EU Zoo Inquiry 2011

An evaluation of the level of implementation and enforcement of EC Directive 1999/22
Directive 1999/22/EC

- Directive came into force in April 2002, when the European Union comprised 15 EU Member States.
- From April 2005 (2007 in the case of Bulgaria and Romania), all EU Member States were required to fully implement and enforce its requirements.
- The Directive provided a framework for Member State legislation, through the licensing and inspection of zoos, to:
  - Strengthen the role of zoos in the conservation of biodiversity
  - Exchange information to promote the protection and conservation of wild animal species.
  - Provide adequate accommodation for animals in zoos that aims to satisfy their biological needs.
  - Ensure animals are provided species-specific enrichment and a high standard of husbandry.
  - Implement programmes of curative veterinary care and the prevention of the escape of animals.

In accordance to the European Community’s obligation to adopt measures for ex situ conservation under Article 9 of the Convention on Biological Diversity (1992).
Pilot study found consistent problems in zoos throughout Spain, believed to be similar in rest of EU

- Lack of implementation of the Directive in some Spanish Regions
- Misinterpretation of definitions / requirements
- Limited Regional/ local implementation: lack of inspection and licensing procedures
- Unknown number of zoos (no national databases)
- Some zoos operating without a licence
- Voluntary and automatic licensing
- Conditions in many zoos believed to be below minimum standards
- Lack of detailed guidance
- Inexperienced staff and zoo inspectorate
- Sub-standard inspection quality
- Lack of resources to inspect zoos
- Irresponsible zoo management
- Lack of planning and expertise to address zoo closure, when necessary
Countries in E.U. (yellow)
Countries participating in the E.U. Zoo Inquiry (green)
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Objectives

• Transposition
  Review of the transposition of the aims and requirements of the Directive 1999/22/EC into Member State law.

• Implementation
  Review the level of implementation of Directive 1999/22/EC and subsequent national law(s) in EU Member State (MS).

• Enforcement
  Review the level of enforcement of zoo laws and the regularity and quality of the zoo inspection.
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Objectives

• Compliance
  Review the status and performance of a selected number of zoos in each MS in relation to nationally/regional requirements.

• Conservation
• Achieving the goals of Article 9, CBD
• Education
• Invasive species
• Animal welfare
• Public safety
• Zoonosis
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Methodology

- Collect national zoo laws and research how they are applied
- Initial meetings with the Competent Authority (CA) in each MS (where possible)
- Questionnaire for CA, govt agencies + veterinary services
  - Application of the law
- Questionnaire for zoos
  - Performance and operations
- Assessment of zoos, their status and performance (on-site visits, publications, website, etc.) against the standards legally required of them
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Methodology

- General zoo information
  - License, species numbers, area, entrance costs, etc.

- Conservation
  - In-situ support, ex-situ, reintroduction, EEP, IUCN Red List, etc.

- Education
  - Public programme, talks / tours, classroom, information, etc.

- Enclosure quality
  - Shelter, security, enrichment, hygiene, enclosure signage, etc.

- Animal wellbeing
  - Behaviour, injuries, condition, space, etc.
19 country reports have been completed.

14 have been published

Available at www.euzoooinquiry.eu
Implementation

FINDINGS

• 2/19 MS have not correctly transposed the Directive

• 1/19 MS has not implemented the Directive at all Regional Government levels

• Since accurate transposition,

→ 2/19 MS have then amended the national law, which is now in breach of the Directive

• 14/19 MS have transposed and implemented the Directive through national legislation
Enforcement

FINDINGS

• 3/19 MS do not have an established zoo inspectorate

• 15/19 MS have not licensed all establishments that would warrant a zoo licence under the Directive

• Efficiency:
  → 18/19 MS do not ensure consistent, regular and effective zoo inspections
  → veterinarians often lack knowledge in animal welfare, particularly concerning wild animals
Animal welfare

FINDINGS

• Zoos in 12/19 MS do not appear to be providing their animals with a complex captive environment

• Environmental enrichment was lacking in the majority of zoos assessed, in all MS

• The majority of the zoos assessed in 7/19 MS appeared to recognise the importance of (and legal requirement for) an complex captive environment to help ensure animal wellbeing
Animal welfare
Public safety

FINDINGS

• Due to poor enclosure design, a lack of stand-off barriers and, in some cases, unlocked enclosures – the public were able to have unsupervised, uncontrolled direct contact with ‘hazardous animals’ in zoos in 16/19 MS.

• The majority of zoos in 12/19 MS actively encouraged the public to have direct contact with wild animals – exposing them to potential physical harm and zoonotic disease.

• Few zoos encouraged the public to wash their hands after contact with wild animals.
Requiring immediate attention:

- MS Competent Authorities lack of knowledge and expertise to effectively interpret and apply the requirements.

- Zoo inspectors lack of knowledge and experience which result in inspections lacking structure, consistency and meaningful outcomes.

- State Veterinarians lack the knowledge and expertise to effectively assess animal well-being, identify poor welfare and address it.

- Zoo operators in many MS do not know how to provide appropriate care for their animals. Without zoo guidance, zoos are often left to their own devices.

- Zoos are not meeting their responsibilities to the conservation of biodiversity under Article 9 of CBD.
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The follow up…
working with the
competent authorities
to seek improvements.

Bulgaria, Cyprus, Ireland and
Romania have established
work plans.

Greece, Latvia, Lithuania,
Poland, Portugal and Slovenia
have indicated that work plans
will be developed and law will
be improved.

Unlicensed zoos identified in
Cyprus, Greece, Latvia,
Romania and the Republic of
Ireland are being licensed.
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• Training of veterinarians in AW in relation to ‘wild animals in captivity’.

• Development of a ‘best practice’ guidance to support the implementation of the EC Directive 1999/22.

• Assist in the development of Action Plans by each MS to address the most severe issues, including amending the law where necessary.

• Consolidation of zoological collections and better use of limited resources.

• Training of zoo inspectors.

• Invitation to EAZA to assist failing zoos.

The EU Zoo Inquiry 2011 at www.euzooinquiry.eu