



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

DG(SANCO) 2010-8389 - MR FINAL

FINAL REPORT OF A SPECIFIC AUDIT

CARRIED OUT IN

ROMANIA

FROM 26 TO 30 APRIL 2010

IN ORDER TO EVALUATE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CONTROLS ON ANIMAL  
WELFARE ON FARMS AND DURING TRANSPORT

IN THE CONTEXT OF A GENERAL AUDIT

## ***Executive Summary***

*This report describes the outcome of a Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) specific audit in Romania which took place between 26 to 30 April 2010, as part of the general audit of Romania carried out under the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 on official food and feed controls of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004.*

*The specific audit evaluated the implementation of national measures, aimed at the control of animal welfare and how these are organised and carried out in accordance with relevant provisions of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, and the multi-annual national control plan (MANCP) prepared by Romania. Specifically the evaluation included measures aimed at the control of animal welfare on farms and during transport. Attention was paid to examining the implementation of corrective actions undertaken in response to the recommendations made in the report of previous FVO animal welfare missions to Romania.*

*The report concludes that the CCA has addressed 5 out of 9 recommendations from the 2007 FVO report and 7 out of 13 recommendations from the 2009-8269 report. The CCA have therefore made sustained efforts to achieve better compliance on animal welfare issues principally by providing training and revising instructions to the county CAs. The approach adopted since 2007 regarding the laying hen sector is starting to show dividends as there has been progress in getting higher levels of compliance; however, it would be premature to conclude that the modernisation of all unenriched cage systems can be achieved by 1.1.2012, as some 42% of holdings would currently not meet the requirements. Likewise with animal welfare during transport there has again been progress but instructions for vehicle approval are recent and have not yet been implemented so that all EU standards are ensured.*

*Regarding the pig sector, which has been included in the scope of an FVO mission for the first time post Accession, although certain deficiencies were not adequately addressed, the incorporation of group housing systems for sows in the newer establishments is a good indication of the willingness to implement EU legislation in this area. Backyard pig farms present a different challenge, not only because they are so numerous, but in relation to the home slaughter of pigs without stunning. In this regard, the CA's publicity initiative has been an important first step, and the next step of making stunning equipment more widely available could at least reduce this practice.*

*The multi-annual national control plan (MANCP) has not yet been developed for prioritising operations and strategies in relation to animal welfare and audits, as required by Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No. 882/2004, have not been carried out on animal welfare controls.*

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

# Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b><u>INTRODUCTION</u></b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b><u>OBJECTIVES OF THE MISSION</u></b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>3</b>	<b><u>LEGAL BASIS FOR THE MISSION</u></b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>4</b>	<b><u>BACKGROUND</u></b> .....	<b>2</b>
4.1	<u>CONTRIBUTION TO THE GENERAL AUDIT</u> .....	2
4.2	<u>SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS FVO MISSION RESULTS</u> .....	2
<b>5</b>	<b><u>FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS RELATED TO IMPLEMENTATION OF REGULATION (EC) no 882/2004</u></b> <b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
5.1	<u>COMPETENT AUTHORITIES</u> .....	3
5.1.1	<u>DESIGNATION OF COMPETENT AUTHORITIES</u> .....	3
5.1.2	<u>CO-OPERATION BETWEEN COMPETENT AUTHORITIES</u> .....	3
5.1.3	<u>CO-OPERATION WITHIN COMPETENT AUTHORITIES</u> .....	4
5.1.4	<u>DELEGATION OF SPECIFIC TASKS RELATED TO OFFICIAL CONTROLS</u> .....	4
5.1.5	<u>CONTINGENCY PLANNING</u> .....	4
5.2	<u>RESOURCES FOR PERFORMANCE OF CONTROLS</u> .....	5
5.2.1	<u>LEGAL BASIS FOR CONTROLS</u> .....	5
5.2.2	<u>STAFFING PROVISION AND FACILITIES</u> .....	5
5.2.3	<u>STAFF QUALIFICATIONS AND TRAINING</u> .....	6
5.3	<u>ORGANISATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF OFFICIAL CONTROLS</u> .....	7
5.3.1	<u>REGISTRATION / APPROVAL OF FOOD BUSINESS OPERATORS</u> .....	7
5.3.2	<u>PRIORITISATION OF OFFICIAL CONTROLS</u> .....	7
5.3.3	<u>CONTROL ACTIVITIES, METHODS AND TECHNIQUES</u> .....	8
5.3.4	<u>SAMPLING AND LABORATORY ANALYSIS</u> .....	8
5.3.5	<u>PROCEDURES FOR PERFORMANCE AND REPORTING OF CONTROL ACTIVITIES</u> .....	8
5.3.6	<u>TRANSPARENCY AND CONFIDENTIALITY</u> .....	9
5.4	<u>ENFORCEMENT MEASURES</u> .....	10
5.4.1	<u>MEASURES IN THE CASE OF NON-COMPLIANCE</u> .....	10
5.4.2	<u>SANCTIONS</u> .....	10
5.5	<u>VERIFICATION AND REVIEW OF OFFICIAL CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES</u> .....	12
5.5.1	<u>VERIFICATION PROCEDURES</u> .....	12
5.5.2	<u>AUDIT</u> .....	12
5.6	<u>MULTI ANNUAL NATIONAL CONTROL PLAN</u> .....	13
<b>6</b>	<b><u>SECTOR SPECIFIC FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS</u></b> .....	<b>13</b>
6.1	<u>ANIMAL WELFARE ON FARMS</u> .....	13
6.1.1	<u>REGISTRATION OF HOLDINGS WITH LAYING HENS</u> .....	13
6.1.2	<u>INSPECTIONS OF LAYING HEN FARMS</u> .....	14
6.1.3	<u>INSPECTIONS OF PIG FARMS</u> .....	16
6.2	<u>ANIMAL WELFARE DURING TRANSPORT</u> .....	17
6.2.1	<u>CHECKS ON TRANSPORT</u> .....	17
<b>7</b>	<b><u>OVERALL CONCLUSION</u></b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>8</b>	<b><u>CLOSING MEETING</u></b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>9</b>	<b><u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u></b> .....	<b>20</b>
	<b><u>ANNEX 1 - LEGAL REFERENCES</u></b> .....	<b>22</b>

#### ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS USED IN THIS REPORT

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
CA	Competent Authority
CCA	Central Competent Authority
DG(SANCO)	Health and Consumers Directorate-General
EC	European Community
EU	European Union
FBO	Food Business Operator
FVO	Food and Veterinary Office
GA	General Audit
MANCP	Single Integrated Multi-Annual National Control Plan
MS	Member State
SA	Specific Audit
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The Specific Audit formed part of the FVO's planned mission programme. It took place in Romania from 26 to 30 April 2010. The audit team comprised two inspectors from the Food and Veterinary Office (FVO). Representatives from the central competent authority (CCA), the National Sanitary Veterinary and Food Safety Authority ( *Autoritatea Nationala Sanitara Veterinara si pentru Siguranta Alimentelor* ), accompanied the audit team for the duration of the audit. An opening meeting was held on 26 April 2010 with the central competent authority. At this meeting, the objectives of, and itinerary for, the specific audit were confirmed by the audit team and the control systems were described by the authorities.

## 2 OBJECTIVES OF THE MISSION

The objectives of the specific audit were to:

- verify that official controls in the sector currently audited are organised and carried out in accordance with relevant provisions of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004, and the multi-annual national control plan (MANCP) prepared by Romania.
- evaluate the implementation of national measures aimed at the control of animal welfare , in accordance with the requirements of EU legislation for animal welfare on farms and during transport. Attention was paid to examining the implementation of corrective actions undertaken in response to the recommendations made in the report of previous FVO missions.

In terms of scope, the audit concentrated primarily on:

- As regards Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 for the sector currently being audited, the organisation of official controls (Articles 3-7), control and verification procedures and methods (Articles 8-10), enforcement (Articles. 54-55), MANCP (Articles 41-42) and registration and approval of establishments (Article 31).
- The following animal welfare legislation concerning the protection of animals kept for farming purposes (Council Directive 98/58/EC), the minimum standards for pigs (Council Directive 2008/120/EC) and laying hens (Council Directive 1999/74/EC) and the protection of animals during transport and related operations (Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005).

The table below lists sites visited and meetings held in order to achieve that objective:

MEETINGS/VISITS		n	COMMENTS
COMPETENT AUTHORITIES	Central	2	Opening and closing meetings with the CAs.
	Regional	2	The Counties CAs of Calarasi and Ialomita.
FARMS		3	Two pig holdings (incl. reproductive pigs) and one laying hen farm (cage system)
ASSEMBLY CENTRES		1	One assembly centre for sheep in the county of Ialomita.
SLAUGHTERHOUSES		1	In Calarasi county (in relation to transport activities).

### **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.

A full list of the legal instruments referred to in this report is provided in the Annex and refers, where applicable, to the last amended version.

### **4 BACKGROUND**

#### **4.1 CONTRIBUTION TO THE GENERAL AUDIT**

Article 45 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires the Commission to carry out general and specific audits in member States. The main purpose of such audits is to verify that, overall, official controls take place in Member States in accordance with the multi-national control plans referred to in Article 41 and in compliance with Community law.

This Specific Audit was carried out as a component of a General Audit to Romania. Section 5 below contains findings and conclusions relating to the implementation of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004; Section 6 below contains findings and conclusions relating to sector specific issues.

#### **4.2 SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS FVO MISSION RESULTS**

Previous animal welfare missions to Romania were carried out in October 2007, May and September 2009 and their results are described in reports DG(SANCO)/7339/2007, DG(SANCO)/8256-2009 and DG(SANCO)/8269-2009 . The reports of these missions (henceforth referred to as reports 7339/2007, 8256-2009 and 8269-2009) have been published on the website of the Directorate – General for Health and Consumers:

[http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/ir\\_search\\_en.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/ir_search_en.cfm)

Report 7339/2007 concerning animal welfare on laying hens and for transport of horses, concluded that measures had been largely ineffective in ensuring that the system of control for animal welfare is satisfactory. First steps had been taken to establish functioning controls, such as the registration of laying hen farms; however, serious non-compliances were seen and have not been adequately addressed by the authorities. In relation to animal welfare during transport some of the measures taken, such as the registration of transporters and means of transport, provide a basic framework for controls, but inspections were not sufficient to ensure that EU requirements were met. As a result, horses and other equidae are transported on long journeys in a way which did not meet the requirements of Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

Report 8256-2009 concerning animal welfare during transport and in particular horses, concluded that although measures on animal welfare have been taken by the Central Competent Authority in the form of training and instruction provided since the previous mission in 2007, the Competent Authority at the county level failed to enforce the relevant EU legislation. Non-compliances in the sector, which were already identified in the previous mission, continue to exist and have not been adequately addressed by the authorities. As a result, equidae continue to be transported on long journeys in a way which does not meet the requirements of Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

Report 8269-2009 concerning welfare of laying hens and animal protection during transport concluded that the CCA has taken action to improve the training of officials for welfare on laying hen premises and during transport but implementation at county level was inconsistent. In relation to laying hens, the CA had taken positive steps to improve the accuracy of data relating to laying hen premises and to accelerate the national modernisation programme for non-compliant establishments. In relation to transport, the CA has put in place a satisfactory documented system for the approval of vessels and for checks at exit points.

## **5 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS RELATED TO IMPLEMENTATION OF REGULATION (EC) NO 882/2004**

### **5.1 COMPETENT AUTHORITIES**

#### *5.1.1 Designation of Competent Authorities*

#### **Legal Requirements**

Article 4(1) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires Member States to designate the competent authorities responsible for official controls.

#### **Findings**

The structure and organisation of the CAs are described in the FVO report DG(SANCO)/8113/2009 country profile of Romania published on the DG SANCO web site [http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/country\\_profiles\\_en.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/country_profiles_en.cfm) . Further information is available on the CCA web site: <http://www.ansvsa.ro/> .

The above documents and the FVO reports 2007/7339, 2009-8256 and 2009-8269 describe the role and responsibilities of the CCA and of other authorities involved in animal welfare controls on farms and during transport.

In addition, the CCA indicated that the National Sanitary and Veterinary Food Safety Agency (NSVFSA) underwent a reorganisation in January 2010 which divided the directorate for inspection and control, the only one authorised to impose sanctions, in three sections: controls, inspection of products of animal origin and inspection of products of non-animal origin. The controls section has supervision responsibilities over the inspection sections.

#### *5.1.2 Co-operation between Competent Authorities*

#### **Legal Requirements**

Article 4(3) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 provides for efficient and effective co-ordination and co-operation between competent authorities.

#### **Findings**

In response to a recommendation from FVO report 2009-8269 the CCA and the Ministry of Agriculture have signed a cooperation protocol regarding information exchange and access to each others databases in order to more effectively enforce the animal welfare requirements of Council Directive 1999/74/EC on laying hen premises.

Regarding the operation of checks on road vehicles, as indicated in previous FVO missions there are formal arrangements for cooperation between the CCA, the Ministry of Administration and

Interior and the Romanian Transport Ministry.

### *5.1.3 Co-operation within Competent Authorities*

#### **Legal Requirements**

Article 4(5) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires that, when, within a competent authority, more than one unit is competent to carry out official controls, efficient and effective co-ordination and co-operation shall be ensured between the different units.

#### **Findings**

Report 2009-8269 highlighted several examples of active coordination and cooperation between the central and county levels of the CA, such as in the preparation and presentation of animal welfare training by county veterinarians and in setting up the system for the authorisation of vessels in Constanta county and the organisation of exit point checks at Midia port.

Concerning exchange of information between the central and county levels of the CA on deficiencies noted during transport, in response to a recommendation from FVO report 2009-8269 the CCA has issued a service note to improve the exchange of this information and enable the requirements of Article 24 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 to be fulfilled. Recent examples in 2010 were noted of communications from counties to the contact point responding to requests for action following receipt of information from other Member States.

### *5.1.4 Delegation of specific tasks related to official controls*

#### **Legal Requirements**

Article 5 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 sets out the scope of possible delegation to control bodies, the criteria for delegation, and the minimum criteria which must be met by control bodies. Where such delegation takes place, the delegating competent authority must organise audits or inspections of the control bodies as necessary. The Commission must be notified about any intended delegation.

#### **Findings**

No delegation of controls in the area of this specific audit.

### *5.1.5 Contingency planning*

#### **Legal Requirements**

Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 also requires that competent authorities have contingency plans in place, and are prepared to operate such plans in the event of an emergency. Article 13 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires Member States to draw up operational contingency plans setting out measures to be implemented without delay when feed or food is found to present a serious risk.

#### **Findings**

Not applicable to this specific audit.

## **Conclusions on Competent Authorities**

The CCA has further strengthened the exchange of information with its county levels and with the agricultural inspectors of the Ministry of Agriculture.

The CCA has also taken measures to improve the exchange of information on deficiencies noted during transport and enable the requirements of Article 24 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 to be fulfilled.

### **5.2 RESOURCES FOR PERFORMANCE OF CONTROLS**

#### *5.2.1 Legal basis for controls*

#### **Legal Requirements**

Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires that the necessary legal powers to carry out controls are in place and that there is an obligation on food business operators to undergo inspection by the competent authorities. Article 8 of the above Regulation requires that competent authorities have the necessary powers of access to food business premises and documentation.

#### **Findings**

This specific audit did not notice any gap in relation to the legal powers of the CAs.

#### *5.2.2 Staffing provision and facilities*

#### **Legal Requirements**

Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires the competent authority to ensure that they have access to a sufficient number of suitably qualified and experienced staff; that appropriate and properly maintained facilities and equipment are available; and that staff performing controls are free of any conflict of interest.

#### **Findings**

- The CCA indicated that as a result of budget restrictions the filling of job vacancies in the CA has been temporarily suspended. This was the case in both regions visited.
- Although no animals were present at the sheep assembly centre during the inspections; facilities provided for inspection, lairaging and loading animals were generally satisfactory. Report 2009-8269 indicated that satisfactory equipment was available for checking environmental parameters in laying hen premises. However, concerning pigs in this 2010 mission, no indication was provided on how the gas concentration or light intensity is checked.
- The mission team did not identify any potential conflicts of interest for the staff involved in animal welfare controls.

### 5.2.3 *Staff qualifications and training*

#### **Legal Requirements**

Article 6 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires competent authorities to ensure that staff receive appropriate training, and are kept up-to-date in their competencies.

#### **Findings**

Report 2009-8269 indicated that training on animal welfare during transport and for cage laying hen premises was provided in 2008, that the training programme for 2009 was stopped in March due to the reorganisation of the NSVFSA and that funds for training planned for the remainder of the year have not been approved.

Report 2009-8269 also indicated how topics of the training plan are selected, that there is no structured approach to identification of training needs for the annual programme and that instead feedback from training sessions and informal communication from county staff may influence the programme developed by the NSVFSA. This informal feedback requested that future training be more focussed on practical aspects of animal welfare controls. Training needs of employees at all levels of the CA are not formally evaluated in the annual job appraisal. Training carried out by the NSVFSA is evaluated by participants according to a formalised procedure.

In 2010 the CA provided training on calculating stocking densities and carrying out inspections in alternative laying hen systems between 22 and 26 of March, in the scope of a twinning project with Germany and the Netherlands. In addition several presentations regarding animal welfare during transport and on farms were provided.

The system of cascade training from county to zonal levels remains as described in the previous report. In the two counties visited, the staff responsible for animal welfare had received training on animal welfare on farms and during transport in 2010, and one of the OVs met was one of the lecturers in March training. Adequate training and guidance material had been provided by the CCA, and in the laying hen visited cage capacities and stocking densities for cage premises had been calculated correctly.

Regarding checks on journey logs, which was also the subject of a previous FVO recommendation on training, those seen from 2009 had been approved even though there were major deficiencies, while the data provided in logs from 2010, albeit in a different region, indicated better compliance. Several local officials were not sufficiently aware of how to assess the criteria relevant to vehicle approval (details are provided in section 6 of this report).

#### **Conclusions on Resources for Performance of Controls**

The CAs have provided mainly satisfactory facilities and equipment so that staff can perform official controls effectively, with the exception of equipment to measure environmental/gas parameters on pig farms. The CCA has taken action to address deficiencies in training identified in the previous report and staff met had received satisfactory training on controls of establishments with laying hens. Training has contributed to better checks of journey logs, but some other more technical aspects of transport have not been adequately explained.

## **5.3 ORGANISATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF OFFICIAL CONTROLS**

### **5.3.1 Registration / approval of food business operators**

#### **Legal Requirements**

Article 31 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires Member States to establish procedures for the registration/approval of food and feed business operators, for reviewing compliance with conditions of registration and for the withdrawal of approvals.

#### **Findings**

Details on the procedures for the registration of holdings with laying hens are described in section 6 of this report.

### **5.3.2 Prioritisation of official controls**

#### **Legal Requirements**

Article 3 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires that official controls are carried out regularly, on a risk basis and with appropriate frequency. Controls shall be carried out at any of the stages of the production and processing chain and, in general, are to be carried out without prior warning. Controls shall be applied with the same care to exports from the Community, imports into the Community and to product placed on the Community market.

#### **Findings**

Report 2009-8269 indicated that the programme of inspections was approved on a weekly basis by the President of the NSVFSA and inspection priorities may change in relation to requests from technical departments, as a result of the diversion of resources to other areas the inspection programme for animal welfare felt behind target in 2009.

The programme of animal welfare checks for 2010 formalises the introduction of risk parameters and a target for checks of backyard pig farms is now indicated. The selection of holdings is made at the beginning of each year by each County. Holdings are selected both randomly and on the basis of risk criteria set in a CCA instruction (previous infringements, large number of animals, increased mortality, use of medicines). The procedures require the inspection of all professional pig holdings and 1% of non-professional holdings (0.5% of holdings with pigs), all laying hen holdings with more than 350 hens are to be inspected too. Details are provided in sections 5.3.3 and 6 of this report.

The same number of checks are programmed for animal health and animal welfare on farms; however in collating the animal welfare inspections carried out, Ialomita county counted the animal health and animal welfare aspects of a single visit separately but included both as animal welfare inspections. As a result their summary had twice as many checks indicated as had actually been carried out.

Regarding transport checks, there is no target for inspections set by central level, the number of checks is decided by each County. It was noted that it is up to each county to prioritise the type of controls based on activities, such as number of slaughterhouses, level of intra-community trade, exports and imports. The plan for 2010 in Calarasi is to check 16 short distance transports and 6

long distance transport; in Ialomita these were 8 and 4 respectively. Details are provided in sections 5.3.3 and 6 of this report.

### *5.3.3 Control activities, methods and techniques*

#### **Legal Requirements**

Article 10 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 specifies the control activities, methods and techniques that should be deployed.

#### **Findings**

- There are integrated animal health and welfare inspections as well as stand-alone animal welfare inspections.
- Checks of backyard pig farms are usually in addition to checks for animal health. The CCA is developing a shortened protocol for the welfare requirements on these farms based on requirements from Directive 98/58/EC.
- Concerning commercial pig farms the CA has chosen to carry out checks on all the listed requirements in Commission Decision 2006/778/EC.
- Each county prioritise the type of transport controls, as a result in Calarasi transport checks were carried out mostly on road-side and in markets, which were mainly focused at enforcing animal health movement requirements. In Ialomita transport checks were mostly at places of destination.

### *5.3.4 Sampling and Laboratory analysis*

#### **Legal Requirements**

Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires competent authorities to have, or to have access to, adequate laboratory capacity. Article 11 of the Regulation establishes requirements for sampling and analysis and Article 12 requires the competent authority to designate laboratories that may carry out analysis of samples taken during official controls. It also lays down accreditation criteria for laboratories so designated.

#### **Findings**

Not applicable to this specific audit.

### *5.3.5 Procedures for performance and reporting of control activities*

#### **Legal Requirements**

Article 8 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires that competent authorities carry out their official controls in accordance with documented procedures, containing information and instructions for staff performing official controls.

Article 9 of the above Regulation requires competent authorities to draw up reports on the official controls carried out, including a description of the purpose of official controls, the methods applied, the results obtained and any action to be taken by the business operator concerned.

## **Findings**

Report 2009-8269 indicated that the CCA has drafted revised procedures which were generally satisfactory and included a full list of EU requirements. Documented procedures relating to checks of laying hen holdings indicated in mission report 2009-8269 have been recently updated, likewise procedures relating to checks of pig and calf holdings. Concerning transport the inspection procedure has also been updated.

However, not all issues were sufficiently clear to several staff such as the assessment of surface of each deck of the vehicle, the head space on board vehicles and how to calculate the ventilation capacity for the vehicle. Details are provided in section 6 of this report.

The CCA instructed the County CAs on how to report transport and farm inspections according to Article 27 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 and Decision 2006/778/EC. Reports from the County CAs were made according to CCA instructions. However, Ialomita reported the deficiencies found during 2009 checks but they were not included in the report at central level and Calarasi did not report the deficiencies found.

For transport checks in Ialomita in 2009, there were discrepancies between the reports kept at central and county level. A recent CCA instruction has been provided on how to report the checks performed on animal welfare during transport as required by Article 27 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005. Details are provided in section 6 of this report.

### *5.3.6 Transparency and confidentiality*

## **Legal Requirements**

Article 7 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires that competent authorities carry out their activities with a high degree of transparency, in particular by giving relevant information to the public as soon as possible. However, information covered by professional secrecy and personal data protection is not to be disclosed.

## **Findings**

Several documents have been made available to the public on the animal welfare section and other sections of the CCA web site, such as most of the instructions and check lists for inspections. The lists of transporters are also available. Working plans and activities of the Counties are available to the public. However, results of the checks performed on animal welfare were not available on the CCA web site. A representative of the CCA indicated that in relation to publicising all their activities on animal welfare, they have come in for some criticism in certain sections of the media for dedicating government resources to animal welfare issues when there are pressing social issues to be addressed in Romania.

## **Conclusions on Organisation and Implementation of Official Controls**

The CCA continues to make good progress in organising official controls which represents action taken in response to recommendations from previous FVO reports. Certain procedures have been recently updated, and staff charged with their implementation need both further explanation and

more time to fully implement them. Checks of animal health and welfare are frequently intergrated, and while this represents better efficiency, by saving on resources and reducing the control burden on the industry, the operational targets for these different issues has not been sufficiently clarified. There is a system for reporting the results of checks to central level and the subsequent processing of this data; however there were some problems with the quality of this information. Recommendation 9 of report 2009-8269 has not been fully addressed.

## **5.4 ENFORCEMENT MEASURES**

### *5.4.1 Measures in the case of non-compliance*

#### **Legal Requirements**

Article 54 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires a competent authority which identifies a non-compliance to take appropriate action to ensure that the operator remedies the situation.

#### **Findings**

Report 2009-8269 indicated that the CA provides copies of inspection reports to operators when non-compliances have been detected in compliance with Article 9.3 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004. There are no written requirements to issue deadlines for corrective actions but the CA has legal powers specified in Government Ordinance 2/2002 to issue warnings, fines and suspend commercial activity until corrective action has been taken.

Regarding farms it was noted that:

- Concerning houses with BP3 cages enforcement action is similar to what is indicated in report 2009-8269. Actions plans are regularly updated and more details are provided in section 6 of this report.
- In the district offices visited, where the mission team reviewed a random selection of the inspections performed in 2009 in pig and laying hen farms, it was noted that following a complaint in Calarasi non compliances concerning welfare of pigs in a backyard farm were detected and a sanction was imposed. However, this was not included in the report to central level required by Decision 778/2006/EC.
- In Ialomita, when non compliances had been detected, decisions had been issued by the CA. Follow-up inspections had been carried out. In holdings with pigs, the follow up inspections had been generally sufficient to ensure compliance, with the exception of certain issues which have proved difficult to solve (see section 6). In holdings with laying hens administrative fines were imposed and follow up checks carried out, in addition the farmer also may receive a warning to enrich the cages after depopulation otherwise the repopulation will not be authorised.

### *5.4.2 Sanctions*

#### **Legal Requirements**

Article 55 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 states that Member States shall lay down the rules on sanctions applicable to infringements of feed and food law and other Community provisions relating to the protection of animal health and welfare and shall take all measures necessary to

ensure that they are implemented. The sanctions provided for must be effective, proportionate and dissuasive.

## Findings

Report 2009-8269 indicated that the law on sanctions in the veterinary and food safety area (Law 984/2005) was modified in 2009 by amendment 564 (of 13 May 2009) which increased the level of penalties and criteria for punishable offences to include specific categories for laying hens, calves and pigs. The CA can now take action relating to specific Community legislation not previously covered by the original law. A further amendment 917 (of 12 August 2009) revoked the concession in Law 984/2005 which allowed a reduction of fines to half the minimum amount if the fine was paid within 48 hours. Fines levied for contraventions which have not been paid within 15 days are passed on to the County fiscal authorities to follow up with the operators. Fiscal authorities contact the County level when fines have been paid.

Report 2009-8269 indicated that the CA had taken documented action when deficiencies in non-compliant BP3 cage systems had been noted and levied fines of RON 1000 (€250). Recent changes to the law on sanctions in the food safety and veterinary area have increased the scope of sanctions applicable for animal welfare offences on laying hen premises. Levels of fines have been increased from a minimum of RON1000 (€250) to RON 3000 (€750) for overstocking offences.

In response to a recommendation in report 2009-8269 to ensure that the enforcement guidance and penalties for non-compliance with Council Directive 1999/74/EC are amended to meet the requirements of Article 55 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 to be effective, dissuasive and proportionate. The CCA indicated that work is in progress to amend by the first half of 2010 the provisions of GD no. 984/2005.

The following was noted:

- Concerning transport in 2009, in Calarasi 13 sanctions were imposed mostly based on animal health or identification grounds and concerned the illegal movement of pigs to markets. One such case also involved an animal welfare infringement and a RON 1200 (€300) fine was imposed, but this sanction was appealed in court and the fine was changed to a warning. In Ialomita there were low numbers of checks and no sanctions were imposed.
- In Ialomita, the operators of two laying hen farms checked in 2009 were fined, one farm with cages was fined twice: RON 6500 (circa 1600€) for use of non-compliant cages (BP3 type) and RON 1000 (circa 250€) for forced moulting of the hens. The second farm, with a daily output of circa 70000 eggs, was fined with RON 400 (circa 100€) for introducing the hens in new cages that were not yet enriched. All fines had been paid.
- The CA indicated that in the first farm it was possible to impose a fine above the upper limit for single offences (RON 1500) because there was a previous penalty. In the second farm the upper limit for single infringement was not imposed as the CA explained that there were mitigating factors which included the late delivery of the cage equipment, which was now on site, and as producers would likely be successful with an appeal as a judge would not usually accept a higher level penalty for a first offence.
- It was noted that in general, for a big farm with circa one hundred thousand hens, it was more economical for the farmer to pay the fines rather than to stop the production of eggs in non-compliant cages.

## **Conclusions on Enforcement Measures**

The majority of enforcement actions have been focused on the laying hen sector with increased inspections and the provision of action plans by producers so that progress can be checked. Although the level and scope for imposing sanctions has been increased, given the daily income obtained by the sale of eggs from non-compliant systems, the fines imposed remain neither proportionate nor sufficiently dissuasive. Recommendation 9 of report 2007-7339 and recommendation 8 of report 2009-8269 have not been fully addressed.

### **5.5 VERIFICATION AND REVIEW OF OFFICIAL CONTROLS AND PROCEDURES**

#### *5.5.1 Verification procedures*

### **Legal Requirements**

Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires the competent authorities to ensure the impartiality, consistency and quality of official controls at all levels and to guarantee the effectiveness and appropriateness of official controls. Article 8 states that they must have procedures in place to verify the effectiveness of official controls, to ensure effectiveness of corrective action and to update documentation where needed.

### **Findings**

Report 2009 -8269 recommended to ensure that procedures for the verification of effectiveness of animal welfare checks on farm are effectively implemented. The inspection team noted that following the subsequent reorganisation of the CA, the supervision of official controls is the responsibility of the section for controls of the inspection and control Directorate. The CCA have recently produced a checklist for use by the control sections to verify the inspections carried out by the inspection and zonal sections.

Concerning supervision by County level, it was noted that in Ialomita the supervision reports were more comprehensive than in Calarasi.

- In Calarasi the non-compliances detected were regarding the training organised by the county, such as that the attendance was not high. However, this verification had not further investigated why no non-compliances were detected on the 15 commercial pig farms inspected in 2009; whereas there were certain long standing deficiencies on the farm visited by the inspection team and detailed in section 6 of this report.
- In Ialomita at the beginning of April 2010, a review of the previous year's farm inspections and each zonal veterinarian was conducted by the responsible person from the controls section. In this report the main irregularities and corrective actions were reviewed.

#### *5.5.2 Audit*

### **Legal Requirements**

Under Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 competent authorities are required to carry out

internal audits, or have external audits carried out. These must be subject to independent scrutiny and carried out in a transparent manner.

## **Findings**

Internal technical audits on animal welfare controls are not planned to start in 2010.

## **Conclusions on Verification Procedures**

There is progress in implementing measures to verify the effectiveness of official controls. Audits as required by Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 on animal welfare were not yet carried out. Recommendation 10 of report 2009-8269 has not been fully addressed.

### **5.6 MULTI ANNUAL NATIONAL CONTROL PLAN**

## **Legal Requirements**

Article 41 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires that each Member State prepares a single integrated multi-annual national control plan (MANCP). According to Article 42 it should be implemented for the first time no later than 1 January 2007 and be regularly updated in light of developments. Details on the type of general information on the structure and organisation of the systems of feed and food control and of animal health and welfare control in the Member State concerned are provided.

## **Findings**

- The chapter concerning animal welfare of the current version of the MANCP of Romania (period 2007-2011) contains basic information regarding this sector, describes the CA but do not indicate how controls are organised.
- The MANCP does not reflect the procedures currently in use by the OV's to perform, ensure compliance, report animal welfare inspections and prioritise such controls.

## **Conclusions on Multi-Annual National Control Plan**

Although the MANCP is drafted in accordance with Article 41 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, the information concerning animal welfare has not been updated to reflect the new organisation and targets for animal welfare controls have not been sufficiently clarified.

## **6 SECTOR SPECIFIC FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

### **6.1 ANIMAL WELFARE ON FARMS**

As recommended in report 2009-8269 Article 4.1(4) of Directive 1999/74/EC on the usable area for birds in alternative systems is in the process of being correctly transposed regarding the derogation to use a stocking density of 12 birds/m<sup>2</sup>.

#### *6.1.1 Registration of holdings with laying hens*

## **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. Article 1(4) of Directive 2002/4/EC requires the register to be updated immediately when changes are notified concerning the registered data.

## **Findings**

Report 2009-8269 indicates that the CCA has completed the registration of holdings with more than 350 laying hens using an electronic database. In the course of populating the database, the CCA requested the CAWS to inspect all laying hen holdings and calculate the maximum capacities of each holding instead of relying on information supplied by the operators.

It was noted that:

- The register is as described in report 2009-8269: formatted in compliance with the Directive, system operational on intranet and data entered at county levels with read only access at the NSVFSA. Service note instructions to the counties were issued to ensure that data was up to date.
- As recommended in mission report 2009-8269 the CCA has issued a procedure to ensure that the information recorded in the register of holdings with laying hens is accurate and when changes occur the register is updated immediately. One discrepancy was noticed by the audit team, where an incorrect value was entered for one of the farms in Constanta; this was corrected after the mission.
- On the laying hen farm visited the maximum capacity had been correctly calculated, Cage equipment needed to be installed to comply with the requirements for enriched cages which could limit the capacity further.

## **Conclusions**

The CCA has taken action so that registered data concerning laying hen holdings is as accurate as possible.

### *6.1.2 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.

## **Findings**

In response to a recommendation in report 2009-8269 to ensure that holdings with laying hens which do not meet the minimum structural standards of Article 5 of Council Directive 1999/74/EC (cage systems) stop operating with immediate effect, the CCA arranged meetings with the producers associations and a service order for the implementation of action plans for the modernisation of holdings with non-compliant cages. The CCA instructed the OVs to carry out quarterly inspections on these holdings to check progress.

The CCA provided the following information on the status of laying hen holdings on 5 May 2010

CA Categories	Type of Holdings	No of holdings	No of active houses	No of birds	%
Category A	Alternative systems (64 holdings)	101 in total	173	1105579	18%
	Improved cages (37 holdings) (Art 6, Directive 1999/74/EC)		90	2209444	37%
Category B	Cages with modernising plan (Art 5, Directive 1999/74/EC)	13	39	350467	6%
Category C	Cages without modernising plan	7	31	953943	16%
Category D	(BP3)	49 (34 have modernising plan)	126	1434317	23%
Total		173	459	6053750	100

According to the above information 58% of all holdings (with 55% of the birds) would already meet 1.1.2012 requirements. Although the remaining 42% would not currently meet requirements, most of these have modernising plans (27% of the total, i.e. 13 category B and 34 category D). 15% need a plan for the phasing out of their cages by 1.1.2012.

Regarding holdings with cages not meeting the requirements of Article 5 of Council Directive 1999/74/EC, there are almost 10% less holdings, 44% less houses and 25% less hens than in September 2009 in this category.

In addition the audit team noted:

- The inspection target was achieved in 2009 in the county visited with laying hens. There were no registered laying hen farms in the second county visited.
- The CA previously indicated (see report 2009-8269) that they would not permit holdings without a satisfactory modernisation plan to continue in production after depopulation of the current flock of laying hens. However, it was noted that six of the 15 Category D holdings which did not have a modernisation plan have been allowed to repopulate between March and October 2010. A CCA representative indicated that more efforts will be made to ensure that there are no hens in BP3 cages by 1 January 2012.
- The main deficiencies identified by the OVs in 2009 in cage systems were, the insufficient height and slope of the non-compliance BP3 cages, the lack of perches, nests and litter area

in enriched cages, and the lack of claw shortening devices in both systems.

- Forced moulting was detected by the CA in a holding with BP3 cages, a fine was imposed (see section 5.4.2).

During the farm visit, the OV adequately checked the capacity of individual cages and the average number of hens per cage and was aware that the introduction of the perches and nest areas before next repopulation has to be taken into consideration in the calculation of stocking densities. The producer had been fined for this missing equipment (see section 5.4.2).

## **Conclusions**

The CCA have made sustained efforts to achieve better compliance in the laying hen sector, albeit with limited scope for imposing meaningful sanctions, and to target those farms which need to modernise before 2012. Although 42% of holdings would not currently meet the requirements, there has been progress with c.10% less non-compliant holdings since September 2009 and the majority of owners/keepers are working with the CA with modernisation plans to meet the 1.1.2012 deadline. The re-population of certain currently non-compliant systems, despite previous CA assurances that this would not happen, undermines the overall progress that has been made. Recommendation 4 of report 2007-7339 and recommendations 6 and 7 of report 2009-8269 have not been fully addressed.

### *6.1.3 Inspections of pig farms*

## **Legal requirements**

Article 8 of Directive 2008/120/EC requires Member States to ensure that inspections are carried out under the responsibility of the competent authority in order to check that the provisions of this Directive are being complied with.

## **Findings**

Training of pig farmers as required by Article 6 of Directive 2008/120/EC was made available by local authorities and by farmers' organisations, and literature available in the farms visited included animal welfare requirements.

Article 3(9) of Directive 2008/120/EC applies to the two farms visited as they were rebuilt after 1.1.2007 (the date of Accession to the EU). The CA demonstrated that the provisions laid down in Article 3 paragraphs 1(b), 2, 4, 5 and the last sentence of paragraph 8 were in compliance in both farms. In particular pregnant sows were accommodated in groups and, in addition, stocking densities complied with those laid down in Article 3 (a) of Directive 2008/120/EC. However it was noted that:

- In both farms visited, the materials provided did not allow proper manipulation and investigation, as required by point 4 of Chapter 1 of Annex I to Directive 2008/120/EC. Routine tail docking was carried out in both farms without sufficient action from the CA to ensure that the farmers had tried changing aspects of the environment or management, as required.
- The CCA has indicated in a checklist that all dry pregnant sows and gilts, are given a sufficient quantity of bulky or high-fibre food as well as high-energy food, as required by Article 3(7) of Directive 2008/120/EC. However, no guidance on what is considered high-fibre or high-energy food was provided to the County CAs and this issue was not investigated by OVs during inspection.

- In the farm visited in Calarasi, there were no animal welfare deficiencies noted in the previous inspection reports. During the visit the mission team identified several deficiencies in particular inappropriate care for sick and injured pigs, contrary to Article 3(8) of Directive 2008/120/EC and point 4 of the Annex to Directive 98/58/EC. Additionally, there was no permanent access to fresh water for the sows kept in individual stalls, contrary to point 7 of Chapter 1 of Annex I to Directive 2008/120/EC.
- In the farm visited in Ialomita, the CA detected the animal welfare deficiencies in the previous inspection reports. A fine of RON1200 (circa 300€) was imposed in 2009 for insufficient manipulable material, but the corrective action subsequently taken still did not adequately address this requirement. No other major deficiencies were noticed.

Regarding backyard pig farms, the CCA had not set a target for checks in 2009. One farm in Calarasi had been visited following a complaint and no checks had yet been made in Ialomita, other counties such as Constanta had started inspections of this category of farm. Apart from insufficient records, the most common major animal welfare deficiencies were related to the standards of buildings (deficiencies found in 10% of checks) and floors (deficiencies found in 3% of checks). Counties are required to check 1% of all types of backyard farms in 2010 (of which 0.5% should be pig farms), as there are an estimated 4 million pigs in backyard farms in Romania, this represents a considerable number of visits.

Concerning stunning of animals prior to slaughter in backyard systems, as required by Article 9(2) of Directive 93/119/EEC, the CCA has mounted a campaign including training of local veterinarians and distribution of posters. By Order 74/2009 of 29 December, published on 12.03.2010, the CCA instructed the counties of plans to provide veterinarians and other staff with stunning equipment for use in backyard farms. The CA indicated that buying of stunning equipment was under public tender.

## **Conclusions**

The pig farms visited generally met the requirements of Directive 2008/120/EC and the requirement for group housing sows was already implemented. However, the requirements for the care of sick and injured animals and the permanent access to manipulable material and other measures to avoid routine tail docking of piglets were not always given adequate priority.

Action is in progress concerning stunning of animals prior to slaughter for personal consumption in backyard systems.

## **6.2 ANIMAL WELFARE DURING TRANSPORT**

### *6.2.1 Checks on transport*

#### **Legal requirements**

Article 14(1)(a)(ii) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 requires that, before long journeys, the CA of the place of departure carries out appropriate checks to verify that the journey log submitted by the organiser is realistic and indicates compliance with this Regulation.

Article 15(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 requires that the CA, at any stage of the long journey, carries out appropriate checks on a random or targeted basis to verify that declared journey times are realistic and that the journey complies with this Regulation and in particular that travel times and rest periods have complied with the limits set out in Chapter V of Annex I.

Point 8 of Annex II to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 requires that a copy of the completed journey log

is returned by the CA of the place of departure within one month after the completion of the journey, unless a navigation system, as referred to in Article 6(9), is used.

## Findings

In relation to approval of means of transport and in response to a recommendation in report 2009-8256, approved means of transport are recorded in an electronic database in a manner enabling them to be rapidly identified by the competent authorities in all Member States, as required by to Article 18.3 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, and are publicly available in the CCA website. Although records of transporters' previous infringements of the legislation on the protection of animals are not yet assessed, the CCA indicated that a database is under preparation. The audit team noted the following:

- The CCA recently update the instructions to CAs, by Order 16/2010, on how to assess the requirements of the means of transport. However, they did not indicate how to calculate the minimum airflow of nominal capacity of 60 m<sup>3</sup>/h/KN of payload, as required by point 3.2 of Chapter VI of the Annex I of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, and did not provide any clarification on what is sufficient headspace to ensure that there is adequate ventilation when the animals are in a naturally standing position, as required by point 1.2 of Chapter II of the Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.
- Field 3 of the Certificate of approval of the long distance vehicles of the Chapter IV of the Annex II to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 requires the area to be specified in m<sup>2</sup>/deck. However, the figure indicated on the approvals seen was the sum of the areas of all the decks.
- The vehicle seen during the visit was approved for long distance transport. However, the watering devices for cattle were not positioned so that each animal has access to water on board the vehicle, as required by point 2.2 of Chapter VI of the Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005. Although the vehicle was fitted with a temperature monitoring system, there was no warning system to alert the driver when the temperature in the compartments where animals are located reaches the maximum or the minimum limit, as required by point 3.4 of Chapter VI to the Annex I of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005. The navigation system on the vehicle did not provide information concerning opening/closing of the loading flap, as required by point 4.1 of Chapter VI to the Annex I of Regulation(EC) No 1/2005.

The procedures in place for dealing with the transport of injured or unfit animals were recently updated by a service note of 24.02.2010 and the requirements of Regulation(EC) No 1/2005 are available on the CCA website.

Concerning checks at departure, the transport of horses from Romania had been temporarily suspended by the CA on a voluntary basis due to animal health reasons; the mission team visited one assembly centre (AC) in Ialomita county authorised for small ruminants. The facilities at the AC were satisfactory and the CA calculated the maximum capacity which was adequate for the average number of sheep transported. There were no vehicles present during the visit. A review of the documentation of a consignment sent to Hungary revealed that:

- The returned journey log indicated 10 hours travel to destination, i.e. average speed 76 km/h.
- Field 3 of the Certificate of approval of the Hungarian vehicle indicated a total area of 132

m<sup>2</sup>, whereas Chapter IV of the Annex II to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 requires the area in m<sup>2</sup>/deck.

- There were 633 sheep stocking with a stocking density of 0.2m<sup>2</sup>/animal, as required by point C of Chapter VII to the Annex I of Regulation (EC) 1/2005. However, this would indicate that four decks were used for this transport and the CA had not produced any guidance on what space is needed above such animals on a four deck vehicle. A CCA representative indicated that further specifications on head space are under consideration for a service note.

The CCA instructions concerning returned journey logs have been implemented in the counties visited as all journey logs requested by the audit team were returned to the issued office.

Concerning the documentation regarding three consignments from Constanta County to a region in the centre of Italy in April 2010, It was noted that:

- Journey logs with incomplete information, such as the estimated total weight and the total space provided for the consignment, had nevertheless been approved.
- One consignment of 700 sheep again indicated that four decks had been used.
- Travel time feasibility was not checked and unrealistic journey times were approved. The CA did not check the drivers' tachographs or the records of the satellite navigation system to ensure that travelling times in Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 are respected.

In relation to the checks during transport the audit team noticed that in 2009:

- In Calarasi checks were performed mostly on transport of pigs (32 checks) at the road-side and in markets, but also in destination. Almost half of these checks detected non-compliances and sanctions were issued. Most were for small consignments that lacked movement documents.
- In Ialomita, the data kept at central level for this county indicated a higher number and different locations of checks than the data kept in the county and sent to central level.
- A representative of the CCA indicated that, following the mission in September 2009, they haven't yet explained the reporting procedures to all those involved as there had not been sufficient time.

In response to a recommendation in report 2009-8269, the CCA has provided more detailed procedures to official veterinarians for the approval of livestock vessels, as required by Article 8(1) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, by order 16/2010. However, certain issues such as how to check requirements for ventilation are not fully explained.

## **Conclusions**

In response to a recommendation in the 2009 FVO report the CCA issued generally good procedures on transport. However, more time is needed for the aspects of control, such as supervision, to make sure that the issues, realistic journey times and fully compliant vehicles operating to required standards, are fully implemented and for the procedure for transporter authorisation to include an assessment of previous infringements. Recommendations 6 and 7 of

report 2007-7339 and recommendation 12 of report 2009-8269 have not been fully addressed.

## 7 OVERALL CONCLUSION

The CCA has addressed 5 out of 9 recommendations from the 2007 FVO report and 7 out of 13 recommendations from 2009-8269 report. The CCA have therefore made sustained efforts to achieve better compliance on animal welfare issues principally by providing training and revising instructions to the county CAs. The approach adopted since 2007 regarding the laying hen sector is starting to show dividends as there has been progress in getting higher levels of compliance; however, it would be premature to conclude that the modernisation of all unenriched cage systems can be achieved by 1.1.2012, as some 42% of holdings would currently not meet the requirements. Likewise with animal welfare during transport there has again been progress but instructions for vehicle approval are recent and have not yet been implemented so that all EU standards are ensured.

Regarding the pig sector, which has been included in the scope of an FVO mission for the first time post Accession, although certain deficiencies were not adequately addressed, the incorporation of group housing systems for sows in the newer establishments is a good indication of the willingness to implement EU legislation in this area. Backyard pig farms present a different challenge, not only because they are so numerous, but in relation to the home slaughter of pigs without stunning. In this regard, the CA's publicity initiative has been an important first step, and the next step of making stunning equipment more widely available could at least reduce this practice.

The multi-annual national control plan (MANCP) has not yet been developed for prioritising operations and strategies in relation to animal welfare.

## 8 CLOSING MEETING

A closing meeting was held on 30 April 2010 with representatives of the central competent authority. At this meeting, the audit team presented the main findings and preliminary conclusions of the mission. The authorities did not express disagreement and stated that they would take whatever actions were necessary in order to achieve the implementation of the animal welfare requirements.

## 9 RECOMMENDATIONS

The competent authorities are invited to provide details of the actions taken and planned, including deadlines for their completion ('action plan'), aimed at addressing the recommendations set out below, within twenty five working days of receipt of this specific audit report.

<b>N°.</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
1.	Recommendations 4, 6, 7, and 9 are outstanding from the previous report 2007-7339 and require urgent action.
2.	Recommendations 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 12 are outstanding from the previous report 2009-8269 and require urgent action.
3.	The CA should further develop procedures, as required by Article 8 of Regulation (EC)

N°.	Recommendation
	No 882/2004, and provide equipment, as required by Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, so that checks of the welfare of pigs can be strengthened.
4.	The CA should ensure that any records of serious infringements of EU and/or national legislation on the protection of animals application are acted upon, as required by Art. 10 (1)(c) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, in relation to the authorisation of transporters.
5.	The CA should ensure that audits are carried out, as required by Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, which include controls of animal welfare on farms and during transport.
6.	The CA should ensure that the Multi-annual control plan, as required by Article 41 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, reflects the organisation of the system of control for animal welfare and the strategic objectives relating to animal welfare.

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

[http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/ap/ap\\_ro\\_2010-8389.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/ap/ap_ro_2010-8389.pdf)

**ANNEX 1 - LEGAL REFERENCES**

<b>Legal Reference</b>	<b>Official Journal</b>	<b>Title</b>
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. 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
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
Reg. 1/2005	OJ L 3, 5.1.2005, p. 1-44	Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 of 22 December 2004 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations and amending Directives 64/432/EEC and 93/119/EC and Regulation (EC) No 1255/97
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. 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
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