



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

DG(SANCO) 2009-8243 - MR FINAL

FINAL REPORT OF A SPECIFIC AUDIT
CARRIED OUT IN
GREECE
FROM 16 TO 20 NOVEMBER 2009
IN ORDER TO EVALUATE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CONTROLS FOR ANIMAL
WELFARE ON FARMS
IN THE CONTEXT OF A GENERAL AUDIT

Executive Summary

This report describes the outcome of a specific audit carried out by the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) in Greece, from 16 to 20 November 2009.

The objective of the mission was to verify that official controls are carried out in accordance with the multi-annual national control plan (MANCP) referred to in Article 41 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 and in compliance with Community law. In addition, the audit sought to specifically verify the implementation of EU animal welfare legislation concerning farms, and to follow up certain recommendations from FVO report 2007-7244.

The report concludes that although the CCA has taken steps to ensure that inspections are carried out by the local CAs to verify that the minimum standards are met, the implementation by the local CAs was still insufficient and sometimes completely lacking. Reporting to the CCA concerning the inspections performed and their results is inconsistent and in some cases unreliable. Regarding laying hens, although instructions and check-lists issued by the CCA were overall adequate, these were insufficient regarding the correct calculation of the maximum capacity of holdings with laying hens and which led to insufficient cage area provided. In addition non-compliant cages continue to be used. Some of these were installed after the ban of 1.1.2003 and some were already in place for many years earlier. Concerning pigs, insufficient attention was given to certain important requirements, such as the provision of material for investigation and manipulation, the measures to avoid routine mutilations, the maintenance of mortality records and the arrangements for killing sick or injured animals on the spot. The recommendations from previous report 2007-7244 have not been addressed or fully addressed.

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

Table of Contents

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 1 | <u>INTRODUCTION</u> | 1 |
| 2 | <u>OBJECTIVES OF THE MISSION</u> | 1 |
| 3 | <u>LEGAL BASIS FOR THE MISSION</u> | 1 |
| 4 | <u>BACKGROUND</u> | 2 |
| 5 | <u>FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS</u> | 2 |
| 5.1 | <u>ANIMAL WELFARE ON FARMS</u> | 2 |
| 5.1.1 | <i><u>FARM INSPECTIONS IN GENERAL</u></i> | 2 |
| 5.1.2 | <i><u>REGISTRATION OF LAYING HEN FARMS</u></i> | 3 |
| 5.1.3 | <i><u>INSPECTIONS OF LAYING HEN FARMS</u></i> | 4 |
| 5.1.4 | <i><u>INSPECTION OF PIG FARMS</u></i> | 7 |
| 6 | <u>OVERALL CONCLUSIONS</u> | 8 |
| 7 | <u>CLOSING MEETING</u> | 8 |
| 8 | <u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u> | 9 |
| | <u>ANNEX 1 - LEGAL REFERENCES</u> | 10 |

ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS USED IN THIS REPORT

| | |
|-------|------------------------------------|
| CA | Competent Authority |
| CCA | Central Competent Authority |
| EC | European Community |
| EU | European Union |
| FVO | Food and Veterinary Office |
| MANCP | Multi Annual National Control Plan |
| OV | Official Veterinarian |

1 INTRODUCTION

The specific audit took place in Greece from 16 to 20 November 2009 as part of the planned mission programme of the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO).

An opening meeting was held with the competent authorities of Greece on 16 November 2009. At this meeting, the objectives of, and itinerary for, the mission were confirmed by the mission team. The mission team comprised two inspectors from the FVO and one National Expert from a Member State and was accompanied throughout the mission by a representative from the Ministry of Rural Development and Food, the Central Competent Authorities (hereafter: CCA).

The Specific Audit formed part of the FVO's planned mission programme and was carried out as a component of a General Audit, as prescribed in Article 45 of 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.

This report focuses on the sector specific issues identified during the audit. It does not necessarily include aspects relating to Regulation (EC) No 882/2004; these aspects will be addressed in the subsequent General Audit report.

2 OBJECTIVES OF THE MISSION

As part of the general audit, the main objective of each specific audit is to verify that official controls are carried out in accordance with the multi-annual national control plan (MANCP) referred to in Article 41 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 and in compliance with Community law. The more specific objectives of the mission were to evaluate the measures taken to implement the requirements for EU legislation for animal welfare on farms. Progress with the implementation of recommendations from previous FVO reports was also assessed.

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

| Visits | | | Comments |
|---------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| Competent authority | Central | 2 | Opening and final meetings |
| | Provincial (Prefecture) | 2 | The Veterinary Directorates of West Attica and Corinthia |
| Farms | | 3 | Two holdings rearing laying hens in unenriched cage systems and one holding rearing pigs for fattening and reproduction. The sites were selected by the inspection team. |

3 LEGAL BASIS FOR THE MISSION

The mission was carried out under the general provisions of Community legislation and in particular Article 45 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules.

Legal acts quoted in this report are provided in Annex 1 and refer, where applicable, to the last

amended version.

4 BACKGROUND

The most recent mission concerning animal welfare on farms in Greece was carried out from 7 to 11 May 2007, the results of which are described in report DG(SANCO)/2007-7244 (hereafter referred as report 2007-7244). The CCA indicated that certain actions had been taken in response to the recommendations, and the effectiveness of several of these actions was assessed during the current mission.

Report 2007-7244 concluded that with the exception of one legislative change, the actions taken by the CCA following the previous mission with the same subject (DG(SANCO)8522/2002) were either inadequate or so recent that they were not yet implemented. Directive 1999/74/EC was transposed into national legislation with an 18 month delay and the registration of farms (Directive 2002/4/EC) had been completed with three and half years' delay. Certain procedures had been issued a few days before the FVO mission. Insufficient staff, lack of training and lack of instructions resulted in a low number and poor quality of inspections. The results of the inspections reported both by Prefectures and by the CCA were unreliable. No enforcement measures were taken when deficiencies were detected. Overstocking (up to 100% in alternative system), lack of claw shortening devices, exceeding floor slope of cages were the main deficiencies detected by the FVO. Additionally, eggs placed on the market were in some cases marked with improper rearing system code.

5 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 ANIMAL WELFARE ON FARMS

5.1.1 Farm inspections in general

Legal requirements

Article 8(1) of Directive 2008/120/EC requires the CA to carry out inspections on a representative sample of the different rearing systems for pigs.

Article 8(1) of Directive 1999/74/EC requires the CA to carry out inspections of laying hen farms.

Article 7(1) of Directive 2008/119/EC requires the CA to carry out inspections on a representative sample of the different rearing systems for calves.

Article of 6(1) of Directive 98/58/EC requires the CA to carry out inspections in holdings with animals kept for farming purposes.

Article 8 of Decision 778/2006/EC requires the CA to report certain information concerning inspections carried out pursuant to the above Directives.

Findings

Report 2007-7244 recommended that the CA should carry out inspections in holdings with pigs and laying hens on the whole territory of Greece. In response to this recommendation, the CCA issued an instruction requesting the PVD to inspect 5% of holdings with pigs and laying hens each year and to ensure that the farms selected for inspections consist of holdings with less than ten sows (20%) and more than ten sows (80%); for laying hens, holdings with conventional battery cages (40%), alternative systems (30%) and enriched cages (30%).

The figures and the different pieces of information provided by the CCA concerning the inspections performed by the local CAs were incoherent. The summary report for 2008 indicates a total of 168 pig holdings inspected, whereas the breakdown of the information provided by 40 local CAs (out of 52 which have holdings with pigs) indicates a total of 192 such holdings. The CCA was not able to calculate whether the overall target was met because the summary report indicates the number of pig holdings selected for inspection instead of the total number of pig holdings in Greece.

Additionally, the feedback of information from the local CAs to the CCA was incomplete. As an example, out of 52 local CAs which have holdings with pigs and 40 which have holdings with laying hens, only 40 and 31 local CAs, respectively, sent their inspection programmes for 2008 and 2009. Two local CAs did not reply on the results of checks on farms performed in 2008 and 31 did not reply regarding checks in 2007. No reply was sent by 11 local CAs on certain specific checks regarding height and slope of unenriched cages for laying hens. 14 local CAs did not reply on checks concerning group housing of sows.

In relation to pig inspections in the two local CAs visited, in West Attica no pig holdings had been inspected in 2008 and one out of seven in 2009. In Corinthia one holding out of 18 was inspected in 2008 and one in 2009, in addition to the follow up of the previous year. In all instances the holdings selected were those with the highest number of animals.

Concerning laying hens, in West Attica 12 holdings out of 188 (6%) were inspected in 2008 but none in 2009. In Corinthia two holdings out of 21 were inspected in 2008 and eight (including two follow-up) were planned for 2009, five of which had already been performed. Different rearing systems had been selected only in Corinthia.

Concerning calves, in Greece in 2008 a total 55 holdings (dairy farms) were inspected. Checks on holdings with calves had not been carried out by the two local CAs visited.

The summary report of the farm inspections performed in 2008 did not provide information concerning checks on species such as adult cattle, sheep, goats, domestic fowls, ratites, ducks, geese, fur animals and turkeys, as required by Decision 778/2006/EC. The CCA explained that such checks are not yet performed. A circular with instructions for reporting such checks using the format laid down in the Annex to Decision 778/2006/EC was sent by the CCA to the local CAs in November 2009.

Conclusions

The CCA has not sufficiently addressed the recommendation of report 2007-7244 concerning inspections on farms to be carried on the whole territory of Greece. In particular, although inspections have been carried in pig, calf and laying hen holdings, the feedback of information from the local CAs to the CCA is still incomplete and inconsistent. As a consequence the information contained in the report to the Commission according to Decision 778/2006/EC is unreliable.

The local CAs visited have not implemented the CCA instructions to inspect different rearing systems, with the only exception of Corinthia and only for laying hens. This does not meet the requirements of Article 8(1) of Directive 2008/120/EC.

In addition, the delayed instruction by the CCA concerning inspections on holdings with species other than pigs, calves and laying hens contributes to the delayed implementation of such checks, and means that their results are unlikely to be available by June 2010 as required by Article 8(1) of Decision 778/2006/EC.

5.1.2 Registration of laying hen farms

Legal requirements

Directive 2002/4/EC requires Member States to establish a system for registering every production site covered by the scope of Directive 1999/74/EC.

Last paragraph of point 1 of the Annex of Directive 2002/4/EC requires the registration of the maximum capacity of an establishment in number of birds present at one time.

Point 2 of the Annex to Directive 2002/4/EC provides that the producer code must be stamped on eggs placed on the market, as laid down in Annex XIV (III)(1) to Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 and Article 9 of Regulation (EC) No 589/2008.

Findings

Report 2007-7244 recommended that all farms are correctly registered and that the register is updated when there are changes to the data, in particular the maximum capacity of the establishment. In response to this recommendation, the CCA instructed the CAs to remind egg producers in writing of their obligation to notify any change of the information registered, in particular concerning the maximum capacity of the holdings and to report the changes to the CCA.

The CCA affirmed that in all Prefectures where there are holdings with laying hens, with the exception of two local CAs which did not reply, the register had been updated for the maximum capacity. In both offices visited the mission team noted that the figures concerning the maximum capacity reported in the register were based on the operators' declaration of the number of birds present, and this was confirmed during the visits to the holdings selected. The CA had not assessed the information provided by the operators, which in all holdings visited proved to be incorrect and which were operating at overstocked levels.

Report 2007-7244 recommended that eggs placed on the market are appropriately marked with the producer code. The CCA indicated that out of 40 local CAs which have laying hen farms, 29 replied that eggs are marked but the remaining 11 did not reply on this issue.

Production sites are currently registered with codes containing either GR or EL for the country code. The CCA explained that following mission 2007/7244 and consultation with their legal service a circular was issued to instruct the local CAs to replace the country code GR with EL. This replacement of codes is being implemented gradually but there is no deadline set in the above circular. In the Prefectures visited a copy of the Prefects' Decisions replacing the producers' code were available both at the offices and the farms.

Conclusions

The recommendation of report 2007-7244 concerning updating of the maximum capacity in the register was not addressed by the local CAs. Updating of the register was made without assessing the information provided by the operators and the actual maximum capacity of holdings has never been assessed.

5.1.3 Inspections of laying hen farms

Legal requirements

Article 8(1) of Directive 1999/74/EC requires Member States to ensure that the CA carries out inspections to monitor compliance with the provisions of this Directive.

Article 5(2) of Directive 1999/74/EC prohibits bringing into service unenriched cages from 1.1.2003, and requires that Member States ensure that rearing in an unenriched cage system is prohibited from 1.1.2012.

Article 5(1)(4) of Directive 1999/74/EC requires that cages are not less than 35 cm high at any point.

Article 5(1)(1) of Directive 1999/74/EC requires that at least 550 cm² per hen of cage area are

provided.

Article (5)(1)(2) of Directive 1999/74/EC requires that at least 10 cm of feed trough per hen are provided.

Point 3 of the Annex to Directive 1999/74/EC requires that about eight hours of uninterrupted period of darkness and a sufficient period of twilight are provided.

Article 5(1)(3) of Directive 1999/74/EC requires that at least two nipple drinkers are within reach of each cage.

Point 5 of the Annex to Directive 98/58/EC requires that records of the number of mortalities found at each inspection are maintained.

Findings

There are 411 holdings with laying hens covered by Directive 1999/74/EC, distributed among 40 Prefectures. The CCA provided the following information concerning the various rearing systems currently in place:

| Rearing system | No of holdings | % of holdings | No of laying hens | % of laying hens |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| With unenriched cages only | 301 | 73.24 | 4 466 773 | 83.94 |
| With enriched cages only | 5 | 1.22 | 30 500 | 0.58 |
| With both enriched (e) and unenriched (u) cages | 4 | 0.97 | (e) 73 000 (u) 162 500 | 1.38 3.05 |
| Alternative (barn) | 59 | 14.36 | 132 725 | 2.49 |
| Alternative (free range) | 16 | 3.89 | 30 030 | 0.56 |
| Alternative (biological) | 26 | 6.33 | 426 180 | 8 |
| total | 411 | 100 | 5 321 708 | 100 |

The CCA explained that although there are no agreed plans with the farmers for phasing out the unenriched cages, the sector is well aware of the deadline of 31.12.2011. The CCA stated that on several occasions, by means of circular letters, they asked the local CAs to remind farmers of the forthcoming ban. In the two Prefectures visited some farms had started to convert buildings and installations to meet the deadline.

Report 2007-7244 recommended that all laying hen farms meet the requirements of Directive 1999/74/EC, in particular concerning the minimum height and slope of the cages. In response to this recommendation the CCA indicated that non compliance with the minimum height of cages was reported only in two holdings by two local CAs, and non-compliance with the slope was detected in one holding by one local CA which imposed a fine. 11 CAs out of 40 which have holdings with laying hens did not reply on this issue.

The CA of West Attica did not report the above non-compliances. In West Attica there are 1.5 million laying hens reared in 188 holdings, representing 45% of the total number of holdings of

Greece. 148 holdings out of 188 have cage systems, all unenriched. In particular, for the two farms selected by the FVO for the visits, the CA of West Attica indicated that these were in compliance. However, on reviewing the inspection reports and during the visits, this information proved incorrect, not only in relation to the minimum height of cages but also for a number of shortcomings recorded in the inspection reports and not reported to the CCA.

In addition to the above, other serious non-compliances had not even been detected or reported. The following observations were made in relation to the CA inspections in the two holdings visited in West Attica:

- In one holding cages were 20 cm high at the back. The CA had erroneously noted down in the inspection report that the minimum height was 33 cm and nevertheless considered this as in compliance. In the other holding the height at the back of the cages was 15 cm but on the inspection report 40 cm was recorded.
- Unenriched cages had been put in place and brought into service in one holding in 2005.
- The OV had noted down that some cages in one holding were overstocked but had not detected the overstocking in the other holding. Remedial action had been requested but without a deadline. The actual degree of overstocking was 14% and 16% in the two buildings visited on one holding, and 6% in the only building of the other holding.
- The inadequate light regime had been detected for one farm and noted down on the inspection reports of 2008 but no remedial action had been requested.
- The insufficient length of the feeder for the number of hens kept in one type of cage, the insufficient number of nipple drinkers in another type of cage and the lack of records of mortalities had not been identified or not been addressed by the CA.

In Corinthia, where the CA had identified shortcomings in the holdings inspected in 2008 and in 2009, remedial actions had been requested within certain deadlines and follow-up inspections performed. On the holding visited by the mission team, the inspection was generally well carried out by the CA with the exception of the assessment of the maximum capacity of the holding which had not been made. As a result the CA had not detected that this holding was 32% overstocked.

It was noted that the instructions issued by the CCA with circular of 7.3.2008 on how to perform inspections and their follow up were overall quite detailed but did not provide sufficient details on how to assess correctly the maximum number of laying hens that can be reared in the various systems.

Conclusions

Although the CCA has taken steps to ensure that inspections are carried out by the CAs to verify that the minimum standards are met, these are insufficient. Certain CAs did not inform the CCA of the results of the inspections and in the case of one CA visited, the information provided was unreliable. In the same Prefecture the CA had not detected or not reported certain deficiencies including the use of cages which structurally do not comply with EU and national legislation and the introduction of unenriched cages after the legal ban.

Although instructions and check-lists issued by the CCA addressed the majority of issues, these were insufficient regarding the correct calculation of the maximum capacity of holdings with laying hens and which led to insufficient cage area provided.

Additionally, unenriched cages were brought into use after this had been banned on 1.1.2003 and cages which do not meet the structural minimum requirements of Directive 1999/74/EC were still in operation.

5.1.4 Inspection of pig farms

Legal requirements

Article 8(1) of Directive 2008/120/EC requires the CA to carry out inspections on a representative sample of the different rearing systems for pigs.

Article 3(4) of Directive 2008/120/EC requires that all holdings newly built or rebuilt or brought into use for the first time after 1.1.2003 provide for group housing of sows and gilts.

Article 6 of Directive 2008/120/EC requires that appropriate training courses are available, focussing in particular on welfare aspects.

Point 4 of Chapter 1 of Annex I to Directive 2008/120/EC requires that pigs have permanent access to a sufficient quantity of material to enable proper investigation and manipulation activities, such as straw, hay, wood, sawdust, mushroom compost, peat or a mixture of such, which does not compromise the health of the animals.

Point 8 of Chapter 1 of Annex I to Directive 2008/120/EC requires that neither tail docking nor reduction of corner teeth are carried out routinely but only where there is evidence that injuries to sows' teats or to other pigs' ears have occurred, and that before carrying out these procedures, other preventive measures are taken.

Point 5 of the Annex to Directive 98/58/EC requires that records of mortalities found at each inspection are maintained.

Point 13 of the Annex to Directive 98/58/EC requires that an alarm system for automatic equipment is tested regularly.

Article 12 of Directive 93/119/EC requires that animals injured or diseased animals are killed on the spot and transport to slaughterhouse of such animals may be authorised by the CA provided that such transport does not entail further suffering for the animals.

Findings

Report 2007-7244 recommended that checks are carried out by the CA on holdings with pigs and that all pig holdings built or rebuilt from 1.1.2003 provide group housing for sows and gilts. In response to these recommendations, the CCA requested the CAs to perform inspections on pig holdings and, in particular, to provide information on the above specific issues. Out of 55 local CAs, 23 replied that the holdings brought into operation after 2003 were in compliance for the group housing of sows; 15 replied that the holdings were prior to 2003; 14 did not reply; three do not have holdings with pigs.

The CA of West Attica, which had not replied, explained that operating holdings were all in existence prior to 2003. Corinthia was one of the CAs which had replied that holdings were in compliance for the group housing of sows.

Report 2007-7244 recommended that training for stock persons is organised. The CCA explained that despite their commitment, they were not able to organise specific training for the OVs which should in their turn train the farmers.

The CA of West Attica had inspected one holding with pigs in 2008, which was selected by the mission team for the visit. The following observations were made:

- A number of issues had not been noted down in the inspection report so that it was unknown whether these had been checked or not, such as the provision of material for manipulation and investigation and the reason for teeth clipping and tail docking.
- Certain shortcomings were noted down but no remedial action was requested, such as the

lack of records of mortalities and that the alarm system for the ventilation had not been regularly checked.

- Although most requirements were met and the stocking densities were overall adequate, material for manipulation and investigation was not provided, with the exception of one hanging chain in some pens of the weaners' unit. Routine tail docking and teeth clipping were performed as a preventive measure, as stated by both the farmer and the OV. There were no records of mortalities and there were no arrangements to kill on farm sick or injured animals which did not react to treatments. The farmer stated that rearing pigs in such situations would be sent to the nearby slaughterhouse, whereas small piglets would be left to die and disposed of at the rendering plant.

The mission team could not visit a pig holding in Corinthia. The visit was scheduled and agreed in advance with the CA but access to the holding was eventually denied by the farmer for bio security reasons. Despite early notification to do so, the CA had not informed the mission team of these rules.

Conclusions

Information on the implementation of certain requirements of welfare in pig holdings in Greece is incomplete because 25% of local CAs did not provide such information to the CCA. Insufficient co-ordination and collaboration by one local CA prevented the mission team from performing the scheduled visit to a pig farm.

Although the CCA provided sufficient guidance to inspect holdings with pigs, insufficient attention was given to certain important requirements by one local CA visited, in particular concerning the provision of material for investigation and manipulation, the measures to avoid routine mutilations, the maintenance of mortality records and adequate arrangements for killing sick or injured animals on the spot.

The recommendation of previous report 2007/7244 concerning training to pig farmers was not addressed by the CCA.

6 OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

Although the CCA has taken steps to ensure that inspections are carried out by the local CAs to verify that the minimum standards are met, the implementation by the local CAs was still insufficient and sometimes completely lacking. Reporting to the CCA concerning the inspections performed and their results is inconsistent and in some cases unreliable. Regarding laying hens, although instructions and check-lists issued by the CCA were overall adequate, these were insufficient regarding the correct calculation of the maximum capacity of holdings with laying hens and which led to insufficient cage area provided. In addition non-compliant cages continue to be used. Some of these were installed after the ban of 1.1.2003 and some were already in place for many years earlier. Concerning pigs, insufficient attention was given to certain important requirements, such as the provision of material for investigation and manipulation, the measures to avoid routine mutilations, the maintenance of mortality records and the arrangements for killing sick or injured animals on the spot.

The recommendations from previous report 2007-7244 have not been addressed or fully addressed.

7 CLOSING MEETING

A closing meeting was held on 20 November 2009 with the CCA. At this meeting, the main findings and preliminary conclusions of the mission were presented by the FVO team. The

representatives of the CCA acknowledged the findings and conclusions presented, and provided further clarification on some of the issues discussed.

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Competent Authority of Greece, within one month after receipt of the report, provide an action plan to address the following recommendations:

| N°. | Recommendation |
|-----|--|
| 1. | Take measures to ensure that the quality of farm inspections is improved, so that deficiencies are detected and reported and in particular, the minimum space of cage area per hen and the structural requirements of Article 5 of Directive 1999/74/EC are met. |
| 2. | Take measures to ensure that the quality of inspections in holdings with pigs is improved, so that deficiencies are detected and reported, and in particular, material for investigation and manipulation as required by Point 4 of Chapter 1 of Annex I to Directive 2008/120/EC is provided; measures are taken to avoid routine mutilations such as tail docking and teeth clipping, as required by Point 8 of Chapter 1 of Annex I to Directive 2008/120/EC; mortality records are maintained as required by Point 5 of the Annex to Directive 98/58/EC; and adequate arrangements for killing sick or injured animals on the spot are taken as required by Article 12 of Directive 93/119/EC. |
| 3. | Take measures to ensure that training courses on animal welfare are made available to pig farmers as required by Article 6(b) of Directive 2008/120/EC. |
| 4. | Take measures to ensure that the information concerning the results of farm inspections collected and reported by all local CAs is accurate, so that the report to the Commission as referred to in Article 8 of Decision 778/2006/EC is reliable. |
| 5. | Take measures to ensure that the information concerning the maximum capacity of holdings with laying hens recorded as required by the last paragraph of point 1 of the Annex of Directive 2002/4/EC, is accurate. |

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

http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/ap/ap_gr_2009-8243.pdf

ANNEX 1 - LEGAL REFERENCES

| Legal Reference | Official Journal | Title |
|------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Dir. 98/58/EC | OJ L 221, 8.8.1998, p. 23-27 | Council Directive 98/58/EC of 20 July 1998 concerning the protection of animals kept for farming purposes |
| Dir. 1999/74/EC | OJ L 203, 3.8.1999, p. 53-57 | Council Directive 1999/74/EC of 19 July 1999 laying down minimum standards for the protection of laying hens |
| Dir. 2002/4/EC | OJ L 30, 31.1.2002, p. 44-46 | Commission Directive 2002/4/EC of 30 January 2002 on the registration of establishments keeping laying hens, covered by Council Directive 1999/74/EC |
| Dir. 2008/119/EC | OJ L 10, 15.1.2009, p. 7-13 | Council Directive 2008/119/EC of 18 December 2008 laying down minimum standards for the protection of calves |
| Dir. 2008/120/EC | OJ L 47, 18.2.2009, p. 5-13 | Council Directive 2008/120/EC of 18 December 2008 laying down minimum standards for the protection of pigs |
| Dec. 2000/50/EC | OJ L 19, 25.1.2000, p. 51-53 | 2000/50/EC: Commission Decision of 17 December 1999 concerning minimum requirements for the inspection of holdings on which animals are kept for farming purposes |
| 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. 93/119/EC | OJ L 340, 31.12.1993, p. 21-34 | Council Directive 93/119/EC of 22 December 1993 on the protection of animals at the time of slaughter or killing |