEC (as amended).¹²

6.2 Implementation

There is not enough co-operation or communication between the CCA and ARs when establishing targets for inspection, with the result that CCA targets are not always implemented.¹³

Instructions have been given to the local inspectors containing information on animal welfare. However, these instructions do not provide guidance on issues such as fitness for transport. The number of recorded inspections does not represent an adequate sample of consignments as required by Article 8 of Council Directive 91/628/EEC. The recording and reporting of checks of animal welfare during transport were inadequate in the regions visited. It is questionable, therefore, whether the CCA has adequate or reliable information on the checks and actions taken, which must also be reported each year to the Commission (Article 8 of Council Directive 91/628/EEC).

Since the time of departure was not indicated on any documentation accompanying live animals, the CA cannot monitor journey times and therefore Article 4 of Council Directive 91/628/EEC has not been implemented.

6.3 Surveillance

The surveillance of the VS in the field of Animal Welfare is insufficient. The detection of severe deficiencies has not been followed by appropriate action. The ineffectiveness of transport checks also results in vehicles which do not fulfil the necessary requirements to continue operating.¹⁴

The enforcement of animal welfare legislation is one of several tasks assigned to the slaughterhouse inspector. Animal welfare in slaughterhouses is considered by local inspectors to be a low priority, and subsequently, an inadequate number of checks are carried out. Moreover, the failure to share information between the Agriculture and Health Departments contributed to the lack of follow-up in cases where an infraction was detected. The equipment used for stunning, in particular the back up devices, do not always fulfil the requirements of article 6 and Annex C-II of Council Directive 93/119/EC.

The reporting of checks from markets was better organised, however, there was a lack of communication between the different levels of the CA regarding follow-up action. In

¹² *In the response to the draft report, the CCA stated that improvements have been made in the existing legislation at a regional level, and that in most AR the legislation allows an adequate response to infringement of animal welfare rules*

¹³ *In response to the draft report, the CCA stated that a specific board with representatives of CCA and the different ARs has been set up in order to achieve a better and more uniform application of animal welfare legislation.*

¹⁴ *In the response to the draft report the CCA stated that a high number of the trucks seen on the markets carry out only short distance transports, and therefore Council Directive 91/628/EEC cannot be applied to them.*

none of the regions visited had legal sanctions ever been directly applied when EU requirements on animal welfare had not been respected.

6.4 Overall assessment of competent authority

Among the various responsibilities of the CA, there has been a failure to implement an adequate level of control because of the low priority given to animal welfare. Although the local inspectors were usually skilled and capable, when infringements have been detected, there has been a lack of follow up. There has been no progress with enforcement since the previous mission 1104/2000 on the same subject. The recommendation to transpose the necessary legislation, which was made in the previous mission report, is therefore repeated.

7. CLOSING MEETING

A closing meeting was held on the 11th of April 2002 with a representative of the CCA. At this meeting, the mission team presented the main findings and conclusions. The representative of the CCA generally accepted the findings and promised detailed comments to the draft report.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1. To the central competent authorities of Spain

The competent Authorities are requested to inform the Commission Services of the actions taken and planned to address the following recommendations and to provide a timetable for the completion of these actions. This should be done within 1 month of receipt of the final mission report. The competent authority should ensure that:

1 – In all regions, checks are carried out on an adequate sample of animals transported each year, as required by Article 8 of both Council Directive 91/628/EEC and Council Directive 93/119/EC.

2 – All parts of Council Directive 91/628/EEC are transposed and applicable throughout Spain, in particular provisions for penalising infringements as laid down in Article 18.

3 – All the animal welfare requirements and provisions of Council Directive 93/119/EC are effectively respected during the slaughtering of animals, in particular that stunning equipment is appropriate and used according to Articles 4, 5 and 6 of Council Directive 93/119/EC.

4 – There is improved co-ordination between the Health and the Agriculture Departments in implementing EU requirements on animal welfare.

5 – Means of transport comply with Council Directive 91/628/EEC (as amended).

6 – There is a system in place to ensure that all animals are accompanied by documentation, which indicates the date and time of departure (Article 4 of Council Directive 91/628/EEC as amended).

7 – Only animals which are fit for the intended journey are transported in compliance with Article 3 of Council Directive 91/628/EEC and Article 12 of Council Directive 93/119/EC. In particular, unfit or slightly unfit animals, which arrive at one slaughterhouse, should not be re-transported to another slaughterhouse.

8 – Take measures to ensure that inspecting veterinarians receive adequate supervision, information, training or other forms of support to assist them in assessing all the requirements of Council Directive 91/628/EEC and Council Directive 93/119/EC.

9 – Each AR has a system for reporting the results of checks and actions taken, so that the requirements of Article 8 of Council Directive 91/628/EEC are respected.

8.2. To the Commission Services

To take into consideration that there has been no progress since the previous mission with reference to the matters at issue in the current infringement proceedings against the Kingdom of Spain, in relation to the failure to transpose Article 18 of Council Directive 91/628/EC concerning sanctions into Spanish legislation and in relation to the failure to implement adequate controls for animal welfare during transport.

ADDENDUM

Competent Authority response to the recommendations in the draft report

1. To improve the controls to be carried out over an adequate sample of the transported animals, the Conference on Animal Welfare shall prepare an updated Protocol of Inspection. This Conference, including representatives of all ARs, shall take place in September.

2. A national Law on Infractions in Farming and in Agriculture is being drafted, including specific sanctions for infringement to animal welfare rules. This Law possibly could come into force by 2003.

3. & 4. In the next Co-ordination Conference, with representatives from the Agriculture department of all AR, it shall be studied how to improve animal welfare conditions in slaughterhouses, taking into account the competencies of the Health department. These recommendations will be also sent to the Ministry of Health, and subsequently to the Health departments of the different AR.

5. In the new Protocol of inspection to be set up, a new procedure for the authorisation of vehicles transporting animals, and the eventual renewal of this authorisation will be adopted in consultation with the ARs.

6. About the need of including date and time of departure in documentation accompanying animals, this subject will be raised in the next Co-ordination Conference.

7. In the new version of the Protocol of inspection, it shall be the concept of “fit for transport” shall be defined and clarified.
8. During 2002, a new course shall be organised in order to train police agents doing road checks on animal welfare issues. Another course, focusing specifically on animal welfare, shall be organised for the officials of the AR during 2003.
9. A new system for recording and sending to the CA the relevant data of checks carried out and the follow up action eventually taken, shall be included in the aforementioned Protocol of inspection.