



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

DG(SANCO)/7548/2005 – MR Final

FINAL REPORT OF A MISSION  
CARRIED OUT IN SPAIN  
FROM 28 FEBRUARY TO 4 MARCH 2005  
CONCERNING ANIMAL WELFARE FOR PIGS  
AND LAYING HENS



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

*This report provides the outcome of a mission carried out by the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) in Spain between 28 February and 4 March 2005.*

*The objective of the mission was to evaluate the implementation of EU legislation regarding the welfare of pigs and laying hens and in particular to provide an update on actions taken in response to previous FVO recommendations concerning animal welfare.*

*Although central level has acted in a constructive way to deal with FVO recommendations, actions to address deficiencies detected during previous FVO missions have been slow and inadequate. In those regions where an adequate legal basis exists to impose sanctions, there is a very low level of enforcement, indicating a general lack of will at regional level to ensure that EU animal welfare requirements are respected. In other regions, where there is still an inadequate legal basis to impose sanctions despite the repeated provision of guarantees by the Spanish authority that steps were being taken to address this issue.*

*The report makes a number of recommendations addressed to the Spanish competent authorities, aimed at rectifying the identified shortcomings.*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2.	OBJECTIVES .....	1
3.	BACKGROUND.....	2
	3.1. Legal situation .....	2
	3.2. Previous missions on pigs and laying hens .....	2
4.	LEGAL BASIS FOR THE MISSION.....	3
5.	MAIN FINDINGS.....	3
	5.1. Legislation .....	3
	5.2. Competent Authority .....	3
	5.3. Information to the pig and laying hen sectors .....	4
	5.4. Inspection programme .....	4
	5.5. Checks of holdings with pigs .....	5
	5.6. Checks of holdings with laying hens.....	6
6.	CONCLUSIONS .....	7
	6.1. Legislation .....	7
	6.2. Competent Authority .....	8
	6.3. Information to the pig and laying hen sectors .....	8
	6.4. Checks on holdings with pigs.....	8
	6.5. Checks on holdings with laying hens .....	8
	6.6. Overall conclusion.....	9
7.	CLOSING MEETING.....	9
8.	RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COMPETENT AUTHORITIES OF SPAIN .....	10
9.	ADDENDUM TO MISSION REPORT DG(SANCO)/7548/2005 .....	10

## ABBREVIATIONS & SPECIAL TERMS USED IN THE REPORT

Artt.	Articles in legislative texts
CA	Competent Authority (regional level)
CCA	Competent Authority (central level)
EEC	European Economic Community
EC	European Community
EU	European Union
FVO	Food and Veterinary Office
REGA	Register of livestock holdings ( <i>Registro General de Explotaciones Ganaderas</i> )

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The mission took place in Spain from 28 February to 4 March 2005, as part of the planned mission programme of the Food and Veterinary office (FVO).

The mission team comprised two inspectors from the FVO and one other official from the General Directorate for Health and Consumer Protection, and was accompanied during the whole mission by a representative from the central competent authority (CCA), the Ministry of Agriculture, Fishery and Food.

An opening meeting was held on 28 February with the CCA and representatives from the Spanish Agency for Food Safety. At this meeting, the objectives of, and itinerary for, the mission were confirmed by the inspection team, and additional information required for the satisfactory completion of the mission requested.

## 2. OBJECTIVES

The objective of the mission was to evaluate the implementation of EU legislation regarding the welfare of pigs and laying hens, in particular to provide an update on actions taken in response to previous FVO recommendations concerning animal welfare. This concerned the measures in place to give effect to:

- (a) Council Directive 91/630/EEC<sup>1,2</sup>
- (b) Council Directive 99/74/EC<sup>3</sup>
- (c) Commission Decision 2000/50/EC<sup>4</sup>.

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

VISITS			Comments
Competent authority	Central level	2	Opening and closing meetings
	Regional level	2	A meeting with representatives from the regional Ministry of Agriculture and Food, General Directorate of Food, Service of Regulations and Animal Health in Aragon.  A meeting with representatives from the regional Ministry of Agriculture and Water, General Directorate of Livestock and Fisheries in Murcia, where documentation from previous checks was reviewed.
	Local level	1	A meeting in Aragon, where documentation relevant to previous checks was reviewed.
Farms		4	One laying hen farm (caged systems) and one pig farm in each region.

---

<sup>1</sup> Legal acts quoted in this report refer, where applicable, to the last amended version.

<sup>2</sup> Council Directive 91/630/EEC of 19 November 1991, laying down minimum standards for the protection of pigs, OJ L 340 of 11.12.1991, p.33-38, as amended (hereafter: Directive 91/630/EEC).

<sup>3</sup> Council Directive 1999/74/EC of 19 July 1999, laying down minimum standards for the protection of laying hens, OJ L 203, 3.8.1999, p.53 (hereafter: Directive 99/74/EC).

<sup>4</sup> Commission Decision 2000/50/EC of 17 December 1999 concerning minimum requirements for the inspection of holdings on which animals are kept for farming purposes, OJ L 19, 25.01.2000, p. 51 (hereafter: Decision 2000/50/EC)

### **3. BACKGROUND**

#### **3.1. Legal situation**

Transposition of the relevant EU texts into national legislation is done nationally through a series of Royal Decrees. However, this leaves certain measures, including sanctions, to be adopted by each region, and here there is a range in the level of transposition. A recommendation to close this legal gap was made in each of the past five FVO mission reports on animal welfare in Spain<sup>5</sup>. In response to recommendations the CCA indicated:

- Following report 1104/2000, that Article 12 of Royal Decree 1041/1997 of 27 June 1997 on animal welfare during transport provides for penalties for non-compliance to be imposed in accordance with the legislation. The regions that have no specific legislation to actually impose sanctions for animal welfare infringements can have recourse to the provisions of the “Fiscal, Administrative and Social Order Measures Act 50/1998” of 30 December 1998, which allows prosecution of various forms of social misconduct<sup>6</sup>.
- Following report 3344/2001, that they, together with the regions, are studying the possibility for a law on animal welfare, including provisions for penalties, which would be applicable throughout Spain.
- Following report 8553/2002, that a national “Law on Infractions in Farming and in Agriculture” is being drafted, and would include specific sanctions for animal welfare infringements.
- Following report 9215/2003, that on 3 April 2004, a compendium of all the legislation of the Autonomous Communities on animal welfare was sent to the Commission's legal services.
- Following report 7230/2004, that all outstanding recommendations from FVO animal welfare missions since 2001 (including the inadequate legal basis in certain regions) are included in an action plan being discussed with the regions.

#### **3.2. Previous missions on pigs and laying hens**

Mission 3344/2001 included the protection of pigs and laying hens and concluded that the inspections seen were carried out in a competent way; however, from the results of previous inspections there was a lack of adequate follow-up when infringements were detected. In response to the

---

<sup>5</sup> See reports: DG(SANCO)/1104/2000 concerning animal transportation and staging points; DG(SANCO)/3344/2001 concerning pigs, calves and laying hens; DG(SANCO)/8553/2002 concerning animal welfare during transport and at the time of slaughter; DG(SANCO)/9215/2003 on animal welfare during transport and at the time of slaughter; and DG(SANCO)/7230/2004 concerning laying hens and long distance transport, on website [http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fvo/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/food/fvo/index_en.htm) (hereafter: reports 1104/2000; 3344/2001; 8553/2002; 9215/2003; 7230/2004).

<sup>6</sup> No region visited in any of the FVO missions ever cited this Act regarding sanctioning procedures.

recommendations in this report the CCA indicated that these issues would be addressed through a co-ordination conference with the regions.

Conclusions in report 7230/2004, on the welfare of laying hens, which were based on the three farms visited, indicated that certain requirements were inconsistently checked due to a lack of uniform guidelines.

#### **4. LEGAL BASIS FOR THE MISSION**

The mission was carried out under the general provisions of Community legislation and, in particular, Artt. 9 of Directives 99/74/EC and 91/630/EEC, Article 7 of Council Directive 98/58/EC<sup>7</sup> and Commission Decision 98/139/EC<sup>8</sup>.

#### **5. MAIN FINDINGS**

##### **5.1. Legislation**

Apart from administrative provisions including sanctions, EU requirements have been transposed into Spanish national legislation by Royal Decrees. The national law on infractions in farming and in agriculture, which was proposed following reports 8553/2002, 9215/2003 and 7230/2004 to fill this gap, has not been forthcoming. The CCA indicated that owing to the change of Government in March 2004, this issue, although part of the ruling party's electoral promises, remains pending.

Self-assessments by all 17 regions of their legal transposition of Article 11 of Directive 91/630/EEC and Article 13(1) of Directive 99/74/EC indicates that one, *Navarra*, has a reference to the relevant EU Directive or was accompanied by such a reference at the time of publication, as required. The inspection team noted that the only fine imposed for infringements in either the pig or laying hen sectors in Spain in 2003, was a case from *Navarra*.

The two regions visited on this mission were Aragon and Murcia. Aragon had previously been visited during mission 9215/2003 and, has an adequate legal basis to impose sanctions. Murcia had never been visited in the context of animal welfare and there is no legal basis to impose sanctions.

##### **5.2. Competent Authority**

The Sub-Directorate General for Regulation and Good Animal Husbandry of the Ministry of Agriculture, Fishery and Food is the central level for animal welfare. Responsibilities of the CCA are described in report 3344/2001. Despite repeated requests, the CCA did not provide any action plan following mission 3344/2001. Through recent action plans, however, the CCA have adopted a more coordinated and comprehensive approach: issues

---

<sup>7</sup> Council Directive 98/58/EC of 20 July 1998 concerning the protection of animals kept for farming purposes, OJ L 221 of 8.8.98, p. 23 (hereafter: Directive 98/58/EC).

<sup>8</sup> 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 States, OJ L 38 of 12.02.1998, p. 10.

are addressed to all the regions, including those not visited, and all outstanding recommendations since 2001 form part of the on-going discussions with the regions at the regular co-ordination meetings.

The following training has taken place:

- A two-day course in October 2004, which included welfare on farm, was attended by representatives from 14 regions. The approach adopted “training for trainers”, was to provide a framework programme to be developed accordingly by each region.
- In Aragon general courses on animal welfare, which included reference to farms for pigs and laying hens, have been provided to officials in 2004.
- In Murcia training was organised in 2004 on the welfare requirements in pig farms and further courses are organised for the current year. In addition, experts from regional level will accompany local inspectors during at least one inspection in 2005 to ensure uniform criteria and methods are adopted.

### **5.3. Information to the pig and laying hen sectors**

In Aragon, information on the minimum standards and their applicable dates had been provided to both sectors. Some training courses to farmers had been organised by the agricultural associations, but this was not provided in a structured way which would meet the requirements of Article 5(a) of Directive 91/630/EEC.

In Murcia, letters on the requirements and deadlines had been sent to all laying hen farmers. Both sectors had also been informed on the possibility of funding their participation in training courses on animal welfare. Training to stockpersons, including aspects of animal welfare, was available through an Agricultural college in this region.

### **5.4. Inspection programme**

In response to a recommendation in report 3344/2001, the CCA indicated that this would be addressed in a meeting to be held with the autonomous regions at the end of 2002. Subsequently in 2003, a target of 5% of all farms was proposed, with certain farms targeted and the remainder selected randomly. Further CCA guidance in 2005 suggested selecting farms on the basis of the date of construction or refurbishment of the buildings, in order to verify compliance with requirements which entered into force in 2003.

In both regions visited, a number of checks were performed on the basis of an “integrated environmental authorisation” implementing regional legislation from 2002. Animal welfare aspects were integrated into these environmental inspections.

In Aragon, inspection targets had been set at 5% of pig farms and 100% of laying hen farms. 6.6% of pig farms and 82% of laying hen farms were checked in 2003 and 5.7% of pig farms and 45.5% of laying hen farms in 2004. The CA instruction also indicated a procedure to follow where



deficiencies were detected and requested a quarterly summary of the results of inspections. Deadlines applicable to the pig and laying hen sectors were also highlighted.

In Murcia the inspection target was 5% of all farms. This was met in 2003 and exceeded for laying hen farms in both 2003 and 2004. There was a shortfall concerning pigs in 2004 as resources were dedicated to dealing with outbreaks of bluetongue. In 2004, the CA improved the checklist used and targeted those farms where serious deficiencies were found for re-inspection in 2005.

## **5.5. Checks of holdings with pigs**

In response to recommendations in report 3344/2001 to ensure that tail docking and tooth clipping of pigs is only carried out where it is justified and to ensure that sick or injured animals receive appropriate care, the CCA indicated that relevant training courses aimed at both veterinarians and persons within the industry have taken place and further training is being organised. A draft document on mutilations, based on recommendations from the Council of Europe, is in preparation.

The report from Spain for 2003, which was sent to the Commission according to Decision 2000/50/EC, indicates that advice was provided in all cases where infringements were detected.

In Aragon, data provided to the inspection team indicated that six infringements had been detected in 2003. However, the report according to Decision 2000/50/EC, which had been made earlier, indicated 81 infringements on the 313 farms checked. All the cases reported in the second summary concerned lack of farm records, which is also a focus of animal health controls, and were sent to the provincial legal service to open proceedings.

On the farm visited in Aragon, a previous inspection had been carried out in November 2003 when absence of alarm, inadequate flooring and fittings and lack of manipulative material had been noted. These problems had not been resolved. Similar deficiencies had been found on other farms and there was also a lack of follow-up action. The regional CA had not provided any written guidance on dealing with such infringements. A representative of the regional CA indicated that it was delegated to the private veterinarian to deal with the provision of manipulative material and that it was up to the farmer to consider appropriate surveillance of automatic equipment. However, EU legislation requires Member States to ensure that requirements such as an alarm for ventilation systems (point 13 of the Annex to Directive 98/58/EC) and the provision of manipulative material (Chapter I (4) of the Annex to Directive 91/630/EEC) are respected.

In Murcia, the report according to Decision 2000/50/EC for 2003 did not correspond with data available in the region. Out of the 27 infringements reported, there were no details available for the two cases of overstocking. There were improvements in document management and follow-up regarding cases from 2004. A letter had been sent imposing deadlines for corrective action in four cases where overstocking had been detected. The

farm visited had been previously inspected in June 2004; however, the problems remained to be corrected. In relation to castration, which had been carried out on this farm without anaesthetic or analgesic after the 7<sup>th</sup> day of life, the farmer claimed this was now in line with requirements. However, intact males, older than two weeks, were in pens with castrated piglets and would have to be re-grouped for the fattening phase, which does not comply with requirements to ensure as little mixing of groups as possible (Directive 91/630/EEC, Annex, Chapter II, D.2).

In Murcia, multiple deficiencies, including the state of maintenance and overstocking, were detected on a farm in July 2004. A letter was issued in September 2004 giving a three-month deadline for correction. A revisit was made on 3.2.2005 when the problems were found not to have been corrected and overstocking had increased. This case finally resulted in a decision on 28.2.05 (the first day of the mission) to suspend the farm's approval for three months. The farm could continue to sell to the slaughterhouse but could not buy in any more pigs during this period. The legal basis, which was not directly linked to animal welfare legislation, was a regulation on the operation of pig holdings.

## **5.6. Checks of holdings with laying hens**

In response to a recommendation in report 7230/2004, the CCA indicated that more detailed guidance on the interpretation of the requirements of Directive 1999/74/EC would be provided. However, this was limited to the provision of a general framework for inspections and distribution of information provided by the Commission services and, apart from checklists, no written guidance was available in either region visited.

In response to a recommendation in report 7230/2004 regarding the registration of holdings, the CCA indicated that the General Register of Livestock Holdings (REGA, *Registro General de Explotaciones Ganaderas*) had been implemented throughout the national territory. However, in neither of the regions visited was it possible to access this database. The database could be consulted at central level and provided all the information required by Directive 2002/4/EC<sup>9</sup>.

The report for Spain for 2003 (Decision 2000/50/EC), indicates that advice was provided in all except two of the cases where infringements had been detected. The two cases were from Aragon, and concerned unenriched cages installed after the ban (1.1.2003). Approval to operate had been refused. A similar case in Murcia in 2003 again resulted in approval not being granted.

The report from Aragon for 2003 (Decision 2000/50/EC), did not correspond to data available in the region. The report indicated 28 infringements, three of which were for lack of "freedom of movement", but data provided in the region indicated a total of four infringements, all of which were in relation to lack of "freedom of movement".

---

<sup>9</sup> Commission Directive 2002/4/EC of 30 January 2002 on the registration of establishments keeping laying hens, covered by Council Directive 1999/74/EC, OJ L30 of 31.1.2002, p. 44.

In Aragon, 8% of farms checked in 2003 and 2004 were found to be overstocked. Such cases had been referred to the legal service of the provincial CA, but without any subsequent action taken. The farm visited was randomly selected by the FVO team. This was stocked with 25% too many birds and the cages had an excessive slope; both of these findings would represent non-compliance with previous EU requirements in force since 1988. Although this had been previously detected by the CA, no corrective action had been taken. This farm had been inspected in the framework of the integrated environmental authorisation and approved by the CA in June 2004.

The report from Murcia for 2003 again did not correspond to data available in the region. The report indicated 2 infringements, one for lack of farm records and the other for deficiencies in relation to breeding procedures, but no details of these infringements were available in the region. In 2004, 30% of farms checked were overstocked and have been scheduled for a follow-up visit in 2005. The farm visited was again randomly selected by the FVO team and had been approved by the CA in 2002. This was the first time it had been checked in detail on the basis of animal welfare requirements and the inspector concluded that it did not comply with either stocking density (20% too many birds) or slope requirements. The inspection team noted that several movement notifications indicated that too many birds had been introduced, but such cross-checking of movement notifications against farm capacity was not carried out by the CA.

In both regions, not all buildings were checked at each inspection; however, the identification of the building where deficiencies were found was not recorded, making it impossible to accurately assess corrective actions at a follow up visit. Inadequacies in checklists meant that in 2003 stocking density was not assessed in Murcia and the questionnaire design gave rise to incorrect slope of the cage being overlooked in Aragon.

Forced moulting had been detected in Murcia and records on the farm visited in Aragon indicated that a stressor, such as would occur with forced moulting, was causing mortality rate to increase from 0.3% a week to 1.2% a week, 13 months after the introduction of the birds. The overall mortality rate was c. 25% over the 19 month laying period. Spent hens were sent from this farm to The Netherlands and the CA accepted the owner's statement that transport time would be c. 8 hours; whereas a conservative estimate is that it would take at least 14 hours and would not therefore comply with Chapter II of the Annex to Directive 91/628/EEC<sup>10</sup>.

## **6. CONCLUSIONS**

### **6.1. Legislation**

- 1) Despite repeated proposals by the CCA, there is still no law applicable throughout Spain for sanctioning infringements for animal welfare.

---

<sup>10</sup> Council Directive 91/628/EEC of 19 November 1991 on the protection of animals during transport and amending Directives 90/425/EEC and 91/496/EEC, OJ L 340 of 11.12.1991, p. 17.

Although administrative measures on the basis of other legislation could be used to impose penalties this is rarely used.

- 2) There is a wide variation in the transposition of Article 11 of Directive 91/630/EEC and Article 13(1) of Directive 99/74/EC by the regions, with only one of the seventeen reporting a correct transposition.

## **6.2. Competent Authority**

- 1) Although central level have adopted a more coordinated and comprehensive approach to respond to FVO recommendations than was previously the case, the structure is such that implementation of proposals to address these recommendations is slow and often incomplete.
- 2) Regional CAs generally perform an advisory role when deficiencies are detected and sanctions are not applied even when these are available. This is frequently ineffective in obtaining compliance in a reasonable timeframe. In addition, data on the results of inspections (Article 6 of Directive 98/58/EC and Decision 2000/50/EC) provided from the regions to the central level and subsequently to the European Commission are inaccurate and inconsistent.

## **6.3. Information to the pig and laying hen sectors**

- 1) Central level has been involved in raising the awareness of both sectors on animal welfare issues.
- 2) Regarding specific training required by Article 5(a) of Directive 91/630/EEC, there was such a structure in place in Murcia for training pig farmers but not in Aragon.

## **6.4. Checks on holdings with pigs**

- 1) In Aragon, there was a general procedure to follow when infringements were detected, but the CA did not have a consistent position on when to classify a deficiency as an infringement. Follow-up action was also inadequately managed as the regional level had not accepted the responsibility to enforce many of the requirements, resulting in cases referred to the legal service being more concerned with ensuring animal health requirements rather than animal welfare.
- 2) In Murcia, although reports and results of inspections were inadequately managed in 2003, improvements have been made in reporting the results of inspections. Although there is an inadequate legal basis for sanctioning animal welfare infringements in this region, the CA have performed follow-up visits, albeit not always in a timely fashion, and for serious deficiencies other administrative means to deal with serious cases, have been tried very recently for the first time.

## **6.5. Checks on holdings with laying hens**

- 1) Guarantees given following report 7230/2004 and at the opening meeting that a national database for registration of holdings was in place, were premature. This database should soon be fully operational.

- 2) Due to the division of responsibilities, detailed guidance is left to regional level and in neither region visited was this sufficient to allow an inspector to fully evaluate all requirements. A recommendation to this effect in relation to Directive 99/74/EC in report 7230/2004 has therefore not yet been adequately addressed.
- 3) Inconsistencies in the methods used for measuring cages and floor slope, which was a conclusion in report 7230/2004 have still not been adequately addressed. As a result, measurements of floor slope were not reliable. Although measurements of cage area were adequately performed, in neither region was either the system of farm approval or information provided on birds delivered, adequately used to ensure that stocking densities were respected.
- 4) In tolerating the practice of forced moulting, the CA does not take account of points 11, 14, 15 and 16 of the Annex to Directive 98/58/EC and Article 3 of Directive 99/74/EC, which makes such a practice contrary to EU law.
- 5) The failure to record which deficiencies correspond to which flock and in which building, make re-assessment at follow-up visits difficult where the enterprise consists of more than one flock/building.
- 6) Although both CAs did not grant approval where unenriched cages were introduced after the ban, cases concerning gross overstocking referred to the legal service did not result in any penalties.
- 7) The CA does not independently evaluate travelling times for species such as poultry, for which no route plan has to be submitted, and as a result the maximum journey time laid down in Chapter II of the Annex to Directive 91/628/EEC is not respected.

## **6.6. Overall conclusion**

Although central level has acted in a constructive way to deal with FVO recommendations, actions to address deficiencies detected during previous FVO missions have been slow and inadequate. In those regions where an adequate legal basis exists to impose sanctions, there is a very low level of enforcement, indicating a general lack of will at regional level to ensure that EU animal welfare requirements are respected. In other regions, where there is still an inadequate legal basis to impose sanctions despite the repeated provision of guarantees by the Spanish authority that steps were being taken to address this issue.

## **7. CLOSING MEETING**

A closing meeting was held on 4 March 2005 with the CCA. At this meeting, the main findings and conclusions were presented by the inspection team. The CCA indicated that such missions were helpful to assist them in finding out what was going on in the regions and to orientate their work accordingly. They also indicated that neither they, nor the regional level, liked the format for reporting the results of inspections provided in either Decision 2000/50/EC or in Article 8 of Directive 91/628/EEC, concerning transport.

## **8. RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE 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 one month of receipt of the final mission report.

- 1) Provide a timescale for the entry into force of a law, applicable throughout Spain, for sanctioning infringements for EU animal welfare requirements. Alternatively, provide, in tabular form, the laws in each of the 17 Autonomous Communities, which in combination with the existing national legislation, will ensure a sufficient legal basis as required by Article 11 of Directive 91/630/EEC and Article 13(1) of Directive 99/74/EC, with a timescale for their entry into force, as appropriate.
- 2) Ensure that training courses are available for pig farmers as required by Article 5(a) of Directive 91/630/EEC.
- 3) Ensure that comprehensive guidance is provided on checking the requirements of Directive 91/630/EEC in particular those introduced by amendments in 2001.
- 4) Ensure that comprehensive guidance is provided on checking the requirements of Directive 99/74/EC, as previously recommended in report 7230/2004, in particular on determining the maximum capacity for each building and the slope of cages.
- 5) Ensure that when a deficiency in relation to EU requirements is detected:
  - a. The details of the infringement are adequately recorded including, where Directive 99/74/EC is applicable, the precise location of the flock.
  - b. As previously recommended in report 3344/2001, that effective follow-up action is undertaken in as short a time frame as possible. In particular, urgent action should be taken to address problems with overstocking of laying hens.
  - c. All infringements in relation to EU minimum standards are reliably reported (Article 6 of Directive 98/58/EC and Decision 2000/50/EC).
- 6) Ensure that travelling times for poultry meet the maximum journey time laid down in Chapter II of the Annex to Directive 91/628/EEC. In particular, in the case of spent hens, further consideration should be given regarding their fitness for the intended journey (Article 3 (1)(b) Directive 91/628/EEC).

---

## **9. ADDENDUM TO MISSION REPORT DG(SANCO)/7548/2005**

In their comments on a draft version of this report the central competent authority indicated:

(1) In relation to recommendation 1, that in reply to three motions by political groups, the legal service of the Department is preparing a draft bill concerning animal protection, which it hopes to be present to the Parliament by the end of 2005.

(2) In reply to recommendation 2, a document concerning training has been prepared and will be discussed at the co-ordination meeting with the Autonomous Communities on 21 June 2005. In Aragon a draft bill concerning standardisation of training courses has been prepared.

(3) In relation to recommendation 3, that the various technical aspects of animal welfare legislation will be dealt with at the meeting of 21 June 2005. The creation of specific working groups for the preparation of guidelines to harmonise animal welfare inspection procedures, for each of the farming species, will be proposed.

(4) In reply to recommendation 4, that a working group on the checklist for farm inspections was held during the training course "Minimum requirements for the protection of domestic poultry" (9-11 May 2005). Again this will be discussed at the meeting of 21 June 2005.

(5) In relation to recommendations 5 and 6, in order to find solutions to such issues, a distinction will be made between the FVO recommendations referring to specific deficiencies and those deficiencies related to working methods. Again these are for discussion on 21 June 2005 and the CCA believe that the achievement of a national legislation will improve the current situation.